

Linguoculturology and the Linguocultural Aspect of Phraseological Units

Maxbuba Shavkatovna Mardiyeva

Teacher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. *It is well known that every nation and ethnic group possesses its own national traditions and customs. Consequently, every individual is connected with a particular culture, language, history, and literature that reflect their national identity. Therefore, each nation's language embodies its unique national traditions and cultural values. Nowadays, comprehensive economic, political, cultural, and scientific cooperation among individuals, nations, and countries is expanding on an unprecedented scale. International cultural and communicative processes have generated numerous linguistic issues related to language culture and the national specificity of language arising from interactions among representatives of different languages and cultures.*

Keywords: *linguoculturology, phraseological units, cultural concept, language and culture.*

Introduction

This has led to the emergence of a new branch of linguistics—**linguoculturology**—which occupies a unique position at the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies and possesses its own specific object and subject of research.

As a result, by the end of the twentieth century, linguoculturology, a discipline devoted to the study of the relationship between language and culture, began to develop rapidly. Linguoculturology is an independent scientific field that investigates the inseparable relationship between language and culture and examines language and culture as interconnected phenomena[1,2]. It emerged as an interdisciplinary field between linguistics and cultural studies and focuses on the interaction and interdependence of language and culture, the formation of this relationship, and its manifestation both within language and beyond it as an integrated system[3,4,5].

On the one hand, linguoculturology studies the role of the human being within the cultural dimension of language; on the other hand, it investigates the role of language in shaping human cognition and culture. In terms of its object of study, linguoculturology is closely related to both linguistics and cultural studies. However, it differs from these disciplines in its content, methodology, and research focus. Its distinctive feature lies in examining how a nation's culture is manifested and expressed through language, exploring linguistic mentality, national identity, and language consciousness, as well as identifying the national and cultural specificities governing speech communication[6,7,8]. Furthermore, linguoculturology seeks to identify and investigate the unique national linguistic features through which a nation's culture is reflected in its language.

Methods

By the twenty-first century, linguoculturology had become one of the leading directions in world linguistics. It studies language as a cultural phenomenon, with language and culture, viewed in their interrelationship, constituting its primary subject of investigation. The history of the relationship between language and culture dates back to ancient times. The renowned German linguist **Wilhelm**

von Humboldt, while examining the relationship between language and thought in his works, also put forward the first theoretical ideas concerning the interaction between language and culture. Likewise, the Russian linguist **A.A. Potebnya**, a follower of von Humboldt's ideas, associated language with the national spirit in his scholarly **research**.

Results

The linguists **Edward Sapir** and **Benjamin Lee Whorf**, who conducted extensive studies on the relationship between language and culture, proposed a theory differing from Humboldt's views, known as **linguistic relativity**. This theory is widely recognized in general linguistics as the **Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis**. It is based on two fundamental propositions:

1. Language reflects the worldview and patterns of thinking of the people who speak it.
2. The perception and understanding of objective reality depend on the language through which an individual thinks.

Similar views can also be found in the works of the linguist **Leo Weisgerber**, who argued that language functions as the principal instrument in all aspects of human spiritual and intellectual life. However, the Sapir-Whorf theory has also been subject to criticism. Many linguists, including **B.A. Serebrennikov**, **R.M. Frumkina**, **T.V. Kolshansky**, **D. Dodd**, and **E. Hollenstein**, have expressed critical views regarding this hypothesis[9,10,11].

In contemporary linguistics, the following principles concerning the relationship between language and culture are regarded as particularly significant:

Language, inherited from generation to generation, constitutes an inseparable component of culture;

Language serves as the primary means through which culture is acquired and transmitted;

Language is one of the most important cultural phenomena through which all aspects of culture, including science, religion, and literature, can be studied.

For this reason, culture can most effectively be understood and interpreted through language. This demonstrates that language is not only an integral part of culture but also its principal instrument, expressing the national characteristics of a people's mentality. At the same time, language is both a product of culture and one of the essential factors in the formation of culture.

The relationship between language and culture may be viewed as that between a part and a whole. Language can therefore be regarded both as a component of culture and as a tool for creating and transmitting culture. Simultaneously, language maintains its autonomy as an independent semiotic system and may be investigated within the framework of traditional linguistics[12,13,14].

In this regard, **V.N. Telia** states:

"Linguoculturology is the discipline that investigates the human factor, or more precisely, the cultural factor embodied in human beings. This implies that linguoculturology represents the totality of achievements characteristic of the anthropological paradigm, with the human being as the bearer of culture at its centre."

According to **N.S. Trubetzkoy**:

"No word can exist without cultural connotations; comparison necessarily presupposes the existence of certain shared cultural elements."

Similarly, **V.V. Vorobyov** defines linguoculturology as:

"A synthetic and interdisciplinary branch of science that investigates the interaction between language and culture. It examines this process as an integrated system of linguistic and extra-linguistic

(cultural) units through systematic methods aimed at contemporary cultural priorities, universal norms, and values."

Explaining the distinctions among these concepts, **O'.Q. Yusupov** characterizes a **linguocultureme** as a linguistic or speech unit whose semantics reflects a particular fragment of culture. According to him, linguoculturemes include words, phraseological units, word combinations, sentences, proverbs, complex syntactic constructions, texts, and other linguistic units representing cultural phenomena.

Yusupov further argues that a linguocultureme possesses both a **plane of expression** and a **plane of content**. The plane of expression consists of the linguistic forms mentioned above, while the plane of content is constituted by their semantic meaning. Unlike a concept, a linguocultureme possesses both linguistic form and semantic content. Consequently, one of the principal objectives of linguoculturology is to reveal the linguistic manifestation of a nation's culture[15].

According to Yusupov, the concept of the linguocultureme is particularly significant for comparative linguistics because "language is a cultural fact. It is both a component of the cultural heritage we inherit and the instrument through which culture is created and transmitted. National culture is verbalized through language, and language activates and expresses the fundamental concepts of culture by means of linguistic signs—that is, through words"[16,17].

As linguistic signs, phraseological units communicate information about events, portray reality figuratively, express evaluation, and convey human emotions. Their semantic structure corresponds to their systematic linguistic form. Semantic analysis of phraseological units reveals the etymology of their imagery, their internal form, and the underlying metaphors that shape their meaning. It also explains the connotations emerging in context and compensates for the limitations of purely rationalized meanings.

The concept of **connotation** extends semantic analysis beyond linguistic meaning into the broader sphere of cultural knowledge. Consequently, linguistic semantics is examined together with cultural semantics, enabling researchers to identify cultural components and culturally marked meanings embedded in linguistic signs.

As linguistic signs, phraseological units preserve the traditions of a nation and transmit cultural knowledge related to phraseological reality from one generation to another. Their imagery may originate from everyday life, rituals, religion, history, literature, mythology, science, and many other domains. Phraseology preserves the earliest models through which people perceive the world, maintaining archetypes that sustain phraseological images and prevent their disintegration. These archetypes remain embedded within the internal structure of phraseological units and continue to shape their meanings.

Language has increasingly become an invaluable source for the scholarly investigation of culture. In many respects, the cultural models formed throughout historical development are encoded within the language that represents them. Fundamental cultural concepts cannot be fully understood through observation alone without considering linguistic symbolism, which renders these concepts meaningful and comprehensible within society.

A linguocultural approach makes it possible to determine the semantic scope of phraseological units representing the same aspect of reality in different languages. It enables researchers to identify shared semantic features, uncover underlying archetypes, determine the ethnic specificity of phraseological imagery, reveal the culturally conditioned conceptual models underlying such images, explain how these models shape the axiological content of phraseological units, and compare their patterns of usage across languages.

Conclusion

Thus, the linguocultural approach reveals universal, culturally conditioned, and nationally specific features at the intersection of language, culture, and communication. It investigates the continuous

interaction between archetypal models and the living cultural components reflected in the semantics of phraseological units. Since phraseological units constitute part of a nation's cultural heritage, their origins are inseparably connected with the natural environment, economic structure, history, culture, way of life, folklore, literature, art, science, and traditions of the people who created and use them.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Mardiyeva, "Gʻ.Gʻulom asarlarida qoʻllangan frazeologik birliklarning lingvomadaniy tahlili," *Educational Research in Universal Sciences*, pp. 105–109, 2023.
- [2] M. Mardiyeva, "Frazeologik birliklarni tarjima qilishning muqobil usullari haqida," *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit*, pp. 674–676.
- [3] N. Z. Nasrullayeva, *Ingliz tili frazeologik birliklar semantikasidagi gender konsepsiyasi*, D.Sc. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2016.
- [4] A. A. Nosirov, *Fransuz, oʻzbek va rus tillaridagi proverbial frazeologizmlarning semantik-stilistik va milliy madaniy xususiyatlari*, D.Sc. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Uzbek State University of World Languages, 2016.
- [5] M. Sh. Mardiyeva, "Gʻafur Gʻulomning individual frazeologizmlar qoʻllash mahorati," *Ilm-fan Yangiliklari Konferensiyasi*, pp. 12–13, 2023.
- [6] I. Z. Shavkatovna, "Comparing interference errors in English of Uzbek and Russian L1 learners," *Manuscripts on the Innovative Research and General Scientific Studies*, vol. 2, no. 11, pp. 45–47, 2025.
- [7] I. Z. Shavkatovna, "Importance of the intercultural aspect in teaching English," *Conduct of Modern Science*, p. 33, 2019.
- [8] G. K. Odilova, *Ingliz va oʻzbek mumtoz sheʼriyati tarjimalarida adekvatlik muammolari*, Ph.D. dissertation, Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Uzbek State University of World Languages, 2011.
- [9] M. V. Osyka, *Toponomicheskie frazeologizmy v natsionalnoy kontseptosfere (na materiale russkoy i frantsuzskoy lingvokultur)*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Belgorod, Russia, 2010.
- [10] Sh. P. Rakhimova, *Ingliz tili idiomatik iboralarini oʻzbek tiliga oʻgirishning lisoniy xususiyatlari*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2019.
- [11] U. M. Rashidova, *Oʻzbek tilidagi somatik iboralarining semantik-pragmatik tahlili (koʻz, qoʻl va yurak komponentli iboralar misolida)*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 2018.
- [12] Sh. Rahmatullayev, *Hozirgi zamon oʻzbek tilidagi obrazli feʼl frazeologik birliklarning asosiy grammatik xususiyatlari*, Ph.D. dissertation, Moscow, USSR, 1952.
- [13] Sh. Rahmatullayev, *Oʻzbek frazeologiyasining baʼzi masalalari*, D.Sc. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 1966.
- [14] B. Reymov, *Frazeologicheskie edinitsy angliyskogo yazyka, kharakterizuyushchie emotsionalnoe sostoyanie cheloveka*, Ph.D. dissertation, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2005.
- [15] E. V. Safronova, *Struktura i semantika frazeologicheskikh edinits s onomasticheskim komponentom bibleyskogo proiskhozhdeniya v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Kyiv, Ukraine, 1997.
- [16] I. Stepanova, *Angliyskie frazeologicheskie edinitsy s floristicheskim komponentom (v sopostavlenii s russkim yazykom)*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Kyiv, Ukraine, 1987.
- [17] D. A. Tosheva, *Zoonim komponentli maqollarning lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari*, Ph.D. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2017.