

LINGUACULTURAL ANALYSIS AS A MEANS OF CONCEPTUALIZING REALITY

Zilola Abdulkhayit qizi Alibekova*

*Teacher,

Department of Foreign Languages in Natural and Exact Sciences,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN

Email id: alibekovazilola91@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2022.00127.7

ABSTRACT

It is of theoretical and practical importance to study any language from different angles, from different approaches. In particular, it is no exaggeration to say that the study of linguoculture plays a Turkish role in our understanding of many issues that are beyond the reach of language. The emergence of linguoculturology is associated with an interest in the interaction of culture and language, and an attempt to understand the phenomenon of culture as a specific form of human existence in the world. At the same time, language serves as a means of interpreting human culture, the mentality of the people. The article discusses the emergence of linguoculturology in relation to the interaction of culture and language, the main thing in the linguistic description of the world is the knowledge reinforced in the words and phrases of certain languages, which cover all the conceptual content of language.

KEYWORDS: *Linguoculturology, Conceptual Content, Linguistic View Of The World, Language, Thinking, Cognitive Need, Cultural Memory, Interaction Of Culture, Mentality, Linguistic Image Of The World.*

INTRODUCTION

Today, an integral part of human life, humanity has experienced a variety of civilizations, even without all the modern technology, computers, the Internet, mobile communications, which we can not do without them. However, it is language that is as necessary to humanity as water and air. Language, on the other hand, is the ability to live, to find a language that embodies many of the characteristics of the individual, such as nationality, social class, worldview, and so on. In this regard, it is of theoretical and practical importance to clearly define it from different angles, from different approaches. In particular, it is no exaggeration to say that the study of linguistics also plays a Turkish role in our understanding of many issues from the point of view of language.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Linguoculturology is associated with a close interest in the interrelated network of cultures and languages that can be identified, and the cultural phenomenon has a unique character that exists in the world [1]. At the same time, language serves as a means of direct use of human culture, the mentality of the people. Modern linguistics and cultural studies are rooted in the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who openly acknowledged the development of the vernacular, the development of education and culture, and the indirect connection between them. In the 19th and 21st centuries, the language and culture movement emerged in relations: in foreign linguistics (V.Humboldt, J. Weisgerber, E. Benvenist, etc.), in the knowledge of the Russian language (I. A. Boduen-de-Kurtene, F. Buslaev, A.Potebnya and others), semiotics (Yu.Lotman and others), cognitive

linguistics (N.Boldirev, V.Krasnix, E.Kubryakova, Z.Popova and others), cultural linguistics (S.Vorkev, V.Vrobi. V. Maslova). As a result of scientific research, views on the literary text were formed as a “condenser of cultural memory” (Yu. Lotman), “unity of culture” (V. Krasnix) [2].

“Cultural linguistics studies language as a quality of culture”, and language itself “works as a quality in the form of a special national mentality”, “condition, basic and fundamental of culture”; “Cultural linguistics is a synthesizing type of construction science that studies the relationship and management of the state of culture and language, and reflects this process as an inseparability of units in the linguistic and extralinguistic composition when using systematic methods. The source is created as a set of views on these disciplines: “modern sustainability and development of cultural institutions [3]”.

In the history of a number of languages and literatures, in particular, the Turkic, national and pre-national stages are distinguished, and we believe that it is appropriate to use the combination of “ethnic culture” in this linguocultural analysis. For example, in Bashkir and, accordingly, in scientific terminology, the word “culture” in Russian corresponds to two lexemes - culture. The second, common term etymologically corresponds to the Persian language (culture - civilization, culture) [4]. In Arabic (culture - culture, civilization), in turn, is formed in the first sense from the verb “to build, to build cities” (maddana). Thus, the term culture is considered to have secretly embodied traces of the idea that the ancient Arab cities were more developed, centers of “cultural” life and cultural-urban, cultural and Bedouin-nomadic, savage opposition. This contradiction was reflected in some aspects of the Muslim religion and remained relevant even during the period of assimilation of Arabic words into Persian, and began to be used culturally in the Turkic languages as well [5]. Thus, culture is “all the ways of life and activity in the world that belong to a particular people, as well as the relationships between people (customs, rituals, communication features, etc.) and the ways of seeing, understanding and changing the world [6]”. Culture creates important events for linguists, such as “cultural image” and “cultural memory”. A cultural background is a characteristic of nominative units (words and phraseological units) that represent social life events and historical events that belong to a particular cultural and linguistic community. The “cultural memory” of a language unit is the association given by the language unit and derived from its past usage, regulating modern meaning [7]. Analyzing the relationship between language and culture, E. Sapir rejected the assumption that they are directly related, especially at the structural level, and warned linguists not to define “language by its vocabulary.” The theory of language relativity, first of all, emphasized that languages leave only a specific mark in the universal categories of thinking: “For us, languages are more than systems of thought transmission [8]. They are invisible veils that clothe our soul and give a predetermined shape to all its symbolic expression”, so we can consider language as a symbolic guide to understanding culture [9]. Many cultural objects and events are so connected with their terminology that the study of the distribution of terms of cultural significance often allows us to see the history of discoveries. ideas from a new perspective” [10]. Thus, the authors of the theory of linguistic relativity, although they did not form it directly, approached an important concept for modern linguoculturology, such as the linguistic picture of the world.

The phrase “picture of the world” came into linguistics from the natural sciences. It is believed that it was first used in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the field of theoretical physics. Used by U.Gerts in relation to the physical picture of the world, he interpreted it as a collection of internal images of external objects from which logical information about the behavior of these objects can be derived. It should be noted that the picture of the world is not the truth itself, but a model of reality. The German physicist Max Planck drew attention to this, noting that the concept of a world image began to be applied out of fear of the illusion of defining a theoretical object and reality [13]. The definition of the boundaries and nature of this concept was made by Albert Einstein, who argued that man “seeks to somehow adequately create a simple and clear picture of

the world within himself in order to separate himself from the world of perception". The artist, the poet, the theorist, the philosopher, and the naturalist all do it in their own way. Man shifts the center of gravity of his spiritual life to this picture and its design, striving to find peace and confidence in it. It shows aspects of the images of the great physical world, such as their incompatibility with the real world and emotional experience, their dependence on the particular spiritual and cognitive needs of the individual, and their multiplicity. Nowadays, it is common to highlight scientific, artistic, linguistic and other images of the world [12]. The concept of "Linguistic Image of the World" (LIW) remains relevant in the study of the relationship between language, thought and culture. A linguistic image of the world is a collection of ideas about the world that are historically formed in the ordinary mind of a particular language community and reflected in the language, a certain way of conceptualizing reality. In the formation of pictures of the world, language is involved in two processes: on the one hand, it serves as the environment and material from which the linguistic picture of the world is formed; on the other hand, it represents and explains other images of the world. That is, it incorporates into them the features of man and his culture [13]. Thus, with the help of language, the knowledge gained by individuals through experience becomes collective knowledge. Consequently, the linguistic picture of the world is all information about the external and internal world reinforced by living languages. The main thing in the linguistic description of the world is the knowledge reinforced in the words and phrases of certain languages, in the narrow sense the linguistic picture of the world as a whole, the whole conceptual content of a given language is obtained [14]. Different languages give the pictures of the world only uniqueness, national color, uniqueness, which is explained by the differences in the cultures and traditions of the peoples. Here the worldview is reflected on the content side of the ethnos language. His analysis helps to understand how national cultures differ, how they complement each other at the level of world cultures. The most detailed analysis of the concept of "linguistic image of the world" and its derivatives was made by O. Kornilov in the monograph "Linguistic images of the world as a product of national mentalities" [15]. The scientist distinguishes the scientific worldview (LIW) - a set of scientific knowledge about the world developed by all private sciences at this stage of development of human society. The national scientific picture of the world - the national form of the general content invariant and the national language, which is the linguistic image of the world. The second, according to the author, is the result of the reflection of the objective world by the ordinary (linguistic) consciousness of a particular language community. Indeed, only the analysis of national languages is the national language image of the world (NLIW), which he described as "the result of the reflection of the objective world by everyday (linguistic) language." Considered as the consciousness of a particular language community, a particular ethnic group also emphasizes the individual linguistic picture of the world (ILPW) - "the result of the reflection of the objective world by the ordinary (linguistic) consciousness of the individual, the native speaker of a particular national language" [18].

The understanding of the national identity, a theoretically detailed description of its unity, necessity and incompatibility, is characterized by the expression of the essence, the legitimacy of this phenomenon in a logically coherent system of concepts of language and culture. Achieving this goal is considered possible only if the basis of the object of knowledge, which is nothing but the national person himself, is found. Society and the people play an important role in determining the existence of an individual in the national definition [19].

Linguoculturological research pays special attention to the ethnolinguistic culture of the language, which significantly facilitates the understanding and acceptance of the national outlook of another people and its peculiarities in intercultural communication. It also makes a huge contribution to cultivating a sense of tolerance in the younger generation, helping them to consciously master languages as scholars. While the relationship between language and the cultural identity of the

person speaking it is unclear, language is a delicate indicator of the relationship between an individual and the linguocultural community to which he or she belongs [20]. According to O. Kornilov, the words "understanding culture" are especially important and reflect a certain culture. Through the linguistic depiction of the world, language becomes one of the means of conceptual direction in life, leaving its mark on people's perception of the reality around them [20]. The linguistic representation of the world is studied in two main ways - the sorting and discovery of worldviews specific to individual languages, i.e. the study of individual concepts specific to a particular language and the sorting of existing results achieved or the introduction of innovations as a result of their processing. The concepts are directly related to the value and semantic orientations of cultural and linguistic communities, as they provide simple similarities to the terms "philosophical concepts of life" and "worldview reinforced in the dictionary of natural languages" and ensure their stability and continuity [21].

In this sense, concepts serve as units of everyday, mainly ethnic consciousness. Their main features are: cultural significance, axiological coloring, and worldview orientation [22]. The question of which words and concepts can be considered concepts remains controversial. There are a number of criteria that allow us to look at a phenomenon as a concept: "Reality events that are relevant and valuable only to a particular culture, with many linguistic units to define them, are the subject of proverbs and sayings. proverbs, poetic and prose texts become concepts" [23]. Concepts arise as a result of the interaction of national traditions and folklore, religion and ideology, life experiences and images of art, the system of emotions and values. The most important concepts for culture are called culture "keywords". They originated in ancient times and can still be traced through the views of thinkers, writers, and ordinary native speakers. "Keywords" are words that have a special meaning and reflect a particular culture [24]. Of course, each word will be reflected in a specific culture according to its application and place in the life of the people. For example, Uzbeks use "qo'zichog'im" and "bo'talog'im" to caress a child, while Russians use "cho'chqacham". The contradictions in the words used by the two peoples in the same situation here are in fact a verbal reflection of the cultural life of the representatives of different nations. The Uzbeks also use the phrase "*Ot olsang Oboqlidan ol, xotin olsang Irg'alidanol.*" In addition, as the level of cultural identity narrows, so does the Surkhandarya region of Uzbekistan. Analyzing this issue in the case of abstract horses, the Uzbeks say, "*Qaribilganniparibilmas*", in English it is translated like this: Shaytan knows a lot because he lived a long time) and two different abstract names, "angel" and "shaytan" are used in the same situation. That is, the nation is thus expressing its knowledgeable elders by an abstract horse. A number of researchers distinguish cultural concepts as the names of special class - abstract concepts, to which cultural information is attached.

The cultural concept in linguistic consciousness is manifested as a network of multifaceted meanings, which are characterized by lexical, phraseological units, precedent texts, moral formulas, and speech-behavioral tactics. Concluding a brief analysis of the definitions given to the concept, it should be noted that almost all authors note its three-dimensional structure: the concept is the unity of mental, ethno-cultural and linguistic layers. Mentality, on the other hand, is defined as a set of mental processes that involve building a specific picture of the world. For linguoculturologists, the phenomenon of specificity in the composition of mental units, the sum of the specific semantic features of certain cultural concepts, and the systematic description are of the greatest interest. In this trend, linguaculturological research is more onomasiologically oriented, moving from the name of the concept to the set of meanings it represents. To date, the methodology for describing and analyzing concepts has been most clearly developed within the framework of cognitive linguistics. It should also be noted that within a given language it is possible to distinguish and consider not one conceptual field (of a particular language in general) but several: in this case the conceptual areas are "assigned" to different conceptual for example,

“the field of the concept of courage”), discursive (the field of political concept), creative fields, individual texts or their groups such as poetry, art (Marina Tsvetaeva’s conceptual sphere) and others. Within a conceptsphere, universal concepts are culture-specific concepts that are present in all or most of the world’s languages and cultures and embody the characteristics of a particular ethnic culture. The concept of “cultural identity” is related to the English word specific to culture, meaning “belonging to a particular culture, and expressing its distinctive features”. The linguistic basis of this phenomenon consists of words expressing reality, culturally specific words and phrases, lexical units with stable associative connections, as well as fragments of culturally significant text from the national literary treasury.

It should be borne in mind that culturally specific words are a conceptual tool that reflects the experience of thinking in a certain way about society’s past behaviors and different things. As society changes, these tools can also be gradually changed or abolished. The basic unit of linguoculturological description is a concept considered in terms of culture, and for ease of definition, the term "linguocultural" or "linguocultural concept" was introduced to avoid confusion with units of study of related disciplines - a traditional mental unit aimed at complex expression of language, consciousness and culture. Linguoculturological analysis may be particularly informative units. The first term is derived from the Latin word *realis* "real, material, real" and has been used mainly in the science of translation since the 1950s. Linguistic, cultural and translation aspects of the introduction of the concept of "reality" in science are analyzed in detail in the collective monograph of S. Vlahov and S. Florin "Can not be translated in translation" [24]. The authors argue that reality is closely related to extralinguistic reality, as evidenced by at least the etymology of the term. Since some objects, concepts, events of daily life, culture, history of a certain people or a certain country, reality ... are names, they must be reflected in the translated text. , historical facts, state institutions, names of national and folklore heroes, mythological creatures, etc. When comparing languages, the words denoting these events fall into the category of non-equivalent vocabulary. The concept of mythology in linguistics (ancient Greek *mýthoc* - myth, tradition and *logos* - thought, reason) came from psychology. It was first introduced by K. Jung and K. Kerényi in “Introduction to the Essence of Mythology” to identify its mythological origins and the images, plots, and motifs that have been recorded for a long time [27].

In linguistics, mythology can be understood as "a set of concepts that are inseparable from each other within the magical thinking of the ancient person, and all the ancient symbols associated with these concepts" [28]. As a material for linguoculturological analysis, as a rule, are used concepts-mythologems or word-mythologems that represent them - the names of characters, words with a special mythical content, which are the result of the activity of mythical thinking in building the world. The ethno-cultural component serves as an appropriate indicator of the connotative structure of word-mythology. Their analysis is especially important when the researcher is confronted with a folklore landscape of the world derived from a mythological culture. [29]

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, one of the most important tasks of any science, in this case linguoculturology, is to define its conceptual and methodological apparatus, because the existence of a conceptual framework and a defined categorical apparatus indicates the full existence of the scientific paradigm. The difficulties faced by scholars in shaping the methodological framework of this science are related to inconsistencies between linguists in the interpretation of language and culture, the presence of relevant paradigms, terminology influenced the choice of linguoculturologists, as well as the relative youth of this science. The study of language as a universal phenomenon and national languages, as a system of national linguistic worldview of the person who owns the language, is closely linked with the formation of tolerance among speakers

of different languages today, understanding the equivalence of mother and "foreign" languages. the study of its importance in the life of the world community is an urgent task. The national worldview is first and foremost reflected in the peculiarities of the linguistic (verbal) division and expression of the surrounding reality, which in no way diminishes the cultural value of a single language. Thus, linguocultural analysis must belong to the units of language and speech, by studying them it is possible to "build" the cultural space of a particular linguocultural community.

REFERENCES

1. Shaklein VM. Linguoculturology: traditions and innovations: monograph. Moscow: Flinta. 2012.p. 4
2. Maslova VA. Linguoculturology: textbook. Allowance for students of higher educational institutions. Moscow: Publishing Center "Academy". 2011. p. 208.
3. Vorobyov VV. Linguoculturology: monograph. Moscow: RUDN. 2014. p. 336.
4. Yartseva VN. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow: Modern encyclopedia, 1990. p. 685.
5. Tkhorik VI, Fanyan NYu. Linguoculturology and intercultural communication: textbook. Allowance. 2nd ed. Moscow: GIS, 2006. p. 260.
6. Sapir E. Status of linguistics as a science. Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies. Translated from English. Edited and with preface. Doctor Philological Sciences. Professor A.E. Kibrika. 2nd ed. Moscow: Progress Publishing Group. 2001. pp. 259-265.
7. Frolova IT. Philosophical Dictionary. 5th ed. Moscow: Publishing House "Politechnical", 1987. p. 592.
8. Triandis GK, Sosnin VA. Culture and social behavior: textbook. Allowance. Moscow: FORUM. 2007. p. 384.
9. Eco W. The name of the rose. Detective. Issue. 2. Moscow: Book Chamber. 1989. p. 496.
10. Khrolenko AT. Fundamentals of linguoculturology: textbook. Allowance. 4th ed. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka. 2008. p. 184.
11. Zinovieva EI, Yurkov EE. Linguoculturology: textbook. St. Petersburg: Osipov Publishing House. 2006. p. 260.
12. Plank M. Unity of the physical picture of the world. Moscow: Nauka. 1966. p. 288.
13. Einstein A. Maxwell's influence on the development of ideas about physical reality. Collections of Scientific Essays. Vol. 4. Moscow. 1967. pp.136-140.
14. Kornilov OA. Linguistic pictures of the world as derivatives of national mentalities: textbook. Allowance. 3rd ed., rev. Moscow: KSU. 2011. p. 350.
15. Kramsch C. Language and Culture. Oxford University Press. 1998.
16. Fatkullina FG, Suleimanova K. (2011) Linguistic picture of the world as a way of conceptualization of reality. Bulletin of Bash SU. 2011;16(3):1002-1005.
17. Stepanov YuS. Constants. Dictionary of Russian culture. Research experience. – Moscow: School "Languages of Russian Culture". 1997. p. 824.
18. Arutyunova ND. Introduction. Logical analysis of the language. Mental actions. – Moscow: Nauka. 1993. pp. 3-6.
19. Fatkullina FG. Typology of concepts in modern linguistics. Pedagogical journal of

Bashkortostan. 2015; 1(15): 239-243.

20. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. 2nd edition. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2003.
21. Popova ZD, Sternin IA. The concept of “concept” in linguistic research. Voronezh: Voronezh Publishing House. 2000. p. 30.
22. Teliya VN. (1999) Primary tasks and methodological problems of studying the phraseological composition of the language in the context of culture. Phraseology in the context of culture. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture. 1999. pp. 13-24.
23. Raupova LR, Safarova GQ. Euphemism—As a Linguistic Unit Expressing National-Mental Identity//Current Research Journal of Philological Sciences. 2021;2(10):125-133.
24. Khursanov NI. On the theoretical and practical foundations of language corpora. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. 2021;10(9):311-318.
25. Vlakhov S, Florin S. Untranslatable in translation. Moscow: International relations. 1980. p. 344.
26. Kerenyi K, Jung KG. Introduction to the Essence of Mythology. Soul and myth: six archetypes. Moscow. 1999. pp. 11-210.
27. Komarova ZI. Technology of scientific research in the system methodology of modern linguistics. Yekaterinburg: Publishing House of UrSPU. 2016. p. 209.
28. Raupova LR, Sultonova Sh. Scientific Basis of Compiling a Dictionary of Grammatical Terms. Current Research Journal of Philological Sciences, 2021;2(10):116-124.
29. Rasuljanovna IN. The phenomenon of lacunarity as the linguacultural issue. Prospects of world science. 2019. 226p.