"THE OATH" AS A CULTURAL CONCEPT.

Saminjonov Mukhammadali
Teacher of the Department of English at the Faculty of Foreign Languages of Fergana State University

Language, a social phenomenon, is one of the greatest achievements of mankind. Its appearance, nature, laws of development, in general, the "way of life" of language has attracted the attention of scientists for centuries. The question of communication between language and culture, language and thinking is one of the issues that do not lose their relevance. The universe is a complex reality. The picture of the world created in human consciousness is not a stable, unchanging structure, it changes depending on the improvement of cognition methods and reflects the achievements of society and science. In the world philosophy and linguistics the question of language and thinking, the relationship between language and culture was first discussed by the ancient philosopher Aristotle, later by Wilhelm von Humboldt, E. Sepir, B. Warf, L. Weisgerber, in the framework of modern linguistics Likhachev D.S., Arutyunov N.D., Telia V.N., Karasik V.I., Ivanov S.V., Maslov V.A., Sabitov Z.K., Alefirenko N.F. and others. In modern linguistics, which recognizes anthropocentricity as its main idea, the concepts of "world picture", especially "linguistic world picture" have taken a central place. " They show the results of recording (expressing) concepts and stereotypes through a system of secondary symbols that materialize and "materialize" the cognitive landscape of this world, existing in the mind as a mediated landscape of the world, including linguistic and artistic landscapes of the world among such landscapes.It should be noted that these researchers are proponents of the view of non-verbal thinking, i.e., non-verbal realization of thought forms, since man has the ability to understand the world and himself. only because of language. In accordance with the peculiarity of language, a linguistic picture of a certain world arises in the minds of its possessors, since a person sees the world through the prism of language". of a people, first of all, belongs to this people, fixed in the linguistic landscape of the world.

The linguistic landscape of the world is the sum of ideas about the world, ways of understanding and division of the world, historically formed in the consciousness of the corresponding linguistic community and fixed in its language, it is customary, natural and obligatory for all native speakers. this language. this language. This custom, naturalness and necessity ensures the stability of the linguistic landscape of the world, its survival and continuity in the language community (people, nation) between historical periods and the transition from generation to generation. There is no doubt that all language levels participate in the creation and formation of the linguistic landscape of the world. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in the creation and reflection of the linguistic landscape of the world, language, especially the lexical, i.e. lexical (phraseological) level, occupies a special place. Such a concept in the conceptosphere of a particular nation, that is, in the national worldview, in other words, the concept can be transferred to the national worldview of another nation. This will certainly happen as a result of one or another level of need.

The process of language research went from description to excessive abstraction and modeling. In each period, the turn in the methodology of linguistics was determined by the increasing interest to one or another side of the subject. Nowadays, the term "paradigm" is understood as a complex model of setting and solving a scientific problem, a general view of the object of science, a system of theoretical rules and methods recognized by experts, and three paradigms are distinguished in linguistics: comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric. As mentioned above, the paradigm is associated with a change in the principle of approach to the object. The 60s-70s of the 20th century marked the "semantic storm" in the history of linguistics, the 80s marked the communicative approach to language, and the last quarter of the 20th century was the heyday of cognitive linguistics[1]. In the new century, the study of language paid attention to the subject of language, which remained outside the scope of structural linguistics. After all, the presence of a mental (spiritual aspect) in the essence of language does not deny the existence of aesthetics (beauty, artistic expression) in it. Or the fact that language is a social phenomenon leaves us in no doubt that it is a unique systematic structure. Therefore, all these features should be taken into account when revealing the essence of

---

[1] Arutyunova N. D. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: soviet encyclopedia, 1990 b.-s. 389-390.

language. The anthropocentric paradigm, which has been rapidly developing since the end of the 20th century, studies the language system through the prism of the individual. That is, language is studied together with its subject, its national mentality, national culture and other inseparable features. In this approach, the objects of science are studied, first of all, from the point of view of their significance for man, in his life activity, for the development of personality. Thus, linguistics of the XXI century began to attach great importance to the study of linguistic phenomena in connection with the culture of the linguistic personality.

The question of the human factor in language research goes back to W. von Humboldt's ideas about the "people's spirit". In his opinion, the uniqueness of different languages, the supreme principle underlying the differences between them, is the "people's spirit". Under the concept of "people's spirit" Humboldt means the spiritual consciousness of the people, intellectual values, concepts of national culture, emphasizing their interdependence and even equality[2]. Since the 80-90s of the 20th century, using the achievements of structural linguistics, interest in the study of the language system through the human prism has increased, and the number of references to Humboldt's ideas has increased. The principle that received priority in this process is the study of language in an anthropocentric approach. Here the views of T. B. Radbill deserve attention. He stated that the fact that a certain object has an anthropocentric nature and an anthropocentric approach to the study of a certain object are fundamentally different concepts[3]. The ancient author Protagoras believed that "man is the measure of all things". The anthropocentric approach to the study of language has its own justification: the object of study by its very nature has an anthropocentric character - language cannot exist without man (society). It is through language that man describes the world, with the help of language he unites it into various groups, and no other instrument can give such detailed evidence of human thinking as language. T. B. Radbill calls this "objective anthropocentrism". T. B. Radbill graphically describes the subjective anthropocentric nature of natural languages as follows: "If we compare a language to a large and meaningful work of art, that work will be a work written in the first person rather than the third person" [17]]. Because the communicative purpose of the speaker, desire - intensionality is an inevitable feature of any judgment. Therefore, the description of the world through language is completely subjective. Continuing his opinion, the scientist expresses such an opinion that the place of a person can be felt in such words as "heavy", "heavy", "strong". That is, things are heavy - hard to lift, hard - hard to change or damage, strong - hard to break[4]. If we pay attention, it is not difficult to notice that as the performer of the above described actions a human being is meant.

Thus, the anthropocentric paradigm studies phenomena with man at the center. Language is its most important formative feature. "...Each nation has its own view, its own discipline of perception, in short, its own principle of thinking. That is why the simple concepts of 'national consciousness', 'national thinking', 'national feeling' have for thousands of years given strength and spaciousness to the light in the heart of the human child[5] ... language, above all, to see and hear the world, is a means of cognition, perception. It should be noted that language is not only a systematic, but also a cognitive-semiological structure.

According to V. Maslova[6], cognitive linguistics and linguistics are the main directions developing within the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics. In cognitology, human activity is considered, first of all, as a system of obtaining, processing, storing and using this information depending on the situation. N. F. Alefirenko notes that the emergence of the cognitive-semiological theory of the word in linguistics was motivated by the recognition that, unlike structuralism, linguistic facts can be explained by facts of a non-linguistic nature. In fact, language has a completely subjective anthropological character in reflecting the world. Because the basis of any change occurring in it since its creation is always outside the language, i.e. it has an extra-linguistic essence[7]. Each nation has, first of all, different climatic (living) conditions, then a way of life, religion and similar "guidelines" resulting from these conditions, a nationally determined appearance, a national linguistic landscape.

It is known that the linguistic landscape of the world is an image of the world created with the help of linguistic means. At present, the conceptual, linguistic, scientific, value, artistic, etc. landscapes are different in science. First of all, it is necessary to distinguish between conceptual and linguistic views of the world. A conceptual (cognitive) view of the world means, first of all, an emotionally perceived, understood, felt view. The linguistic landscape of the world is the conceptual landscape embodied in language. If the conceptual landscape of the world appears as a set of concepts, the linguistic landscape of the world is a set of meanings of linguistic units and ways of expressing these meanings. Therefore, the linguistic landscape of the world is not equal to its conceptual landscape, but is a part of it, expressed in language. The presence of its representative is determined by the place of this concept in the real communication of a nation. The conceptual landscape of the world is vast and colorful compared to its linguistic landscape. Because different,

---

[2] Gumboldt V. fon. Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju [Selected works on linguistics]. - Moskva., Progress,. 1984. - 398 p.

[3] Radbil T.B. Osnovyi izucheniya yazyikovogo mentaliteta. – M. : Flinta, Nauka,. 2010. – 328 s.

[4] Radbil T.B. Ko'rsatilgan manba. –B. 245.

[5] NATIONAL-MENTAL FACTORS IN THE ARTISTIC DISCOURSE OF ISAJON SULTAN (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE NOVEL "GENETICIST"). http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=54168090

[6] Маслова В. А. М 31 Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб, заведений. — М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. — 208c.

[7] Алефиренко Н.Ф. Лингвокультурология: ценностно- смысловое пространство языка. –Москва: Флинта: Наука, 2015

including non-verbal, forms of thinking are involved in the creation of the conceptual landscape. The national language, or rather, its owner wraps the conceptual landscape in a national-cultural garment. Z. D. Popova and I. A. Sternin distinguish between direct and indirect views of the world. According to their views, the direct view of the world is a cognitive picture of the world created as a result of the perception of the world by a person through his senses and thinking, i.e. direct cognition of existence. This landscape consists of a set of stereotypes and conceptospheres formed in human consciousness through culture. The indirect view of the world consists of the reflection of the conceptosphere through the system of secondary signs, which materializes the direct (cognitive) view of the world in human consciousness. The linguistic and artistic landscape of the world is a part of this landscape[8]. However, as Prof. N. Makhmudov notes, such definitions, the separation of conceptual and linguistic pictures of the world should not lead to the conclusion that national consciousness exists without a national language. The linguistic landscape of the world is "the sum of ways of understanding and dividing the world, as well as its representations of the world, historically formed in the consciousness of the corresponding linguistic community and fixed in the language"[9].

The scientific landscape of the world is a system of general knowledge about the world that has developed at a certain historical stage in the development of scientific knowledge. The system of natural sciences will have its own view of the world. The universe will have its own narrow meaning, such as physical or chemical landscape. Thus, the scientific landscape of the universe summarizes the properties of the elements of the universe of interest to the field.

O. Kornilov in his monograph[10] "Linguistic Landscape as a Product of National Mentality" distinguishes between the national landscape of the world and the linguistic landscape of the world and compares the relationship between them with a picture depicting the same landscape and a verbal description of that landscape.

Based on the above, the characteristics of the linguistic landscape of the world can be defined as follows:

1- It has a social character. It is a product of the experience of the whole linguistic community.

2. It is anthropocentric. It is a fundamental feature of language. In the process of linguistic creation, man takes the measure of himself.

3. it is national. Different peoples create their specific linguistic landscape under the influence of different factors.

4- It is a whole having a discrete nature.

It is known that linguoculturology is a science formed at the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies. It focuses on man, his culture and language. According to V. Maslova, language is considered as a "translator" (carrier) of culture[11]. After all, man, language and culture make up a unity, like nails. Language is the pride of the nation, the condition of its existence, the soul of the people, the indicator of national culture. Stagnant moral rules and values peculiar to the national mentality are especially clearly reflected in the stable units of the national language. After all, the cultural code - images of national character, formed over centuries, are stored in stable units.

Life experience, knowledge and culture accumulated by a certain society create a unique form of perception of the world. In fact, knowledge is more abstract than language because it cannot be physically observed. The existence of knowledge derives from the existence of language. Language itself is a product of the activity of the cognitive system; language content is formed as a result of thinking activity.

The conversation about language and culture prompts us to pay attention to the definitions of the concept of culture. "Culture is a certain level of historical development of society, creative forces and abilities of man. It is expressed in various aspects of life and activities of people, as well as in the material and spiritual riches created by them"[12]. However, as noted by E. Sepir, the concept of "culture" is usually limited to the concepts of art, science and religion, which is inappropriate[13]. After all, "under the concept of culture, rather than the belief of a particular people or the product of their activities, one should consider their attitude to this product, the role of this belief and product in the life of the nation"[14]. Culture means a social organism, the rules of existence of which are determined by the priority values in the life of the nation. It is a world of material and spiritual values, filled with human content and meaning. Values are the basis and foundation of any culture. Cultures of different nations are different, because different peoples perform different actions to fulfill the same need, which means they perceive the world differently and have different values. National identity is manifested in the way people work, rest, eat, and socialize in different situations.

---

[8] Стернин И.А. Основы речевого воздействия. Учебное издание. – Воронеж: «Истоки», 2012.- 178 с.

[9] Маҳмудов Н., Нурманов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – 149 б

[10] Корнилов О.А. «Языковые картины мира как производные национальных менталитетов» http://www.ffl.msu.ru/research/publications/kornilov-yazykovie-km/

[11] Маслова В. А. M 31 Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб, заведений. — М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. — С.177.

[12] O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. XII jildlik. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2000-2006. –B. 44

[13] Сепир Э. Этнографическая лингвистика // "Вопросы языкознания", 1954, № 1.

[14] Сепир Э. Ko'rsatilgan manba.

E. Durkheim defined culture as a reflection of the sum of collective ideas and social relations[15], and E. Sepir defined it as "the art of collective thinking" (collective art of thinking).

It seems that the axiological approach based on the analysis of society's value system has priority in defining the concept of culture. There is another informational definition of culture, according to which culture is defined as "the sum of all non-heritage information", its organization and storage methods. So, culture has its semiosphere. In this case, such stagnant units as symbols, stereotypes, traditions, rituals, religious narratives form the signs of culture, and when studying it, according to Y. Lotman's definition, it becomes a "secondary-coded text"[16]. The codification of value concepts formed in culture in different ways is a system of cultural codes. This system forms the national linguistic landscape of the world as a whole. In our work, the priority is the approach to culture as it is - as a semiotic system reflecting the system of values.

It is known that in cognitive linguistics and linguistics the notion of concept occupies a central place. In cognitive linguistics it is defined as "a unit of information system, reflecting the thinking and spiritual capabilities of the human mind, its knowledge and experience, in linguocultural science - a unit of collective consciousness, which has the characteristics of mentality and linguistic expression and is distinguished by its ethno-cultural identity". Without considering different definitions of this concept, we recognize that culture is a unique way of reflecting the world, and the result of this practice is preserved in the consciousness of the nation in the form of national-mental concepts. From this point of view, concepts are the founders of culture. G. V. Tokarev shows that a concept by its content structure can be of two types[17]. The first type of concepts is a set of knowledge that is considered important for all mankind. A vivid example of this is the use of universally recognized concepts by a scientist in the process of scientific creativity. Such concepts the author calls universal concepts. Concepts of the second type collect nationally specific knowledge characteristic of a linguocultural community, which unites it with certain symbols (language, history, culture, religion, etc.) and can be called a cultural concept. Of great importance for linguoculturology is the analysis of national-cultural concepts that reflect the peculiarity of the national mentality. The task of linguoculturology is to find out the cultural content of linguistic units reflecting the national-cultural mentality of a nation, to identify cultural stereotypes through its language, and through them to reveal the value system of this culture as a whole. , the discipline of perception.

REFERENCES:

1. Semenkin A.K. Problema romanticheskogo istorizma v romane H.A.Polevogo «Klyatva pri grobe gospodnem»: Avtoref. diss. ... kand. filol. nauk. – Moskva, 2016. – S. 24.
2. Dementyev V.V. Teoriya rechevыx janrov. – Moskva: Znak, 2010. – S. 8-15.
3. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya. – M.: Akademiya, 2007. – S.8.
4. Radbil T.B. Osnovы izucheniya yazыkovogo mentaliteta. – M.: Flinta, Nauka, 2010. – S. 90. 15 Shermuhammedova N. Falsafa va fan metodologiyasi. – Toshkent, 2005. – B. 127.
5. Kolshanskiy G. V. Obyektivnaya kartina mira v poznanii i yazыke – M., 1990. – S. 62.
6. Kazakova O.A, Frik T.B. Praktikum po kulture rechevogo obщyeniya na russkom yazыke: uchebnoye posobiye /
7. Saminjonov Muxammadali Salimjon oʻgʻli. – TILSHUNOSLIKDA NUTQIY JANRLAR VA SOHA QASAMLARI MASALASI FarDU. ILMIY XABARLAR 1-2023; 355-358.
8. Xazratqulov A. Dialagicheskaya rech v sovremennom uzbekskom literaturnom yazыke. – Samarkand: AKD, 1966. – 28 s;
9. Moʻminov S. Oʻzbek muloqot xulqining ijtimoiy-lisoniy xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. dokt. ... diss. avtoreferati. – Toshkent, 2000. – B.12-16.
10. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya. – 4-ye izd., ster. – M.: Akademiya, 2010. – S. 11.
11. Arutyunova N.D. Yazыk i mir cheloveka. Yazыki russkoy kulturы. – Moskva: Yazыki russkoy kulturы,,1999. – C. 650.
12. Radbil T.B. Osnovы izucheniya yazыkovogo mentaliteta. – M.: Flinta, Nauka, 2010. – S. 90. 15 Shermuhammedova N. Falsafa va fan metodologiyasi. – Toshkent, 2005. – B. 127.
13. Effektivnoye rechevoye obщyeniye (bazovыye kompetensii) //slovar-spravochnik. – Krasnoyarsk: Izdatelstvo SFU, 2012. – S. 485.
14. Gray J.M. So help me God: Oaths and the English reformation. A Dissertation submitted to the department of history and the committee on graduate studies of Stanford University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of philosophy. – USA, 2008. – P. 600.
15. Сепир Э. Этнографическая лингвистика // "Вопросы языкознания", 1954, – №1.
16. Radbil T.B. Osnovyi izucheniya yazyikovogo mentaliteta. – M. : Flinta, Nauka, 2010. – 328 s.
17. Tokarev G. V. Lingvokulturologiya. – Tula: Id-vo TGPU im. L.N. Tolstogo, 2009. – 136 c.
18. Маҳмудов Н., Нурманов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – 149 б.
19. Gumboldt V. fon. Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju. –Moskva, Progress, 1984. – 398 p.

---

[15] **Dyurkgeym E**. O razvitiya obshestvennogo truda. Metod sotsiologii – M.: 1990.

[16] Лотман Ю. М. Л80 Семиосфера. — С.-Петербург: «Искусство – ПБ», 2000. –704 c.

[17] Tokarev G. V. Lingvokulturologiya. – Tula: Id-vo TGPU im. L. N. Tolstogo, 2009. – 136 p

20. Дементьев В.В. Теория речевых жанров (Коммуникативные стратегии культуры). – Москва: Знак, 2010. – 411 с.

21. Dyurkgeym E. O razvitiya obshestvennogo truda. Metod sotsiologii – M.: 1990. – 248 с.

22. Лотман Ю. М. Л80 Семиосфера. — С.-Петербург: «Искусство – ПБ», 2000. –704 с.

23. Маслова В. А. М 31 Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб, заведений. — М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.

24. M.Saminjonov Interactive appointments of the idioms in English and their alternatives in Uzbek Central Asian Academic Journal of Scientific Research Volume – 2, Issue – 5, p 536-543

25. Saminjonov Muhammadali Analysis of Origins of Idioms in English and their Alternatives in Uzbek FarSU Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) 2021/7/12, Volume 12, Issue 13, p 6391-6396

26. Saminjonov Muhammadali MANAGEMENT STYLE AND LEADERSHIP ISSUES Conference Zone 2021/11/30 p 61-62

27. Muxammadali Saminjonov TILSHUNOSLIKDA NUTQIY JANRLAR VA SOHA QASAMLARI MASALASI Scientific journal of the Fergana State University 2023/6/22 Issue 1, p 93-93

28. Saminjonov Mukhammadali OATHS CLASSIFICATION. OATHS OF THE FIELD The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations 2023/10/24 Volume 5, Issue 10, p 31-37

29. Muxammadali Saminjonov ВОПРОС О РЕЧЕВЫХ ЖАНРАХ И ОТРАСЛЕВЫХ КЛЯТВАХ В ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ Farg`ona davlat universiteti ilmiy jurnali 2023/2/25 Issue 1, p 450-453

30. Saminjonov Muhammadali THE ROLE OF SYNONYMY AND VARIANCE IN ENGLISH, Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal 2021/11/29, Volume 9, Issue 11, p 689-691