

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ASPECTS OF WORD MEANING

Nishonova Shaxnoza Muhammadjonovna*

*English Teacher,
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: nishonova_shaxnoza@umail.uz

DOI: 10.5958/2278-4853.2022.00022.2

ABSTRACT

The article deals with connotative meaning varies in different languages, in particular, the role of words acquired from English in the formation of linguistic vocabulary. There is a complex and infinitely ongoing relationship between the linguocultural background, the model, and the conceptual image, that is, the understanding of the world within a particular language and the general worldview.

KEYWORDS: *Phenomena of the World, Conceptual Worldview, Linguistic, Assimilation, Connotation.*

INTRODUCTION

Objective events and, such as night, day, seasons, time, being, are understood in the same way within all languages. Assimilations, in other words, can realize the conceptual world in a different way than the semantic volume in one language compared to another. For example, the word one in English serves primarily as a quantitative indicator: One for all, all for one.

In the Uzbek language, the word has a slightly broader connotation (in the sense of quantity, to put one's head on a pillow, to beat two crows with a stick, a bucket, a coin, a piece, a shirt;

In comparative analysis, connotative meaning varies in different languages. For example: the words dog, zoo have a positive connotation in English. However, in the Uzbek language, more negative meanings are used in an exaggerated way. For example, in Uzbek, to look after a dog, to lie down, to stand up, to sacrifice a dog, the dog came, he does not know the owner of the dog.

Understanding the world embodied by assimilations is a time-consuming process that can take the lives of several generations in human history. Our knowledge of the world is very relative. The properties of the pre-text that we do not perceive remain a puzzle to us. Absolute knowledge does not exist, because things and events, the relationship between them continues indefinitely, man understands, perceives, sees, feels, thinks, receives information, compares, draws conclusions about the world around him with his mind [1].

The conceptual worldview is important for human life activities. Throughout his conscious life, man repeatedly refers to, uses, accepts, contributes to, and perfects the categories of conceptual worldview [2].

The formation of a linguocultural background or worldview is a long historical process. He has come a long way from the primitive archaic stage to the modern scientific stage. In the distant

past, our ancestors were far from the current scientific theory of the world and its creation. The mythological worldview of different peoples is an example of this.

M.Khalikova says there are several types of worldviews formed on the basis of linguocultural knowledge;

- Worldview formed through the personal experience of each person;
- Linguistic worldview formed within a particular language;
- a conceptual worldview that is unique to all individuals.

The national character of the worldview, as noted above, is related to its limitation within a particular language. The metaphors, stereotypes, and standards that permeate every linguocultural community lead to a feature that is unique to only one language. For example, good knowledge is expressed in Uzbek, Czech and French as "knowing like five paws", "knowing like one's own pocket", "knowing like one's own boots".

Thus, there is a complex and infinitely ongoing relationship between the linguocultural background, the model, and the conceptual image, that is, the understanding of the world within a particular language and the general worldview [3].

According to VA Zvegintsev: "The process of cognition is the activity of thought, which is aimed at creating an internal model of the world given by experience in the mind. Here, language objectifies this model in the process of communication activity, making it the basis of communication. The semantic meaning of assimilations arises as a result of the act of thinking. Through it, a person connects this or that with his inner world, and through language, he communicates with other people's inner models. In this way a linguistic model of the world observed in this or that language emerges [4].

Where there is no historical or factual material, some researchers claim that "man first linguistically systematized the experience he gained by observing and seeing beings," trying to prove this idea as mythological material available in world languages as well as material from underdeveloped languages. The model of scientific perception, which is closely related to the knowledge of objective being, consists of a transitional stage, followed by the artistic expression of being, which indicates that language is fully formed. Referring to history should serve as one of the arguments used in these cases to confirm or reinforce the general idea [5].

In this case, language must manifest itself as the creator of its own lingvoculturological model, and as a result it must become an independent force of 'linguistic cognition'. This does not correspond to the assertion that the original judgment, that is, the material form of consciousness. The subjective nature of language becomes the decisive force of knowledge, and its structure turns out to be immanent, essentially hereditary, innate. Here, information is focused on the task of creating and transmitting thoughts, knowledge about an objective being. The language system itself contains this linguistic commonality that emerges in the process of knowing existence. The system of concepts expressed in language expresses such a complex relationship of concepts that their complex use allows to convey the content of human thought in different ways, that is, using simple and descriptive definitions. This is the peculiarity of language, that is, language is a tool for the formation of thought, language can be not only a means of storing knowledge, but also a way of expressing it with the dynamics of its

development. From a semantic point of view, different national languages are different variants of the nominal structure of "universal concepts", a potentially unique universal culture - a whole of civilization [6].

It would not be so correct to regard the Assimilations, which manifest themselves as a system of self-regulating, two-sided characters, and other linguistic elements which serve to form and convey thought in its complex application as a "linguistic image of being." Knowledge creates the image of the world, not language.

If this is approached more strictly, the presented image can only be created using the ideal full text, i.e. universal language. The conceptual systems of national languages cannot be simplified in terms of the "correctness" of the results of knowledge. These systems are considered to be different variants of a single universal human language, and their content is historically flawless [7].

In this regard, attempts to compare individual linguistic phenomena isolated from different languages to solve the lingvoculturological problems of the Assimilations cannot be considered methodologically correct. Here, basically, there are two controversial aspects that make it difficult for not only an expert who has studied the problem in depth, but also an ordinary reader to feel it. These are:

- a) An attempt to compare assimilations directly with existing things in a material being, rather than with a system of concepts;
- b) the analysis of this or that Absorption in the language outside the language system, in other words, the compensation for the close interdependence of lexical, grammatical and other means prevailing here due to the lack of scope of the complex mechanism of language in the analysis is completely ignored.

The first discussion leads the authors to the conclusion that "there is a lingvoculturological model of the world". In fact, the linguist had to show the peculiarities of concrete forms in a general language system capable of expressing any concept.

The second argument distorts the essence of language, denying that language can be analyzed as a whole system, in which only certain parts of language are systematically analyzed and compared to other languages without any basis, when used in English text. translated into Uzbek means that the Uzbeks have not been able to comprehend this concept, or that Uzbek perception and thinking have never encountered it before.

When comparing some of the meanings of Assimilations in two or more languages and observing inconsistencies in meanings, linguists come to the "universal" conclusion that "the conceptual apparatus of peoples who speak different languages is different."

The national specificity of the semantic content of linguistic units does not exclude the possibility of the emergence of complex semantic complexes in word structure, sentence and text structure, which may also be similar in different languages according to the scope of meaning expressed by these complexes. Due to the objectivity of the conceptual form of perception, the national identity of the semantic side of language cannot be a source for the subjective element of the cognitive process [8].

Another aspect of the level of civilization of language semantics is related to the specificity of motivation in the choice of sound form in the process of language development, as a result of which even in similar groups of meanings "internal form" forms different boundaries. gives The fact that the sound composition remains the same in different languages is thought to indicate that the differences are in different directions and that this external similarity is creating an 'additional specific meaning'. For example, the English head - the front of the ship - the nose; head - the cap of the nail; head - the top of the milk, cream. This subjective property in linguistic senses does not apply to the exact expression of the denotation itself. In all cases, the corresponding physical event is determined by the sign of one of its signs. The choice of this symbol depends on the specifics of the English or Uzbek language [9].

The national and subjective facts of language, which are closely related to etymology, cannot refute the general idea that "the relationship between the elements defined in all languages is given the same". Thus, just as there is no need to oppose the inclusion of purely sensory knowledge as additional elements in the conceptual model of the world, it cannot be agreed with the idea that sensory information in language is added to the rational elements of language in the conceptual model and linguoculturological model of the world. [10]

"The basis of the conceptual model of the world is the information given in concepts and the basic information in the linguistic model of the world, which is the knowledge available in words and phrases in specific spoken languages. [11]

According to the Sepir-Wharf hypothesis, the additional national subjective information brought about by the lexical model of language is incorrectly equated with the specific information brought by language to the linguistic landscape of the world, because the lexical model of language has been associated not only with lexical but also grammatical aspects. Therefore, the information expressed by grammatical means cannot be excluded from the information entered by the Assimilations. [12]

Many researchers repeatedly refer to lingvoculturology and the Sepir-Wharf hypothesis. Well-known scholar E. Lenneberg, concluding his discussion of the experimental study of the Sepir-Wharf hypothesis, was compelled to conclude that "there is very little evidence of a violent judgment on word-knowledge" [13].

The results of experiments conducted in this field also show that the Sepir-Wharf hypothesis does not correspond to reality in its classical form [14].

National identity should be sought not in the linguistic image of the world, but in the specificity of human cognitive activity, which is closely related to various geographical, historical, production-related and many other factors [15]. It should be noted that the logical and philosophical analysis of the problem of national identity of language and its lingvoculturological model in relation to the human worldview remains quite speculative, does not help to draw any clear conclusions from the theoretical study of the problem of national language. But psycholinguistic analysis of speech confirms the specificity of language as an isomorphic process of consciousness. But it does not prove that language plays a dictatorial role in thinking. [16]

In such cases, the various hypotheses that often arise in the process of translating from one language to another, as well as the loss of the "psyche" of language in translation, are often cited as evidence of the above hypothesis. [17]

All of them are methodologically incorrect, because the method of proof cannot be applied to language, and because the information given at the entrance and at the exit belongs to different layers and scales, it contradicts the basic logical rules for the correctness of judgments. For example, the fact that there is an article in German does not mean that Germans accept objects according to some gender-related features. [18]

The Uzbek word for "hand" is the English word for "hand," "arm," and the Uzbek word for "pigeon" and "musicha" is the same word for "taube" in German. should not lead to the conclusion that it cannot be distinguished from one another. Because in practice, the Germans do the same as the Uzbeks do the difference between pigeons and music. The fact that the word "know" in Uzbek is given with the German verbs "wissegn" and "kennen" does not mean that Germans know more than Uzbeks, or that they understand different types of knowledge. Which of the following determines the nature of the relationship between language and thinking? Language or thinking? - causes many to answer "thinking" in answering the question. [19]

The conclusion from the comparative analysis is that both language and thinking have their own logic, and this logic distinguishes languages from one another. The thinking among the peoples is the same, its logic is the same. The language of the peoples is different and the logic of the language in them is also different. Logic determines word choice. Logic is defined by thinking. So, thinking is primary.

REFERENCES:

1. Heidegger M. Unterwegs zur Sprache. Tübingen, 1959. 380 s.
2. Уфимцева НВ, Лексическое значение. Принципы семиологического описания лексики. Moscow: Наука, 1986. 318p.
3. Хомский Н. Язык и мышление. Moscow, 1972. 120p.
4. Holiqova M. Milliy mentalitet va uning til kartinasi bilan o'zaro bog'liqligi. Til va adbiyot ta'limi. Ilmiy jurnal. 2002;(6):23-27.
5. Звегинцев ВА. Язык и лингвистическая теория. Moscow: URSS; 2001. 210p.
6. Виноградов ВВ. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. Moscow: Наука, 1977. 420p.
7. Вольф ЕМ. Состояния и признаки. Оценка состояний. Семантические типы предикатов. Moscow, 1982. pp. 320-339.
8. Воробьев ВВ. Лингвокультурология (теория и методы). Moscow, 1997. 380p.
9. Гак ВГ. Прагматика и языковые преобразования. Moscow, 1998. pp. 554-586.
10. Гухман ММ. Лингвистическая теория Вайсгерберга. Вопросы теории языка в современной зарубежной лингвистике. Moscow, 1985. pp. 123-162;

11. Демянков ВЗ Прототипический подход. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. Moscow: Изд.МГУ, 1996. pp. 140-145.
12. Караулов ЮН. Русский язык и языковая личность. Moscow, 1987. p. 240
13. Джусупов НМ. Лингвокогнитивный аспект исследования символов в художественном тексте: Автореф. дисс. ...канд. филол. наук. Tashkent, 2006. 24p.
14. Карасик ВИ. Язык социального статуса. Moscow: ИЯ. РАН, 2001. p. 330.
15. Кибрик АА Константы и переменные языка. СПб.: Апетейя, 2003. p. 719.
16. Кубрякова ЕС. Начальные этапы становления когнитивной науки. Вопросы языкознания, 1994;(4):34-47.
17. Лакофф Дж. Мышление в зеркале классификатора. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. XXIII. Moscow; 1988. pp. 12-51.
18. Умаров ЭА. Как создавался рунический алфавит. Tashkent: Наука; 2015. 126p.
19. Lenneberg E, Roberts J. The Language of Experience. Bloomington; 1996. p.354.