

The Concept of Linguocultural Studies and its Significance in Linguistics

Rakhimova Mokhlaroyim Makhammadjon qizi¹

¹ Teacher of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract:

The current article will consider the concept of linguacultural studies, which explores the inseparable interconnection of linguistics and culture. Linguacultural studies analyze the mental, cultural, and mental characteristics of representatives of different ethnic groups, which allows us to identify the features of their cultural values and the specifics of their concepts of the material and inner world of man.

Keywords: legal basis, representative bodies, Local Budget, executive authority, council, local representation, principle, public bodies, centralized authority.

INTRODUCTION. The problem of the relationship and interconnection of language, culture, and ethnicity is interdisciplinary, the solution of which is possible only through the efforts of several sciences - from philosophy and sociology to ethnolinguistics and linguacultural studies. For example, questions of ethnic linguistic thinking are the prerogative of linguistic philosophy; the specifics of ethnic, social, or group communication in the linguistic aspect are studied by psycholinguistics, etc. Language is closely connected with culture: it grows, develops, and expresses it.

Based on this idea, a new science emerged — linguacultural science, which can be considered an independent direction of linguistics that took shape in the 1990s. The term "linguacultural science" appeared in the last decade in connection with the works of the phraseological school headed by V.N. Telia, the works of Yu.S. Stepanov, A.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Vorobyov, V. Shaklein, V.A. Maslova and other researchers. If cultural science studies the self-awareness of man concerning nature, society, history, art, and other spheres of his social and cultural existence, and linguistics examines the worldview, which is reflected and recorded in the language in the form of mental models of the linguistic picture of the world, then linguacultural science has as its subject both language and culture, which are in dialogue, interaction. While the traditional way of thinking about

the problem of interaction between language and culture is to try to solve linguistic problems using some ideas about culture, our work studies how language embodies, stores, and transmits culture in its units.

Linguaculturology is a branch of linguistics that emerged at the junction of linguistics and cultural studies and studies the manifestations of a people's culture that are reflected and fixed in the language. Ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics are closely related to it, so closely that this allows V.N. Telia to consider linguaculturology a section of ethnolinguistics. However, these are fundamentally different sciences. Speaking about the ethnolinguistic direction, it should be remembered that its roots in Europe go back to W. Humboldt, in America - to F. Boas, E. Sapir, B. Whorf; in Russia, the works of D.K. Zelenin, E.F. Karsky, A.A. Shakhmatov, A.A. Potebnya, A.N. Afanasyev, A.I. Sobolevsky, and others were of great importance. It was ethnolinguistics that V.A. Zvegintsev described as a direction that focuses on studying the connections between language and culture, folk customs, and the social structure of society or the nation as a whole. Ethnos is a linguistic, traditional-cultural community of people connected by common ideas about their origin and historical destiny, common language, cultural and psychic features, and self-awareness of group unity. Ethnic self-awareness is the awareness by members of an ethnic group of their group unity and difference from other similar formations.

At the center of modern ethnolinguistics are only those elements of the lexical system of language that are correlated with certain material or cultural-historical complexes. For example, ethnolinguists reveal a complete inventory of cultural forms, rites, and rituals based on the material of the Belarusian and Ukrainian Polesie. This territory can be considered one of those "key" Slavic regions, with which, first of all, the task of a comprehensive study of Slavic antiquities should be set"[3] Sociolinguistics — only one of its aspects is the study of the relationship between language and society (language and culture, language and history, language and ethnicity, language and church, etc.), but sociolinguistics mainly studies the features of the language of different social and age groups. Thus, ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics are fundamentally different sciences. If ethnolinguistics operates mainly with historically significant data and seeks to discover historical facts of a particular ethnic group in modern material, and sociolinguistics considers exclusively the material of today, then linguaculturology studies both historical and modern linguistic facts through the prism of spiritual culture. In fairness, it should be said that there are other opinions on this issue. V.N. Telia, for example, believes that linguacultural studies only the synchronous interactions of language and culture: it studies living communication processes and the connection between the linguistic expressions used in them and the synchronously acting mentality of the people.

The concept of culture is fundamental to linguacultural studies, so we consider it necessary to examine in detail its ontology, semiotic character, and other aspects important for our approach. The word "culture" has as its source the Latin *Colere*, which means "cultivation, education, development, veneration, cult". Since the 18th century, culture has come to be understood as everything that has appeared due to human activity, his purposeful reflections. All these meanings have been preserved in later uses of the word "culture", but initially this word meant "purposeful human influence on nature, changing nature in the interests of man, i.e. cultivating the land".[2]

Anthropology is one of the first sciences about man and his culture, which studied human behavior, the formation of norms, prohibitions, and taboos associated with the inclusion of man in the system of socio-cultural relations, the influence of culture on sexual dimorphism, love as a cultural phenomenon, mythology as a cultural phenomenon and other problems. It arose in English-speaking countries in the 19th century and had several directions, the most interesting of which in the context of our problem can be considered cognitive anthropology. Cognitive anthropology is based on the idea of culture as a system of symbols, a specifically human way of cognition, organization, and mental structuring of the world. According to the supporters of cognitive anthropology, language contains all the cognitive categories that underlie human thinking and constitute the essence of

culture. These categories are not inherent in man immanently; they are formed in the process of man's introduction to culture.

The most important property of culture, which makes it practically impossible to develop a single and consistent definition of culture, is not just its complexity and multi-aspect nature, but its antinomy. We understand antinomy as the unity of two opposite, but equally well-founded judgments in culture. For example, exposure to culture promotes the socialization of the individual and at the same time creates the prerequisites for his individualization, i.e. promotes the disclosure and affirmation of his uniqueness by the individual. Further, to a certain extent, culture does not depend on society, but it does not exist outside of society, it is created only in society.

Culture ennobles man, and has a positive influence on society as a whole, but it can also have a negative effect, subordinating man to various kinds of strong influences, such as, for example, mass culture. Culture exists as a process of preserving traditions, but it continuously violates norms and traditions, receiving vital force in innovations, its ability to self-renewal, constantly generating new forms is extremely great. The analysis of culture is complicated not only by the multitude of its definitions, but also by the fact that many researchers (cultural scientists, anthropologists, philosophers, ethnographers, and other scientists) return to the analysis of this essence several times, not only clarifying this concept but also changing their views.

At the turn of the century, the place and weight of cultural argumentation in modern language science changed, primarily in cognitive semantics. The analysis of linguistic units in the context of culture led to the formulation of some problems new to linguistics. Linguacultural studies as an independent branch of knowledge must solve its specific problems and, in doing so, answer, first of all, many questions that can be formulated in the most general form as follows: how does culture participate in the formation of linguistic concepts; to what part of the meaning of a linguistic sign is "cultural meanings" attached; are these meanings recognized by the speaker and listener and how do they influence speech strategies; do the cultural and linguistic competence of a native speaker exist in reality, based on which cultural meanings are embodied in texts and recognized by native speakers. As a working definition of cultural-linguistic competence, we accept the following: it is the natural mastery of the processes of speech production and speech perception by a linguistic personality and, what is especially important, mastery of cultural attitudes; to prove this, new technologies of linguacultural analysis of linguistic units are needed.

The object of linguacultural studies is the study of the interaction of language, which is a transmitter of cultural information, culture with its attitudes and preferences, and man, who creates this culture using language. The object is located at the "junction" of several fundamental sciences - linguistics and cultural studies, ethnography, and psycholinguistics. The subject of this science's research is language units that have acquired symbolic, standard, figurative-metaphorical meaning in culture and that generalize the results of human consciousness itself - archetypal and prototypical, recorded in myths, legends, rituals, ceremonies, folklore, and religious discourses, poetic and prose artistic texts, phraseological units and metaphors, symbols and paremias (proverbs and sayings), etc.[6]

Traditionally, philology and lingua folklore studies examine the status of paremias, the terminological features of paroemias, and the problem of distinguishing between proverbs and sayings, but there is still no consensus on these issues [3]. In this regard, when comparing known definitions of paremias, the researcher is faced with a variety of views on paroemia as a term. Moreover, an analysis of modern domestic encyclopedic linguistic dictionaries has shown that the non-linguistic term "proverb" is used today much more often than paremia (in the same meaning), which indicates the versatility, debatability, and complexity of this linguistic phenomenon and the unresolved issue of its status.

Proverbs, being nationally marked units, often cause difficulties in translation. The translation studies aspect helps to solve various problems that arise in artistic practice and translation theory.

This aspect is connected with the contrastive method, however, some factors are important and distinctive: the competence of the translator, knowledge of the paremiological fund of languages, and understanding of the writer's intention – the author of the work of art. In addition, the translation of proverbs "requires the translator to have a good knowledge of the culture and national specifics of the language, preservation of functional dominants, emotional and expressive background, and stylistic features" [1]. The translation aspect makes it possible to study the techniques and methods of transferring proverbs from one language to another.

The analysis of ethnolinguistic markers - components of phraseological units and paremias (proper names, names of artifacts inherent in the material culture of a particular people, ethnonyms - names of peoples and tribes), reflecting national identity, "cultural memory" and often have no direct analogs in another language, allows us to reveal the ethnospecificity of a linguistic sign [2], as well as to prove the universal nature of the world paremiological fund. The selection of phraseological/paremiological equivalents helps to identify the system of national worldview. According to the theory of E.M. Solodukho, the semantic equivalence of the related units is determined by the coincidence of their content. According to V. Khlebda, "theoretically, or potentially, any proverb of any language should have its equivalent in any language - not necessarily figurative, but semantic. Demotivators are a productive Internet genre for studying the text-forming potential of proverbs. The presented material demonstrated that the commentary on the slogan expressed by the proverb does not differ in different languages. It is promising to consider the functioning of the same proverbs in the verbal part of demotivators of different languages to prove the presence of semantic condensate.

CONCLUSION. The study of proverbs in modern linguistics is based on principles that have already become classical, as well as on relatively new ones. Comparative-contrastive linguacultural analysis, combining features of contrastive and linguacultural methods, is integrative and allows obtaining important information about the interaction of language and culture. Comparative-contrastive linguacultural analysis of proverbs with a toponym component showed that the semantics embedded in some proverbs is reflected in the proverbs of other languages. Paremiological material has proven the idea of the existence of semantic equivalents in different, even unrelated, languages, despite the presence of toponyms characteristic of each country as cultural signs that act as ethnolinguistic markers.

REFERENCES:

1. Belikov V.I. Paremias as an object of lexicography // Computer linguistics and intelligent technologies: Based on the annual International Dialogue Conference (Bekasovo, June 4-8, 2008). Issue. 7 (14). M.: Publishing House of the Russian State Humanitarian University, 2008.
2. Tareva E.G. Teaching language and culture: a soft power tool // Bulletin of Moscow City Pedagogical University. Series: Philology. Theory of language. Language education. 2016. No. 3 (23). Page 94-101.
3. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Лингвокультурология. Ценностно-смысловое пространство языка. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2010. – 214 с
4. Маслова В.А. Введение в когнитивную лингвистику: уч. пособие. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2004. – 296 с.
5. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. Пособие для студ. Высш. Учеб. заведений. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.
6. <https://mgpu-media.ru/issues/issue-21/philological-science/linguocultural-features-paremies.html>