



LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH IN THE STUDY OF LITERARY TEXT

Valiyeva Nilufar Shamsitdinovna

Teacher of English literature and stylistics department Bukhara State University
ruhshonanurova@gmail.com

Annotation

The importance of linguocultural study of literary texts is demonstrated in this paper. The author explains the research's key directions, demonstrating that defining the writer's dominant language and attitudes – basic language personality – allows for the interpretation of individual works of art, cycles, and the entire collection of works as a single language space. The importance of studying the processes of creating a text, including an artistic text, as the most important field of human cognitive and communication activities, determines the significance of this path.

Key words: Linguoculturology, literary text, the writer's language personality, linguoculturological analysis of literary text, interpretation of literary text

Introduction

Linguoculturology is a new area of linguistics that explores a person's cognition of the interrelationship between language and culture, similar to many other recent developments in the direction of linguistics. Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) were the first to propose a connection between language and its speakers. However, Franz Boas (1858–1942), Edward Sapir (1884–1939), and Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941) are mainly identified with the ethno-linguistic approach as an exploration of the language through the lens of its spiritual community. E. Sepir has made the most significant contribution to the advancement of the issue of the relationship between language and culture. He defined culture, demonstrated the general characteristics of language and culture, demonstrated their interaction, and defined the role of linguistics in the study of cultural phenomena-exchange.





Linguoculturology is particularly linked to ethno-linguistics (anthropological linguistics), a combination of ethnology and linguistics that studies the relationship between language and culture, as well as how different ethnic groups view the world. Modern linguoculturology is linked not only to ethno-linguistics but also to sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and psycholinguistics, demonstrating the anthropocentric essence of modern linguistics once more. The difference between ethnolinguistics and linguoculturology is in the research direction: ethnolinguistics is concerned with the diachronic reconstruction of cultural, ethnopsychological, and mythological imagination of linguistic data, while linguoculturology is concerned with the synchronous research and description of language and culture interrelations [Khrolenko 2009, 25–26].

Main part

Russian linguists Vitaliy Grigorievich Kostomarov (1930) and Evgeniy Mikhailovich Vereshagin (1939), the pioneers of country studies through language, a research direction that includes teaching a foreign language and knowledge about the country of the target language, stressed the importance of learning one's culture while studying a foreign language. The term "Linguistic problems of country study in teaching Russian to foreigners" first appeared in their work "Linguistic problems of country study in teaching Russian to foreigners" (1971), and it became increasingly popular after the publication of their book "Language and Culture" (1973).

Linguoculturology is characterized as a study of the interrelationship between language and culture, as well as the attitudes and preferences of the individual who produces the culture and uses the language. The subject of linguistic units "... that have acquired a symbolic, normal, figurative metaphorical cultural meaning and that generalize the results of human consciousness - archetypal and prototypical, as recorded in myths, legends, practices, ceremonies, folklore and religious discourses, poetic and prosaic literary documents, idioms, phrasal verbs and metaphors, icons, proverbs sayings, and etc." [Maslova 2001, 36]. In modern science, the literary text, as a multifaceted ideological-aesthetic phenomenon, is examined from various philological perspectives by various philological branches and disciplines.

As a result, the problems of literary text science, study of categorical features and notions, on the basis of which it is formed and exists as a whole, do not have a clear and widely accepted definition today. None of the current approaches to literary text





analysis were found to be optimal or exhaustive. The phenomenon of language and expression, in the words of L.M. Loseva, is one of the "most challenging subjects of study" [Loseva1980, 96]. In this regard, literary text is a more complex formation, since it appears and works in practice as a visual product of the combined action of several variables. The relationship between such dynamic and enigmatic phenomena as culture- thought-language is at the heart of the production and interpretation of literary texts.

That is why, in the broad sense of the relationship between culture, thought, and language, a multifaceted study of a literary text decides its use. These "co-dinats," which exist beyond the "boundaries" of which the literary text's context is concealed, become the epitome of philological divisions and disciplines: the grammar of the text (V.G.Gak, I.R.Galperin, B.M.Gasparov, M.Ya.Dymarsky, N.S.Valgina); text philology (M.M. Bakhtin, Yu.M. Lotman, N.A.Nikolina, L.G. Babenko, Yu.V. Kazarin); cultural linguistics (V.V.Vorobiev, L.N.Murzin, G.G. Slyshkin, S.G. Vorkachev, V.A.Maslova); linguistic and cultural studies (E.M.Vereshchagin, V.G.Kostomarov, A.A.Bragina, Yu.E.Prokhorov); cognitive linguistics (Yu.N.Karaulov, A.N.Baranov, V. A.Maslova, E.S.Kubryakova). Despite a number of significant discrepancies, there are areas of overlap between these sectors and disciplines, such as research into the phenomenon of text in general and literary text in particular.

The research methods are integrative, and the conceptual analysis takes place within the context of the model culture - thought - language. This trend aids in the development of new and more successful approaches to the study of artistic texts, as well as the identification of trends in their formation and functioning.

Cultural linguistics is one of the aforementioned research fields in which scientists are interested in following the particulars of the literary text. The works of G.V.Stepanov, D.S.Likhachev, and Yu.M. Lotman are the first to mention a literary text as a subject of linguoculturological study. The first queue for study of the specificity and role of the "culturally marked expression," which specifies "the coordinate system in which the individual resides, in which the picture is created the world", is the subject of linguoculturological research of literary texts[Lotman 1997, 206]. Yet, it's not just the term "status" that's in the spotlight; it's also the vocabulary of a work of art. According to Yu.M. Lotman, language, which is both a required state and a material for the creation of literary texts, is characterized by a mental stew. In this sense, he "represents a special content, from marked by social interaction even before the hand





of the artist reached him nickname", according to the scientist's description [Lotman 1997, 202-212]. As a consequence, the author "turns to content that condenses the effects of centuries of human interaction directed at the cognition of existence" [Lotman 1997, 202-212].

Results and Discussions

It becomes important for a cultural linguist to treat the study of a literary text as a "formal unit of culture" as a result of this point of view. L.N. Murzin suggests that "culture "decomposing" into a text, consists of texts, but it is not qualitatively reduced to them" [Murzin, 1994, 165]. "First and foremost, it catches a certain image of the world of a given cultural linguistic community," V.V. Vorobyov says of the linguoculturological parameters of a literary text. Second, the text, as a representation of the personality's linguistic realization, represents the level of culture in synchronicity, as represented by a specific homo loguens (homo logvens - an individual speaking) in the present. [Vorobyov, 1997, 302]

V.N. Telia adds another dimension to the "language - word" model, demonstrating the importance of studying not only language, but also discourse, in which various linguistic and discursive units reflect the corresponding picture of the world [See: 1; p.19]. All of this helps to complete the chain of thought that leads to the linguistic and cultural study of literary texts for wives: culture - thinking - language - word - discourse. The text "The brightest result of the symbiosis of language and culture, actualizing and manifesting creating the features of the linguocultural code, provides the basis for "polyphony" artistic text," according to S. V. Ivanova, accomplishes all of this. [Ivanova, 2003, 367].

As a result, the linguoculturological approach to research appears to be successful and promising for the study of literary texts, since each poet is both unique and traditional in his artistic and linguistic manifestations. He represents a specific country, is interested in a specific cultural context and linguistic discourse, and thus has linguistic knowledge. A nation's identity is defined by its people's linguistic consciousness. We may say the same about the writer's language based on W. Von Humboldt's assertion that each national language has its own "Internal type," a special structure due to the identity of the native spirit [See: 1; from. 67]. Each writer's original "internal type" and basic structure, in addition to themes and the language of artistic imagination, are due





to us by the creator's originality, that is, by the features of his personality, thought, and language.

According to Yu.N.Karaulov, “highlighting her life and situational dominants, attitudes, and motives reflected in the processes of generating texts and in their content” [Karaulov 2002, 264], the definition of the linguistic personality with the aim of further study should begin with “highlighting her life and situational dominants, attitudes, and motives reflected in the processes of generating texts and in their content”. On the basis of this argument, we can conclude that by analyzing the particulars of a writer's language, we are very close to recreating his linguistic model of the universe. “As units should be called generalized (theoretical or ordinary everyday) concepts, broad concepts, ideas, which are represented by those the same as if the terms of the zero rank, but now dressed with descriptor status,” according to Yu.N. Karaulov [Karaulov 2002, 264]. This method is ideally suited for studying a literary text's language "network," in which the author's linguistic consciousness is expressed in its specificity. The conceptual sense of such "sign units" is exposed in this case, resulting in the creation and expression of the linguistic model of the world in the writer's work - a unique linguistic identity.

As a result, over the last two decades, the most common and widely used methods of analyzing literary texts with linguistic and cultural positions among scientists have been those that involve working with concepts. “The method of defining the concept by its associative field” [Alefirenko, 288] and “the method of studying the concept by the lexico-grammatical field of the lexeme that represents it ” [Alefirenko,288] are described by N.F.Alefirenko. Despite the fact that linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics today distinguish three approaches to the understanding of a concept, they both agree on the importance of the relationship between culture, thought, and language.

Conclusion

We came to the conclusion that linguoculturology is a new aspect of a complex approach to language and culture, their interrelationship with each other, mutual influence on the growth of culture and language, and their links with social life, psychology, and philosophy after investigating "Linguocultural aspect of interrelation of language and culture. The last time on the system or representations of concepts, linguoculturology-specific methods were developed. As mentioned in the article, the





ideas of the scholars on this topic differ, but taking all of these peculiarities in the differentiations of ideas into account, a general notion on the linguoculturological aspect of language research was still possible. We endorse the linguoculturology concept, which states that linguistic approaches to cultural phenomena should not be viewed as a “transition” of culturological terms to linguistic terms, but rather as a structurally more precise approach to culture as a semantic whole. Thus, the linguoculturological approach to literary text analysis provides the researcher with the ability to solve problem of "finding the whole by section" [1; from. 12]. Researchers lead to the semantic characteristics of the leading semantic dominants of the writer's linguistic consciousness, study them separately and in detail, after the first stage of collecting and classifying language representatives in a literary text, definition and explanation of the general meanings, structural and content analysis, expression, linguistic stylistic analysis, meaningful text analysis, and cultural analysis of basic text

List of used literature:

1. Alefirenko F. N. Lingvokulturologiya: valuable and semantic space of language. M.: Flinta: Science, 2010. 288 pages.
2. Gerd, A. C. Introduction to ethnolinguistics [Text] / A. S. Gerd. - SPb. : Publishing house of St. Petersburg University, 2005. - 457 p.
3. Maslova, V. A. Linguoculturology [Text] / V. A. Maslova. - M.: Publishing Center "Academy", 2001. - 208 p.
4. Khrolenko, A. T. Fundamentals of cultural linguistics: a textbook [Text] / A. T. Khrolenko. - M.: Flinta, Nauka, 2009. -- 184 p.
5. Karaulov Yu. N. Russian language and language personality. M.: Editorial of URSS, 2002. 264 pages.
6. Askoldov S. A. Concept and word // Russian literature. From the theory of literature to structure of the text. Anthology / under edition of V. P. Neroznak M.: Academia, 1997. Pages 267-279.
7. Bespalova O. V. Conceptsphere of N. Gumilev's poetry in its lexicographic representation: Autoabstract diss. of Candidate of Philology. SPb., 2002.
8. Murzin L. N. The language, the text, the culture // The person – the text – the culture / under edition of N. A. Kurina, T. V. Matveeva. Ekaterinburg: IRRO, 1994. Pages 160-169.





9. Ivanova S. V. Lingvokulturologiya's aspect of research of the language units: the dissertation on competition of a scientific degree of the doctor of philological Sciences in the discipline 10.02.19 – The theory of language (on philological sciences). Ufa, 2003. 367 pages.
10. Loseva L. M. How the text is under construction / under edition of G. Ya. Solganik. M.: Education, 1980. 96 pages.
11. Lotman Yu. M. Semantics of the culture and notion of the text // Russian literature. From the theory of literature to structure of the text. Anthology / under edition of V. P. Neroznak M.: Academia, 1997. Pages 202-212.
12. Vorobyev V. V. Lingvokulturologiya (theory and methods). M.: People's Friendship University of Russia, 1997. 331 pages.

