

LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: PROBLEMS OF INTERACTION

The relationship between language and culture

Jabbarova Shoirra Boltayevna
Senior teacher Termez State University
Termez, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes language as a principle that unites culture and society. The connection between language, culture and art is represented by the linguistic concept. The problem of the origin of language and the purpose of the existence of language (the role of a social integrator in Humboldt and a symbol in Potebnaya) is revealed. It is shown that language acts as a social fact, as a phenomenon determined by social practices, and, therefore, the language of even an individual (as his thinking, and his worldview) will change as his social status changes.

Key words: language, national culture, linguistic concept.

Introduction

Language is what lies on the surface of a person's being in culture, therefore, since the 19th century. (J. Grimm, R. Raek, V. Humboldt, A. A. Potebnaya) to this day the problem of the relationship, interaction of language and culture is one of the central in linguistics. The first attempts to solve this problem are seen in the works of W. Humboldt (1985), the main provisions of the concept of which can be reduced to the following: 1) material and spiritual culture are embodied in the language; 2) every culture is national, its national character is expressed in language through a special vision of the world; the language has an internal form specific for each nation (EF); 3) VF language is an expression of the "national spirit", its culture; 4) language is a mediating link between a person and the world around him. V. Humboldt's concept received a peculiar interpretation in the work of A. A. Potebnaya "Thought and Language", in the works of C. Balli, J. Vandriez, I. A. Beau-duen de Courtenay, R.O. Jacobson and other researchers.

Main body

Language as a phenomenon of national culture is a constant object of attention and research of modern specialists [see: K. Levi-Strauss, N.I. Tolstoy, Yu.A. Belchikov, G. A. Brutyan, E. M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov, A. Vezhbitskaya, E.S. Yakovleva, Yu.S. Stepanov, V.A. Maslova, V.V. Vorobiev, R.A. Budagov, A.A. Bragin, A.D. Vasiliev, I. T. Vepreva, E.V. Lukashevich, L.N. Murzin, M.K. Petrov and others]. In search of a solution to the problems associated with the relationship between language and culture, several approaches have been outlined. Under one of them, which is being developed by such philosophers as S.A. Atanovskiy, G.A. Brutyan, E.S. Markarian, priority is given to the one-sided influence of culture on the language: with the change in reality, cultural and national stereotypes and the language itself change [Maslova, 1997, 34]. From the standpoint of a different approach, the influence of language on culture is considered, which so far, it seems, is still considered quite controversial. Based on the understanding of language as a spiritual force (V. Humboldt, A.A. Potebnaya), the hypothesis of linguistic relativity of Sapir-Whorf was put forward, according to which every nation sees the world through the prism of its native language, reflecting reality in the "linguistic picture of the world". This hypothesis was further developed in the works of J.L. Weisgerber, who understands language as an "intermediate world" standing between objective reality and consciousness, and defines language as "world creation" (this is how it is proposed to understand the term "Weltbild") [Radchenko, 1998].

The third known approach is based on the idea of interconnection and interaction of language and culture. Language is an integral part of culture, the main tool for its assimilation, it is the reality of our spirit. Language expresses specific features of the national mentality [Maslova, 1997, 35, 37]. On the other hand, "culture is included in the language, since it is all modeled in the text" [Maslova, 1997, 107].

The relationship between culture and language can be seen as a relationship between the whole and its part. Language can be perceived as a component of culture or an instrument of culture [Tolstoy, 1991, 6]. Among the abundance of definitions of the concept of "culture" (according to some estimates, there are more than two hundred of them [Alefirenko, 1994, 31]), in our opinion, the most successful ones contain indirect or direct indications of the importance of language.

If we define culture as a set of non-hereditary information, ways of organizing and storing it by various human groups [Lotman, 1970, 5-6], then the history of culture can be represented as the dynamics of self-awareness of culture, to one degree or another explaining the corresponding change in normative attitudes [Lotman, Uspensky 1977, 3]. Since culture experiences a constant need for self-description, satisfied primarily by linguistic means, it is true that "to consider language in abstraction from culture is not to understand the language. To consider culture in abstraction from language means not to understand the essence of culture "[Burago, 1992,9]. However, language is at the same time autonomous in relation to culture as a whole, and it can be considered separately from culture or in comparison with culture as an equivalent and equal phenomenon [Tolstoy, 1991, 6].

Comparison of culture and language in general, and in particular of a specific national culture and a specific language, reveals a certain identity of structures in the functional and intra-hierarchical planes. So, just as we

distinguish between the literary language, dialects, vernacular, and in some cases and argot as an incomplete, strongly reduced linguistic subsystem in the following correspondences:

- 1.literary language - elite culture
2. vernacular - "third culture"
- 3.adverbs, dialects - folk culture
4. argo is a traditional professional culture

Conclusion

The relationship between language and culture can be seen as a relationship between part and whole. Language can be perceived as a component of culture and as an instrument of culture (which are not the same thing). However, language is at the same time autonomous in relation to culture as a whole, and it can be considered as an independent, autonomous semiotic system, i.e. apart from culture, which is done in traditional linguistics.

According to our concept, since every native speaker is at the same time a bearer of culture, linguistic signs acquire the ability to perform the function of cultural signs and thereby serve as a means of representing the main cultural attitudes. That is why the language is able to reflect the cultural and national mentality of its speakers. Culture is related to language through the concept of space.

So, each culture has its own keywords, for example, for Germans, attention, order, accuracy. In order to recognize this or that word as a concept, a key word of culture, it is necessary that it be common, frequent, included in phraseological units, proverbs, sayings, etc.

Linguistic norms are correlated with cultural attitudes, which, however, are not as obligatory (obligatory) as the norms of language: the bearer of culture, distributed in different societies, has the right to a wider choice.

So, culture lives and develops in a "linguistic shell". If primitive cultures were "material", then modern ones are increasingly verbal. Language serves culture but does not define it.

REFERENCES

1. Humboldt W. von. On the influence of the different nature of languages on literature and spiritual development. In the book: Selected works on linguistics. M., Progress, p. 324, 2000a.
2. Humboldt W. von. On the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind. Ibid, p.51, 2000b. Cowley S.D., Kravchenko A.V. Dynamics of cognitive processes and the science of language. Questions of linguistics, no. 6, p. 134, 2006.
3. TADJHIEVA, M.F., & TURAIEVA, G.KH. (2018). SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF THE LANGUAGE PICTURE OF THE WORLD OF THREE CULTURES Development and topical issues of modern science, (2), 73-77.