

## **LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: PROBLEMS OF INTERACTION**

**Abdullaev Ulmasbek Khairullayevich**

Uzbekistan state world languages university

Linguistics (English) specialty 2nd year master's degree

Tel: +998917805929

e-mail: [abdullayevulmasbek99@gmail.com](mailto:abdullayevulmasbek99@gmail.com)

### **ABSTRACT**

*The article explores the intricate relationship between language and culture, tracing its historical roots from the 19th century to contemporary perspectives. It highlights the foundational theories of V. Humboldt, Sapir, and Whorf, and discusses the hypothesis of linguistic relativity. Through historical insights and real-world examples, it navigates the complexities of this discourse, emphasizing the profound impact of language and culture on individuals and the development of linguistic theory.*

**Key words:** *Language and culture; Linguistic relativity; Sapir-Whorf hypothesis; Sociolinguistics; Memetics; Cultural relativism; Linguistic determinism; Language acquisition; Semiotics.*

## **TIL VA MADANIYAT: O'ZARO TA'SIR MUAMMOLARI**

**Abdullayev O'lmasbek Xayrullayevich**

O'zbekiston Davlat Jahon tillari Universiteti Lingvistika (ingliz tili) mutaxassisligi 2-bosqich magistranti

Tel: +998917805929

e-mail: [abdullayevulmasbek99@gmail.com](mailto:abdullayevulmasbek99@gmail.com)

### **ANNOTATSIYA**

*Maqolada til va madaniyat o'rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlar, uning tarixiy ildizlari XIX asrdan to zamonaviy istiqbollargacha bo'lgan izlanishlar o'rganiladi. Unda V. Gumboldt, Sapir va Uorfning asosiy nazariyalari yoritilgan va lingvoqarashlarining gipotezalari muhokama qilinadi. Tarixiy tushunchalar va amaliy misollari orqali nutqning murakkabliklari, til va madaniyatning shaxslar hamda lingvistik nazaiyaning rivojlanishiga chuqur ta'sirini o'rganadi.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *Til va madaniyat; lingvistik nisbiylik; Sapir-Uorf gipotezasi; Ijtimoiy lingvistika; Memetika; Madaniy relativizm; Lingvistik determinizm; Tilni o'zlashtirish; Semiotika.*

## **ЯЗЫК И КУЛЬТУРА: ПРОБЛЕМЫ ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЯ**

**Абдуллаев Улмасбек Хайруллаевич**

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Лингвистика (английский язык) магистрант 2-го курса

### **АННОТАЦИЯ**

*Эта статья исследует сложные взаимосвязи между языком и культурой, прослеживая их исторические корни с XIX века до современных взглядов. Она подчеркивает основные теории В. Гумбольдта, Сапира и Уорфа, и обсуждает гипотезу лингвистической относительности. Через исторические аспекты и примеры из реальной жизни она освещает сложности этого дискурса, подчеркивая глубокое влияние языка и культуры на индивидуумов и развитие лингвистической теории.*

***Ключевые слова:** Язык и культура; Лингвистическая релятивность; Гипотеза Сапира-Уорфа; Социолингвистика; Меметика; Культурный релятивизм; Лингвистический детерминизм; Усвоение языка; Семиотика.*

### **INTRODUCTION (ВВЕДЕНИЕ)**

The interplay between language and culture has been a longstanding focal point in the realm of linguistics, dating back to the 19th century. From the foundational concepts of V. Humboldt, through the hypotheses of linguistic relativity proposed by Sapir and Whorf, to contemporary perspectives, scholars have delved into the intricate relationship that defines the way individuals perceive, communicate, and interpret the world around them. This article embarks on an exploration of the multifaceted connections between language and culture, unraveling their intertwined nature and shedding light on the nuanced dynamics that have shaped linguistic theory. Through historical insights, theoretical frameworks, and real-world examples, we navigate the complexities of this discourse, aiming to unravel the profound impact language and culture have on each other and the individuals who navigate the intersection of these two fundamental aspects of human existence.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS (ЛИТЕРАТУРА И МЕТОД).**

Language is that problem of interrelation which lays on the surface of person's culture life, therefore since XIX century (J.Grimm, R.Raek, V.Humboldt, A.A.Potebnja) and to this day, language and culture interactions is one of central in linguistics. The first attempts of the decision of this problem have shown in V.Humboldt's [1,199 ] works which substantive provisions of the concept can be

reduced to the following: 1) material and spiritual culture are embodied in language; 2) any culture is national, its national character is expressed in language by means of special vision of the world; internal specific view of the world is inherent for every language; 3) language is an expression of "national spirit», its culture; 4) language is a mediating link between the person and the world surrounding it. W.Humboldt's concept has received original interpretation in A.A.Potebni's work «Thought and language», in S.Balli, Z.Vandrieza's works, Bo-duena de Courter [2] R.O.Yakobson and other researchers.

The best minds of XIX century treated language as spiritual force. Language is such environment surrounding us, out of which and without which participation we cannot live. As V.Humboldt wrote, language is «the world lies between the world of the external phenomena and private world of the person». Hence, being the environment of our dwelling, language does not exist out of us as an objective reality, it is in ourselves, in our consciousness, our memory; it changes the outlines with each movement of thought, with each new welfare role.

Within the limits of the second approach Sapir and Whorf School, various schools of neogumbolts, developed a so-called hypothesis of a linguistic relativity investigation of this problem.

At the heart of this hypothesis the belief lays, that what people see the world differently - through a prism of the native language. For its supporters the real world exists so far as it is reflected in language. But if each language reflects the reality in the way inherent only for it, hence, languages differ with their «language pictures of the world».

Sapir [3] and Whorf [4] interpreted these data as indicating that colors are not objective, naturally determined segments of reality. In other words, the colors we see are predetermined by what our culture prepares us to see. That research indicated that they went too far. All normal humans share similar sense perceptions of color despite differences in color terminology from one language to another. The physiology of our eyes is essentially the same. People all over the world can see subtle gradations of color and can comprehend other ways of dividing up the spectrum of visible light. However, as a society's economy and technology increase in complexity, the number of color terms usually also increases. That is to say, the spectrum of visible light gets subdivided into more categories. As the environment changes, culture and language typically respond by creating new terminology to describe it.

In hypothesis of Sapir-Whorf [3;4] following substantive provisions are allocated: 1. Language causes a way of thinking of the people speaking on it. 2. The

way of knowledge of the real world depends on in what languages learners think. “We dismember the nature in a direction prompted by our language. We allocate in the world of the phenomena those or other categories and types at all because they are axiomatic, on the contrary, the world appears to us as a kaleidoscopic stream of impressions which should be organized in our consciousness, and it means basically - the language system stored in our consciousness. We dismember the world, we will organize it in concepts and we distribute values so, instead of differently, basically because we are participants of the agreement ordering similar ordering. This agreement is valid for certain language collective and is fixed in system of models of our language”.

The given hypothesis has got support and the further working out in L.Vejsgerbera’s works, in its concept of language as “the intermediate world», standing between the objective reality and consciousness. “Language operates as creating force in all areas of a spiritual life” [5,288].

In researches of some authors the hypothesis of a linguistic relativity has received modern actual sounding. First of all - in D.Olfrd’s works, J. Carrols, D.Hajmsa and other authors in which concepts Sapir-Whorf theory is essentially filled. So, D.Hajms has entered one more principle of a functional relativity of languages according to which there is a distinction in character of their communicative functions between languages. Negative estimation to hypothesis of Sapir Whorf give D.Dodd, G.V.Kolshansky, R.M.Uajt, R.M.Frumkina, E.Hollenshtejn.

### **DISCUSSION (ОБСУЖДЕНИЕ).**

Verbal illusions play the big role in creation of social stereotypes, for example, national stereotypes of “German”, “Chukchi”, “Caucasians” who form national prejudices. Verbal stamps which paint the world in the necessary color take root in minds of people: the light future, great indestructible friendship of the people, great accomplishments etc.

There are many ways of theorizing the relationship between the social and the cultural. In this limited context, we just want to stress that all societal life may be considered as both social and cultural.

The analysis of social life typically deals with relational, temporal and spatial aspects of activities, institutions and structures, whereas the analysis of cultural life typically deals with the production and reproduction of meaning and representations of various realities. The two sides cannot be separated from each other. All social life carries meaning, and all exchanges and negotiations of meaning are embedded in more or less shifting social structures and relations of power.

When we focus on language as a means of forming meaning, we enter an intellectual tradition very different from the sociolinguistic approach we have just outlined. The intimate connections between (specific) languages and (specific) cultures has been a fundamental theme in the nation building process in Europe since the late 18th century, not least in the German form of national romanticism.

Foreign language studies since the 19th century have been deeply influenced by this figure of thought, and are just beginning to question the national paradigm and look for alternative ways of conceptualizing the study of language, literature and culture.

Nowadays, the most usual and easy way of dealing with the relationship between language and culture is to state that it is a complex relationship, thus verbalizing the difficulties of coming to grips with this thorny question. Those who do formulate an opinion on the issue may largely be characterized as holding one of two opposite positions:

- language and culture are inseparable
- language and culture are separable

The first view is associated with the cultural turn in linguistics since the 1980s, and is maintained in various forms in research disciplines such as linguistic anthropology, translation studies, and studies of intercultural communication. This is of course also a popular belief among people in general, not least in Europe in the present process of political integration of nation states in a larger union. The second view is mostly associated with the study of English as an international language. In this case it is maintained that languages - and especially English - should be seen as flexible instruments of communication that may in principle be used with any subject matter by anybody anywhere in the world.

As we already said, none of these positions is satisfying. The first one emphasizes that language is culture-bound, and one is not far from a conception of a closed universe of language, people, nation, culture, history, mentality and land. This position is totally at odds with the social and transnational view of language that I have just presented. The other position claims that language is culturally neutral. Language is seen as a code, and one is not far from a reconstitution of the classical structuralist conception of the autonomy of language. To this we would say that no language is culturally neutral. All natural languages (i.e. their users) constantly produce and reproduce culture (i.e. meaning).

For many people, language is not just the medium of culture but also is a part of culture. It is quite common for immigrants to a new country to retain their old customs and to speak their first language amid fellow immigrants, even if all present

are comfortable in their new language. This occurs because the immigrants are eager to preserve their own heritage, which includes not only customs and traditions but also language. This is also seen in many Jewish communities, especially in older members: Yiddish is commonly spoken because it is seen as a part of Jewish culture.

Linguistic differences are also often seen as the mark of another culture, and they very commonly create divisiveness among neighboring peoples or even among different groups of the same nation. A good example of this is in Canada, where French-speaking natives of Quebec clash with the English-speaking majority. This sort of conflict is also common in areas with a great deal of tribal warfare. It is even becoming an issue in America as speakers of standard American English - mainly whites and educated minorities - observe the growing number of speakers of Black English vernacular. Debates are common over whether it is proper to use “Ebonics” in schools, while its speakers continue to assert that the dialect is a fundamental part of the “black culture”.

L.Elemsev [6,36-55] expressed an idea that language and reality are structurally similar and language structure can be equating to the structure of the reality or can be regarded as its deformed reflection.

E.F.Tarasov [7, 126-136] notices, that language is included in culture as sign “body” (meaning) is a cultural subject, in which language and communicative ability of the person are featured, value of a sign is also cultural formation which arises only in human activity. As well culture is included into language, because it is shaped in text.

At the same time, language and culture interaction is needed to be investigated extremely cautiously, remembering, that they are different semiotics systems. For the sake of justice it is necessary to tell, that, being semiotics systems, they have much in common: 1) culture, no less than language, are the forms of consciousness displaying outlook of the person; 2) culture and language exist in dialogue between themselves; 3) the subject of culture and language is always the individual or society, the person or a society; 4) norm is general for language and culture line; 5) a historicism is one of intrinsic properties of culture and language; 6) “dynamic-static” is inherent for language and culture.

Language and culture are interconnected: 1) in communicative processes; 2) in ontogenesis (formation of language abilities of the person); 3) in phylogenesis (formation of the patrimonial, public person).

These two essences differ in following: 1) language as a phenomenon installation on the mass addressee while in culture the elitism is prevailed; 2) though

culture is a sign system (like language), but it is incapable for self realization; 3) as it was already marked by us, language and culture are different semiotics systems.

These reasoning allow drawing a conclusion that culture is not isomorphic (absolutely corresponds), and homomorphic to language (is structurally similar). The picture which shows a language and culture parity, is extremely difficult and multidimensional. For today some approaches were outlined in the decision of this problem.

Other approaches were developed basically by Russian philosophers - S.A.Atanovskim, G.A.Brutjanom, E.I.Kukushkinym, E.S.Markarjanom. The meaning of this approach in the following: the interrelation of language and culture appears movement in the same side; as language reflects the reality, and culture is the integral component of this reality which faces the person, also language is a simple reflection of culture. Reality changes, cultural-national stereotypes vary also, language changes also. One of the attempts to answer a question on influence of separate fragments (or spheres) cultures on language functioning was issued in functional stylistics of the Prague school and modern sociolinguistics.

Thus, if culture influence on language quite obviously (it is studied in the first approach) the question on return influence of language on culture while remains opened. It makes essence of the second approach to a problem of a parity of language and culture.

## **RESULTS (РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ).**

There are many ways in which the phenomena of language and culture are intimately related. Both phenomena are unique to humans and have therefore been the subject of a great deal of anthropological, sociological, and even memetic study. Language, of course, is determined by culture, though the extent to which this is true is now under debate. The converse is also true to some degree: culture is determined by language - or rather, by the replicators that created both, memes.

In this vein, anthropologist Verne Ray [8, 157-159 ] conducted a study in the 1950's, giving color samples to different American Indian tribes and asking them to give the names of the colors. He concluded that the spectrum we see as "green", "yellow", etc. was an entirely arbitrary division, and each culture divided the spectrum separately. According to this hypothesis, the divisions seen between colors are a consequence of the language we learn, and do not correspond to divisions in the natural world. A similar hypothesis is upheld in the extremely popular meme of Eskimo words for snow - common stories vary from fifty to upwards of two hundred.

Extreme cultural relativism of this type has now been clearly refuted. Eskimos use at most twelve different words for snow, which is not many more than English

speakers and should be expected since they exist in a cold climate. The color-relativity hypothesis has now been completely debunked by more careful, thorough, and systematic studies which show a remarkable similarity between the ways in which different cultures divide the spectrum.

Of course, there are ways in which culture really does determine language, or at least certain facets thereof. Obviously, the ancient Romans did not have words for radios, televisions, or computers because these items were simply not part of their cultural context. In the same vein, uncivilized tribes living in Europe in the time of the Romans did not have words for tribunes, praetors, or any other trapping of Roman government because Roman law was not part of their culture.

Our culture does, sometimes, restrict what we can think about efficiently in our own language. For example, some languages have only three color terms equivalent to black, white, and red; a native speaker of this language would have a difficult time expressing the concept of “purple” efficiently. Some languages are also more expressive about certain topics. For example, it is commonly acknowledged that Yiddish is a linguistic champion, with an amazing number of words referring to the simple mind.

We carry the further reasoning on interrelation of language and culture to the third approach.

Language is the fact of the culture because: 1) it a component of culture which we inherit from our ancestors; 2) language is the basic tool by means of which we acquire culture; 3) language is major of all phenomena of a cultural order, if we wish to understand essence of culture - a science, religion, the literature we should consider these phenomena as the codes developed model. Therefore the conceptual judgment of culture can occur only by means of a natural language [9,288].

According to our concept, as far as each native speaker is simultaneously the culture bearer and language, signs get ability to carry out function of signs on culture and by that serve as means of representation of the basic installations of culture. For this reason language is capable to display cultural-national mentality of its speaker. The culture is correlated with language through the concept of spaces.

So, language is a component of culture and its tool is the reality of our spirit, a culture face; it expresses bared specific lines of national mentality. Language is the mechanism which has opened before area of consciousness before the person [10,312].

**CONCLUSION (ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ)** In conclusion, the discourse on the relationship between language and culture traverses a rich tapestry of historical developments, theoretical frameworks, and empirical observations. From the



pioneering ideas of V. Humboldt to contemporary investigations into linguistic relativity, the journey has been marked by a quest to understand the profound interconnections that shape human perception, communication, and identity. Through the lens of language, we glimpse into the diverse landscapes of culture, exploring its manifestations, influences, and complexities. While debates persist regarding the inseparability or separability of language and culture, one thing remains clear: their symbiotic relationship transcends mere communication and delves into the very essence of human experience. As we continue to unravel the intricacies of this relationship, we gain deeper insights into the ways in which language and culture intersect to define our worldviews, shape our interactions, and forge the pathways of our collective understanding.

### **REFERENCES (ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННАЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРА)**

1. Гумбольдт В. фон, общие вопросы лингвистики, литературы и филологии языкознание философия языковедение, 2000. – 199 с.
2. Бодуэн Де Куртэне И. А. Избранные труды. - М., 1963. -- Т. 2.
3. Sapir, E. (1961). Culture, Language and Personality. Selected Essays. Ed.: david G. Mandelbaum, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
4. Whorf, B.L. (1956). Language, Thought and Reality. Selected Writings. Ed.: J.V. Carroll. MIT, New York: J.Wilky/London: Chapinaon & Hall.
5. Вежбицкая Анна Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов/Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. - М.:Языки славянской культуры, 2001. - 288 с.
6. Л. Ельмслев. Основы лингвистической теории. – М, 1964. – С. 36-55
7. Тарасов Е.Ф. К проблеме функционирования языка // Вопросы психолингвистики. 2020. № 3 (45). С. 126–136.
8. V.Ray, Lower Chinook ethnographic notes, University of Washington, 1938. – С 157-159
9. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов /Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. - М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. - 288 с
10. Жинкин Н.И. Бархударов С.Г. Филин Ф.П. Панфилов В.З., Язык и мышление, 1967. – 312 с.