

## Current Trends In The Development Of The Problem Of Linguistic Picture Of The World

**Kuldashev Akramjon Makhmudovich**

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Professor,  
Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc)

E-mail: [akramkuldashev@gmail.com](mailto:akramkuldashev@gmail.com)

**Kuldasheva Shaknoza Akramovna**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD),  
Associate-Professor, UzSWLU, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: [skuldasheva@mail.ru](mailto:skuldasheva@mail.ru)

### Abstract

The article studies the problem of linguistic picture of the world in different languages. It is well known that the concepts “world picture” and “world model” are frequently used interchangeably in linguistic study. However, we believe that these ideas differ significantly from one another. In reality, language, thought, and culture are all part of one system made up of these three interrelated components. Without the other two, nothing of these elements can exist on its own. Together, they interact with the outside world, mirror it, and take part in its creation. Consequently, “world pictures” are created. The authors of this article seek to elucidate the essence of concepts like “world”, “world picture,” “real picture,” “cultural picture,” “linguistic picture,” and “national picture.”

**Keywords:** The picture of the world, world model, linguistic reality, extralinguistic objectivity, alternative worlds, the cultural picture of the world, subjective perception, the national picture of the world, linguocultural isoglosses, dialect.

### Introduction

Currently, in studies dedicated to this topic, two terms are used in parallel: “the picture of the world” and “world model,” which are used interchangeably. However, it seems to us that there is a significant difference in their meaning. The word “model” is presented as “something” logically organized and planned, while the concept of “picture” carries a slightly different property—it contains elements of creativity. In this regard, we will henceforth prefer the term “picture of the world”.

Languages “died” not under the influence of a foreign culture, but under the influence of new means of accumulation, consolidation, transmission, and consumption of the natural language. Thus, while noticeably losing their language, these cultures imperceptibly lost their symbolism. The death of any culture, as far as it can be understood, is always carried out by the

same path—by isolating the elements of culture; that is, when symbolism disappeared as a result of changed living conditions, language, as an isolated element of culture, was thereby already doomed. Thus, language, thinking, and culture are so closely interconnected that they practically constitute a single whole consisting of three components, none of which can function (and consequently exist) without the other two. Together, they correlate with the surrounding world, reflect it, and simultaneously form it. At the same time, they form so-called pictures of the world.

### Literature analysis

Many linguists and researchers have worked on the role and significance of the worldview in linguistic and cultural studies. For example, Yu.D.Apresyan, V.I.Karasik, P.S.Gurevich, Yu.N. Karaulov, N.Korneyev, G.D. Gachev, A.I.Gelyayeva, M. Heidegger,

I.Trier, S.G.Ter-Minasova, Sh.Safarov, M.Hakimov and others. All of them interpreted the concept of “worldview” differently and gave different definitions to this concept.

V.I.Karasik writes about the need to clearly differentiate between two principles of researching the linguistic picture of the world [4]:

- 1) the reflection in language of a world picture existing outside of us, independent of us, whose objects have their own specific relationships and connections;
- 2) extracting from language a picture of the world that exists outside of us, independent of us, and whose objects have their own specific relationships and connections.

V.I.Karasik notes that “in the first case, the researcher proceeds from the uniformity of the objective world for all languages to the diversity of world pictures, and in the second case, from the diversity of world pictures in the language (s) to the uniformity of the objective world”. [4] In the first case, linguistic reality is constructed; in the second, extralinguistic objectivity is reconstructed. It is noteworthy that to date, researchers have voiced a number of conclusions regarding both the first and second aspects of the problem.

### **Theoretical basis**

The concept of the “picture of the world” is fundamental, reflecting the specifics of man and his being, his relationships with the surrounding world, as well as the conditions of his existence in this world. The picture of the world is the original global image of the world, which lies at the heart of man's worldview, represents the essential properties of the world in the understanding of its bearers, and is the result of all human spiritual activity. This is always a subjective image of objective reality, as the picture of the world is merely an interpretation and not a mirror image of the phenomena of reality. The “worldview” is characterized by change, and consequently, it is dynamic in

nature and oriented toward the cognitive process. It arises in the process of human contact with the world, with experience and contact forms characterized by great diversity.

According to M. Heidegger, the concept of the “picture of the world” is as follows: “When we say “picture,” we primarily think of the depiction of something.” The picture of the world will then be a corresponding canvas of existence as a whole. The picture of the world, however, speaks of more. Here we mean the world itself, its being as a whole, as it is defining and binding for us. Here, “picture” does not mean what is copied, but what is heard in speech: we have created a picture of something for ourselves... To construct a picture of something for oneself means: to present oneself, the being, as it is, and to have it constantly presented to one. But there is not yet a decisive definition regarding the essence of such a picture. “We have formed a picture of something” means not only that the existent is represented to us in some way in general, but also that it has presented itself to us in all that is inherent to it and constitutes it as a system. In this “creating a picture,” competence, equipment, and purposefulness are heard. Where the world becomes a picture, existence as a whole is approached as what a person aims at and what they therefore want to present to themselves accordingly, to have before them. The picture of the world, understood essentially, thus signifies not a picture depicting the world, but a world understood in the sense of such a picture... Wherever it comes to a picture of the world, a cardinal decision is made regarding existence as a whole. The being of the existent is sought and found in the representation of the existent” [2].

### **Results and Discussions**

Within the very term “world picture,” the concept of “world” requires clarification. In accordance with the usages of the word

"world," the world is understood in two ways. First, it is the world in general, perceived as a kind of all-encompassing reality into which man is included alongside other people and which unites him with all other people. At the same time, "the world in general" is not contrasted with any other world. Here we are talking about the opposition to the human subject, who is linked to the world by a special relationship. Subjective perception inevitably leaves its mark on the world picture recreated in the speaker's mind, which becomes the subject of the message in their statement about the world. [5]

On the other hand, there are so-called alternative worlds. Such a world may represent some sphere of being that differs from other comparable spheres and is characterized by its own specific patterns. This world is perceived, as a rule, against the background of opposing worlds. For example, the world of fantasy is contrasted with the world of reality, and one social world is contrasted with another social world. The linguistic picture of the world is understood as a systematically ordered socially significant model of signs expressed through various linguistic means, conveying information about the surrounding world. Its foundation, according to many scientists, is the conceptual picture of the world. At the same time, it is argued that the conceptual picture of the world is a more complex phenomenon than the linguistic picture of the world, as not everything perceived and known by a person acquires a verbal form. The units of the linguistic picture of the world are two-sided and two-dimensional, as they combine meaning with the "bodies" of signs. S.T. Ter-Minasova distinguishes three forms of representing the world surrounding a person: the real picture of the world, the cultural (or conceptual) picture of the world, and the linguistic picture of the world [7]. The real picture of the world is an objective

non-human reality, the world surrounding a person. The cultural picture of the world is the reflection of the real picture through the prism of concepts formed on the basis of human perceptions received through the senses and passed through his consciousness, both collective and individual. The linguistic worldview reflects reality through the cultural worldview. Furthermore, the author notes that it is still more correct to speak not of the part-whole, or language-part of culture, but of interaction.

Language is a part of culture, but culture is only a part of language. Consequently, the linguistic picture of the world is not fully absorbed by the cultural one, if the latter is understood as the image of the world broken in human consciousness, i.e., the worldview of a person created as a result of their physical experience and spiritual activity. Thus, cultural and linguistic worldviews are closely interconnected, are in a state of continuous interaction, and trace back to the real worldview. [6]

According to S.T. Ter-Minasova, the national picture of the world is primary in relation to the linguistic one. It is fuller, richer, and deeper than the corresponding linguistic one. [7] However, it is the language that realizes, verbalizes, preserves, and transmits the national cultural picture of the world from generation to generation. Language does not capture everything that exists in the national worldview, but it is capable of describing everything. We believe that it is inappropriate to speak of the primacy of culture in relation to language or, conversely, language in relation to culture. Rather, these are two interconnected "world pictures" to which cause-and-effect relationships cannot be applied.

Characterizing the current state of the linguistic picture of the world, Yu.D. Apresyan notes that such research proceeds in two main directions [1].

1. On the one hand, "stereotypes" of linguistic and general cultural consciousness, as well as individual concepts characteristic of a given ethnos, are investigated. The author refers to them as a kind of linguocultural isoglosses and isogloss bundles. These are typically Russian concepts such as soul, longing, fate, courage, will, and others. On the other hand, the author notes, these are specific connotations of non-specific concepts (for example, the symbolism of color designations in different cultures).

2. Simultaneously, "a search and reconstruction are being conducted for a holistic, albeit pre-scientific view of the world inherent in language." That is, the "dialect as a whole" is investigated.

According to Yu.D. Apresyan, while taking into account national specificity, the emphasis is placed precisely on the holistic linguistic picture of the world.

### Conclusion

The linguistic picture of the world can be represented in two models: 1) the linguistic model, 2) the conceptual model. The content, methods, and techniques for describing these models are not the same. Differences in the perception and conceptualization of the world by linguistic means in different languages can be significant even with their kinship. In other words, worldviews in different languages can have their own characteristics. In the linguistic picture of the world, ethnic mentality is actualized in "key" cultural concepts verbalized in symbolic images that reflect the mental representation of language speakers about the surrounding world.

Words in different languages denoting the same concept may differ in semantic capacity and may cover different parts of reality. The methods and forms of reflection, as well as the formation of concepts, are in turn determined by the specifics of the

socio-cultural and natural characteristics of the life of this speech collective.

### Bibliography

Apresyan Yu.D. Deyksis v leksike i grammatike i naivnaya model mira // Semiotika i informatika. 1986, vip.28.-S. 5-33. - Апресян Ю.Д. Дейксис в лексике и грамматике и наивная модель мира // Семиотика и информатика. 1986, вып.28.-С. 5-33.

Heidegger M. Kartina mira // Vremya i bytiye. – M.: Izd-vo «Respublika», 1993. – S. 41 – 62. -Хайдеггер М. Картина мира // Время и бытие. – М.: Изд-во «Республика», 1993. – С. 41 – 62.

Juraboyeva, G., & Alikulova, N. (2026). Integrating the mystery approach as a pedagogical tool for promoting critical thinking and learning strategies in primary classrooms. // Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования, 5(7), 9–11. извлечено от <https://in-academy.uz/index.php/zdpp/article/view/77487>

Karasik V.I., Yarmaxova Ye.A. Lingvokulturny tipaj «angliyskiy chudak». M.: Gnozis, 2006. 238 s. - Карасик В.И., Ярмахова Е.А. Лингвокультурный типаж «английский чудак». М.: Гнозис, 2006. 238 с.

Kuldashev A. Tillarda paremiya va turg'un birikmalarni yangi paradigma doirasida o'rganishning ayrim masalalari. Turkiy xalqlar folklorining qiyosiy tadqiqi: lokal xususiyatlar va ilmiy nazariy yondashuvlar. // Xalqaro ilmiy-nazariy anjuman materiallari. II-Jild. - Toshkent, 2026. – 459 b. – B. 350-355.

Qo'ldasheva, S. A. (2024). Dunyoning til yordamida bilishda ongning roli. "Tarjimashunoslik: Muammolar, yechimlar va istiqbollar II" mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy anjuman, 1(1), 750–752. Retrieved from <https://conference.uzswlu.uz/conf/article/view/352>

Ter-Minasova S.G. Lichnost i kollektiv v yazykax i kulturax // Vestnik MGU, Seriya «Lingvistika i mejkulturnaya kommunikatsiya», 2003, № 2. S.7-16. - Тер-Минасова С.Г. Личность и коллектив в языках и культурах // Вестник МГУ, Серия «Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация», 2003, № 2. С.7-16.