



The Concepts Of "Mythology", "Linguaculturology", "Intercultural Relations" In Modern English Linguistics

Pulatova Sarvinoz Botir kizi

PhD student Faculty of Foreign Phiology National University of
Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Phone: +998933757755

sarvinoz-yasmina9209@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the views of several scholars on the specifics of the concepts of "mythology", "linguaculturology", "intercultural relations". It has also been suggested that a number of factors contribute to the interdependence of these lexeme units. In recent years, linguists to the problems of the language and culture of a particular ethnic group have paid much attention. The article pays attention to such concepts as a conceptual and linguistic worldview and their relationship.

Keywords:

Mythologeme, mythology, linguaculturology, intercultural relations, lexical units with a mythological component of meaning, semantic changes, secondary nomination.

It should be noted that the study of intercultural communication requires intercultural understanding, which is the ability to understand and appreciate cultural differences. Language is a component of intercultural understanding. Due to this, intercultural relations have a special meaning in the linguistic landscape of the world includes almost all types of spiritual creativity of the people.

The terms "mythology", "linguaculturology", and "intercultural relations" are units that require in-depth study in the field of linguistics. [1] These concepts are linked to the language and culture at the center of our research. Although they have different meanings, they all discuss the representation of culture in language. The distinguishing feature is the object and direction of their study. Linguaculturology and mythology are independent disciplines in the field of science, and this aspect is their unifying feature.

The study of the means of developing intercultural interaction is the study of cultural

traditions, while the term is the development of a complex set of competencies necessary to enable an individual or organization to function successfully in intercultural situations

The problems of the relationship between language and culture remain one of the most urgent problems of modern linguistics. One of these problems is the use of lexical units of the English language in a mythological and religious cultural context. The first form of thinking by which the model of peace was formed was mythopoetic mentality.

Myths are seen as specific narratives of gods or superhuman beings involved in emergencies or circumstances at indefinite times. The form in the myth is identical to the content.

Makovskiy defines two main patterns characteristic of primitive thinking: lack of causality and relationship of past and present. Myth as a conceptual worldview includes a set of individual and ethnic knowledge about the objects of reality and represents one or another at the level of national knowledge about the

world [5]. Perceiving and structuring the world with the help of mythological thinking, a person tried to determine some laws and bring the incomprehensible world to a certain norm and system [1].

Nominalism is crucial for the mythical mentality: names (nouns, noun phrases) that represent the core of the mythological worldview and reflect archetypal images are realizations of mythological images, that are usually called mythologemes. Mythological thinking is an integral part of thinking, and its implementation is carried out in myths and mythologemes that make up the mythological conceptual sphere of the national-cultural worldview.

There is no consensus among scholars on the term mythologeme. Makovskiy defines mythologemes as the unity of several concepts that are inseparable from each other in terms of magical thought about primitive man [5].

Bykova and Rakitina consider the mythologeme as an actualized meaning of the mytheme. The significant structure of the mythologeme contains signs of denotative and connotative aspects. Its actualization is based on the transition of the denotative or connotative characteristics pass from the signifier to the signified, so the connotation penetrates into the denotative meaning of the mytheme [6].

According to Pitina, a mythologeme is a discrete unit of collective consciousness, a concept that reflects the objects of possible worlds, which is verbally represented in the national memory of native speakers. The verbal way of representing the mythologeme is carried out using dictionary units, lexemes and word combinations used in the direct and figurative meaning. In cases of secondary nomination, various external and internal characteristics of the mythologeme appear, giving reality to the initially ideal images [7].

Krutalevich defines a mythologeme as a concrete interpretation of the universal model of the collective unconscious possessing such features as retrospectivity, and regional and ethnic special character. A mythologeme is a meaningful unit, stored in the ethnic memory,

which reflects the cultural features in the particular language worldview [3].

Mythologemes can belong to a culture in general and reflect the general features of mythological thinking that have been preserved in modern society (e. g: giant, fairy, dwarf) due to the mutual influence of cultures and stereotypical reflection of the unreal in all peoples. Such universal, understandable mythologemes are called international.

International mythologemes represent only a part of the mythological conceptual sphere. In a specific mythological worldview, international mythologemes acquire specific characteristics and vary depending on the specific linguistic and cultural situation.

Language is a purely human phenomenon. This is the only way to express and store systematic knowledge about the world. Different languages in terms of their semantics, grammar and phonetics reflect the way of thinking of different nations. A peculiar worldview, expressed by language means, is characteristic of any ethnic group, though it is a combination (and not presence or absence) of prevailing components that makes it different from other worldviews.

The mythological worldview was the initial one and provided the basis for the creation of the first semiotic system. As the first way of thinking expressed in the language it is characterised by a number of features, such as the authenticity of the myth at the time of its creation, its cognitive function, the accumulation of knowledge about the world, ethnic connotation, and high emotiveness.

Vocabulary is one of the most obvious ways to express a peculiar worldview. Thus, lexical units containing some mythological component clearly demonstrate the influence of the mythological worldview on the modern word usage. The analysis is based on the material of words and phrases of the English language selected from *the Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*. As a result, 374 lexical units with mythological meaning were singled out [4].

Those are grouped by their origin, and it can be concluded that Classical mythology and native mythological ideas form the core of the

mythological worldview reflected in the modern English language.

A considerable part of all lexical units appears to have no semantic changes registered in the dictionary (167 entries). However, most of the words and phrases selected have undergone some semantic changes. Semantic changes are expressed in English in different ways from an additional meaning within the major one to a separate word or phrase without any fixed connection to the source mythologeme.

Due to the development of the language, mythologemes have acquired a new meaning based on their primary ones. The secondary nomination is primarily (72.5% of all words with semantic change) of metaphorical nature, since some peculiar feature of the initial nomination is preserved and transferred to a new characteristic of a human being, some extra linguistic phenomenon or the formation of a new expression describing a new phenomenon.

It is clear that the unifying aspect is the study by the culturologist and linguist for the units of "mythology", "linguaculturology", and "intercultural relations" mentioned above [8]. For this reason, these units are of special importance in harmony with the linguistic landscape of the world.

Consequently, mythologemes as lexical units that represent the mythological worldview in modern English demonstrate not only the mythological ideas proper but also deeply assimilated in the language and, therefore, serve as the basis for the formation of new units and derivatives of a metaphoric character.

As a conclusion, the terms "mythology", "linguaculturology", and "intercultural relations" are units that require in-depth study in the field of linguistics. [9] It should be noted that these concepts are inextricably linked to the language and culture at the center of our research. Although they have different meanings, they all discuss the representation of culture in language. The distinguishing feature is the object and direction of their study. Linguaculturology and mythology are

independent disciplines in the field of science, and this aspect is their unifying feature.

Used literature:

1. Khayrullina, R., & Berger, V. (2018). Human character in the mythological world view (on the material of the Russian, Kazakh and English languages). *Philology at MGIMO*, 2(14), 61-67.
2. Kleymenova, V. Yu. (2019). Modern mythologeme: variability and invariance. *Proc. International scientific conference "Variability in language and speech" at Minsk State Linguistic University*. Minsk, 103-105.
3. Krutalevich, A. N. (2016). "Mythologeme" in the conceptual apparatus of cultural studies. *Culture and civilization*, 1, 10-21.
4. Longman (1999). *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*. Barcelona: Cayfossa.
5. Makovskiy, M. M. (2014). *Language – Myth – Culture. The Symbols of Life and the Life of Symbols*. Moscow, Inst. of the Russ. lang. n. aft. V.V. Vinogradov, Russ. Acad. Sci.
6. Mechkovskaya, N. B. (1998). *Language and Religion*. Moscow, Agency "FAIR".
7. Pitina, S. A. (2002). *Concepts of Mythological Thinking as Components of the Concept Sphere of the National Worldview*. Chelyabinsk State University Publ. House.
8. Xomskiy N. Aspekti teorii sintaksisa. M., 1972. – S. 259; Yazik i mishlenie. M., 1972. – S. 122
9. Gerder I. G. Idei i filosofiya istorii chelovech estva. –M., 1977. – C. 233.