TOPICAL ISSUES OF LANGUAGE, ITS FUNCTION IN SOCIETY AND CULTURE

Otajonova Shakhnoza Shavkatovna
Inogamova Nargiza Shavkatovna
Senior lecturers of the National
University of Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION
The problem of interaction of languages and cultures is considered. The combination of various approaches to the study of this issue allows us to determine the key features of the language in the context of active intercultural interaction. The author turns to an actively developing area - the study of the influence of language on the way of thinking of a native speaker.
KEYWORDS: *national language, national culture, linguistic determinism, cultural determinism.*

АКТУАЛЬНЫ ВОПРОСЫ ЯЗЫКА, ЕГО ФУНКЦИЯ В СОЦИУМЕ И КУЛЬТУРЕ

Отажонова Шахноза Шавкатовна,
Иногамова Наргиза Шавкатовна-
Старшие преподаватели Национального
университета Узбекистана

Аннотация
Рассматривается проблема взаимодействия языков и культур. Объединение различных подходов к изучению данного вопроса позволяет определить ключевые особенности языка в условиях активного межкультурного взаимодействия. Автор обращается к активно развивающемуся направлению — исследованию влияния языка на образ мышления носителя языка.
Ключевые слова: национальный язык, национальная культура, лингвистический детерминизм, культурный детерминизм.

One of the main problems of cultural and linguistic research is the specificity of the national language, the role of language in the genesis of culture, the phenomenon of the dialogue of cultures. Questions about the nature of language, its functions in society and culture are topical. Language is an object of study in various disciplines: culturology, philosophy, psychology, logic, semiotics, cultural linguistics, etc. People quite early discovered that the possession of language (speech) is one of the most important differences between humans and animals, and the ability to speak is closely related with the ability to

think. The problem of the origin and essence of language can be attributed to the oldest in science. IN XII-XIII centuries. interest in this issue was due to the search for a "universal language" of culture and attempts to construct a universal grammar, assuming the existence of an initial proto-language, for the role of which Hebrew or Latin was proposed.

According to the "natural" theory of Plato's language, the name of any object corresponds to the essence of this object. Plato thus posits a living, direct connection between ontology and language. In accordance with the theory of Aristotle, names are

given to objects "by appointment", that is, by virtue of a contract between people and are not associated with the nature and essence of the designated objects. It was this point of view that became dominant in the European culture of modern times. Therefore, throughout the ХУШ-Х1Х centuries. linguistics problems were mainly studied in linguistics - an independent, separate science. In the XX century. language becomes the subject of interdisciplinary research and the question of the relationship between language and ontology is gaining relevance. [1]

Many works are devoted to the problem of the relationship between language and culture. According to the concept of K. Levi-Strauss, language can be viewed as a product, part and condition of culture: "it is with the help of language that an individual acquires the culture of his group" [2.] RO Shor claims that language is a cultural tool created and transmitted by the community , the team. The choice of a particular language by an individual, his assimilation of certain forms of speech is determined exclusively by that society, that ethnic or social collective, cultural and historical unity of which he is a member. [3] Thus, R.O. Shor defines language as a social form of thought transmission.

A. N. Whitehead states: "Human civilization is a product of language, and language is a product of a developing civilization" [4]. That is, a person can learn about the achievements of civilization of past eras only through language. In cultural linguistics, the understanding of language, formulated by PM Bitsilli, is widespread: "Language in relation to its structure, its vocabulary is one of the most important aspects of culture, perhaps the most important" [5.]

In the Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language of V. I. Dahl, language is defined as "the totality of all the words of the people and their correct combination, for the transmission of their thoughts" [6]. In the dictionary of linguistic terms by J. Maruso, "language is any system of signs suitable for serving as a means of communication between individuals" [7].

O.S. Akhmanova defines language as "one of the original semiological systems, which are the most important means of communication between members of a given human collective, for whom this system also turns out to be a means of developing thinking, transmitting cultural and historical traditions from generation to generation, etc." [8].

For the first time in the history of philosophy, thinkers of the 18th century turned to the study of culture as the most important aspect of the life of society and to the role of language in human life. Culture was understood as the result of the spiritual activity of people. I. Herder called it "a fragile revelation of the essence of the people" [9.] Moreover, the existence in the world of culture is recognized by the thinkers of the 18th century. the natural state of man. According to I. Herder, a person, living among

people, cannot "detach from culture" [9]. Language is considered as the main condition for human existence, because language made possible the development of the human mental sphere. IG Fichte, a follower of Kant, and then his critic, is convinced that the purpose of humanity in ensuring the constant progress of culture [10.] F. Schelling called culture the second nature, which in the process of his activity a person creates, building it over the first [11.] According to L. Feuerbach, language is a criterion that determines the level of human culture [12]. The decisive role of language in human mental activity was noted by G. Hegel, arguing that thought manifests itself, first of all, in language [13.] Thus, all representatives of German classical philosophy have a high assessment of the role of language.

Nominated by German thinkers of the XVIII century. the idea of language as the main component of human spiritual activity became the core of W. Humboldt's teachings, the main provisions of which are the fundamental basis of modern concepts of language. His idea that language is inherent in the very nature of man and is necessary for the development of his spiritual forces and the formation of his worldview is developed by researchers in the field of the humanities in many directions. W. Humboldt identified priority areas for further research on the relationship between language, culture and thinking. In his works, he sought to prove that intellectual activity and language are a single whole. Following I. Kant's idea of the difference between the transcendental and the transcendental, W. Humboldt believed that the connection of thought, organs of speech and hearing with language is as inexplicable as the structure of human nature is inexplicable. According to V. Humboldt, language always embodies the originality of the national vision of the world, national culture. V. Humboldt's ideas were further developed in the works of many foreign and domestic scientists - C. Bally, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenet, L. Weisgerber, J. Vandriez, A. A. Potebnya, E. Sapir, B. Whorf and others researchers who studied the problems of language and culture.

E. Sapir, following the views of Humboldt, considered language a tool, a means of communication and expression of thought: "Language is a communicative process in its purest form in every society we know" [14.] E. Sapir also did not deny the influence of thinking on language. B. Wharf, developing the thought of E. Sapir, argued that a person's mental activity is conditioned by the grammatical models of his own language: a person thinks within a certain language - English, Sanskrit, Chinese or any other [15]

E. Sapir put forward an important methodological proposition that reveals the unity and specificity of culture and language: "Culture can be defined as what a given society does and thinks. Language is the way people think. It goes without saying that the content of language is inextricably

linked with culture "[14.] In this regard, language acts as a realized" internal form "of expression of culture as an extra-linguistic content of a subject-conceptual nature, and culture - as a process of man's assimilation of reality and as a factor, influencing the development of human society, which is directly influenced by language. This is the essence of the well-known "theory of linguistic relativity" E. Sapir - B. Whorf, according to which, first, language determines the way of thinking of the people speaking it; secondly, the way of knowing the real world depends on the languages in which cognizing subjects think.

A staunch supporter of the ideas of E. Sapir B. Wharf did not question the determinism of language in relation to culture. The scientist argued that the generally accepted models of using words are a priori not only in relation to thought processes, but to forms of behavior. Whorf partly recognized the influence of cultural factors on language, but considered such influence insignificant and slow, arguing that linguistic phenomena have an immediate effect on culture. For all the absolutization of the role of language, he emphasized the complexity of the nature of the relationship between language and culture, arguing that language and culture are something whole, in which one can assume the interdependence between separate areas [16.]

The famous American psychologist and linguist Stephen Pinker challenges the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity: "The idea that thinking and language are the same is an example of what can be called a common fallacy" [17.] Stephen Pinker states that there is no scientific confirmation of the significant influence of language on the way of thinking of a native speaker. The idea of linguistic relativity, in his opinion, was born in the Boas school in the course of attempts to show that non-literate cultures are no less complex and sophisticated than modern Western culture. Stephen Pinker suggests the possibility of using a certain code for the embodiment of concepts and their interaction in our head, the language of thought or thought code, which is different from all languages existing in the world. As a result of the research, S. Pinker formulates an important proposition: "the images underlying thinking, on the one hand, and sentences in the language, on the other hand, act in many respects in opposition to each other" [18]. Thus, according to S. Pinker, people do not think in English or German; they think in a thought code, which is probably the basis of all languages. A person, presumably, has symbols to express concepts and combinations of symbols that correspond to the carrier and object of the action. Knowledge of the language means knowing how to translate the thought code into verbal chains and vice versa. People without language, however, have a thought code.

According to L.P. Tarnaeva, in the interpretation of the relations between language and culture, the authors of the hypothesis of linguistic relativity have

significantly departed from the views of their predecessor and teacher F. Boas. Not being a supporter of direct parallels between the state of language, the development of culture and intellectual activity, F. Boas admitted that the lexical system formed in the subconscious of people can influence the formation of their customs [18.] Based on the data of field research, F. Boas argued that features of the language are clearly reflected in the views and customs of the peoples of the world. Here he rather supports the point of view of cultural determinism, recognizing the influence of culture on thinking and language. He believed that language is a reflection of the state of culture and in its development follows its needs. F. Boas did not exclude the influence of language on culture: linguistic units can play a significant role in the formation of cultural relations, serve as symbols of these relations.

E. Sapir went even further in this direction. He considered language to be the basis of culture: in his opinion, the emergence of language preceded the initial development of material culture, the development of culture itself could not take place until language, an instrument for expressing meaning, took shape [14.] In this, E. Sapir follows Humboldt's idea that a person "must first be formed through language in order to understand art acting apart from language" [19.]

In the concept of L. Weisgerber, the hypothesis of linguistic relativity has received a modern, relevant meaning: language is considered as an "intermediate world" between objective reality and consciousness. L. Weisgerber defines the essence of language as a "force", the action of which is carried out in the following forms: language as "the force of spiritual formation", as "the force of cultural creativity", as "the force of historical life". Language as a "force" that forms a person's idea of the world around him determines his "micro-understanding", its internal form and influences the culture of the people.

The recognition of linguistic determinism is characteristic of many Russian scientists. So LV Shcherba, in particular, points out that "the world that is given to us in our direct experience, remaining the same everywhere, is comprehended in different ways in different languages" [20]. The same position is taken by Yu. D. Apresyan, believing that each language has its own way of "thinking the world", in this way "an integral collective philosophy is embodied, its own for each language" [21]. SGTer-Minasova believes that language "imposes" on a person the idea of the world (picture of the world).

The main provisions of the theory of linguistic determinism have been repeatedly and continued to be criticized by representatives of the anti-verbalist position (G.A. Brutyan, P. Ya.Gal'perin, N.I. , B. A. Serebrennikov and others). Proponents of this trend believe that language is a reflection of human consciousness, therefore, the interpretation of language as an ideal entity that develops independently of a person and pursues its own goals is erroneous.

Researchers adhering to the anti-Berlist tradition believe that in the human mental sphere there are some cognitive structures of an innate "universal" language that precede language, on the basis of which individual ethnic languages are built in the process of socialization of a child as he enters the world of the language around him. J. Piaget, for example, despite the high assessment of the role of language in human cognitive development, emphasizes its "secondary nature", believing that language is part of a broader context - the context prepared by different stages of sensorimotor intelligence [22.] The role of language J. Piaget sees in the fact that he conveys to the individual a ready, formed system of concepts.

In accordance with the theory of NI Zhinkin, thinking is carried out in a special information language - the language of schemes, images, kinetic impulses, etc. These operations do not depend on the language spoken by the person. The recognition of the concept of a universal subject code leads to the idea of the general genetic structure of the national language. From this point of view, languages differ only in the ways of integrating the subject code, thanks to which information about reality is processed.

The research literature examines two vectors of cultural determinism. According to one of them, the primacy of culture in relation to thinking is postulated, in accordance with the other, the determining role of the cultural factor in relation to language is affirmed, that is, it is recognized that language and the texts generated by it are only a reflection of the stereotypes of a given society. The determining role of the cultural factor in relation to language is understood in different ways by researchers. J. Bruner, highlighting language among the most important factors affecting human cognitive activity, comes to the conviction that the individual development of a person largely depends on the cultural conditions in which he grew up [23.] D. Hymes believes that people belonging to different cultures, have special communication systems, and not the same natural communication capabilities, which allows us to assert that "cultural values and beliefs partly create linguistic reality" [24.]

In the studies of Russian scientists (A. A. Leontiev, Yu. A. Sorokin, E. F. Tarasov and others), the prevailing belief is that language "models the system of relations of a public person to the world" [25.] A. M. Shakhnarovich, for example, it emphasizes that any process of assimilation of sociocultural facts of the environment in human society is carried out with the most direct participation of language. Language serves as a repository of the social experience of previous generations and of all mankind [26.]

MA Tsareva in the monograph "Intercultural Communication and Dialogue of Cultures" refers to the nominalist and relativistic points of view in the study of the issue of a different vision of the world of representatives of different linguistic pictures [27.] According to the nominalist approach, a person's perception of the world around him is carried out without the help of the language in which he speaks. Language is simply an external "form of thought". Different languages do not mean that people have different perceptual worlds, and thought processes are different. The relativistic approach assumes that the language spoken, especially the structure of this language, determines the peculiarities of thinking, perception of reality, structural patterns of culture, stereotypes of behavior, etc. That is, the formation of thoughts is part of a particular language and differs in different cultures. and sometimes very significantly, as well as the grammatical structure of languages. According to this approach, language has an impact on culture, and culture has an impact on the expression of concepts and categories in the language.

Thus, we can conclude that language is a multifaceted and unique cultural phenomenon. Language and culture turn out to be correlative and inextricably linked. Moreover, language and culture are in a relationship of bidirectional vectors, language cannot exist outside of culture, and culture without language. The ambiguity of understanding the relationship between language and culture testifies to the complexity of this problem, which confirms its relevance for several hundred years. The study of the relationship between language and culture in science is carried out within the framework of various approaches and theories. They showed that the language embodies the originality of the people, the national vision of the world, is the basis of its culture. It should be noted that the theories of linguistic and cultural determinism are of particular importance.

LITERATURE

1. *See: In the perspective of cultural studies: everyday life, language, society / Ros. Institute of Culturology; editorial board: O. K. Rumyantsev (editor-in-chief) et al. M.: Acad. project: RIK, 2005.S. 449.*
2. *Levi-Strauss, K. Structural Anthropology. M.: Eksmo-Press, 2001.512 p.*
3. *See: Shor, R.O. Language and society / preface.V.M. Alpatov. 3rd ed., Rev. and add. M.: Librokom, 2010.160 p.*
4. *Whitehead, AN Selected Works on Philosophy. M., 1990.366 p.*
5. *Ter-Minasova, S. G Language and intercultural communication. M.: Publishing house of Moscow State University, 2004.348 p.*
6. *Dahl, V.I. Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language: in 4 volumes.Vol. 2.M., 1978. 1980 p.*
7. *Maruso, J. Dictionary of linguistic terms. 2nd ed., Rev. M.: URSS, 2004.435 p.*
8. *Akhmanova, OS Dictionary of linguistic terms. 5th ed. M.: Librokom: URSS, 2009.569 p.*
9. *Herder, I. G. Ideas for the philosophy of humanity. M.: Nauka, 1977.388 p.*
10. *See: Fichte, I.G. Appointment of a person // Fichte, I.G. Works: in 2 volumes. T. 2. SPb. : Mirfil, 1993.*

11. *See: Schelling, F.V. The system of transcendental idealism // Schelling, F.V. Works: in 2 volumes. T. 1.M .: Mysl, 1998.580 p.*

12. *See: Feuerbach, L. Preliminary theses for the reform of philosophy // Feuerbach L. Works: in 2 volumes.Vol. 1.M., 1995.*

13. *See: Hegel, G.V.F. Lectures on aesthetics: in 2 volumes. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg: Science, 1998.*

14. *14 Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies: per. from English. / E. Sapir; ed. and foreword. A. E. Kibrik. M.: Progress: Univers, 1993.654 p.*

15. *Whorf, B. The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language // Language, Thought and Reality. N. Y.; L., 1956, p. 258.*

16. *See: Wharf, B. The relation of norms of behavior and thinking to language / B. Wharf // Foreign linguistics.I. M.: Progress, 2002.91 p.*

17. *Pinker, S. Language as an instinct: trans. from English. / total ed. V. D. Mazo. 2nd ed., Rev. M.: Librikom, 2009.*

18. *Boas, F. Linguistics and Ethnology // Language in Culture and Society / Dell Hymes. N. Y. etc. : Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964, p. 449.*

19. *See: Humboldt, V. The nature of language and the nature of the people // Language and philosophy of culture. M.: Progress, 1985.S. 378.*

20. *See: Shcherba, L.V.Language system and speech activity. L.:Nauka, 1974.69 p.*

21. *Apresyan, Yu. D. Deixis in vocabulary and grammar and the naive model of the world // Apresyan, Yu. D. Selected Works. T. 2.M .: Languages rus. culture, 1995.629 p.*

22. *Piaget, J. Language within cognition // Language and Learning. Camb., Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1980.167 pp.*

23. *Bruner, JS Psychology of Cognition (Beyond Direct Information). M.: Progress, 1977.377 p.*

24. *Hymes, D. H. Ethnography of speech // New in linguistics. Issue Vii. M., 1975.S. 232-233.*

25. *Leont'ev, A.A. Language, cognition and communication // Methodological problems of language analysis. Yerevan, 1976, p. 46.*

26. *See: Shakhnarovich, A. M. Language, culture and socialization of the individual // National and cultural specificity of speech communication of the peoples of the USSR. M.: Nauka, 1982.20 p.*

27. *See: Tsareva, M. A. Intercultural communication and dialogue of cultures: monograph. Khabarovsk: Publishing house of FESGU, 2006.61 p.*