European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education (EJINE)
Volume 2 | Issue 2 | ISSN: 2795-8612

Analysis of the Linguoculturologic Characteristics of Prefaces and Entries

Ernazarova Hilola Ergashevna
Teacher of Kokand state pedagogical institute, Uzbekistan

A B S T R A C T

The article illustrates analysis of entries and prefaces in english and uzbek discourse. It informs about linguoculturology and its origin as well as studying entries in linguoculturological way.

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:
Received 25 January 2022
Received in revised form
29 January 2022
Accepted 09 February 2022

Keywords: entry, preface, foreword, linguoculturology, speech, ethnography of speech.

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2022

INTRODUCTION

All types of written sources or spoken speech must be given with an introductory part as well as preface is essential part of the written work. Since these parts of speech is very important, it opens the main meaning of the whole text and gives first impressions and ideas about upcoming text. There are various types of introductory parts of a speech, such as introduction, preface, heading, subheading, foreword are main of them. A "foreword" is an introduction to a book, usually written by someone other than the author. A preface is an introduction to a book, usually written by the author. Preface explains what the book is about or why it was written. It is the introductory remarks of a speaker or author. With the help of introductory remarks, a reader can predict about the whole text because it should include all the meaning of the passage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Linguoculturology is a new direction study in linguistics and culture. It is mentioned both culture and linguistics, so it is called as linguo and culture.

Linguistic and cultural studies is a section of linguoculturology that considers the characteristics of the country of the language being studied in their linguistic expression, the vector of which is determined by the professional orientation of the researcher. Linguo-cultural studies (ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology) detached from cultural studies (philosophy) in the 60-s of the XX century. It took the form of an independent discipline after the publication of a special issue of the American journal "Ethnography of Speech" (1964) with articles by a number of well-known researchers, among whom were V. Labov, E.T. Hall, D.H. Hymes. The authors stated the urgent need to unite the efforts of several scholastic disciplines (linguistics, history, anthropology, ethnography, sociology) in the context of the discovery of the enormous potential of the human language. It should be noted that the concept of sociocultural determinism of the phenomena of the human language did not originate from a scratch. It was prepared by the works of European scholars of the past – K.W. Humboldt in Germany, A. Meillet and E. Benvebiste in France, A.A. Potebnia in Russia. Later, the famous Russian scholars A.F. Losev, M.M. Bakhtin, Y.M. Lotman, D.S. Likhachev, R.A. Budagov studied several areas of connection between languages and cultures.

A large number of works devoted to linguoculturological problems have appeared in modern linguistics. Linguoculturology is a complex field of scientific knowledge on the interconnection and interaction of language and culture that arose on the basis of the research works of the phraseological school of V. N. Telia, the publications of V. V. Vorobev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. A. Maslova, the works of other linguists [Kourovo, 2005, p. 27]. Linguoculturology is closely connected with such disciplines as linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitivistics.

Linguoculturology is considered as the theoretical basis of linguistic culture; It is defined as "a complex scientific discipline of the synthesizing type that studies the interrelation and interaction of culture and language in its functioning and reflects this process as an integral structure of units in the unity of their linguistic and extralinguistic (cultural) content through systemic methods and with an orientation to modern priorities and cultural Establishment (a system of norms and universal values)" [Vorobyev, 1997, p. 36–37]. The main object of linguoculturology, the author calls "the interaction and interaction of culture and language in the process of its functioning and the study of the interpretation of this interaction in a single systemic integrity", and the subject of this discipline are "the national forms of society, reproduced in the system of language communication and based on its cultural values", — everything that makes up the "linguistic picture of the world". Vorobyov introduces the main unit of linguocultural analysis — lingvoculture, defining it as a "dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic (conceptual and objective) content".

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the process of verbal communication, units belonging to all levels of language are activated, and the highest coordinator of these movements is called as communicative syntax. Speech and text, which are the basic units of verbal communication, are ultimately formed on the basis of these laws of communicative syntax.

Communicative syntax always implies the connections between the speaker, the listener, and the speech, as well as the specifics of those connections. Of course, the rules of semantic-structural and systemic syntax cannot be ignored, because communicative syntax focuses on the processes of verbal realization of these rules, which is its main task.

The homogeneity of the syntactic structure in a sentence or text, the stereotype, makes the reader bored, weakens the perception of the content, reduces the power of the aesthetic impact of the text. While parentheses naturally "disrupt" the syntagmatic structure of a sentence or text, "breaking down" the horizontal syntactic connections in them[1], they add an unexpected emphasis, expressiveness to the text.

Some researchers argue that "insertions are incorporated into a grammatically formed ready-made sentence structure, breaking both the grammatical connection and the complete intonation in the sentence". In fact, the insertion is not included in the finished sentence without prior planning, but gives the reader the impression of such an "unplanned", "which creates the conditions for the actualization of the semantic value of the input in the speech."[2]

CONCLUSION

All in all, introductory words are essential in any kind of passage, as these words and expressions give extra meaning to the given idea. Without usage of introductory words, speaker does not lose the meaning of the sentence. However, it shows extra meaning to the given consideration. All languages around the world have their own grammar, vocabulary and other aspects of linguistics, uzbek and English are also among them. In English there are several types of introductory words to express the feelings of extra ideas to the given speech. For instance: Frankly speaking, to cut it short, so, to speak, by the way, as far as I know, therefore, in any case and many others can be good examples. In uzbek, To'g'risini aytganda, albatta, shu biln bir qatorda, shu bilan birga, shunga qaramay, ehtimol and many of them can be

[1] Александрова О.В. Проблемы экспрессивного синтаксиса. –М.: Высшая школа, 1984.- С.30.

[2] Бабайцева В.В. Русский язык. Синтаксис и пунктуация. –М.: Просвещение, 1979.- С. 186.

mentioned as introductory sentences to give extra meaning to the speech or text. Studying these levels of linguistics linguoculturologically is very essential as all languages have their own features and characters in their own having the similarities and differences between them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Камалова, Д. А. Lingvoculturology as a new direction of contemporary linguistics / Д. А. Камалова. — Текст : непосредственный // Молодой ученый. — 2017. — № 15 (149). — С. 700-702. — URL: https://moluch.ru/archive/149/42202/ (дата обращения: 28.01.2022).
2. Александрова О.В. Проблемы экспрессивного синтаксиса. –М.: Высшая школа, 1984.- С.30.
3. Бабайцева В.В. Русский язык. Синтаксис и пунктуация. –М.: Просвещение, 1979.- С. 186
4. Rajapova M. A. The usage of cognitive metaphor and allegory in discourse. “Экономика и социум” №1 (80) ч 1ю 2021ю www.iupr.ru