

Interpretation of the Problem of World Linguistic Representation in Modern Linguistics

Boboyeva Muazzam Narimonovna

ESL teacher, Department of Foreign Languages, Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology

Abstract: Currently, two terms are used interchangeably in research on this topic: "world view" and "world model". However, in our opinion, there is a serious difference in their meaning. The word "model" sounds like a logically organized, planned thing, "and the concept of a landscape has a somewhat special character, it reflects elements of creativity. For this reason, we will use the term "worldview" more often hereafter.

Keywords: world view, perception, reality, linguistic reflection, objects, uniformity, factors, extralinguistic, culture, phenomena, worldscape, anthropocentricity, visualization, solution.

Introduction

According to G.V. Kovshansky, "world view" is the main concept that reflects the characteristics of a person and his life, his interactions with the wider world, as well as the conditions necessary for him to live in this world. "The world view is the main global image of the world, which is the basis for human perception of the world, reflects the essential features of the world in the understanding of the bearers of such a view, and is the result of all the spiritual activity of a person." The author specifically notes that this is always a subjective image of objective reality, because the world view is not a mirror image of events in reality, but only an interpretation. "Worldview" is characterized by change, therefore it has a dynamic tone and is oriented towards the process of cognition. It arises in the process of human relations with the world, in which the experience and forms of relations are characterized by great diversity.

- 1) a linguistic reflection of the world scene, which operates outside of us, without depending on us at all, and which has its own special relations and connections between its objects;
- 2) obtaining from the language a picture of the world that exists outside of us, with special relations and connections between its objects, that act without dependence on us at all.

The author notes that "in the first case, the researcher goes from the uniformity of the objective world for all languages to the diversity of world views, and in the second case, from the diversity of world views in language(s) to the uniformity of the objective world. In the first case, a linguistic reality is constructed, in the second case, objectivity outside language is created. It is worth noting that until now researchers have made a number of conclusions regarding the first and second aspects of this problem. It is noted that the following set of factors participate in the formation of a linguistic unit: 1) extralinguistic - factors related to the objective nature of reality reflected in thought and language; 2) factors related to the laws of reflection of the conceptual-objective world in the human mind; 3) in particular, the factors related to the special laws that apply to human language.

Interpreting the relationship between language and culture is an extremely complex task. Language, thought, culture - these are phenomena that are always in motion and change. In order to

study them, it is necessary to stop them, but it will no longer be that "language", "thought", "culture", or rather, they will not be themselves: they are or remains motionless, separated from each other.

It is impossible to define what was primary, but the fact is that there is no ethnos without a language, and the death of a language means the destruction of both the ethnos and the culture.

The destruction of any culture always occurs in exactly one way - through the isolation of cultural elements, that is, when symbolism leaves life as a result of changes in living conditions, language as a separate element of culture also dies.

Thus, language, thought, and culture are so closely intertwined that in practice they form a three-component whole, none of which can function (and therefore function) without the other two components. All of them interact with the surrounding world, reflect it and shape it at the same time. In doing so, they create phenomena called worldscapes.

A.A. Vetrov concludes the above-mentioned thoughts and writes: the linguistic landscape of the world can be imagined in two models: 1) language model, 2) conceptual model. The content, presentation style and methods of these models are not the same.

G.V. Kovshansky cites the following aspects related to the "world view" problem:

1. In the non-objectified (non-materialized) state of the human world view, such a view is considered the "field" of localization;
2. "Worldscape" is created by a person in the following cases: a) as a result of the objectification and objectification of the images of the world that are the basis of life activity, this is essentially the re-emergence of the image of the world, and b) the development of new images in the process of reflection as a result, it consists in the construction of the image of the world;
3. The view of the world is not a mirror image of reality, but its interpretation in a certain way, because "any view of the world created by seeing the world through certain prisms always inevitably contains signs of human subjectivity, individuality" "The world view is the basis of human perception of the world, and it embodies its main features" which is related to the anthropocentricity of the language.

Conclusion

Competence, integrity, and focus on a specific goal resonate in this phrase "visualization of the landscape". When the world becomes a landscape, it reacts to the existence in general as if it were the object on which a person focuses all his attention, and therefore he tries to keep this landscape in the treasury of his imagination. In essence, the realized world view does not mean the view that describes the world, but the world that is understood in the sense of such a view. When it comes to the world view, a fundamental solution to the existence in general is given. The existence of a being is sought and found in the image of this being.

Reference:

1. Anthony, L. English for Specific Purposes: What does it mean? Why is it different? CUE, 5 (3), 1997. - 9-10 pp.
2. Ковшанский, Г.В Соотношение субъективных и объективных факторов в языке, 1975.
3. Komil Djalilov, Exam skills for teachers and learners of English. – ToshkentTuron Zamin Ziyoy, 2016

4. Gairns, R. & Redman, S. Working with words: A guide to teaching and learning vocabulary. USA: Cambridge University Press. Gruneberg, M. & Sykes, R. (1991). Individual differences and attitudes to the keyword method of foreign language learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 4, 1986. 60-62 pp.
5. Richard, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. . *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 34-39 pp
6. Schmidt, N. *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000
7. Thornbury, S. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.
8. Z.Fitria, *Teacher Strategies in Teaching Vocabulary to the Eight Grade Students in Extracurricular program at MTs N II Surakarta*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, 2017. – 209 p
9. Richards, & Renandya. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
10. Pütz M., Sicola L. *Cognitive Processing in Second Language Acquisition*. – Amsterdam.: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2010. – 375 p.
11. Reinhold P. *What Is the Matter With Communicative Competence?: An Analysis to Encourage Teachers of English to Assess the Very Basis of Their Teaching*. – Lit Verlag, 2005. – 60 p.
12. Richards J.C., Nation P. et.al *New Ways in TESOL series: Innovative classroom techniques*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL, 1999. – 200 p.
13. Richards J.C., Rodgers Th.S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. – NY.: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 270 p.
14. *Professional Development for Uzbekistan English Teachers Training Toolkit Module 1* Toshkent, 2009 .61-68 pp.
15. Allen, V.F, *Techniques in vocabulary teaching*, Oxford university press, New York. 1993
16. Carter, R. , *Vocabulary*, Rutledge, London, 1987
17. Turahanova, H. . (2021). The Poetics of "Lison Ut-Tayr". *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 19, 319-321. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.19.989>
18. Akbaraliyevna, A. S. . (2021). Differences Between Phrasal Verbs and Phraseologisms. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 19, 222-224. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.19.966>
19. Ahunbabaeva Nargiza Hamidjanovna, Yunusova Nilufar Mahmudjanovna **HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF UZBEK MILITARY TERMINOLOGY**. Namangan Engineering Technological Institute, Namangan, Uzbekistan. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S06.478>
20. Gulzoda Ergasheva, Boboyeva Muazzam. (2022). **MEANING AND SEMANTIC ROLES OF WORDS IN CONTEXT**. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 3756–3759. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S06.500> (Original work published December 29, 2022)