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ABSTRACT

In the article, the notion of linguistic world picture and its relations with other types of world picture are discussed. Linguistic picture of the world is considered as subjective model of the objective world, the system of language units used in representation of conceptual model of the world from individuals’ mind. Phraseology is a huge bank of linguistic means that verbalize national linguistic world picture. In the analysis part of the article, several phraseological units with the component “fire” in English and Uzbek languages are studied from the aspect of linguoculturology.
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INTRODUCTION

In the second half of XX century, a special interest of linguists was drawn to the term “world picture” and its essence in different modern trends of linguistics. Some scientists claim that the term “world picture” itself was initially used by physicians, namely by V. Gertz, while others consider L. Wittgenstein as the first person to talk about this notion in his work titled “Logical and philosophical trilogy” [1]. An appearance of this term and its wide usage in linguistics will further be discussed in the article.

METHODOLOGY

In linguistics, various ideas on the relations between a language and a world picture were also discussed among different linguists. One of them was F. Boas from American school of ethnolinguists who claimed “…traditions and vision of the world of a particular nation could be seen through their language” [2]. Saphir and Whorf put forward a hypothesis: “People who speak different languages and belong to different cultures percept the world also differently” [3]. Another prominent idea was introduced by V. von Humbolt when he said that each language in corporation with cognition produces a subjective picture of an objective world. In other words, people who speak a particular language percept the world in their unique way and produce
the language also differently compared to other nationalities with another mother tongue. Followed by his teacher and advisor, L.V. Weisberger introduced the term “linguistic world picture” to the linguistics in the 80s of previous century.

When talking about the definition of this term, we find necessary to mention that there are a number of assumptions proposed by different linguists. Some of them argue that linguistic world picture is a subjective picture of an objective world which could be used as a tool of conceptual world picture representation. Other linguists as R. X. Xayrullina, T. N. Nikolayeva define this notion as the fixed scheme of reality perception in the minds of a particular nation [1]. According to D.U. Ashurova, M. R. Galiyeva, linguistic world picture is the verbal explication of the conceptual world picture, a means of transmitting information about the world, people and relationships.

Looking at the different definitions of the term, we could summarize them and consider the l.w.p. as one of the ways of presenting our general and specific knowledge about the world, our surroundings, feelings and world vision with the help of a language. In this sense, the language serves as a means of communication, perception of the world and representation of our thoughts, knowledge structures and emotions. Here we should also give a brief overview of other types of world picture and their relations and distinctive features with linguistic world picture.

First and foremost, the link between the conceptual and linguistic world picture should be analyzed. According to Kolshanskiiy, conceptual world picture is “a product of the man’s cognitive activity” [4]. It represents a structured system of knowledge, information about the world, all scientific and pre-scientific knowledge, reflecting the cultural and cognitive experience of a human [1]. The language is considered as the main means of reflecting the conceptual world picture since people generally perceive the world and action taking place around us with the help of a language. And with this very language also works as the tool of representation of our conceptual world picture, so we can call the linguistic world picture as the conceptual world picture fixed in the language.

Linguistic world picture is also closely interrelated with national world picture, the notion widely studied in cultural linguistics. Each ethnic majority and their language reflect own unique world picture, conditioned by a particular way of world perception and peculiar linguistic means. Each nation perceives the world in their peculiar projection which is then embodied in their language forming a national linguistic world picture that is transmitted by generations. In other words, a particular model of the world will be shaped in the minds of individuals related to specific
nationality and this model is closely related with people’s mentality, culture, lifestyle and values. As a result, people from different nationalities may not have similar linguistic world pictures concerning to the same objects or phenomena of the nature. Here it should be mentioned that linguistic world picture and national world picture are not fully different notions, on the other hand, they coincide and are interrelated with each other based on the objects described from global or nationally-specific scope.

RESULTS

To explain statements given above with some examples, we intend to talk about English and Uzbek culture, mainly their world picture in the field of natural phenomena. In English language, women’s eyes are metaphorically compared to the stars (Her eyes are shining stars, eyes are diamonds, sparkling eyes). English people rarely compare women’s beauty to the natural phenomena because they find this type of metaphorization rude towards females. In Uzbek culture and literature unlike English, women’s appearance frequently is compared to natural concepts as sun, flowers, moon, etc. For example, phraseological units as oy yuzli, to’lin oy kabi go’zal, yuzidan nur charaqlaydi, yuzi yorug’, quyoshdek mehribon, zahro ko’zli could be taken here into consideration.

One of the linguistic means representing national linguistic world picture is phraseology. In our case, we analyzed several phraseological units with the component “fire” in English and Uzbek languages. First of all, mentioning about similarities should be found necessary. In both languages, there are phraseologisms that denote a strong affection and interest towards something: burn like fire, fire and fury (strong passion), fire in one’s belly (to have great ambitions), fire that is closest kept burns most of all (a person whom you love most can hurt you most); ilm o’chog’i (knowledge bank), sevgi o’ti (fire of love), ishqning o’tida yonmoq (under the fire of affection), orzusida yonmoq (wait eagerly for someone). Fire is compared to the risk: play with fire, set fire to somebody, olov bilan o’ynashmoq, kimnidir olovga otmoq. Fire denotes vigor and a symbolic meaning of youth: fire in the blood, fire from the mind, fire of the youth; olov yigit, yuragida o’ti bor, olov ko’zlar, olov nafasl).

There are also some differences in meanings that are denoted by phraseological units with “fire”. In Uzbek language, we observed phraseological units where fire denotes the state of anger (lov etib yonib, lov etib o’chdi, olovday fe’li bor, ko’zidan o’t chaqandi, jahil o’ti, ko’zi yondi).
DISCUSSION

In English language, fire is also compared to other domains as criticism. Draw fire, open fire towards someone, Kentish fire could serve as samples for the meaning of criticism. The phrase “Kentish fire” is originated from the history of Kent when people opposed the Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1828-1829. This ph. unit activates historical knowledge structures. However, the most characterized feature of these phraseological units is they denote religious and mythological values. To the phrases originated from Bible and other religious sources we can enumerate go through fire and water, Promethean fire, fires of hell, fire and brimstone, between two fires. “Promethean fire” means nonstop pursuit of power and authority. This expression represents mythological knowledge structure and connotative meaning is related to the myth of the God Promethean who stole the torch of fire from Zeus. In the phraseological units “fire and brimstone” (hell and afterlife punishment”), “go through fire and water” (to undergo great difficulties or dangers) we can observe the representation of religious knowledge structures (taken from Bible).

CONCLUSION

To summarize the article, we should mention that linguistic world picture is widely studied in modern trends of linguistics. It is verbal explication of the conceptual world picture and closely related with national picture of the world. They can be verbalized with the help of different language units, as phraseological units. This units with “fire” component were analyzed and we conclude that the concept fire in English and Uzbek phraseology denote both positive and negative cultural values.
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