



LINGUOCULTUROLOGY AS A LINGUISTIC DISCIPLINE

Dadakhonova Zulaykho Ma'murjohn qizi¹

*¹A Teacher of the Department of "Foreign Languages in Natural Sciences",
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Fergana State University, Fergana city, Republic of Uzbekistan*

Ergasheva Malika Khakimjonovna²

*²A Teacher of the Department of "Foreign Languages in Natural Sciences",
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Fergana State University, Fergana city, Republic of Uzbekistan*

Usmonova Shakhnoza Yoqubjon qizi³

*³A Teacher of the Department of "Foreign Languages in Natural Sciences",
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Fergana State University, Fergana city, Republic of Uzbekistan*

ABSTRACT

The article under discussion describes linguoculturology as a linguistic discipline. Linguistics becomes not only a science about language, but also a science about a person, his consciousness, language and culture. It is time to change the linguistic method of consciousness, i. e. a system of established stereotypes and views on the language and text, the ways in which they are taught in connection with a number of achievements in linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics, when a significant number of linguistic facts have been accumulated and explained. Along with cognitive linguistics, another trend emerged in the twentieth century, i. e. linguoculturology, the main issues of its study were the concept sphere of the culture and the language picture of the world.

KEYWORDS: *linguistics, linguoculturology, cognitive, culture, scientific environment, comparative, conceptual, essence, comparative analysis, discourse,*

DISCUSSION

The emergence of the interdisciplinary science of linguoculturology at the intersection of linguistics and culturology at the end of the XX century aroused a great interest in it among linguists. Already at the beginning of the next century, linguistic-cultural schools were being formed (for example, under the guidance of N.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Vorobiev, V.I. Karasik, V.V. Krasnykh, Yu. S. Stepanov, V.N. Teliya, etc.), and a certain conceptual and terminological apparatus of this linguistic direction was being formed taking into account various scientific concepts and methods of linguistic-cultural analysis.

As a rule, the emergence of new concepts and corresponding terms leads to some fundamental

disagreements and misunderstandings in the scientific environment. According to a remark by A. V. Lemov, "...scientists quite often cannot agree on the meaning of scientific words" [5]. However, linguoculturology as a humanitarian discipline is a rare exception in terms of defining its conceptual essence by the scientific community. A comparative analysis of the numerous definitions of linguoculturology that function in the scientific discourse has shown that almost all researchers are unanimous in their definition of this concept, which is based primarily on the dyad "language - culture". Only some of them can be compared.

Thus, for example, V.V. Vorobyov in his definition: "Linguoculturology is a complex scientific discipline of a synthesizing type that studies the



interrelation and interaction of culture and language in its functioning and reflects this process as an integral structure of units in the unity of linguistic and extra-linguistic content using systematic methods and oriented to modern priorities and cultural settings" [8], in addition to the mutual influence of culture and language, singles out other, rather significant indicators of linguoculturology: "complex scientific discipline of the synthesizing type". Thus, the place of linguoculturology in the system complex of humanitarian knowledge is clearly defined as a scientific discipline, which, accordingly, entails the presence of its own subject and object of study. No less important is the indication of the synthesis of scientific knowledge, which, in turn, is remarkable for the modern scientific paradigm, on the one hand, and on the other hand, requires the establishment of both common and differentiating features of the concept under study. In our opinion, the definition of linguoculturology proposed by V. Vorobyov is also capacious and substantial because it immediately orients researchers to a certain method of linguistic analysis - "system methods".

The definition of linguoculturology given by V.V. Krasnykh is also based on the general integrative family "culture - language"; but, in addition, the definition specifies other relevant features of the studied discipline: the national picture of the world, linguistic consciousness, national-mental features as fundamentally new objects of research: "linguoculturology is a discipline that studies the manifestation, reflection and fixation of culture in language and discourse. It is directly related to the study of the national picture of the world, language consciousness, and peculiarities of the mental-linguistic complex" [4].

In linguoculturology, there are relatively simple and complex oppositions that require a synergistic approach. This is the meaning-to-sense opposition. Meaning in synergetics is considered to be "the emergence of a new quality of the system, or, in other words, the self-negation of meaning" [2]. Therefore, the same linguistic unit, placed in different contexts (systems), can obtain very different meanings, which are generated, on the one hand, by contexts and, on the other hand, by the cultural semantics of these units themselves. Thus, phraseology is "души не чаять" in the meaning "to love very much, infinitely", it is like a standard of love, its limit. But from experience we know that infinite love makes a person vulnerable, dependent on what kind of soul the object of love has. It would seem that context can give both negative and positive assessment to the phraseology. But, as M.L. Kovshova rightly notes, this assessment does not depend on context, because the context itself "is conditioned by the cultural semantics of phraseology" [3]. An example of this also serve proverbs and

sayings with ambivalent meanings. In these cases, a space of new diffuse meanings is created that complicates the understanding of a language unit and creates a deeper vision of it, which creates a cultural space.

Each language, through the prism of which its native speaker absorbs culture and world understanding, has its own way of conceptualizing the world. Hence, we conclude that each language has to some extent a special picture of the world, and the linguistic personality is obliged to organize the content of the statement in accordance with this picture. This is the specific human perception of the world fixed in the language. V. Humboldt also wrote that each language outlines a circle around its people, beyond which it is possible to go only by mastering one more language.

The linguistic picture of the world of each nation reflects not only the modern mentality of the nation, but also includes folkloric, mythological, archetypical elements. It is here that those prescriptions, attitudes and values are stored, and guided by them, a person becomes a national-oriented personality. Let's consider it by example. Since 80% of information about the world comes through the eye, it is considered the most important of the organs, so the eyes were attributed a mysterious magical force. In Slavs, "bad" was considered to be a slanting eye. The belief in the evil eye was born when the world, according to the ancient ideas, was inhabited by spirits. But until now, when we feel bad, we say: "это сглазу", "кто-то сглазил", "недобрый глаз поглядел" ("it's an evil eye").

The phraseologies with the "eye" component have fixed and preserved to this day the ancient stereotypes of behavior. For example: "глаз не отвести" (so you had to communicate with your interlocutor); "для отвода глаз" (prevent you from perceiving the truth), etc. To deceive someone is to prevent him from adequately perceiving the world, i.e., first of all, to prevent him from looking, hence the phraseology "замазать глаза", "пускать пыль в глаза" ("to smear his eyes", "to let dust into his eyes").

Since ancient times, from the evil eye turned amulets, which were made of precious metals and stones and people made them in the shape of the eye, hence the phraseology of the type of "глаз-алмаз" ("eye - diamond") is the ability to see the important, the main; "беречь как глаз" ("take care as an eye") (very careful), "возьми глаза в руки" ("take the eyes in your hands") (be careful), "вооружённый глазом" ("armed with the eye" (the modern form of this phraseology "with the naked eye"). All of them are related to the protective function of the eye decoration [4].



CONCLUSION

Each particular language encapsulates a national, original system that defines the worldview of its speakers and forms their picture of the world. It is fair to say that not all linguists agree with this position. Thus, G.V. Kolshansky wrote that there is no reason to raise the question of special world membership through language [6]; the language only "changes thoughts" (L. Wittgenstein). We believe that our worldview is to a large extent in captivity of the linguistic picture of the world.

What will cognitive research give linguistics? It is difficult to assume concrete results, but new data on the content structure of human mentality, language consciousness, unconscious are already being viewed, because cognitive structures of the personality are in the depths of its psyche, in a sphere that unites myth, religion, art and other phenomena.

REFERENCES

1. *Dadakhonova, Z.M. Applying interactive methods in developing students' reading skills. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal Volume: 6 | Issue: 5 | May 2020 || Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || ISI Value: 1.188. URL: https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/733pm_4_5.EPRA%20JOURNALS%20-4428.pdf*
2. *Ergasheva M.K. Linguocultural study of national mental relations (on the example of respect category). EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD) Volume: 5 | Issue: 6 | June 2020. Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online) URL: https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/1122pm_73.EPRA%20JOURNALS-4712.pdf*
3. *Kovshova, M. L. Linguistic and cultural method in phraseology. Codes of culture. Moscow. 2012. P.p.34-37*
4. *Krasnykh, V.V. Some basic concepts of cultural linguistics // Russian language: Historical destinies and modernity. - Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow University. 2010. P.p.659-660.*
5. *Lemov A.V. Russian language and culture of speech. Moscow. 2004. P.p.67-78*
6. *Maslova, V. A, Pimenova, M. V. Codes of culture in the space of language. Series "Conceptual and lingual worlds." Issue 9. St. Petersburg. 2015. P.78*
7. *Prigogine, I. From the existing to the emerging. Moscow: The World. 1984. P.p.78-83*
8. *Vorobyev, V.V. Linguoculturology. Moscow. 2008 . P. 340.*