

TO THE QUESTION OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE ON THE MATERIAL OF RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Anar Tadjibaevna Masharipova*; Hilola Musinovna Sotvaldieva**

*Assistant Teacher,
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Fergana State University,
Fergana, UZBEKISTAN

**Senior Teacher,
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Fergana State University,
Fergana, UZBEKISTAN

DOI: [10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00236.7](https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00236.7)

ABSTRACT

In this article, the author examines the relationship between language and culture, relying on the issues of intercultural communication, while comparing some of the linguistic features of the Russian and Uzbek languages. The subject of study here becomes words that are nationally significant (for example, birch for Russians, laylak ("stork") for Uzbeks) or non-existent, fictional objects and characters (mythological, fabulous: Baba Yaga, mermaids, goblin - among Russians, peri, deyva, jinn - among the Uzbeks). The merit belongs to W. von Humboldt, in whose works a deep and holistic understanding of language and linguistic pictures of the world is presented.

KEYWORDS: *Language, culture, comparative aspect, intercultural communication.*

INTRODUCTION

The study of languages in comparison is one of the most demanded areas of modern linguistics. This is the area that narrowly expands the scientific interests of linguistics, gives scope for the study of broad humanitarian problems: the relationship between language and culture, language and national consciousness. This is the knowledge of various unique linguistic cultures, national characteristics of people's perception of the world and determining their place in it. Thanks to this, linguistics (and comparative linguistics in particular) attracts the attention of ethnologists, culturologists, psychologists, historians and representatives of many other sciences. When exactly did the interest in language matching appear? It is impossible to give an exact answer. Apparently, this was always the case, at least for those who studied languages and, of course, paid attention to the similarities and differences between them.

The actual scientific foundations of comparative linguistics go back to the end of the XVIII - the beginning of the XIX centuries. The merit belongs to W. von Humboldt, in whose works a deep and holistic understanding of language and linguistic pictures of the world is presented. "Through the diversity of languages, the richness of the world and the diversity of what we learn in it opens up for us, and human existence becomes wider for us, since languages in their distinct and effective features give us different ways of thinking and perception. Language always embodies the originality of an entire people ..," [1. p.349]; "Different languages are by no means different designations of the same thing, but different visions of it. Languages and differences between them should be considered as a force permeating the entire history of mankind" [1. p.375]. Humboldt's thoughts sound especially relevant today, when there is a revival and renewal of the national spiritual wealth of peoples, an integral part of which is their languages. And today, I think, everyone is interested in knowing why different colors are found in different languages, although physiologically everyone's vision is the same; discrepancies in the specifics of the names of parts of the human body; inconsistent linguistic understanding of the structure of the

surrounding world, geographic and climatic features, flora and fauna, etc.

The nature, the surrounding world, the environment in which a person lives, initially and quite naturally form his associative representations, reflected in the language by metaphorical transfers of meanings, specific comparisons, connotations, etc. This can be clearly and vividly demonstrated by referring to the sketch by the Uzbek writer T. Pulatov: "The sun in Russian is not at all what kuyosh is in Uzbek, and certainly not at all what often is in Tajik. After all, an Uzbek who lives most of the year under its scorching rays will never say an affectionate diminutive "sun", just as a Russian does not have the feeling that the sun can be not only fruitful and earth-renewing, but also hostile. But the Uzbek has a completely different attitude to the moon, this night luminary, which brings coolness and peace. He calls everything beautiful and desirable "moon-faced", "moon-like", and with such an intonation that for the Russian ear it may seem at least pretentious "[2. p.109]. What is said in the above fragment is the area of the concept sphere, i.e. psycho-mental representation, "the spirit of the people", according to Humboldt, which accompanies the language of each nation with an invisible halo, reflecting its culture. What is culture and language? The word culture has many meanings in all languages. The academic dictionary gives several meanings of this word, considering culture as the totality of the achievements of human society in the industrial, social and spiritual life of society. In different definitions of the word, the words "customs, traditions" are repeated, the word "beliefs" is often used, as well as the phrase "way of life" [5. p.669].

Definitions of the word language agree on the main thing: language is a means of communication, a means of expressing thoughts [5. p. 1580]. These are the most basic functions. Language serves communication. Communication is an act of communication, a connection between two or more individuals based on mutual understanding; communication of information by one person to another or to a number of persons [5. p.610]. In accordance with the existing classifications of culture, one can talk about other norms and values that distinguish different peoples, and, of course, are embodied in the differences in their conceptual and linguistic ideas about the world and about themselves. The range of such differences is extremely extensive and diverse, since any feature of the cultural sphere is somehow fixed by the language and may remain unnoticed until the moment of comparison with other languages. So the usual for Russian-speaking differentiation of the verbs to go and go according to the mode of movement is absent in the Uzbek language. In Russian, however, there are also certain restrictions regarding the fact that, for example, a train goes, and a car goes, but these are already stylistic norms. And the appearance of wheeled transport was reflected in the Russian language in the delimitation of such verbs as to carry and carry. The Uzbek verb olibormoq can equally denote these two actions.

The influence of the extra-linguistic sphere can also explain the differing cultural model of such a common artifact as a table, even if it is only a dining table. For example, in traditional Muslim culture, there is no table at all. Within the framework of the cultural and ethical models of their languages, there is a significant group of words-references associated with the peculiarities of national etiquette. Thus, the habitual in Uzbekistan address aka, opa ("brother", "sister") to a stranger and a non-native person in Russia may seem strange and will be attributed to the sphere of church vocabulary. A separate and extensive topic is linguistic differences due to national rituals, customs, rituals, folklore and mythological representations, symbolism, to which quite a lot of special works have been devoted recently. The subject of study here becomes words that are nationally significant (for example, birch for Russians, laylak ("stork") for Uzbeks) or non-existent, fictional objects and characters (mythological, fabulous: Baba Yaga, mermaids, goblin - among Russians, peri, deyva, jinn - among the Uzbeks). Some names are spread around the world and become known even to those who are not directly familiar with the culture of a given people, but identify these names as stereotypical ideas about it. [4]

For example, everyone knows that cabbage soup, dumplings are Russian words that call typical

Russian dishes, and shurpa and pilaf are dishes of the peoples of Central Asia. But you can only comprehend the content of these names (concepts) when you try Russian cabbage soup or Uzbek pilaf. The most interesting for comparison are, of course, the metaphorical meanings proper, in which the originality of the national color is revealed. These are cases when, for example, Russians call the word crane not only a bird, but also "an adaptation at the well", and a dragonfly is both an insect and a "very mobile girl" in a figurative meaning. Asal - "honey" and "pretty, nice, pretty" (about a child) - in Uzbek. The most important indicator of semantics is lexical collocation, which detects mismatched meanings of matched words. Ignorance of stable traditions of fixed meaning leads to typical lexical interference, i.e. erroneous transfer of the meanings of words of the native language in speech in another language. Lexico-semantic compatibility in many ways also bears the imprint of the national, distinctive in the language. Therefore, the Russians say green tea, piercing the wind, and the Uzbeks say ko'to choy ("blue tea"), achchiqshamol ("bitter wind").

The features of lexical compatibility are well studied.

Here, as a rule, two types of stable combinations are distinguished:

1) Due to the semantics of control words and 2) phraseological combinations, which are a valuable treasure for identifying the national linguistic identity of the people. They show how the same concept is transformed in different languages. There remain cases that regulate the compatibility of a certain part of the vocabulary. For example, the Russian word beautiful has almost unlimited compatibility, and the Uzbek chiroyli is limited in use and meaning. Or cases when the translation of a single word does not coincide with the translations of this word in phrases can be illustrated with examples with the word "fresh": fresh newspaper - yangigazeta, fresh cucumber - barrabodring, fresh handkerchief - tozadastro 'mol, fresh air - sofhavo, fresh spring - musaffobuloq, fresh blush - sog 'lomyuzqizilligi, fresh old man - tetikchol, fresh colors - tiniqranglar, fresh news - eng so' nngiyangiliklar. These are the subtleties of intercultural communication, which are also given some attention in comparative lexicology. [6]

The definition of intercultural communication is obvious from the term itself: it is the communication of people representing different cultures. E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov [3, p.63] the following definition is given: "Intercultural communication. This term refers to an adequate understanding of two participants in a communicative act, belonging to different national cultures. " Communication interactions can be successful or can result in communication failure. It depends on the culturally determined mutual communicative competence of the participants in the event. Obviously, the practical importance of contrastive research for increasing the effectiveness of teaching, for improving the lexicographic base of such teaching, since comparative linguistics was born from the practical needs of teaching foreign languages. The provisions and results of comparative studies are organically intertwined with ethno linguistics, cultural linguistics, theory and practice of translation, problems of intercultural communication. All this is important, especially nowadays, when, thanks to the increase in the general educational level of people, the circle of those who know and want to know other languages, in addition to their native language, has significantly expanded [7].

REFERENCES:

1. Wilhelm von H. Language and philosophy of culture. M., 1985.
2. Pulatov T. Ascent. M., 1987.
3. Usmanova SR, Ismatullayeva NR. Expression of Lacunas in Comparative Study Of Kinship Terms In Chinese And Uzbek Languages. Solid State Technology, 2021;63(6):4974-4985.
4. Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture. M., 1990.

5. Manakin VN. Comparative lexicology. Kiev, 2004.
6. Rasuljanovna IN. The phenomenon of lacunarity as the linguacultural issue. Prospects of world science. 2019, 226.
7. Soviet encyclopedic dictionary. Chief editor A.M. Prokhorov M., 1986.