



Linguistic and Lexicographic Features of Touristic Vocabulary in Uzbek and English Languages

Summary: *This article reveals that the cognitive content of culture, expressed in cultural concepts, requires separate parallel studies to identify at the same time their national cognitive specificity, which should be referred to the subject of linguocognitive studies.*

Keywords: linguocultural, phraseological units, semantics, culturological

Language is closely related to the spiritual culture of humanity along with other sign systems and can tell a lot about it and its specifics. The substantive units of the language form a linguocultural code - a system of interrelated meanings that reflect the specific, historically conditioned world perception and worldview inherent in a particular linguistic community.

It should be taken into account that most of his life an ordinary person spends, imitating one or another cultural samples, following established patterns of behavior. Accordingly, if some value, belief, conviction and knowledge have passed the baton of generations and found their reflection in the language, then this is a sufficient criterion of the cultural significance of all these forms of experience.



It is quite right to assert that "spiritual culture as an objective mental education has an effect on people, to a large extent determines their value-oriented orientations"

We believe that not all the national specificity of the semantics of linguistic units, representing a special type of interpretation of reality in the national consciousness, can be due to the reflection in the semantics of culture of a particular people. It seems that in the study of problems related to the national characteristics of a language, of all the many, numerical definitions proposed by the authors of semantic and linguocultural studies preferable to adopt a narrow interpretation of culture, understanding it as a spiritual culture - these are the values, principles, norms and rules, rituals as the principles of standard household behavior, as well as the production of literature and art (artistic culture).

Accordingly, giving a particular word a cultural or key status for a given linguistic culture tradition requires a linguistic justification, in identifying the so-called cultural dominants "through the juxtaposition of value judgments that stem from the stereotypes of behavior and are fixed in the meanings of words, stable expressions, precedent texts "

So, in the semantics of many lexical and phraseological units, stylistic and broader - functional-structural differences are revealed that are not in any way conditioned by cultural factors specific to the people concerned. At the same time, according to the results of our research, in the semantics of comparable units of different languages, many identical identical semantic components of meaning are recorded that reflect universal, universal human phenomena of culture, since they belong not to a single people, but are the property of mankind generally.



International Journal of Research

ISSN: 2348-6848 Vol-5, Special Issue-18

**2nd EduIndex® International Conference on Science
Changes the World** held on 28-29th June 2018 at **EduPedia
Publications Pvt Ltd**, New Delhi in Association with www.tadqiqot.uz
of the Republic of Uzbekistan



For example, the following phraseological units of the Uzbek language and their translation correspondences in the English language are differentiated according to the composition of their constituting components and the phraseological image, that is, they have a national specificity of semantics, but they express the cultural values that are identical for the two cultures, most lack of culturologically significant national differences.

The very statement about the linguistic and cultural nature of a particular linguistic phenomenon must in any case be proved by concrete facts of a concrete culture. In the presence of such proofs, this phenomenon becomes a linguistic fact and supplements the description of the national specificity of the language, otherwise - linguocultural versions remain hypotheses that do not give linguistics reliable knowledge of the language.

Why did some lexical differentiations or integrations arise, why is this or that symbol of this or that phenomenon symbolized - questions that cannot usually be solved unequivocally, most of the explanations are in the sphere of randomness, which goes back to the initial nomination of the subject by a word; especially often this can be attributed to the detail of the nomination of a particular sphere of validity (the nominative density of lexical groups), the differentiation of the nominative means of the language, the internal form of units, metaphors, symbolism.

It seems that at the present stage of the development of the science of language it is already quite insufficiently generalized to state, as is often done in some modern works, claiming the status of linguocultural, that this phenomenon is "very significant in the culture of the people", "reflects the specific features of the culture



of the people " etc. - it is necessary to explain explicitly which cultural phenomenon, phenomenon, fact of national culture reflects this or that unit, its value or semantic component.

In other words, in order to ascertain the fact of the national and cultural specificity of the semantics of linguistic units, it is necessary to explicitly isolate the linguoculturally significant sema or seman conditioned by the concrete facts of a particular national culture, phenomena, phenomena and processes that occur or were once fixed in the culture of that or other people.

If, however, the proposed explanation of the linguistic phenomenon is hypothetical or general (for example, it reflects the special sincerity of the Uzbek people, this reflects the love of this people for nature, this reflects the special love of the English to the sea), then such statements simply state the possible connection between the semantics of the word and culture, which may well not be confirmed in a specific study. Communicatively-conditioned differences in the nominative density of linguistic spheres from the point of view of explanatory linguistics need a specific analysis in each individual case.

The specifics of the internal form of the linguistic unit, as well as the differentiation of linguistic means in the nomination of a particular subject area, can not automatically be interpreted as a reflection of the linguistic and cultural specifics of the language-these differences may be due to purely random causes. If these differences can be motivated by the concrete fact of a particular national culture, then such differences can be recognized as national-cultural. If such a motivation is impossible, then we can speak only about the national peculiarities of semantics, but not about the national and cultural peculiarities of semantics.



We believe that the identification of the cultural specificity of semantics as a reflection of the mental culture in the semantics of the word is associated with the reflection in the semantics of linguistic units:

- spiritual phenomena (images of artistic culture): literary realities, precedent artistic (paremias, myths, fairy tales) and non-fiction (for example, advertising, public) texts, including screened works;
- as well as objectified spiritual phenomena (social rituals, cultural phenomena, social institutions, reflecting spiritual phenomena as elements of people's consciousness).

Let us emphasize that the linguistic and cultural approach in modern linguistics should be regarded as an additional aspect of the linguistic description of the semantics of linguistic units aimed at explaining and proving the culturally conditioned reasons for the emergence of national features of the semantics of linguistic units.

This point of view has an undoubted advantage, primarily because it allows us to delimit the linguistic and cultural specifics of semantics from a broader concept - the national specificity of semantics, to determine the correlation of these concepts, to specify and clarify these terms.

Bibliography:

1. Vezhbitskaya A. Understanding of cultures through the medium of key words. - M., 2001



International Journal of Research

ISSN: 2348-6848 Vol-5, Special Issue-18

**2nd EduIndex® International Conference on Science
Changes the World** held on 28-29th June 2018 at **Edupedia
Publications Pvt Ltd**, New Delhi in Association with www.tadqiqot.uz
of the Republic of Uzbekistan



2. Popper K. Logic and the growth of scientific knowledge (Logik der Forschung). with him. - Moscow: Progress, 1983
3. Slyshkin G.G. From text to symbol: linguocultural concepts of precedent texts in consciousness and discourse. - M .: Academia, 2000