

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 08 Volume: 88

Published: 19.08.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Sharifa Madaliyeva Iskandarova
Ferghana State University
Professor, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Department of Uzbek Linguistics,
sharifa-18@gmail.com

GNOSEOLOGY AND THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD

Abstract: The article discusses different interpretations of the semantic system, the issue of semantic and anthropological approach, folk ethno-culture, the content of ethnographic lexicon, some problems in the field of ethnolinguistics.

Key words: semantic field, speaker, ethno-culture, ethnographic vocabulary, ethnolinguistics, customs, names of customs, ethnographic system, ethnos.

Language: English

Citation: Iskandarova, S. M. (2020). Gnoseology and the linguistic landscape of the world. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (88), 19-22.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-88-5> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.08.88.5>
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The spread of systematic linguistics around the world has intensified the focus on the study of the internal structure of languages belonging to different systems as a system. As a result, all levels of language began to be studied based on systematic principles. We all know that any new direction in the history of science is born through the old. It is known that the study of high-level units of language with a semantic plan into semantic fields is a separate direction in linguistics, and it has its method and methodology of verification. While the problem of categorizing words has existed since antiquity, the concept of the semantic field is relatively new. It is a product of systematic (linguistic) linguistics, which emerged in the middle of the XIX century as a result of a different approach to the construction of the lexical-semantic system.

Linguists have different answers to the question of what is a lexical-semantic system, what elements it consists of, what relations lead in it, and according to this answer different directions in linguistics are formed. The most important difference between these directions is determined by the recognition of the independence of speech.

Recognizing that a word is the basic unit of language, linguists construct a lexical-semantic system based on the semantic structure of that word, the problem of polysemy. The result is a system of

lexical-semantic variants. Linguists who deny the independence of the word recognize semantic fields as the main "building block" of the system [1, p. 5].

It seems that both directions are the product of systematic (structural) linguistics. The first direction was the development of structural semantics, and the second direction was the study of the structure of language concerning the speaker, the introduction of the "speaker" in the paradigm of linguistic research.

The focus on the speaker in the speech process has been a major event in the history of linguistics. As a result of structural linguistics' focus on the study of the relation of sign to sign, the question of the relation of sign to object and sign to the subject was far removed from the view of structuralists who interpret language as a pure "form." In Uzbek linguistics, due to the attempt to fill the same limited area of linguistics, new directions of linguistics, called pragmalinguistics, apropos-linguistics, have emerged [2; 3; 4].

According to Professor Sh. Safarov, the chain "Language - thinking - culture - the world" is strong, each nation has a special place in the common node of the chain, but the status and nature of this place are reflected in the scale of relations between peoples "[5, p. 334].

The national identity and culture of each nation are radically different from the culture of other

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

nations. This, of course, is manifested through his eloquent speech habits [6], dialogue [7], and ethnographic vocabulary [8].

“It is one of the obvious truths that a phenomenon as complex as the semantic structure of a linguistic unit, but at the same time not beyond the principle of dynamism, develops following the mental and social dynamics of society and language. Therefore, the anthropological approach should be a priority in semantic research as well ” [8, pp. 9,7].

Indeed, no language can be learned correctly and completely without distinguishing it from the "master of the language." After all, in every act of speech, the identity of the speaker is felt. In the speech process, the communicators' knowledge of the language helps them to understand each other correctly and clearly. The great German scientist W. Humboldt's antinomy of "understanding and misunderstanding" was used to describe the same process.

Linguistic knowledge of speakers means not only their ability to use language codes correctly but also their ability to relate language codes to beings. The second skill is inextricably linked to a concept that has been called the "linguistic landscape of the world" (LLW) in recent times. LLW is an integral part of epistemology and reflects the reflection of the members of the universe in the human brain. In other words, the members of the universe are conditioned and interrelated in the human mind, and these reflected members are represented by the codes of a particular language.

While the members of the universe are interconnected and reflected in the human mind as groups, so are its codes. Such an associative relationship between codes is the basis for uniting linguistic units into specific semantic fields. For example, a person's semantic field, such as his behavior, intellectual ability, lifestyle, culture, behavior; while the semantic field of the bird includes the linguistic units that name the behavior, a series of signs that represent its members.

In particular, verbs such as speak, sing, laugh, read, write; qualities such as intelligent, wise, prudent, cultured, rich, poor, based on the "human" archetype; verbs such as fly, dive, spread wings, lay eggs; Horses such as feathers, wings, and beaks form a semantic field based on the "bird" archetype. The semantics "human" or "bird" are repeated in all members of a semantic field. This repetitive sema acts as a unifying sema-archisema for all these members. There will be a hierarchical relationship between small areas and large areas that are broken down from the content of a content area. It is this connection that unites them under one semantic field.

At the same time, the concept of LLW is also closely related to the field of ethnolinguistics. It is known that each nation has its ethnoculture, and ethnoculture as a whole consists of various components that are inextricably linked. One such

component is tradition. "Traditions are the best and most exemplary lessons of human life from ancient times, his life and social activity, labor, exemplary life. It would not be wrong to call them instructive lessons for generations to come "[9, pp. 10, 39].

The set of traditions of a nation is an integral part of the ethnoculture of that nation. Any ethnoculture finds its expression in the language of these people. So, it is also a means of expressing the culture, lifestyle, customs, and so on of the speakers of this language. This feature is manifested in the cumulative function of language.

If we consider all the peoples and nations living on earth as a single system, the individual ethnoses in this macrosystem are distinguished by certain characteristics, in particular, language, origin, material and spiritual culture, lifestyle, and psychology.

While customs play the role of a differential sign in the whole ethnographic system of a particular ethnos, the study of their linguistic expression is of great importance not only for linguistics but also for ethnography. Each language has specific lexemes that represent ethnographic concepts, which form a group of ethnographic lexicons, and this microsystem is considered to be part of that language macrosystem.

In linguistics, there is a separate field of study of linguistic means of expressing the ethnoculture of the people, which is called ethnolinguistics. Ethnolinguistics is a branch of science that studies the ethnoculture of particular people with the help of linguistic methods. Ethnolinguistics as a separate branch of linguistics was separated from ethnography in the early twentieth century and developed in America in the 1920s. This direction initially focused on ethnographic materials specific to Hindu tribes in North and Central America.

Ethnolinguistics as a pure linguistic direction was formed in the first quarter of the twentieth century. F. Boas is recognized as its founder. One of the main tasks of ethnolinguistics, founded by F. Boas, is to determine the issue of the genetic kinship of Hindu tribes.

Later, his problems included issues such as the interaction of languages, bilingualism, the influence of ethnoculture on language development. In the process of studying the influence of ethnoculture, special attention was paid to the customs of ethnoses and their naming.

This is because the existence of common name and common language, customs, and traditions of each ethnos has been recognized as important features that distinguish them from other ethnoses. Hence, traditions are recognized as an integral part of ethnos ethnoculture as a key factor determining its existence, and the study of its names is an important area of ethnolinguistics. In our language, tradition and its name are expressed through the mind. In other words, the members of tradition are reflected in our minds as

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

concepts, and it is manifested through the elements of language.

In particular, one of the first works in Uzbek linguistics was the study of A. Juraboev's study of the existence of various traditions of the Uzbek people, which led to the emergence of several names in the language, and their study is an important theoretical and practical linguistics. is of great importance in disclosing the issues [11].

The author notes that the study of the ethnographic lexicon in the Uzbek literary language and dialects is of great importance not only for linguistics but also for such disciplines as history and ethnography, as these materials are unique for a deeper study of folklore, culture, and customs. shows that it is important.

He points out that ethnographic vocabulary is very broad in terms of subject matter and scope. Includes names of births, circumcisions, and weddings, hospitality, banquets, folk festivals, games and songs, various religious ceremonies, rituals that occur with the death of a person, as well as other relationships [p. 11,10].

A. Juraboev combines lexemes belonging to a certain lexical-semantic group as a whole under the name "wedding ceremony lexemes" and defines their sememe "wedding" as a system-forming feature.

Also, in Uzbek linguistics Z. Husainova's monograph "Onomasiological study of the names of wedding ceremonies in the Uzbek language (based on the materials of the Bukhara dialect group)", F. Hayitova's "Linguistic interpretation of wedding songs" [12, pp. 12; 13].

These dissertations served as a special stage in the history of the study of Uzbek ethnographic vocabulary. In these studies, the names of several concepts representing and related to custom names were analyzed within a limited layer of consumption.

In M. Kakharova's research, ethnographic lexemes belonging to a certain lexical-semantic group contradict each other within a paradigm, and the

unifying (integral) and differential (differential) semantics of such lexemes are described [8].

Until the end of the twentieth century, terms specific to various aspects of our lives, production and science were studied in the name of professional and scientific-technical terms, but by the beginning of the XXI century, they were all combined under the term sectoral lexicon. In particular, in her research on the names of wedding ceremonies in the Uzbek language, Z. Husainova introduces such lexical units into the field of everyday lexicon and distinguishes them as a unit different from terms [13, p. 12,7].

In this regard, the research of M. Abdiev is of special importance. Based on the dichotomy of language-speech, the author opposes the contradiction between traditional literary language and folk dialects and acknowledges that folk dialects are also a form of speech. Therefore, in his view, at the lexical level, the general linguistic lexicon and the sectoral lexical system contradict each other based on gender-species relations [14, pp. 14,15].

Subsequent needs necessitated a comparative study of language units. In particular, a special systematic study of the names of concepts related to customs in the Uzbek language is one of such needs. To this end, the integration of concepts related to various traditions and ceremonies in the Uzbek language into a specific microdistrict and their semantic analysis has acquired a special significance.

In subsequent studies, such linguistic units have been studied by combining them into a traditional micro field. These units combine all image-representing lexemes into a specific paradigm based on a custom semantics. At the same time, it is observed that these units merge into smaller cells based on a certain common meaning within the generalization. The study of such units belonging to the field of tradition serves as an important tool in illuminating the peculiarities of any nation, its national values.

References:

1. Karaulov, Jy.N. (1976). *Obshhaja i russkaja ideografija*. Moscow.
2. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika*. Toshkent: Ўzbekiston millij jenciklopedijasi.
3. Xakimov, M. (2013). *Ўzbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari*. Toshkent: Akademnashr.
4. Hudajberganova, D.S. (2015). *Ўzbek tilida badiij matnlarning antropocentrik talkini*: Filol.fanl.d-ri. diss.avtoref. Toshkent.
5. Safarov, Sh. (2015). *Til nazariyasi va lingvometodologija*. Toshkent: BAYOZ.
6. Iskandarova, Sh.M. (1993). *Ўzbek nutk odatining mulokot shakllari*: Filol.fanlari nomzodi. . diss.avtoref. Samarkand.
7. Mýminov, S.M. (2000). *Ўzbek mulokot hulkining izhtimoiy-lisonij hususijatlari*: Filol.fanlari dokt. diss.avtoref. Toshkent.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

8. Kaharova, M.M. (2009). *Ўzbek jetnografizmlarining sistemavij tadkiki*: Filol.fanlari nomzodi. . diss.avtoref. Toshkent.
9. Maxmudov, N., & Odilov, Jo. (2014). *Sʻz maʼno tarakkijotida ziddijat*: (Ўzbek tili jenantiosemik sʻzlarining izoxli lufati), Toshkent: Akadernashr.
10. Murodov, M., Koraboev, U., & Rustamova, R. (2003). *Jetnomadaniyat*. Toshkent: Adolat.
11. Dzhurabaev, A. (1971). *Nazvanija svadebnyh ceremonij v uzbekskom jazyke* (na materiale andizhanskom gruppy govorov): Avtoref.diss....kand.filol.nauk. Tashkent.
12. Husainova, Z. (1984). *Onomasiologicheskoe issledovanie nazvanij svadebnyh obrjadov v uzbekskom jazyke* (na materialah Buharskoj gruppy govorov): Avtoref.diss. . kand.filol.nauk. Toshkent. .
13. Xajitova, F. (1998). *Nikoʻx tʻjji kʻshiklarining lingvistik talkini*: Filol.fanlari nomzodi. diss.avtoref. Toshkent.
14. Abdiev, M.B. (2005). *Soʻxavij leksikaning sistem taxlili*: Filol. fanlari dokt. diss. avtoref. Toshkent.