Interaction Between Language and Culture

Matyakubov Zohid Mo'minbayevich	English language Teacher

ABSTRACT

This article provides information about the words used in Linguistics and the interaction between language and culture.

When talking about the interaction between language and culture, it is necessary to dwell in detail on the concept of "culture". There are many attempts to interpret this concept. For example, G.V. Yelizarova includes the concept of "culture" among axiomatic concepts that seem intuitively transparent. However, it is extremely difficult to define such a complex concept. There are also definitions of culture that seek to cover all aspects of the concept without focusing on one aspect, such as "Culture is how we live here." The initial approach to the definition of culture is based on the assumption that culture is a homogeneous state characteristic of all societies. Differences in society are interpreted not as differences in their essence and content, but as differences in the same situation - the level of development of culture. Progress from savagery to civilization served as a yardstick. The more signs of civilization a society has at its disposal, the more culturally advanced it is considered to be. We find the most vivid expression of this approach to the understanding of culture in the works of E. Taylor. His more widespread definition of culture expresses culture as a whole complex phenomenon that includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs and any other characteristics and habits that a person acquires as a member of a society. . [1] But it is difficult to agree with such a point of view: civilization and culture are very different concepts. One case cannot be evaluated by another case, because both of these concepts refer to cases with different meanings. At the end of the 19th century, with the beginning of F. Boas's anthropological studies, the term "culture" began to be applied to different societies.Such a modification of attitudes towards culture is very important in terms of the importance of language. Since then, language and culture are considered inextricably linked. A. Vejbitskaya gives a particularly effective definition of culture proposed by Clifford Hertz. It says that culture is a historically formed pattern of essences embodied in symbols. This is a system of inherited ideas, with the help of which people communicate with each other, and their knowledge of life and life rules are recorded and developed based on these ideas. defined as something that becomes the basis for. The content and structure of culture have been interpreted differently depending on the implemented components, learning goals, and

the schools to which researchers in different fields of science and culture belong. [2] The social definition of culture the approach is based on the consideration of this situation as a completely different situation from the biological and physiological aspects that are not limited to nature, an individual, but a group of people who communicate. The cognitive approach to the definition of culture is that culture is created by a person can be considered in terms of mental realities, structures and processes as they are mastered. This approach to the concept of culture pays special attention to culture as a process of knowledge and cognition and is called cognitive (V. Goodenough). based on understanding as (K. Lévi-Strauss). But none of the given definitions can be considered complete, because they reveal only one aspect of the multifaceted aspects of culture, they are limited to the "approach" to culture and do not consider it as a whole. [3] M.K.Mamardashvili and A.M.Pyatigorsky note that "culture is a phenomenon that introduces the automatism of objectively oriented thinking." E. Sepir writes: "There is no doubt that language plays a major role in the accumulation of culture and its historical inheritance. This applies equally to the highest levels of culture and its simplest forms.A large part of the cultural stock of the simplest society is preserved in the form of a more or less precisely defined language.'' There will be no "simple" or "developed" cultures. According to Z.K. Tarlanov, "Language is not a simple form of communication and a simple tool, it is a completely independent world, whose laws and rules are based on their essence. When it is expressed through language, it is closely connected with the social psychology of the speakers and the type and composition of the culture they create. Ethnoculture does not exist without ethnic language or at all, or even if it exists, it is not reliable, because ethnos expresses itself completely and on a large scale, uniquely, only through its language. On the other hand, the language that is separated from ethnic culture, ethnic worldview, and the experience of cognitive activity loses its deep essence and thus becomes one of the simple means of communication. Interpreting the relationship between language and culture is an extremely complicated task. [5] Language, thought, culture - these are phenomena that are always in motion, changing. In order to study them, it is necessary to stop them, but it will no longer be the same "language", "thought", "culture". , rather, they do not exist: they remain dead, motionless, separated from each other. It is impossible to determine which is the primary, but the fact is that there is no ethnos without language. , the death of a language means the destruction of both ethnos and culture. The destruction of any culture always occurs in exactly one way - through the isolation of cultural elements, i.e. through the change of living conditions. As a result, when symbolism left life, language as a separate element of culture also died at the same time. Thus, language, thought and culture are so closely connected that in practice they form a whole consisting of three components, which these components neither can function (and therefore function) without the other two components. All of them interact with the surrounding world, reflect it and shape it at the same time.

In doing so, they create phenomena called world views. In current research, two terms are used interchangeably: "world view" and "world model". However, in our opinion, there is a significant difference in their meaning. The word "model" sounds like something logically organized, planned, and the concept of "landscape" has a somewhat different character, which reflects elements of creativity. Therefore, we will use the term "world view" more often. [5] According to G. V. Kolshansky, "world view" is the characteristics of a person and his life, his interactions with the surrounding world, as well as his is the main concept that reflects the conditions of living in the world. "The world view is the main global image of the world that forms the basis of human perception of the world, reflects the essential features of the world in the understanding of the language owners, and is the result of all the spiritual activity of a person." The author specifically notes that this is always a subjective image of objective reality,

because the world scene is not a mirror image of events in reality, but only an interpretation. "Worldview" is characterized by change, therefore it has a dynamic tone and is oriented towards the process of cognition. It arises in the process of human relations with the world, in which the experience and forms of relations are characterized by great diversity. O.N.Yermolayeva writes about the need to clearly differentiate two bases of the study of the world landscape in language:

1) a linguistic reflection of the world scene, which operates outside of us, without depending on us at all, and among its objects there are special relations and connections;

2) obtaining from the language a view of the world that exists outside of us, with its objects having special relations and connections, which act without dependence on us at all.

The author notes that "in the first case, the researcher goes from the uniformity of the objective world for all languages to the diversity of worldviews, and in the second case - from the diversity of worldviews in language(s) to the uniformity of the objective world. In the first case, the reality of language is multiple in the second case, objectivity outside the language occurs. It is worth noting that until now, researchers have made a number of conclusions regarding the first and second aspects of this problem. It is noted that the following set of factors participate in the formation of a linguistic unit:

1) extralinguistic - factors related to the objective nature of reality reflected in thought and language; 2) factors related to the laws of reflection of the conceptual - objective world in the human mind; 3) in particular, factors related to the special laws of human language.

A.A. Vetrov concludes the above-mentioned thoughts and writes: the world's linguistic landscape can be imagined in two models: 1) language model, 2) conceptual model. The content, presentation style and methods of these models are not the same.

G.V. Kolshansky cites the following aspects related to the "worldview" problem:

In the non-objectified (non-materialized) state of the human worldview, such a view is the "field" of localization;

1. "Worldscape" is created by man in the following cases:

a) as a result of the objictification and objectification of the images of the world, which are the basis of vital activity, this is essentially the re-emergence of the image of the world, and b) as a result of the development of new images in the process of reflection, it consists of the construction of the image of the world;

2. The world view is not a reflection of reality in a mirror, but its interpretation in a certain way, because "any view of the world created by seeing the world through certain prisms always inevitably contains signs of human subjectivity, individuality The world view is the basis of human perception of the universe, and it embodies its main features" which is related to the anthropocentricity of the language.

Conclusion:

Words expressing the same concept in different languages can differ according to their semantic capacity and cover different fragments of reality. Pieces of the mosaic presenting a world view can be differentiated in different languages depending on the amount of conceptual material obtained in the human brain as a result of the perception of the surrounding world. depends on socio-cultural and natural characteristics. Differences in thinking through language are manifested precisely in the perception of excess or lack of forms of expression of the same concept.

References:
1. Mamatov A. - Modern linguistics. Tashkent, 2018.[1]
2. Mahmudov N. Searching for ways of perfect study of the language...// Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, 2012. - No. 5.[2]
3. Sabitova Z.K. Linguistic culture: textbook. - M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2013.[3]
4. Tangirova, G. I. (2020). INTERAKTIVNOE OBRAZOVANIE I EGO DIDAKTIChESKIE VOZMOJNOSTI. Science and Education, 1(Special Issue 3).[4]
5. www.ziyonet.uz[5]