

Background Vocabulary of the Russian Language

Khanova D. B.

Teacher of Foreign Languages at Termez University of Economics and Service

Abstract:

The linguo-cultural concept of background knowledge and their classification are considered, the classification of vocabulary with national-cultural semantics as a means of mastering background knowledge is analyzed. On the basis of this, the parameters of deobjectification of the national and cultural specificity of the lexical unit are determined, and new types of vocabulary with national and cultural semantics are distinguished.

Keywords: linguistic and cultural studies, background knowledge, vocabulary with national cultural semantics.

Introduction

The analysis of such a constituent part of a LU as its linguistic sign for quantitative correspondence allows us to single out, along with non-equivalent, duo-equivalent and multi-equivalent vocabulary. For example, the multi-component sign "mother-in-law" corresponds to two signs of the Russian language: the one-component "mother-in-law" (1) and the multi-component "mother-in-law" (2). The language sign "brother-in-law" corresponds to four (!) signs of the Russian language: "son-in-law" (1); "brother-in-law" (2); "in-law" (3); "brother-in-law" (4). This makes it possible to attribute the corresponding lexical units to duo-equivalent and multi-equivalent vocabulary (having, respectively, partial national and cultural specificity - in contrast to non-equivalent vocabulary). Let's move on to the analysis of the qualitative correspondence of the "mother-in-law" sign to its Russian equivalents. From the point of view of the content aspect, the sign "mother-in-law" is complex, as it consists of the following independent signs: "mother" ("mother") and "in-law" ("property", i.e. a relative from the side husband or wife). The latter ("in-law") includes another independent unit that has a specific national and cultural load in English culture - "law" ("law"). As you can see, signs with this meaning are not included in the Russian equivalents "mother-in-law" and "mother-in-law" (lit. "own blood"). The combination of independent signs in the compound "mother-in-law" allows us to trace the following English-language logic of naming "mother-in-law" / "mother-in-law": in accordance with the "law" of marriage, the wife's mother becomes the husband's mother, and the husband's mother becomes the wife's mother, but not by mother. "blood", but "mother-by-law" (according to the "law" of marriage). Let's move on to a brief analysis of the opposition "sign - system of signs". In the system of signs, the opposition "mother-in-law - mother-in-law", apparently, is not equivalent (in this case, both the content and structural aspects of the system of signs are specific), while in English there is an absolutely identical, "equal" naming people performing equivalent social roles. The source of this "equality" is the category of



“law”, which has a special meaning in the English-speaking culture. Summarizing the above, we can state that the multi-equivalence of the “mother-in-law” sign, which has partial specificity, is associated with its multi-level national-cultural semantics. At the same time, the modern temporal layer of the linguistic sign is subjected to analysis. Analysis of the sign for quantitative and qualitative correspondence allows us to identify another type of vocabulary with NCL, which can be called vocabulary with a different naming logic or vocabulary with a different logic of constructing a language sign. From the point of view of the analysis for quantitative correspondence, the above-mentioned “in-law” sign has one equivalent correspondence (“property”) and from these positions does not have national and cultural specifics (this unit is neither non-equivalent, nor duo-equivalent or multi-equivalent). However, further analysis for qualitative compliance reveals the national and cultural specificity inherent in this sign, more precisely, in the content aspect of this complex sign. The constituent unit “law” indicates, as we explained above, a different logic of naming (and, accordingly, perception) of reality by the speakers of the English-speaking culture. This kind of vocabulary can be called vocabulary with a different naming logic or vocabulary with a different logic of constructing a linguistic sign. This category of vocabulary can also include such lexical units as “take an exam” (“take an exam”, lit. “take an exam”), “slippers” (“slippers”, lit. “slippers”), “pineapple” (“pineapple”, lit. “pineapple”), “butterfly” (“butterfly”, lit. “butter fly”), etc. Vocabulary with an “inverted” structure of the linguistic sign. From the point of view of analysis for quantitative correspondence, the “I” sign has one equivalent correspondence (s) and from these positions does not have national and cultural specifics, like the “in-law” sign. However, further analysis for qualitative compliance reveals the national and cultural specificity inherent in this sign, more precisely, in contrast to the “in-law” sign, in the structural aspect of this simple sign. The English version of “I” is capitalized, which is an example of a structural “reversal” relative to its Russian equivalent. Apparently, this fact of the language as part of the English-speaking culture testifies to the priority of the individual-personal principle in relation to the collective, social. This is evidenced by the order of recording the surname and name (respectively, there is also a structural aspect). In English, it is customary to start not with a surname, but with a given name. When filling out the English form (personal data), the following characters are often used: “first name” (“name”), “second name” (“surname”). Here, even the content of the sign itself (the method of naming) testifies to the unconditional priority of the name - in contrast to the Russian-speaking or, to a special extent, Chinese culture, where the public, social principle traditionally dominated the individual. Vocabulary with NCL, distinguished in connection with the significant Connotative vocabulary. This category is associated with such a component of the signification as connotations (associations). At the same time, connotations are not directly determined by the meaning of the lexical unit itself (unlike the lexical background). Connotative vocabulary includes two subspecies of vocabulary. • Initially, non-equivalent vocabulary, which received stable correspondences in translation (and thus lost the concept of non-equivalence), but at the same time did not lose a bright cultural component, which is expressed in the connotative meanings of words that do not always coincide in different languages. For example, English



names and surnames like John, Goerge, Shakespeare, geographical names like London, New York, the Tames, the Mississippi, which have stable correspondences in Russian and which therefore ceased to be non-equivalent, have no less for linguistic and regional studies, but, on the contrary, is more important than non-equivalent, but little-known in their own environment, proper names like Hanema, Thorne, Appleby. For example, the English name John has a bright cultural component, which symbolizes the English nation (John Bull) and, in terms of most connotations (i.e., emotional and aesthetic associations), perhaps only slightly inferior to the name Ivan in Russian. For an Englishman, the name John is not at all what the name John is for a Russian; at the same time, Ivan in English is deprived of all that warmth that surrounds the name Ivan in Russian, its diminutive variants (Vanya, Vanyushka, Vanechka, Ivanushka), the anthroponym Ivanov derived from him ("All Russia rests on the Ivanovs"), combinations like Ivan da Marya. Quite the contrary in the English-speaking environment: Ivan has a negative connotation and is associated with the only historicism Ivan the Terrible known in this environment - Ivan the Terrible. A similar picture is observed in toponymy: the Volga for a Russian person is not at all what the Volga is for an Englishman or an American, and at the same time, we do not know a lot of associations associated, say, with the Mississippi river ("The Ol' Man River" - "Old man; buddy; grandfather," as she is called in the Negro blues) [4, p. 48].

- "Equivalent" vocabulary with nationally determined connotations. This group of connotative vocabulary (equivalent) requires special attention, since the equivalence of its dictionary meaning gives rise to the appearance of connotative equivalence, which leads to unexpected failures in communication, cultural shock and intercultural conflicts (in an initially non-equivalent vocabulary, its foreign cultural origin is always felt, its initial non-equivalence).

background vocabulary. This category is associated with such a component of the signification as the lexical background. The lexical background of E.M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov name the entire set of non-conceptual semantic parts related to the word [3, p. 26]. Such non-conceptual semantic parts are sometimes called secondary features of a word. The lexical background is responsible for:

- thematic words. For example, the Russian "letter" and the English "letter" are conceptually quite identical, comparable. However, there are discrepancies in the field of lexical background: the address on the envelope is written differently. The lexical backgrounds of the main words of a language, as a rule, are closely related to the totality of all the values of the spiritual culture of a society, therefore, even words that seem to be far from national specifics should be treated with due attention. So, the words "school" or "university" for foreign languages cannot be considered non-equivalent, because they are easily translated, but the whole set of information that relates, for example, to the American "university" differs sharply from the lexical background of the Russian "university". This foreign-language background information reflects the specifics of the American education system and ultimately shows the characteristic features of a different way of life [4, p. 50];
- for syntactic links. Ignorance of the lexical background also leads to a violation of the use of the language or to the construction of meaningless phrases: the expression "You should have written the sender's address on the back" in relation to our conditions is meaningless [4, p. 50].



Literature

1. Suleymanov D. N. PROBLEMS OF SPEAKING IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES //Academic research in educational sciences. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 9. – С. 4-8.
2. Suleymanov D. N. PROBLEMS OF SPEAKING IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES //Academic research in educational sciences. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 9. – С. 4-8.
3. Berdievich I. B., Nazinovich S. D. N. S. D. Lesson and Its Analysis as a Factor of Increasing the Quality of Education //European Scholar Journal. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 1. – С. 42-45.
4. Berdievich I. B., Nazinovich S. D. N. S. D. Lesson and Its Analysis as a Factor of Increasing the Quality of Education //European Scholar Journal. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 1. – С. 42-45.
5. Ханова Д. Б. ФОНОВАЯ ЛЕКСИКА РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА //Экономика и социум. – 2022. – №. 10-1 (101). – С. 727-730.
6. Ханова Д. Б. НАСТОЛЬНЫЙ ТЕННИС: ТЕХНИКА И ТРЕНИРОВКИ //Авиценна. – 2018. – №. 27. – С. 7-9.\
7. Gulinodira A. Features of Systemic education //The Peerian Journal. – 2022. – Т. 11. – С. 82-85.
8. Gulinodira A. Features of Systemic education //The Peerian Journal. – 2022. – Т. 11. – С. 82-85.

