


<b>THE STUDY OF NATIONAL - CULTURAL UNITS IN UZBEK AND WORLD LINGUISTICS</b>		<b>Linguistics</b> <b>Keywords:</b> national-cultural unit, non-equivalent vocabulary, association, linguoculturology, linguocultural code, metaphorical unity, symbol, precedent name, national-cultural association.
<b>Tajiboev Botir Rakhimjonovich</b>	<b>Lecturer at Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature. City Tashkent, Uzbekistan.</b>	

**Abstract**

This article discusses the national-cultural units of a particular nation, their specific features, the role of these units in the life of the people. It highlights the study of national-cultural units, especially in world linguistics, as well as in Uzbek linguistics from scientific and social point of view. The views of different linguists on this issue have been comparatively analyzed. Furthermore, the units observed in only one nation, not in others have been analyzed in pragmalinguistic, cognitive, psycholinguistic, statistical, associative aspects. The results of the analysis are summarized and a scientific conclusion is drawn. It is taken into consideration to analyze the impact of person's speech of national-cultural units through psychological aspect.

It is known that one of the important features of a nation is its culture and the existence of a language that reflects it. As the cultures of different nations have never been compatible, the units that represent cultural events are incompatible, too. Each language will have special units that reflect the elements of people's culture, referring to the nation and its national values. Such units represent the ethnic, socio-cultural views, national traditions, customs, etiquette, norms of communication specific to a particular nation. Units that contain such extra linguistic information are called national-cultural units or national-cultural specific units.

National-cultural units reflect the national identity of a language. As V.N. Telia points out, language, with its meanings and associations, adorns the conceptual model of the world with national-cultural colors [18, p. 41], while national-cultural units in language make this color clearer and help identify national differences between different languages.

In linguistics, there are different approaches to the definition of national-cultural units. Russian scholar V.N.Telia distinguished 2 types of units with cultural sign in language: in the first type of units, information of cultural value covers the denotative aspect of meaning (realities of material, spiritual and social culture); the second type of units are the units that carry information of cultural value in the connotative sense [19, p.235].

Thinking about this, D. Rustamov also states that "the cultural features of a word can completely cover its semantic structure or be reflected in any of its semantics, or in one of the types of sememe, ie denotative, connotative or function semes" [15, p.15].

E.M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov interpret the semantic sign formed within the boundaries of ethnocultural and national-linguistic commonality as a national-cultural seme [2, p. 67].

I.A. Stern argues that linking the linguocultural features of a word to its semantics alone, and that it is wrong to derive meaning from nationalism in comparative and contrastive studies, nationality does not always fully reflect in word semantics. According to him, stylistic and functional structural differences in language units are not conditionally related to cultural factors, many semantic components of the word reflect universal phenomena related to humanity, material and spiritual culture, rather than cultural phenomena specific to each nation [17, p.9]. At this point, the scientist seems right. Indeed, as he claims, the composition of two phraseologies used in different languages in relation to the same cultural value acquires a national character on the basis of their chosen words. However, the fact that the common meaning in expressions is expressed in a unique way in each language through a portable meaning shows that even in this type of units, the national-cultural sign can be defined through a semantic approach.

The scientist E.N. Maklakova, who studied the linguocultural features of the word, found that the linguocultural sign in language units is manifested in the following cases:

- The names of historical events preserved in the historical memory of the people (*мамаево нашествие, мамаево побоище, тяжела ты, шапка Мономаха*);
- Names of cultural realities (*бесструнная балалайка, вольный казак, сибирский валенок*);
- Names of onomastic realities (*не помнящий родства Иван, коломенская верста; Иванов, Петров, Сидоров*);
- Names related to national precedent texts (*человек в футляре, лебедь, рак да щука, Маша-растеряша, кисейная барышня, лишний человек*);
- Names of non-equivalent national-historical realities (*большевик, барин, боярин, интеллигенция, казак, кулак, мужик, меньшевик, стрелец, троцкист, цесаревич, номенклатура, власти, вождь, беспартийный*);
- Names of national-material (household) realities (*тугая / толстая мошина, аршин с шапкой, кладезь премудрости*);
- Names representing national-cultural symbols (*голубой (гомосексуалисты), черный цвет (безобразия, ненависть, печаль, смерть), черная сотня, черная душа, чернь*).

According to the scholar, the listed language units that reflect the ethnic, social, historical, etc., reflecting the worldview of a particular nation, constitute a linguocultural paradigm that is important in determining the national identity of a particular language semantics [10, pp.3-9].

In some sources, national-cultural component units include national customs, traditions and ceremonial names, parems, persistent analogies, metaphorical units, symbols, examples of folklore, precedent names, some socially significant units, religious culture units, popular names, phraseologies. In particular, D.Khudoyberganova considers precedent texts on popular works of art, films, materials of folklore as a means of transmitting cultural symbols from one generation to another. According to her, texts containing similes, metaphors, proverbs and phraseological units, speech etiquette, prayers are a linguistic and cultural phenomenon that embodies national and cultural values [23, pp.9-10].

It is understood that national-cultural units are mainly units that reflect the ethnic aspects of a particular nation, its national-cultural worldview, traditions and customs, morals associated with historical traditions, norms of communication, examples of creativity in a specific national spirit.

National-cultural symbols are reflected differently in language units. While some units directly represent a sign of national identity, in some units this sign appears indirectly. In some words, cultural seme coexists with lexical meaning, while in others it arises through their portable meaning.

For example, since idioms reflect reality in a figurative sense, they directly reflect the national-cultural character. The *beshtik* lexeme in the Uzbek language is a national-cultural unit because it directly reflects the subject, which in its sense has become one of the national values of the Uzbek people. In such a situation, the cultural sign inherent in a language unit is understood through its lexical meaning. Such units are historically formed, play an important role in the cultural life of a nation, and are not observed in other languages.

In linguistics, this kind of units is referred as non-equivalent lexicons or realities [2]. In the Uzbek lexemes *doppi*, *atlas (cloth)*, *yaktak*, *belbog*, *karnay-surnay*, *nogora*, the cultural seme is embodied together with their lexical meaning. Such lexemes directly refer to the Uzbek people, its national traditions. D.Lutfullaeva and B.Tajibaev also put forward their ideas that the dreams and hopes of a certain people or nation are reflected in the various traditions in which they follow [9, pp.49-59]. Similarly, in the Russian *samovar* and Kazakh *beshtarmak* lexemes, the cultural seme is directly understood.

In linguistics, lacunae are also distinguished as a separate type of national-cultural units. V.G. Gak interprets lacunae as a remnant in the lexical system of a language, a condition that should be present in the language but is not [3, p. 291]. D.Rustamov also thinks that a phenomenon that does not have a noun in one language is expressed in another language, and a situation without a noun is considered a national-mental lacuna in Russian, Uzbek and English. explains with examples of *старший брат* – elder brother – *ака, младший брат* – little brother – *uka*. He notes that in many cases, the comparison of these languages also shows that such a situation does not exist. In particular, the fact that the words *xola* and *amma* in Uzbek do not have exact alternatives in Russian and English shows that there is a lacunae in these languages based on national-mental values [15, p.10].

It is understood that national-cultural units differ from each other in what they call a cultural event. But they merge into a common paradigm according to their possession of a cultural component.

In linguistics, the use of the terms cultural-historical component of the national-cultural component of meaning in relation to the cultural component observed in the lexical meaning of the word is also observed.

Characteristically, there are also lexemes in the language system that rise to the level of national-cultural unit in a particular speech usage. According to Sh. Kalandarov, “all derivative meanings of words are culturally specified national meanings. But the main meaning of the word is also a culturally specified national meaning, if the word has no alternative in another language” [6, p.55]. He showed that cultural meaning comes to existence in the derivative meaning of *ajralmoq* “to get out of marriage,” the lexeme of *ayb* is “a shameful, embarrassing act; in the sense of “shameful deed, shame” or in the literal sense of the lexeme of *do‘pposlamog* “to criticize ruthlessly, to point out mistakes and shortcomings, negative qualities”, in the derivative meaning of the lexeme *vaziyat* “person’s appearance, mental and other conditions; appearance” [6, p.24].

It is clear that in such lexemes the cultural seme is not clearly visible. However, semantic analysis shows that they show a sign of culture when used in a derivative meaning in speech. In general, it is reasonable to think that derivative meaning has a cultural seme, as it reflects the perceptions and views of people about the world, while the derivative meaning is formed by the speakers of a particular language.

Sh. Kalandarov tries to justify the existence of culturally specified national meanings in these lexemes by the fact that they are not given in bilingual (translation) dictionaries. In our opinion, it would be more correct to interpret the national-cultural semantics of a language unit not by whether lexemes are given in translation dictionaries, but by expressing in the lexeme the national views of language owners, their attitude to the world. Because translation dictionaries are man-made, their meanings may not always be clear.

Thus, it is expedient to differ the following types of units, which are distinguished in the language as national-cultural lexemes:

1. Units with a national-cultural seme.
2. Units with a national-cultural character in a particular speech.

It is known that national-cultural units are the object of study of linguoculturology, which has been studied with great interest in world linguistics in recent years. After all, the national culture, which has been polished for many years is clearly seen in the national-cultural units. For example, as a national-cultural unit, proverbs based on many years of experience of the people play an important role in drawing the national-cultural image of the world.

In researches, which are being conducted in the linguoculturological aspect in recent years, the study of national-cultural units in comparison with non-sister language units has become more widespread. Of course, this method of research allows for a more vivid description of the national-cultural characteristics of language units. For example, the national-cultural units of the Uzbek language were studied in comparison with the English, Russian, Kazakh units [1; 13], or the Russian language units were studied in comparison with the English, German, French, Tatar and other language units [12; 4; 20; 22; 14; 21].

Language does not directly reflect the national culture, but also adds a person's perceptions and views, emotional experiences, knowledge about folk culture to it. In this respect, it can be acknowledged that not only the culture experienced through language units, but also the external world can never be an exact copy. Even the artist imitates the external world through his imagination and national consciousness. In painting, at least, the way and level of the artist's perception of colors vary.

While there is a human factor between language units and their speech phenomena, the study of language in collaboration with the human sciences is one of the urgent tasks in this process. Linguoculturology, which studies national-cultural units, is one of such disciplines.

Since the last quarter of the last century, new approaches to the study of language in world linguistics have led to the formation of a separate branch of linguistics - linguoculturology, which studies national-cultural units in relation to the human factor. In the new era, the influence of language on language, the manifestation of human personality traits in speech, the manifestation of national-cultural values, views, national imagination and consciousness in language attracted the attention of linguists in the study of the language system. Such an approach to the study of language has shown that the notion of narrow understanding it, limiting its function as a means of communication, evaluating language as a spontaneous phenomenon outside of man is wrong.

Linguoculturology studies the issue of reflection of cultural symbols in language as a branch of linguistics that arises in the interaction and interconnection of language and culture. As long as culture has a national character, its expression in language also has a sign of nationality. Linguoculturology studies the linguistic expression of culture through cultural codes.

Studies in the linguoculturological aspect have led to the view of language as a carrier of the national-cultural symbol, i.e. the cultural code symbol. Cultural codes are the ways of expression in social practice that are specific to each culture, the values and rules of the game introduced for community existence, the normative and evaluative criteria developed by humans, through which the nation takes over the world [11, p.3]. National-cultural units are units that generate cultural codes specific to a particular language. For example, the word *beshik*, which is a national-cultural unit for the Uzbek language, serves as a linguocultural code that reflects the subject. *Beshik* is a symbol of the culture of the Uzbek people, as a code, it is also expressed in the language. Hence, the *linguocultural code* is formed on the basis of the interaction of culture and language code.

According to some linguists, the "cultural" information reflected in the national language is 'coded' in the semantics of the internal structure, semantic structure, syntax of grammatical forms, not in the upper part of the language unit, so the "cultural events" only when it leaves and acquires national dignity takes the status of a national-cultural code [11, p.25].

In the study of the relationship between language and culture, there is a need to study the problem of expression of national consciousness, national thinking in language. After all, as long as language reflects cultural events, it cannot go beyond the realm of national consciousness and thinking. Language not only names cultural events, but also serves to reveal and describe its essence, which necessitates an appeal to national perception and national thinking. In this case, the scope of study of lingvoculturology is further expanded and connected with such disciplines as cognitive linguistics, associative linguistics.

The national consciousness and associative thinking of native speakers play an important role in the realization of culture in language. National-cultural units reflect not only the cultural way of life of native speakers, but also their national thinking. This situation further expands the boundaries of approaches to the study of national-cultural units.

In language, national-cultural units are manifested primarily as representatives of national culture. However, in the process of cultural expression in language, factors such as the psychological perception of native speakers about them, their subjective attitude to the cultural phenomenon also emerge.

The subjective attitude that arises in the linguistic realization of culture leads to the inter-associative relationship of units that express a positive or negative assessment in language. For example, while the phraseological units of *tili uzun* and *tili kalta* in a contradictory relationship remind each other in the memory of language speakers, they also openly express the subjective attitude of the speaker at the same time.

In general, in the study of national-cultural units, it is important to study a person's attitude to cultural events, the extent to which one perceives it and how it is expressed in language, in relation with the problem in relation to the national consciousness, thinking, memory of native speakers. These issues are topical issues not only of lingvoculturology, but also of cognitive and associative linguistics.

It is known that in linguistics, national-cultural units have been studied mainly from the linguocultural aspect. The research work in this aspect revealed the linguistic nature of national-cultural units, defined the criteria for distinguishing national-cultural units, distinguished the distinctive features of national-cultural units on the example of different languages.

Since the end of the last century, scientific research has been conducted on such issues as the formation of associative relations in the minds of linguists, their integration into the field of national-cultural associations, their participation in the formation of the text. As a result, a number of terms such as *national consciousness*, *national thinking*, *associative thinking*, *national-cultural association*, *associative lacuna* have entered the linguistics of the new period.

It is known that the role of culturally specified units is unique in the creation of the national-cultural landscape of the world. Such units are the result of looking at the world from a

national perspective. The associative approach to the study of national-cultural units substantiates the important role of associative connections in creating the national-cultural landscape of the world.

According to the data, since the end of the nineteenth century in linguistics, special attention has been paid to the study of issues such as the formation of lexical associations, associative meaning, integration into associative groups in human memory. In Western linguistics, the study of linguistic associations began from this period [8, p.12].

From the end of the twentieth century, national-cultural units were separated and studied in an associative way. The study of the association of national-cultural units reached a special stage in Russian linguistics. In particular, V.A. Ryzhkov studied the national-cultural aspects of associative meaning in international stereotypes, N.V. Dmitryuk studied the national-cultural features of verbal associations, Y.N. Karaulov studied the expression of national mentality in the associative-verbal network [5; 16; 7].

In linguistics, the study of national-cultural units in the associative aspect is also carried out on a comparative basis. For instance, Han Chjipin studied lacunae in Russian and Chinese comparatively in an associative aspect. He identified lacunar dissonance in intercultural communication on the basis of the following circumstances: 1) differences between language systems; 2) the emergence of contradictions in the models of "own" and "foreign" culture; 3) the contradiction between perception and associative imagination and others.

Han Chjipin divides the causes of lacunae into purely linguistic, mental (associative), extralinguistic (culturological) and so on [24].

Han Chjipin also described the concept of *associative lacunae*. In his view, the associative lacuna is a nationally specific element of culture that is ignored (misunderstood) by speakers or not fully understood by representatives of different cultures in communication [24, p.136].

The study of national-cultural units in the associative aspect also clarifies their role in text formation.

It is known that the study of the problem of associative connection of words in the language in the creation of the text has been in the focus of linguists. Due to the associative relationship of words with each other, the text is logically and semantically structured. For instance, language units with national-cultural markers are associated with similarly marked language units in the text and serve to create a national spirit in the text. This showed that, it is also necessary to study their associative relationships in determining the nature of language units in practical use.

## References

1. Бакиров П.У. Номинацентрические пословицы в разносистемных языках (на материале русского, узбекского и казахского языков): автореф. Автореф. дисс. ... докт.филол. наук. Ташкент, 2007. 50 с.
2. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Лингвострановедческая теория слова. М.: Русский язык, 1980.
3. Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. Л.: Просвещение, 1977.
4. Грицко М.И. Глагольные фразеологизмы русского, английского и французского языков в сопоставительном аспекте: Автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук. – Новосибирск, 2005.
5. Дмитриук Н. В. Национально-культурная специфика вербальных ассоциаций: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 1985.
6. Қаландаров Ш. Ўзбек лингвомаданий мухитида халқ мақоллари эвфемизацияси: Филол. фан. ... фалс. докт. (Phd) дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 2017.
7. Караулов Ю.Н. Показатели национального менталитета в ассоциативно-вербальной сети // Языковое сознание и образ мира. М.: Институт языкознания РАН, 2006. С. 191-206.
8. Лутфуллаева Д. Ассоциатив тилшунослик назарияси. – Тошкент: Meriyus, 2017.
9. Лутфуллаева Д., Тажибаев Б. Association of National and Cultural Units in Uzbek Language. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*. Volume 7. Number 6. June 2018. Pp. 49-59.
10. Маклакова Е. А. О понятии лингвокультурологической специфики значения слова // Текст. Дискурс. Картина мира. – Воронеж, 2011. Вып. 7. С. 3-9.
11. Маслова В.А., Пименова М.В. Коды лингвокультуры. Учебное пособие. М.: Флинта-Наука, 2018.
12. Мирсаетова Л.А. Образ человека во фразеологической картине мира в татарском и русском языках: Дисс... канд. филол.наук. Уфа, 2004. С. 165.
13. Насруллаева Н.З. Гендерные концепты в английской и узбекской фразеологии. Ташкент: «Фан ва технологиялар», 2018. 144 с.
14. Рамазанова З.М. Сопоставительное исследование гендерной фразеологии в лакском, русском и английском языках: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Махачкала: ДГПУ, 2011.
15. Рустамов Д. Лексемалар миллий-маданий хосланган семемасининг лингвомаданий тадқиқи: Филол. фан. бўй. фалс. фан. докт. дисс. автореф. Фарғона, 2018.
16. Рыжков В.А. Национально-культурные аспекты ассоциативного значения интернациональных стереотипов: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 1983.
17. Стернин И.А. О понятии лингвокультурной специфики языковых явлений // Язык. Словесность. Культура. М., No.1, 2011. С. 9.
18. Телия В.Н. Метафора как модель смыслопроизводства и эксперссивно-оценочная функция // Метафора в языке и тексте. М., 1988.
19. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1996.



20. Тишина Н.В. Национально-культурные особенности эвфемии в современном английском и русском языке: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2006. 22 с.
21. Холмурадова Л.Э. Инглиз ва француз тилларидаги образли ва мотивлашган фразеологизмларнинг тематик-идеографик талқини (лингвомаданий аспект): Филол. фан. ... фан. докт. (Phd) дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 2017. 50 б.
22. Хомякова Н.А. Эмотивные фразеологизмы в русском, французском и английском языках: сопоставительный анализ: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2008. 212 с.
23. Худойберганаева Д. Ўзбек тилидаги бадиий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини: Филол. фан. докт. ... дисс. Тошкент, 2014.
24. Чжипин Х. Национальная специфика ассоциативной лакуарности в межкультурном взаимодействии (на материале русского и китайского языков): Дисс. канд. филол. наук. Благовещенск, 2016. 184 с.