


| | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------|
| ANALYSIS OF VIEWS ON THE FORMATION OF THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD | |  | Linguistics |
| | | Keywords: linguistics, linguistic landscape of the world, worldview, linguistic relativity, linguoculturology, linguistic semantics, semantics, representation, social function. | |
| Zukhro Akbarova Akmaljonovna | Associate Professor, Department of Uzbek Linguistics, Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc) | | |
| Abdullazizova Rokhatoy Usmonalievna | Master, the Direction of Theory and Methodology of Education (Primary Education) Faculty of Preschool and Primary Education, Fergana State University | | |
| Abstract | | | |
| <p>The article provides a linguistic analysis of the linguistic landscape of the world (LLW) and a general interpretation of the concept of “world landscape”. The study of the compatibility of LLW in different languages, its introduction into Uzbek linguistics, linguistic relativity, the influence of linguoculturology on LLW and several functions of the concept of LLW are also studied.</p> | | | |

Introduction

In modern linguistics, there are different views on the formation of the worldview in the human mind and the extent to which the linguistic landscape is reflected. Although the term Linguistic Landscape of the World (LLW) is very common in later linguistics, there is no universally accepted definition. Does LLW differ for the general language and its individual manifestations, if so, how does it differ, to what extent is the proportionality of LLW in different languages? LLW is a very complex system: “Undoubtedly, the first stage in the formation of any linguistic device is the birth of a concept that occurs as a result of the conscious perception of the perceived reality in the mind and its digestion in thought, and the next stage of linguistic event language system features. Experience has shown that the principles that underpin linguistic activity are radically different from those that exist within other types of activities. Consequently, these principles differ from our visual, musical, and artistic abilities, as well as our logical and mathematical abilities. So it is better to think of the human mind as a “collaboration” of more subsystems than of an entire system, but these subsystems, no matter how independent they are, are interconnected” (Safarov, 2008).

Materials and Methods

The foreign experience of modeling the linguistic landscape in a polyethnic environment is developing rapidly. In particular, the studies of B. Spolsky and R. L. Cooper (Spolsky, Cooper 1991), as well as the works of M. Reh (Reh, 2004) and P. Backhaus (Backhaus, 2007) prove our opinions. We believe that the general theory of research in this area should be interdisciplinary in nature, since a complete and exhaustive study of the modern linguistic landscape requires the involvement of knowledge of social psychology and sociology, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics.

Despite the fact that since about the middle of the 20th century, in different areas of the humanities, along with a general linguistic turn (and in linguistics - with a pragmatic turn), general trends have been traced, to which extensive literature is devoted, the concept of everyday life, which is very widely used in many scientific disciplines (for example, , sociology of everyday life, the history of everyday life, as well as an appeal to the subjective assessment of native speakers (Svodesh, 2001; Vepreva. 2005; Chulkina, 2007; Gritsenko, Gronskaya, 2009; Kirilina, Maslova, 2007; Kirilina, 2009a, 2011, Nikolaeva, 2010), are not yet fully recognized as a resource for (socio)linguistic description and as a productive methodological basis for explaining the fleeting processes of language change in the era of globalization and technology change.

Results and Discussion

LLW is a large system and it also has component systems in the form of subsystems. If we refer to these sub-systems as slabs in relation to the landscape, the concepts are their building materials.

The concept of LLW entered Uzbek linguistics through Russian linguistics. The term “landscape” is common in a variety of disciplines and is not limited to linguistics. The term was first used in physics: According to G. Gerts, “the internal images or symbols of external objects created by researchers should be a reflection of the necessary logical consequences of these ideas, which in turn should be a reflection of the natural necessary consequences of what is on display” (Serebrennikov, 1988).

The term “landscape of the world” was also used by physicist Max Planck, in his study that “the physical view of the world is a “landscape of the world” that is physically shaped and reflects the true laws of nature. With the first, it represents a holistic view of the world of man, gradually developing on the basis of his own experience. He interpreted the scientific worldview as an example of the real world, in the absolute sense, independent of humans and all human thought” (Serebrennikov, 1988).

“The following aspects should be kept in mind when interpreting this term:

- The landscape of the world is between two poles: science and worldview or science and philosophy;
- The landscape of the world is a worldview that embodies a type of social practice;
- The landscape of the world is a type of philosophical reflection;
- The landscape of the world is a unique type of scientific knowledge” (Seregina, 2019).

A general interpretation of the concept of “landscape of the world” allows us to move on to the concept of linguistic view of the world, as language is directly involved in two processes related to the worldview.

First, at its bottom is formed the linguistic landscape of the universe, one of the deepest layers of the human world. Second, language itself expresses and interprets other images of the human world, which enter the language through a social dictionary and introduce the specific characteristics and culture of a person. Experiential knowledge acquired by individuals through language becomes collective property, collective experience” (Postovalova, 1988).

The term “linguistic landscape of the world” was first coined by L. Weisgerber as “a collection of ideas about the world in language, a form of conceptual reality, historically formed in the everyday consciousness of a particular linguistic community” (Sternin, 2007). However, the concept of the linguistic landscape of the universe is based on the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the first researcher of a specific (polysynthetic) type of language; they led to the formation of basic postulates for the identification of the language of observational thinking:

- 1) material and spiritual culture are combined in language;
- 2) each culture is national, its national character is expressed in language has its own internal form (IF) for each nation;
- 3) the internal form of language is an expression of the “national spirit”, its culture;
- 4) language is a mediating link between man and the world around him.

In his concept, the scientist noted that “different languages have different perceptions of the same thing, not different perceptions” (Humboldt, 1984). In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the study of the linguistic landscape of the world was closely connected with the concept of relativity, the key to ethnolinguistics, a branch of linguistics that studies language in relation to culture. In the 90s of the twentieth century, with the emergence of an independent branch of linguistics - linguoculturology, a new view of the linguistic landscape of the world was formed. Today, linguoculturology is described as “a field that emerged at the crossroads of linguistics and cultural studies and studied the manifestation of national culture, reflected and entered into the language. It is known that from childhood, a person learns the language and culture of his people. All the unique charms of folk culture are reflected in its language, which uniquely reflects the world and the people in it” (Maslova, 2001). This idea is important in linguoculturology and defines a new approach in the consideration of language and culture.

This approach was developed mainly by Russian philosophers – S.A. Atanovsky, U.I. Kukushkin, and E.S. Markaryan. The essence of this approach is: “the interaction of language and culture is a one-way street; because language is a reflection of reality, and culture is an integral part of this reality that man encounters, language is a simple reflection of culture” (Maslova, 2001). Thus, as V.A. Maslova notes, “because every language bearer is a native speaker, language signs have the ability to perform the function of cultural symbols and thus serve as a means of demonstrating the basic parameters of culture” (Maslova, 2001).

Thus, there are currently two main approaches to the study of the interaction of language and culture, in particular the linguistic landscape of the world. On the one hand, there is a lot of evidence about the impact of language on culture (V.Humboldt, E.Sepir, B.Worf, and A.Potebnya). On the other hand, the impact of culture on language is clear.

“Language is the most important means of the formation and existence of human knowledge of the world. Man verbally defines the results of cognition in the course of his activity, reflecting the objective world. The generality of this knowledge, encompassed in the form of language, is expressed through various expressions, such as ‘the intermediate world of language’, ‘linguistic representation of the world’, ‘linguistic model of the world’, and ‘linguistic landscape of the world’.” (Serebrennikov, 1988). We decided to choose the last term that is most popular.

“The linguistic landscape of the universe does not stand alongside specific images of the world (chemical, physical, etc.), which creates and shapes them earlier, because man can understand the world and himself through language based on both universal and national socio-historical experience. Y.D. Apresyan emphasized the pre-scientific nature of the linguistic landscape of the world and called it a simple image. The linguistic landscape of the universe often complements objective knowledge of reality by distorting them” (Makoedova, 2016).

O.V. Rtishcheva compares the linguistic and scientific landscape of the universe and identifies the similarities and differences between its two different images: “Common features: general structure of space and time; a reflection of the world of the same material objects; plays the same role as a mediator between the subject and the object of knowledge. Specific features also include a variety of universals, which include changing the scientific landscape of the universe in the history of knowledge. The interdependence of linguistic and scientific descriptions of the universe can be realized through the metaphorical translation of meanings from language to scientific imagery” (Rtishcheva, 2006).

Thus, the following are the main ideas of the concept of the linguistic landscape of the universe:

- 1) the worldview offered by language differs from “scientific” (in this sense, the term “simple image” is also used);
- 2) each language draws its own image reflect a slightly different way. (Maslova, 2001)

Linguistic semantics studies the linguistic landscape of the universe in two ways. On the one hand, based on a systematic semantic analysis of the lexical richness of a particular language, the entire system of expression expressed in a particular language, regardless of its specific language or universality, is reconstructed in contrast to “scientific” reflecting a “simple” worldview” (Rtishcheva, 2006).

On the other hand, individual (linguistically specific) concepts specific to a particular language are studied in terms of two features: “they are “key” to a particular culture (gives a “key” to understand it) and at the same time there is a problem in translating relevant words. The equivalent of a word disappears altogether (for example, in Russian *тоска, надрыв, авось, удаль, воля, неприкаянный, задушевность, совестно, обидно, неудобно*) or a similar equivalent exists in principle, but it does not contain the components of meaning that are specific to a particular word (e.g. *душа, судьба, счастье, справедливость, пошлость, разлука, обида, жалость, утро, собираться*)” (Rtishcheva, 2006).

“The ontological function stems from differences in the way peoples of certain cultures understand the world.

Semantic function. To confirm the existence of this function, L. Weisgerber gave the concept of the linguistic landscape of the universe, which he believed that the lexical system of language has great potential for expressing worldview. The semantic function is aimed at changing the word in the human mind and as a result the meaning it expresses has a typical value for that language carrier.

The representational function shows that language as a single semiotic system represents the linguistic landscape of the universe (Maslova, 2001).

“The social function of the concept is that the linguistic landscape of the world is an expression of the existence of language in a particular historical period. The development of science, the media, and the increase in the level of higher and secondary education affect the linguistic landscape of the world. Some scientific terms move from professional language to national language and thus do not cause any inconvenience to anyone. They are formed in this language and are mastered by the speakers” (Rtishcheva, 2006).

The communicative function of the linguistic landscape of the world is a form of interpersonal communication. The essence of interpersonal communication is to understand and interpret. “Understanding means the unity of language or the similarity of levels of social development, the unity of mental activity. Understanding within the linguistic landscape of a nation is achieved through language, as it preserves cultural riches in written and oral forms in lexicon, grammar, idioms, proverbs, folklore, fiction and scientific literature. Thus, language is a national component of culture” (Rtishcheva, 2006).

As P. Backhaus (Backhaus, 2005, 2009) notes, the diachronic description of LL provides significant data - a change in the mode of functioning of languages (F. Kulm’s term) can lead to a change in LL. The reverse is also true: LL plays an important role in any study of linguistic regime transformation.

Models of multilingual signals have also undergone typology. M. Reh (Reh, 2004, pp.10-14) offers 4 models:

- a) the same information in several languages (duplicating multilingual writing);
- b) all information is presented in one language and partially in another (fragmentary multilingualism);
- c) different parts of information are given in different languages with partial overlap (overlapping multilingual writing);
- d) different parts of the general information are given in different languages (complementary multilingual writing).

J. Kolten and E. Dhonnahy argue that since signification uses language through a visual channel, it opens up ways to go beyond the literal meaning of the sign and evokes an implicit meaning (covert meaning) through the use of visual techniques - font, color - and through the use of interlingual expressions and games words that could not arise in oral communication (Kalten, Dhonnache, 2010).

The authors consider M. Reh's typology (Reh, 2004) to be incomplete and suggest taking into account three more points:

- notation systems specify a choice that generates meanings regardless of the content of the message (for example, the Latin alphabet and stylized Old Irish writing - Celtic English).
- meaning is built on the ability to create linguistic hybrids, which, in addition to the literal meaning, serve some other special purpose.
- linguistic landscapes show different reactions to modernity and globalization.

M. Barni and K. Bagna (Barni, Bagna, 2009, p.5) aim to study and understand the role played in the visibility / visibility / representation of the language in LL by such factors as the language situation, the size of the city, the size of the immigrant community, the level of their "rootedness", employment opportunities in the area, migration channels and status, community organization. Local policy towards migrants, etc.

Today, the LL description method is expanding its scope. It seems to be extremely useful for describing the linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociological situation, as well as for fixing the manifestations of social cognition in the dynamically changing post-Soviet space, in particular, for describing the changing linguistic situation in large cities of the Russian Federation.

Thus, in the linguistic description, with its help, the change of moral attitudes, changes in the functioning of the language, its semantics and pragmatics are studied; zones of invasion and spread of other languages are established. Three stages of repression are noted: hybrid texts, the understanding of which (albeit not always fully) is possible without knowledge of the English language; hybrid texts that only those who speak English can understand; fully English texts (e-ticket; printouts of some medical studies, some billboards, etc.) (Kirilina, 2011a. p.37)

An extended interpretation of the possibilities of LL allows us to consider public signs as an indicator of a changing picture of the world, for example, expanding the semantic zone of trade, sale, expanding the scope of the market logic, transforming the human model and, in particular, the gender construct, etc. (Kirilina, 2009; 2011a).

The foregoing allows us to recognize the analysis of LL as a promising interdisciplinary method that reflects modern, post-non-classical, cognitive attitudes.

Conclusion

Natural language thus automatically performs the task of modeling the world: language models the system of understanding the world, creating a unique community model that unites the entire language community. In part, this model of the world reflects some universal categories, but it cannot be considered to be exactly the same for language speakers in different languages, leading to an understanding of the world because of language categories.

On the other hand, the linguistic landscape of the universe is so simple that in important respects it differs in many respects from the “scientific” image. Moreover, the simple ideas expressed in language are by no means unfounded: in many cases they are no less complex and interesting than scientific ideas. For example, ideas about a person’s inner world reflect the introspective experience of dozens of generations over thousands of years and can serve as a reliable guide to this world. In a simple depiction of the universe, simple geometry, simple physics of space and time, simple ethics, psychology, and so on can be distinguished (Rtishcheva, 2006).

The study of the concept of LLW shows that this concept combines several different functions and is characterized by individual differences in general aspects for language owners.

References

1. Safarov, Sh. Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: Fan, 2008. P.29
2. Serebrennikov B.A. The role of the human factor in language: Language and picture of the world. M.: Nauka, 1988. P. 12.
3. Seregina M.A. The concept of the language picture of the world in cognitive linguistics: aspects and types. [Electronic resource]. http://tverlingua.by.ru/archive/006/section_3_6/3_3_6.htm. Access date: 12/20/2019.
4. Postovalova V.I. The role of the human factor in language: Language and picture of the world. M., 1988. P. 78.
5. Sternin I.A., Popova Z.D. Cognitive linguistics. M.: “AST - East – West”, 2007. P. 22.
6. Humboldt, V.Fon On the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the development of mankind. Selected works on linguistics. M.: Progress, 1984. P. 312.
7. Maslova V.A. Linguistics: Proc. allowance for students. higher teach. establishments. M.: Publishing Center “Academy”, 2001. P. 26.

8. Makoedova N.V. Linguistic picture of the world as a linguistic concept. Modern trends in the development of science and technology. 2016. No. 10. P. 62.
9. Rtishcheva O.V. Ontological and epistemological aspects of the functioning of the language picture of the world: author. dis.....cand. philosopher. Sciences: 09.00.01 Kemerovo state. un-t cult. and arts. - Kemerovo, 2006. P.13
10. Backhaus P. Signs of multilingualism in Tokyo – a diachronic look at the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. V. 2005, Issue 175-176. Pp. 103-121
11. Backhaus, Pr. Linguistic Landscape. A comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokio. *Multilingual Matters* (136). NY- Ontario – Clevelon, 2007. P.158.
12. Backhaus P. Rules and regulations in linguistic landscaping: A contrastive perspective. Florian Coulmas (ed.). 2007. *Language Regimes in Transformation. Future Prospects for German and Japanese in Science, Economy, and Politics (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 93)*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp.152-172.
13. Backhaus P. Rules and regulations in linguistic landscaping: A contrastive perspective. Shohamy E., Gorter D. (eds). *Linguistic Landscape. Expanding the Scenery*. Routledge, NY-Oxon, 2009. Pp.152-172.
14. Reh M. Multilingual writing: A reader oriented typology – with examples from Lira Municipality (Uganda). *International Journal of Sociology of language*, 2004, 170. Pp. 1-41.
15. Kalten J. L., Dhonnache E. H. Language and Inter-language in Urban Irish and Japanese Linguistic Landscapes. Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael E., Barni M. (eds). *Linguistic Landscape in the City*. NY Bristol – North York, 2010. Pp.19-36.
16. Barni, M., Bagna C. Ligistic landscape and language vitality. Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael E., Barni M. (eds). *Linguistic Landscape in the City*. NY Bristol–North York, 2010. Pp. 3-19
17. Kirilina A.V. Russian language in the metropolis as an indicator of changes in the language situation. *Russian language in conditions of cultural and linguistic polyphony*. Ed. V.V. Zhdanova. Verlag Otto Sagner. München-Berlin, 2009a. Pp. 75-87.
18. Kirilina A.V. Some signs of the penetration of the English language into the functional space of the Russian. *Modern linguistic paradigms: fundamental and applied aspects. Sat scientific. Articles based on the materials of the Third Readings in memory of O.N. Seliverstova (October 17, 2008)*. M., 2009b. Pp. 92-109.
19. Kirilina A.V. Translation and linguistic consciousness in dynamic synchrony: the mental boundaries of the language (on the material of the Russian language of Moscow). “*Questions of psycholinguistics*”, 2011a, no. 2. Pp. 30-39
20. Kirilina A.V. Everyday life as a “resource” for describing language in dynamic synchrony. *Collection of reports of the Fifth International Conference Society - Language - Culture: Actual Problems of Interaction in the 21st Century*. Moscow, MIL, December 2, 2010. In print. Publication-2011.
21. Kirilina A.V., Maslova L.N. Some features of oral scientific discussion. *Language consciousness: Research paradigms*/ed. N.V. Ufimtseva and T.N. Ushakova. Moscow-Kaluga, 2007. Pp. 255-276.