

COMMONALITY OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

Qalandarov Shuxratjon

Senior lecturer at Kokan State Pedagogical Institute (PhD)

Annotation. *In this article, an analysis of the opinions of scientists on the formation, development and functionality of the common language and culture has taken place.*

Keywords: *language, culture, commonality, formation, development, specialist, external being, linguistic relativity.*

As many experts admit, the language has been improving in the influence of culture for thousands of years. Today, the views on the fact that the language and culture are twin, one dictates and denies dialectical integrity, the other is a condition of existence for the other, the latter for the latter, the latter for the latter, are becoming popular. The number of individual caregivers in them is changing inversely to the rapid development of linguoculturology, which works on the basis of the principle of the commonality of language and culture.

Commonality of language and culture is evident in the following cases in connection with their formation, development and functionality. This position will be in a two-way direction. That is, culture:

- occurs as a result of mutual linguistic communication;
- develop the level of community linguistic communication;
- formulate and develop team linguistic abilities and individual linguistic abilities.
- As for language:
- it is formed as a result of mutual cultural communication;
- develop the level of cultural communication in the community;
- team cultural wealth and cultural ability of the person;

et.

The difference between language and culture is that all speakers are equally involved in language formation, and that the "authors" of collective culture are some of the speakers; error in the formation of language, in the predominance of order in the formation of culture; the elements of the language system are basically homogeneous, and the elements of the cultural system are heterogeneous; while the relationship between the elements of the language system is dominated by the relationship of the elements of the culture, the relationship of integration and harmony is predominant.¹ Nineteenth-century linguists V.Humboldt², A.A.Potebnya³ It is clear from the history of linguistics to experts that language is understood as a spiritual force. He is so important to us among the elements of existence that it is impossible to live without him. After all, the most

¹Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. – S. 55.

²Humboldt W. background. On the difference in the structure of people of languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind // Selected Works on Linguistics. - M., 1984 // www.classes.ru/gra

³Potebnya A.A. Symbol and myth in folk culture. - M., 2000 // www.platona.net/load/kni

important things for a person are categorized as follows: air - water - food - society - language. Among them, language plays a key role.

As Humboldt put it, language is “a bridge between the external being and the inner world of man”⁴ function. Language differs from the phenomena of being obtained in relation to man in that the phenomena of being really have an "external" adjective. However, it is impossible not to give the language an "inner" quality. In this respect it differs from the phenomena of existence. Based on the views of scholars such as V.Humboldt, A.A.Potebnya, this problem was studied in various schools of neo-Humboldtism in the school of E.Sepir and B.Worf, who developed the linguistic relativity hypothesis (Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) based on the theory of relativity in physics. Views in this direction have developed as a new approach to the interdependence of language and culture⁵. The essence of an event in one language can be fully determined by comparing it with an alternative (s) in another language. One language is the most convenient tool in evaluating other language phenomena. Therefore, the role of typological research in the reconstruction of the essence of linguistic phenomena is much wider. While the essence of any phenomenon is revealed in comparisons, typological research can be considered as the most productive form of comparison. Summarizing the views and ideas put forward in the hypothesis of Sepir-Wharf linguistic relativity, the following main cases arising from them can be identified:

- 1) the way of thinking of a nation (people) is similar to its language;
- 2) the linguistic image of being is formed in connection with national thinking⁶.

V.A.Maslova relies on the following ideas of Sepir-Wharf as a methodological basis. We "divide" nature as our language dictates. When we divide the phenomena of existence into one or another type, we do not proceed from their original state, they are manifested as a stream of colorful imaginations created by our consciousness - it is formed on the basis of our language, and therefore the language system. We also place beings in concepts and meanings in such a way that the system is based on our own "agreement" of the participants. This agreement is specific to a particular linguistic community and is subject to the laws of our language"⁷. The hypothesis of linguistic relativity, which evaluates knowledge and consciousness in relation to language, was developed in detail by L. Weisgerber, one of the later scholars who studied the communicative function of language in new aspects.⁸. Linguist VA Maslova notes that no matter how well-founded the hypothesis of linguistic relativity is, it has been criticized to some extent in other doctrines. that the language is a means of reflecting existence, that language is to some extent adapted to human physiological features, and that this result is the result of the adaptation of a living being to human

⁴Humboldt W. background. On the difference in the structure of people of languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind // Selected Works on Linguistics. - M., 1984 // www.classes.ru/gra

⁵See: The history of the creation of the hypothesis of linguistic relativity // www.edu-psycho.ru

⁶See: The history of the creation of the hypothesis of linguistic relativity // www.edu-psycho.ru

⁷Whorf B.L. Relationship of norms of behavior and thinking to the language // New in foreign linguistics. - M., 1960. - Issue. 1. - S. 174.

⁸See: Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. - P.56.

existence; conveys his views on the definition of originality⁹. This is, as mentioned above, due to the appropriate scientific approach and its methodological basis. The views of a researcher armed with a material approach will, of course, need to be evaluated in terms of his or her methodology and worldview. It is clear from the analysis that the doctrine of the theory of linguistic relativity has its roots in Humboldt. such as separating types¹⁰ the chauvinistic spirit is felt to a certain extent. On this and other grounds, the views that criticize this theory are themselves diverse. However, researchers in the field of language and culture are still appealing to them.

The characteristics of language as a sign of culture are as follows:

first, a certain level of culture is characterized by a certain state of development of the language, the past, the past and the present of the language correspond to the present culture: there can be no culture behind or beyond the language;

secondly, the language reflects the spiritual outlook and morals of the nation, the speech reflects a certain spiritual image and behavior of the individual;

And third, while language preserves culture and spirituality in its bosom, it reveals and realizes this code in art and speech.

So language is an integral part and a weapon of culture, it is the presence of our spirit, the manifestation of our culture and spirituality; each language represents the history and present of its owners, their material and spiritual wealth, their way of thinking and their attitude to existence¹¹.

Language is not part of culture. In this sense, the view that culture and language reflect the relationship of philosophical whole and part in the dialectical relationship is also relatively relative. Rather than looking at language as part of a culture, it is more appropriate to evaluate them as species and gender, as common and private beings. Because the part represents a part of the whole, and the rest of the parts are free of that part. Privacy, as a manifestation of commonality, leaves its mark on other qualities as well. But language, as noted in traditional linguistics, is conditional on being regarded as an independent, autonomous semiotic system in relation to culture, which is only a convenient and acceptable method of research. This is because every linguist is a cultural figure at the same time, and any linguistic sign can serve as a sign of culture and is considered to be the mainstay of culture.

⁹See: Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. - P.56.

¹⁰See: Komilov N. Tafakkur karvonlari: Sharku garbning civilization alokalari. - Tashkent: "Sharq" NMAK, 2011. -B. 297–304.

¹¹See: Zhinkin N.I. Speech as a conductor of information. - M., 1982 // www.klex.ru/mwh; Zhinkin N.I. Language. Speech. Creation. - M., 1998. (- 368 p.) www.klex.ru/mwh

Culture is associated with language in a specific space and time. Each social environment has its own set of words and concepts that reflect a particular period. For example, Uzbeks have faith and Russians have faith. These concepts, in addition to being specific to a particular nation, change their meaning over time. Evidence of this is the emergence of new words in the language or the acquisition of new meanings of existing words.

REFERENCES

1. Jorayev, N. S. (2021, July). QUALITY LEARNING PROCESS-AS A MECHANICAL SUM OF TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES. In Euro-Asia Conferences (pp. 57-59).
2. Sadullayevich, J. N. (2021). Improving psychological technologies for the development of professional reflection in future teachers. *ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL*, 11(1), 229-232.
3. Ravshanbek, J. (2022). CREDIT-MODULE SYSTEM, ITS BASIC PRINCIPLES AND FEATURES. *Yosh Tadqiqotchi Jurnal*, 1(4), 304-309.
4. O'G'Li, J. R. M. (2022). METHODS OF ORGANIZING INDEPENDENT STUDY OF STUDENTS IN THE CREDIT-MODULE SYSTEM. *Ta'lim fidoyilari*, 25(5), 93-97.
5. Джураева, М. А. (2022, May). ПРИЁМЫ КОНТРОЛЯ УРОВНЯ ЗНАНИЙ НА УРОКАХ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА И ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE* (Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 28-32).
6. Abdukakhhorovna, Z. M. (2022). Lexical Polysemy of the Russian Language. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 22, 77-81.
7. Akilovna, E. M. (2022). METHODS OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGUES. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH* ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(05), 228-232.
8. Akilovna, E. M., & Fotima, B. (2022). MODERN APPROACHES TO CHILDREN'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH* ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(05), 233-237.
9. РАДЖАБОВА, Г. У., & САТТАРОВА, Д. К. (2017). ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОЦЕССЫ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИЯ НА РЫНОК ТРУДА В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ. In *МОЛОДЕЖЬ И СИСТЕМНАЯ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИЯ СТРАНЫ* (pp. 252-254).
10. Erkinovna, I. M. (2022). The importance of critical thinking in the education of junior school age students. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH* ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(04), 151-155.
11. Мирахмедов, Ж. М. (2017). Бағрикенглик ижтимоий-фалсафий кадрият. *Молодой ученый*, (4-2), 27-28.
12. МИРАХМЕДОВ, Ж. М., & БАБАЕВА, Н. М. (2016). К ВОПРОСУ О СУЩНОСТИ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ. In *Будущее науки-2016* (pp. 16-19).
13. Мирахмедов, Ж. М. (2016). Некоторые аспекты проблемных концепций осмысления динамики научного знания. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 245-247).
14. Мирахмедов, Ж. М. (2017). Тарих фалсафий тадқиқот предмети сифатида. *Молодой ученый*, (4-2), 26-27.
15. Мирахмедов, Ж. М. (2016). Теоретическая подготовка студентов к социологическим исследованиям в практической и самостоятельной работе. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 318-319).