

The Concepts of the Worldview of the Language and Language Pictures of the World

Bobohonov Muhammad Yakhhaevich
Senior Teacher of Namangan State University

Abstract

The article investigates the understanding of the term «language picture of the world» in modern Russian and foreign linguistics. The author points to classical theories of it and the latest researches concerning different languages.

Keywords: Language picture of the world, worldview of the language, concept, perception of the world.

Cognitive linguistics, one of the new and current areas of linguistics, has turned its attention to how language and consciousness are related, because language is a sign system in which the experience of humanity is recorded, which encodes it. Thus, language describes the world through human perception. Thus, we can talk about such a concept as “linguistic picture of the world.”

The linguistic picture of the world is a set of people’s ideas about reality recorded in language units at a certain stage of the people’s development, an idea of reality reflected in linguistic signs and their meanings - the linguistic division of the world, the linguistic ordering of objects and phenomena, information about the world embedded in the systemic meanings of words . The national picture of the world is understood as something common, stable, and repeated in the pictures of the world of individual representatives of the people. The linguistic picture of the world in the minds of native speakers is a set of concepts and values. This is one of the components of the cognitive level of a linguistic personality, which is very closely related to culture. Thus, one cannot help but correlate the concept of a linguistic picture of the world with the slightly narrower concept of “linguoculture”, which in turn is a culture reflected and reproduced in linguistic signs.

The linguistic picture of the world considers linguistic signs as carriers of a special form, making it possible to analyze language from the point of view of its influence on the consciousness of its speakers and its mediation; it includes both reality and individual traits inherent in 6 individual speakers of the language. While linguoculture is interested in components containing meanings that have value exclusively for culture, the most objective, but nationally colored units, inherent in all speakers of linguoculture, and which do not vary from individual to individual. According to S.G. Shafikov, the linguistic picture of the world, or, in his terminology, the “model of the world”, does not exist and can only be perceived as a metaphor. For him, differences in languages are not of great significance and do not allow him to judge the uniqueness of certain elements. Thus, the interpenetration of cultures is possible only if the content of linguistic signs coincides - which is indisputable. But in this study there is a categorical attitude towards the role of building a picture of the world: due to the dynamism of modern reality, the picture of the world cannot be conveyed through language. It is difficult to agree with this position. As will be shown below, even in synchrony, traces of centuries-old experience remain, they have simply

lost their primary role over time, and also the nuclear meanings of the two linguistic cultures, both in language and in consciousness, do not coincide, which means that the national and linguistic aspects still leave their mark on the worldview. As G.I. Galeeva and M.V. Kononenko point out, "Language is the soul of a nation, its historical memory. Everything that the people have experienced is expressed in words," they believe that such values are eternal. This is exactly the position we give preference to in our work. In this regard, it should be mentioned that it is important to study how elements of culture are reflected in units of language and through what mechanisms the perception and understanding of these elements by a speaker of linguistic culture occurs. In the terminology of V.V. Vorobyov, the units that embody this unity of language and culture are called linguoculturemes - this is the totality of the form of a linguistic sign, its semantics and the cultural connotation that accompanies it. One of the connections between language and culture arises due to cultural connotations - this is the result of comprehension (through correlation with cultural ideals, values and stereotypes) of the figurative and associative component or metaphor of set expressions.

Among the cognitive subsystems of linguistic culture and the national image of the world, one can separately highlight the reference subsystem, the most relevant in the context of the analysis of the value layer. The paremiological fund of the language, of course, for the most part organizes these basic cultural standards, which are transformed into typical meanings, clothed in a bright and expressive, nationally specific form. Studying reference niches helps determine which values are significant (core) for a culture and which are ignored (periphery). In parallel with the reference subsystem, a symbolic subsystem is being developed. Its units are less culturally determined. With the development of language, they undergo rethinking and are mediated by culture, but their base is preserved, and it is universal. O. A. Kornilov identifies four levels of national ideas about the world, of which the concept of "national linguistic picture of the world" is the most valuable for our research. The national linguistic picture of the world is a set of lexical equivalents of prototypes of the collective consciousness of the people. And this is also the result of the reflection of the objective world by the everyday consciousness of a particular ethnic group. One of these levels is the individual national linguistic picture of the world, which allows us to explore the subjective reflection of the world by a native speaker of language and culture, coupled with cultural universals and nationally specific realities. On this occasion, V.I. Postovalova writes: "In the strict sense of the word, there are as many pictures of the world as there are observers in contact with the world."

The moral and value component of linguistic consciousness is of great importance in the formation of a separate zone of the national linguistic picture of the world, which consists of nationally colored vocabulary and idiomatic expressions in which the collective life experience of many generations of people is recorded, from the point of view of the principles established in a given society relating to moral -moral and value priorities. Value assessments in the shell of a specific language are deeper and more significant than emotional assessments (connotations).

Of course, there are universal components inherent in all cultures and languages, but they constitute only part of the picture of the world of each people. It is these universals that allow cultures to interface and come into contact. However, if you pay attention to the differences, they also do not become an insurmountable barrier: under the national shell, which only delays the awareness of the objective side of the concept, it is easy to detect the basic meaning, understandable to any reasonable person, since when a person comes into contact with a speaker of another language, in the face of lacunarity, he has to resort to understanding a new concept or a concept that has national specifics. And this does not mean that linguistic differences are cast aside, and this happens not because these differences do not play any role, but only because of a person's natural ability to think and thereby reflect the true, and in this case contextual, meaning of everything that surrounds him. In her work "On the issue of comparing linguocultural concepts," T.S. Medvedeva proves, using the example of comparing the concept "money" in the Russian and German languages, that even universal concepts have ethnic characteristics not only in form, but also in content, which depend on the reference subsystem. Concepts, from her point of view, vary from culture to culture, and if we consider their conceptual, figurative and

value content, it turns out that it is the figurative and value components that have the greatest features, and values are the fundamental elements of culture, while the conceptual component is as universal as the concept itself. In the proverb collection of any language, it is fashionable to find a correspondence for each proverb and saying of another language. But it is correspondence, and not exactly the same proverb. They will have the same meaning, the same correlation of objects, but these objects (realities) themselves will be different, therefore, in order to highlight the nationally specific elements of a particular culture, turning to proverbs, we must isolate cultural connotations from them.

Phraseological units differ in the degree and nature of cohesion of lexical components. This feature is taken as the basis for V.V. Vinogradov's classification:

1. Phraseological units, or idioms, are units that are absolutely indivisible in semantics; their meaning cannot be deduced from the meanings of the components. Consequently, they are demotivated and act as equivalents to words;
2. Phraseological unities - phraseological units, the meaning of which does not coincide with the sum of the values of the components, but is deducible from them. In such phraseological units, the meaning of the whole is associated with an understanding of the potential meaning of the words forming phraseological units, and therefore is partially motivated. These are potential word equivalents;
3. Phraseological combinations – phraseological units in which the meanings of the words that make up the combination are not free, i.e. exist only in certain word groups; they are not equivalent words.

According to the classification of A. G. Nazaryan, proverbs are predicative phraseological units with a closed structure, i.e. they express moral and value meaning and have a sentence structure.

V.V. Vinogradov and A.G. Nazaryan classify proverbial expressions as phraseological units, but, nevertheless, we will adhere to the following point of view: proverbs do not belong to the phraseological fund of the language, forming a specific layer of nationally colored components of the picture of the world. By the term “proverb”, most modern researchers understand aphorisms of folk origin, primarily proverbs and sayings. Folklore aphorisms, along with aphorisms of non-folklore origin, form a whole layer of linguistic expressions, which is included in the phraseological fund of the language.

The question regarding the attribution of proverbs and sayings to phraseology remains open, since proverbs have the characteristics of phraseological units, sentences and free combinations. In addition, proverbs and sayings are correlated separately with phraseological units according to different characteristics, and the reason for the difference is the unequal syntactic nature of these proverbs. Some researchers argue that the main difference between a proverb and a phraseological unit is the sentence form of the proverb. In our opinion, this is a very unconvincing argument. While the provisions that proverbs have semantic and intonation completeness, syntactic division, are based on a whole judgment (and not a concept, like a phraseological unit), and also that phraseological units always have a figurative meaning (to varying degrees, but this condition is obligatory), while among the proverbs there are no such ones that are used in their literal meaning.

In addition to the problem of correlating phraseology and paremiology, separating the concepts of “proverb” and “saying”, modern linguistics also deals with the issue of distinguishing between proverbs and aphorisms. An aphorism is considered a bookish stable expression that briefly and originally expresses the author's opinion regarding any life phenomenon or philosophical concept. Proverbs are also aphorisms, but they are of folk origin, characterized by laconic form, reproducibility of meaning and, as a rule, have an edifying meaning. They have an evaluative orientation towards all aspects of human life (from character to activity). Summarizing the concepts delimited above, we can say the following: phraseological units, paremias and aphorisms are types of set expressions, each of which is characterized by its own set of

structural, semantic and functional features. In the narrow sense, only proverbs and sayings are considered proverbs, since they perform the function of moral teaching and can claim the status of exponents of folk wisdom.

References:

1. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка. - М.: Наука, 1974. - 251 с.
2. Башкова И.В. Творческая языковая личность и вариативность русской языковой картины мира // Вестник ТГПУ, 2015. №4 (157). С.112-116.
3. Воротников Ю.Л. Языковая картина мира как лингвистическая категория // Международная научная конференция «Язык и Культура», Москва, 14.09. 2001г. - 17.09.2001г.
4. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры. – М., 1985.
5. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.