Mythological Paradigms in the Linguistic Picture of the World

Pulatova Sarvinoz Botirovna*

*National University of Uzbekistan,

Uzbekistan.

Abstract

The article is devoted to contemporary problems of comparative linguistics and cultural studies in the light of the theory of myth-making and the linguistic picture of the world using the example of the mythological code of the model of the world and its representation in English, Uzbek and Russian.

Keywords: Myth-Making Activity, Language-Text, Language Interaction.

Introduction

Myth-creating consciousness accompanies human cognitive activity throughout the history of his civilization. The mythological penetrates the deepest thought processes. The history of spiritual culture shows that myth-making is a manifestation of some yet insufficiently studied features of human spirituality [1, p. 9]. In modern conditions, the effectiveness of myth as an important cultural factor is increasing, since the mythopoetic strata of culture can serve as a powerful moral basis for spiritual education.

The unified theory of myth that is emerging today has significant prospects. Myth-making is studied as a cognitive ability of consciousness and is recognized as a necessary and regular phase in the logic of the development of thinking from image to thought. The essence of this myth-creating phase is that thought is formed as a result of operations on sensory images of objects. Operations on images allow revealing relationships between objects, i.e. judge some aspects of reality represented in the images not directly, but indirectly. Relations are expressed through abstractions that highlight some properties in the content of the image, but do not reflect the essential relationships of this object. At this stage of thinking, the subject does not yet distinguish his subjective attitude to something from the objective situation. The transition from mythological to conceptual thinking occurs when not only visual images, but also the objects themselves act as

the subject of thought. The active relations of the subject with the object lead to the activation of the "world-man" system, to the construction of new objects, to the transformation of thinking, to the improvement of all mental activity. The weakening of the will to knowledge leads to the revival of the myth-creating function of consciousness [1, p. 427].

Attitude to myths in different periods was extremely polar. But a modern person with his vast historical experience of knowing and transforming the world has enough reasons not only to admire the artistry of myths, but also to study them, benefiting from the valuable heritage of the cognitive activities of various civilizations.

At the beginning of the second half of the 20th century, qualitative changes took place in cultural anthropology. Researchers began to study not things, not facts or objects (tangible and intangible) that distinguish one culture from another, but interpretations of things, the meanings that objects are endowed with representatives of different cultures. This allowed us to see global trends in the development of world culture, to understand which categories of cultural phenomena are interdependent.

In recent years, experts in the field of intercultural studies have begun to admit that much in the development of world culture is the result of elementary copying. The bearers of a particular culture act either unconsciously or consider it their sacred duty to follow the traditions of their ancestors. And since some changes and mistakes are inevitable in this process of transferring traditions, the history of mankind is the result of unpredictable activity. But certain forms of social organization, ideology, technology depend not only on one another, but also on the natural environment. Therefore, migration and cultural contacts are not the whole story, but its very essential part.

The totality of data on the mythology of the peoples of the world is an important source for the reconstruction of some historical processes. Similar motifs in myths help to discover long-broken ties between groups of people. Long-range relocations, colonization of vast territories, long and short contacts between people and different cultures, cultural unification, along with a contrasting abundance and diversity of cultures, could not leave their traces in the mythology of the peoples of the world [2, p. 403].

Myths as texts are part of fiction. Myths as images of the world, myths, concepts serve as a sign or metaphor for something that is a material for scientific interpretation. Comparative linguistics also helps to recreate the picture of the historical path of culture. The work of such prominent linguists as F. de Saussure, I. A. Baudouin de Courte-ne, O. Jespersen, E. Sepir, R. O. Jacobson, N. S. Trubetskoy, K. Levy-Strauss, contributed to the emergence and the development of the ideas of symbolism, a structural analysis of culture, structural linguistics, the theory of sign systems.

Culture is not only text, not only a sign system that is stable in time, but also organized activity, which is aimed at providing for the life support and survival of people. Mythology is one way to streamline the world around us, to represent in a symbolic form some collective values, encoded representations of a group of people about themselves and others. And although individual mythologies are completely different from each other, the materials collected over the past 200

years indicate that some patterns and trends are traced in them [2, p. eighteen]. Individual episodes and images are repeated and spread across all continents. And the content of myths, their plots do not vary endlessly.

The following stages can be distinguished in the history of the interpretation of myths. A rationalistic approach in the era of antiquity, contradictory in the era of the Middle Ages, valuable in the era of Enlightenment, romantic and philosophical in the era of romanticism [1, p. 20-200]. In the 19th century, the theory of myth-making was already developing in such forms as evolutionism (E. Taylor and others), Freudianism (Z. Freud and others), psychologism (R. Benedict and others). In the 20th century, the idea of the collective unconscious and archetype (C. Jung et al.), The solar-lunar interpretation (M. Müller), the idea of a "world tree" (V. N. Toporov), the theory of tropes (I. M. Dyakonov) were put forward , The theory of the sign, symbolic and code nature of myth (E. Cassirer). Since the second half of the 20th century, thanks to powerful scientific progress, structuralism has been developing (C. Levy-Strauss, R. Jacobson), social anthropology (O. Redcliff-Brown), the theory of the influence of migrations and historical contacts (F. Boas), a functional approach to mythology (B. Malinovsky), the historical and geographical direction of the study of myths (K. Kron), migrationism (Fr. Ratzel), etc. [2, p. 18-80].

At the same time, the researchers concluded that certain myths were simply and easily borrowed or translated into other languages. And the bearers of different traditions interpreted them in their own way. But we will never know what was in the very "beginning" of history in the same way as, obviously, we will never know how the first words arose and which language was the very first. But right now, the data of such sciences as archeology, anthropology, population genetics, comparative linguistics allow us to draw up a rather detailed diagram of the development of culture and turn to mythology as a serious historical source [2, p. 79]. We need a complete picture of the past, and this can be done if all known and existing facts and materials are used in a complex and systematic way.

A person looking at the world could not and cannot be absolutely objective. Even scientific knowledge is not the result of knowledge abstracted from generic anthropomorphism. It is impossible to look at the world with absolute objectivity. The knowledge gained in one sphere of experience extends to other spheres and fits into the picture of the world. Mythological thinking forms precisely the picture of the world, modeled in the image and likeness of a person, since a person perceives himself living in one reality, which for him is both the inner world and the outside world, and he himself and the whole Universe.

A mythical symbol is a symbol to the extent that it is simply a thing or object. Any real object is a symbol, because we perceive it as directly and independently existing. The mythical symbol is history, as it is associated with the empirical formation of man. The symbol of a thing is its meaning, which model generates and constructs it. The symbol of a thing is its generalization, which introduces a semantic regularity into objects [3, p. 42-45]. Myths are certain predictions, transmitted from generation to generation, elements of a person's real existence in real conditions or created by a person's imagination about phenomena that he doesn't know. According to K. G. Jung, over time, myths lose their original real basis and become archetypes or prototypes of some knowledge, the so-called collective unconscious. Changes in living conditions transform the myth into a symbol, which in turn becomes a sign - a shortened-generalized meaning of what lies behind

the symbol and myth. Moreover, each sign is associated with many objects and many meanings, which allows it to serve to designate many objects.

The first function of the language is modeling the world around it. The essence of this process is a formal description of objects, their properties, relationships, with the aim of orienting the subject in the world and managing it. This is a mental reproduction of the image of the world, based on visual perception.

The next stage in the perception of reality (physical objects) is symbolic or symbolic. Thought objects (i.e. known properties and attributes) get their name. Only those signs that are most necessary for the performance of some activity are highlighted and signified. Therefore, a separate mental image gets its name. Each object is perceived as a set of features, a nomination is an assignment to an object of one of these properties. The material embodiment of this perception (image) of an object is a sign.

Any activity of a person as a social being is oriented to another person. This is also the language activity, communication - the transfer and storage of information, knowledge, culture. This is the second language feature.

Today, the archetype has a broader cultural meaning. This is not only a "collective unconscious", but a certain set of ideas that rely on genetic memory and do not correspond to actual empirical experience or even contradict it.

Every person from birth is faced with the already existing and continuously carried out around him and next to him activities. With this approach, the universe of social activity can no longer be considered as belonging to people as their attribute. On the contrary, people themselves appear to belong to the activity and are included in it as elements along with machines, things, signs, social organizations, etc. Activity turns out to be a system with numerous and diverse functional and material components and the relationships between them.

Then it is logical to assume that a person exists in a world that is organized as a result of his (and many others) activities and is built as a system of certain symbols. Human social activity is considered as the initial universal integrity broader than the people themselves. The mystery of speech-language as an element of activity is that all forms of the existence of a sign are equally real, and the sign itself (or speech-language) exists as a systemic unity of all these forms. Meanings and meanings are different components of a sign, giving it different ways and forms of existence in syntagmatics and paradigmatics, social situations and culture [3, p. 76]. Thus, an individual discovers his ideas and knowledge about the world when it is signified by means of linguistic units. In the process of signification, a lot of semantic units are formed, each of which, representing a two-sided language unit, corresponds to a certain ideal entity and may be adequate or inadequate to reality, but it does not coincide with it and cannot coincide.

Any movement of thought can receive an infinite number of language incarnations, just as any language material can receive an infinite number of language rethinking. The main task in the analysis of linguistic meaning is to not lose sight of, on the one hand, the openness and mobility of meaning, on the other hand, its embodiment in linguistic material and attachment to objective language utterance, the form of which is empirically obvious and objective.

A characteristic feature of modern linguistic semantics is that it seeks to cross the boundaries of only linguistics or only literature. Attention arises to other problems, to a deeper layer that embraces spiritual life. The transition from linguistic to non-linguistic structures allows us to speak of a semiotic description of the model of the world both at the level of universals and in projection onto specific traditions. The boundaries between language and culture become arbitrary, language acts as an important factor in culture itself, and culture is conceived as content realized in language [4, p. 33]. In this way, the language is presented and explored as a text: paradigmatics moves to the syntagmatic level, becoming a text of a special kind.

Modern opportunities for the exchange of information in the global global space make N. S. Trubetskoy's ideas on a specific form of linguistic interaction and on a "multicultural personality" especially geographically unlimited in space. This theory was then successfully developed by R. O. Jacobson and other members of the Prague Linguistic Circle as applied to Eurasian languages. Using the idea of a linguistic union to a huge linguistic space allows us to discover connections of a completely different scale between language systems, which must be interpreted at a completely different paradigmatic level.

The study of languages in the aspect of linguistic union at an early stage attracts in addition to linguistics (comparative studies, linguistic geography, areal linguistics) such disciplines as ethnolinguistics, cultural anthropology, semiotics, etc. At the level of verbal text, this means the involvement of fiction, which in turn brings to the concept of cultural space (European, Eurasian, Balkan, etc.). At the paradigmatic level, one can speak of a language whose grammar and vocabulary form a model of the world, and at the syntagmatic level - of a "complex text" built on this vocabulary, according to the rules of this grammar [4, p. 173]. A text understood in this way acquires a promotional aspect and becomes an action / action. A vivid manifestation of such a complex text is a myth.

Like any classification has its origin, the description of the model of the world goes back to the archetypal model of the world and is verified precisely by the archetype. The synchronous level of the world model and the principle of its structure can be described and understood also from the study of the archetype. A comparison of different world models and linguistic pictures of the world makes it possible to "go beyond," to find common ground where it is least expected. This approach is based on the universals of the human mentality. This probably happened to everyone when, for example, he was thinking about something recently, "suddenly" it became the subject of news or some kind of talk show. Assuming that consciousness is indeed not subject to the limitations of space and time, then it is possibly "one for all people." And if this is so, then the percentage of random coincidences is greatly reduced, and the concept of "border" is expanding significantly - spiritual processes divide space and time in a completely different way.

According to her host, foreign and domestic rock musicians are increasingly using mythological plots in their work. Indeed, in an interview with Dark City magazine, Finnish musicians from the Amorphis group admit that the Karelian-Finnish epos "Kalevala" serves as a unifying force for their work, it is their practically inexhaustible source of inspiration [5, p. 14]. And in the radio talk, it was about the element of the Wind, which, it turns out, more than a dozen musicians around the world have chosen as the name or theme of their compositions. Just looking at a fairly impressive list of their names, without resorting to the content, confirms this idea ("The

Wind of Change" Scorpions, "Wild is the Wind" David Bowie, "Whispering Wind" Moby, "But the wind was stronger 'Diary of Dreams , "Last Wind", "Wind Embraced" Nightwish, "The Wind Is Always Alone" Time Machine, "Wind of Random Lucks" by K. Nikolsky and others). Names chosen by us exclusively with an allegorical attitude to the wind indicate a nonrandom interest of musicians in this symbol.

Thus, the interpretation of only one unit of the mythological dictionary and one sign of the mythological code of the world model, one of the symbols of spiritual culture made it possible to present not only the text of the linguistic picture of the world, but also to reflect the history of world culture - human life and the history of society as the result of centuries of knowledge of the real world.

Reference

Naydysh V. M. Mythology. M.: Knorus, 2010.432 p.

Berezkin Yu. E. Myths of the Old and New Worlds. From the Old to the New World: Myths of the World. M.: AST; Astrel, 2009.448 p.

Prokhorov Yu. E. In search of a concept. M.: Nauka, 2008.17 p.

Tsivyan T. V. Language: theme and variations: favorites: in 2 books. M.: Nauka, 2008. Book. 1. Balkanistics. 314 p.

Amorphis II DarkCity. 2009. No51. pp. 14-15.

Encyclopedia of symbols, signs, emblems. M.: Eksmo, 2005.

Mythology: encyclopedia of the first chapter. ed. E. M. Meletinsky. M.: Big Russian Encyclopedia, 2008. p. 73. URL: http: IIen.wikipedia.orgIwikiIWind_god.

Lisichkina E. Ayurveda, equilibrium medicine II Psychologies. 2011. No57. pp. 134-138.