

HUMANİTAR VƏ İCTİMAİ ELMLƏR
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2789-6919/33/9-18>

Nigar Valiyeva
Azerbaijan University of Languages
doctor of philological sciences
nigar_veliyeva@yahoo.com

**THE PROBLEM OF THE INTERACTION OF LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
IN THE CONTEXT OF AZERBAIJAN**

Abstract

In a dynamic postmodern civilization, the rate of renewal of science and technology, art and economics, politics and law is increasing. Our presence in the present is limited. The period of life and stable operation is reduced. It is an irrefutable fact that progress directed towards the future multiplies the number of forms of historical culture.

The article discusses the process of “language - culture - communication”, as well as the opinions and some scientific works of famous scientists involved in the study and explanation of these concepts, such as, for example: Ferdinand de Saussure, Friedrich Wilhelm von Humboldt, Solomon Davidovich Katznelson, Michael Halliday, Stefan Gremli, Dan Sperber, Hermann Lubbe, as well as A.N. Abregov, A.I. Dolgikh, G.L. Zelenin, A.Yu. Suprun, V.V. Miteva, M.M. Lebedeva, B.A. Sheozheva, E.A. Sokur, L.L. Nelyubin, A.A. Kretov, N.A. Fenenko, including Afad Gurbanov, Tofik Gadzhiev, Nigar Valiyeva.

In each national literary language there are a number of lexical units, the meaning and function of which are determined by belonging to a particular culture. Undoubtedly, a traditionally defined number of terms are used, such as: “non-equivalent vocabulary”; “exotic vocabulary” or “exoticisms”; “barbarisms”, “ethnography”; “alienisms”; “background words”; “connotative words”, “words with a cultural component”, “gaps”, “realia”.

Words that reflect the inextricable connection between language and culture and the culturally significant associations they contain constitute the cultural component of the semantics of linguistic units. These lexical units are realia. Currently, the study of realia is of great interest in linguistics. Realia as lexical units of language have semantic meaning, as well as a certain emotional connotation and stylistic significance. In language, realia are a product of a certain social environment, a particular era, they change, improve, and stabilize in connection with changes in the life and living conditions of language speakers and, finally, fall into the hearts and take a strong root in memory. Sometimes they are difficult to understand and interpret unless one takes into account the semantic development of realia, which are a collection of crystallized ideas filtered by time. Realia has not been fundamentally studied in Azerbaijani linguistics.

Keywords: *intercultural communication, national culture, linguistic diversity, multilingual education, realis*

Nigar VəliyevaAzərbaycan Dillər Universiteti
filologiya elmləri doktoru
nigar_veliyeva@yahoo.com**Azərbaycan kontekstində dillərin və mədəniyyətlərin qarşılıqlı təsiri problemi****Xülasə**

Dinamik postmodern sivilizasiyada elm və texnologiyanın, incəsənətin və iqtisadiyyatın, siyasətin və hüququn yenilənmə sürəti artır. İndiki zamanda mövcudluğumuz məhdudlaşır. Həyat və sabit fəaliyyət müddəti azalır. Təkbizolunmaz bir həqiqətdir ki, gələcəyə yönəlmiş tərəqqi tarixi mədəniyyətin formalarının sayını çoxaldır.

Məqalədə “dil - mədəniyyət – kommunikasiya” prosesini və bu anlayışların tədqiqi və izahı ilə məşğul olan tanınmış alimlərin fikirləri və bəzi elmi əsərləri araşdırılır, məsələn: Ferdinand de Sössür, Fridrix Vilhelm fon Humboldt, Solomon Davidoviç Kaznelson, Maykl Hallidey, Stefan Gremlı, Den Şperber, Herman Lübe, həmçinin A.N.Abreğov, A.I.Dolqikh, G.L.Zelenin, A.Y.Suprun, V.V.Miteva, M.M.Lebedeva, B.A.Sheojeva, E.A.Sokur, L.L.Nelyubin, A.A.Kretov, N.A.Fenenko, o cümlədən Afad Qurbanov, Tofiq Hacıyev, Nigar Vəliyeva.

Hər bir milli ədəbi dildə bir sıra leksik vahidlər vardır ki, onların mənası və funksiyası konkret mədəniyyətə mənsubiyyətlə müəyyən edilir. Şübhəsiz ki, ənənəvi olaraq müəyyən edilmiş sayda terminlərdən istifadə olunur, məsələn: “ekvivalentsiz leksika”; “ekzotik lüğət” və ya “ekzotizmlər”; “varvarizmlər”, “etnoqrafiya”; “xarici mənşəli sözlər”; “fon sözləri”; “konnotativ sözlər”, “mədəni komponentli sözlər”, “lakunalar”, “realilər”. Dil və mədəniyyət arasında qırılmaz əlaqəni, onların ehtiva etdiyi mədəni əhəmiyyətli assosiasiyaları əks etdirən sözlər dil vahidlərinin semantikasının mədəni komponentini təşkil edir. Bu leksik vahidlər realilərdir. Hal-hazırda realilərin öyrənilməsi dilçilikdə böyük maraq doğurur. Realilər dilin leksik vahidləri kimi semantik məna ilə yanaşı, müəyyən emosional konnotasiyaya və üslub aktuallığına da malikdir. Dildə realilər müəyyən ictimai mühitin, bu və ya başqa dövrün məhsulu olub, dilin daşıyıcılarının həyat və məişət şəraitinin dəyişməsi ilə əlaqədar olaraq dəyişir, təkmilləşir, sabitləşir, və nəhayət, qəblərə düşür, yaddaşda möhkəm kök salır. Xalq şüuru, xalq həyatı ilə yoxsulmuş, dövrlərin süzgəcindən süzülüb gələn, büllurlaşmış fikirlər toplusu olan realilərin semantik inkişafı nəzərə alınmasa, onları bəzən başa düşmək, şərh etmək çətinlik törədir. Azərbaycan dilçiliyində “realilər” geniş və fundamental şəkildə tədqiq olunmayıb.

Açar sözlər: mədəniyyətlərarası ünsiyyət, milli mədəniyyət, linqvistik müxtəliflik, çoxdilli təhsil, reali

Introduction

In the dynamic civilization of postmodernism, the rate of renewal of science and technology, art and economics, politics and law increases. Our time in the present is shortening. Time becomes limited, and therefore needs social and technical organization - as a medium for coordinating our actions. Irrefutable fact that progress directed towards the future multiplies the number of forms of historical culture. One of the most urgent, complex, and controversial problems of modern linguistics, cultural studies, semiotics, and philosophy is the extent and nature of the degree of interaction and connection between language and culture. The complexity of the problem is determined by its multifaceted nature, huge chronological scale, great formal, structural and functional diversity of language and culture. Language and culture are relatively independent phenomena. Nevertheless, their ontological unity exists. It is the meanings of linguistic signs that provide this unity.

As Ferdinand de Saussure notes: “Language is an integral part of culture, the main tool for its assimilation, it is the reality of our spirit. Language expresses specific features of the national mentality. Language is a mechanism that has opened up the realm of consciousness to man. Culture

from a linguoculturological point of view is interpreted, first of all, as a repository of the boundless experience of a nation, accumulated by many generations. Culture is included in the language since it is all modeled in the text. In this theory, language is interpreted as a universal form of primary conceptualization of the world; an integral part of culture inherited by a person from his ancestors; a tool through which culture is acquired; a translator, exponent and custodian of cultural information and knowledge about the world. However, culture cannot be inherited genetically, and to transmit it to subsequent generations, a “conductor” is needed, which is the language” (Coccyur, 1977: 69). The word “cultura” is of Latin origin and means “the education of a free man”. In other words, it means “education of own soul.” It is in the struggle for the soul of man that the philosopher Socrates challenges Protgor the sophist in Plato’s dialogue of the same name. The Platonic school gave a definition that Cicero may have had in mind: the ability of the soul to take care of itself.

Investigating the presence of the connection between language and culture Solomon Davidovich Katsnelson wrote: “Despite all the apparent obviousness of the relationship between language and culture, this question is not simple and cannot be solved unambiguously. All attempts and points of view in modern linguistics and cultural studies can be reduced to two hypotheses: denial of the connection between language and culture and recognition of the connection between language and culture. One way or another, today in philosophy and linguistics most researchers adhere to the hypothesis about the relationship between language and culture. One of the first attempts to solve and substantiate this connection is seen in the works of Friedrich Wilhelm von Humboldt. He substantiated the idea of the national character of culture, which is reflected in language through a special vision of the world. Language and culture, being relatively independent phenomena, are connected through the meaning of linguistic signs, which ensure the ontological unity of language and culture. Thanks to language, the continuity of human culture is carried out, and the accumulation and assimilation of experience developed by previous generations occurs. Language shapes a person, and determines his behavior, lifestyle, worldview, mentality, national character, and ideology (Katsnel'son, 2015: 15).

The philosophy of culture of Dan Sperber presented as the epidemiology of representations, allows us to see the processes of cultural transmission and cultural dynamics, taking into account both the cognitive characteristics of a person and his environment (ecological factor). The philosopher constantly emphasizes the material nature of these processes and his commitment to the Darwinian model (albeit with some reservations). At the same time, he expands the sphere of rationality, introducing into it the mysterious, half-understood, and questionable, which brings him closer to the symbolic theory of culture developed in the middle of the XX century (Ivanenko, 2022: 313).

Contemporary French philosopher Dan Sperber develops a naturalistic approach to culture: he studies culture that behaves like nature. Sperber argues that culture consists primarily of contagious, or better yet, contagious ideas. Therefore, to explain culture means to explain how and why certain ideas become contagious. The cultural process appears as an epidemic, and, accordingly, epidemiology should study such a process. Dan Sperber calls cultural epidemiology the epidemiology of representations, which he declares to be a naturalistic research program in the field of social sciences. Sperber believes that the most important science on which the epidemiology of representations should be based is cognitive psychology. So, the essence of the epidemiological approach to culture is to explain why this or that property (idea, skill, etc.) is distributed in a given population in one way and not another, to explain the essence of cultural transmission and cultural dynamics. Sperber emphasizes that the epidemiology of representations uses different explanatory models, which it borrows from different sciences, but all these models have one thing in common: they all explain macrophenomena as the cumulative effect of microprocesses. This is one of Sperber’s main ideas, which he repeatedly returns and emphasizes (Ivanenko, 2022: 298-299).

Considering the structural phenomenology of culture, let us briefly familiarize ourselves with the scientific work of Herman Lubbe. The work “In step with the times” most fully represents one of the aspects of the intellectual creativity of Herman Lubbe, namely that direction that can be

called the philosophy of culture of modern civilization. Expressed in accordance with the German tradition, it should be called culture-philosophy. For the same reason that today a number of modern areas of cultural analysis call themselves cultural sociology. The reason is that the analysis of culture is not carried out here on the basis of some predetermined philosophical system, but the starting points are the semantic structures of modern culture, realized in various practices: both everyday and specialized. Lubbe's work is rich in terminology borrowed from a variety of philosophical traditions: phenomenology, analytical philosophy of language. This scientific work expresses another aspect of the "bifurcation" of contemporary culture, where, on the one hand, a global, delocalized humanities culture is emerging, represented in international peer-reviewed journals and in international campus humanities, which, on the other hand, is complemented by a concentrated penetration of progressive complexities and details of local and national culture. And if the first is distinguished by global fame and recognition, then the second is distinguished by its direct influence and participation in local socio-cultural processes.

Language plays an important role in the life of every person and society as a whole, since it reflects the culture and way of life of each people and at the same time carries the national cultural code of a particular people. The development of language is impossible without some kind of environmental influence, therefore genetically pure, unspoiled languages do not exist. Therefore, the problem of interlingual relations is one of the most complex and interesting problems of modern linguistics. Due to the complexity and versatility of the problem, it is the subject of consideration by several sciences: Linguistics, Psychology and Sociology.

At the same time, the interaction of language and culture must be studied extremely carefully, taking into account that they are different semiotic systems. Consequently, they have both common and different features. For example, in language as a phenomenon, the orientation towards a mass addressee predominates, while in culture elitism is valued. Although culture is a sign system, like language, it is not capable of self-organization. Culture, like language, is a form of consciousness that reflects a person's worldview. Culture and language exist in dialogue with each other. The subject of culture and language is always an individual or a society, a person or a society (Maslova, 2011: 25).

There are several approaches and opinions about relationship of the language and culture. One of the approaches considers language in the relation as a mirror of culture. With this approach, the role of language seems passive and is reduced to a formal reflection of cultural facts. Another approach recognizes the active role of language in the process of thinking and its influence on culture. The impact of culture on language is obvious. Language and culture are interconnected in the processes of communication, ontogenesis (the formation of linguistic abilities), phylogenesis (the formation of a generic, social person).

As is known, representatives of different cultures interact with each other, resulting in the exchange of information at the linguistic level. Thus, in any language there are numerous lexical units that express events characteristic of a particular people. Language and culture are in a dialectical unity, depend on each other and are in constant interaction with each other, while remaining autonomous sign systems. Literary language is a common, universal means of communication formed from the historical point of view of the nation, a model language that is the carrier and expresser of culture. Literary language does not include dialects, sociolects and dialects of the national language, all these are living forms of communication in territorial diversity. There is certain regularity in the time gap between the national language and the literary language. The nature of each field of activity or area of knowledge provides a special approach to the choice of linguistic means and types of texts, determined by a unique picture of the perception of the world. However, any speech is characterized by a number of non-linguistic features, for example, accuracy, abstraction, imagery, logic, and peculiarities of presentation of ideas, regardless of the object of study and type of thinking.

Tofiq Hajiyev notes that "after a certain period of use, the literary linguistic form of the national language arises and becomes legal, it is recorded in writing. It is prepared by historical, cultural and

national conditions...” (Hacıyev, 1991: 178). The image of modern national culture is not identical to the most important features of the medieval Azerbaijani Renaissance. Perhaps this is a quality polished by a system of aesthetic ideas that changed and developed, updated and updated, based on those times. Therefore, it is wrong to lose and forget a concept whose roots are connected with the deep spiritual layers of the history of the people. There are also valuable democratic tendencies that have been forgotten and become potential in national cultures that should be explored and identified. Internationalism is born on the national soil, its principles of solidarity, cooperation, equality, mutual assistance; friendship, etc. are manifested through nationality. The essence of the principle of internationalism is the same for all nations and peoples. However, each nation and people accepts these principles in accordance with their specific characteristics and way of life. Nationalism mainly manifests itself in intranational relations, and internationalism – in interethnic relations.

Linguistics studies linguistic relations as a combination of two or more independent language systems, that is, processes at different levels: phonological, lexical and grammatical. Psycholinguistics deals with individual multilingualism: how knowledge of several languages coexists in the mind. Sociolinguistics considers the interaction of multilingual societies as a specific linguistic situation in the process of assimilation of linguistic units. The results of such interaction depend on a number of factors, including the duration and intensity of contact between language groups, the types of contacts between them, and the functions performed by the languages that serve as means of communication.

Let us clarify the types of verbal communication when realis are considered as a matter of verbal expression of the specific characteristics of national cultures. Communication specialists distinguish cognitive, logical (persuasive), expressive (impressive), goal-oriented (spontaneous) and ritual (traditional) types of communication. Cognitive communication implements the assimilation of new information and its application in experimental activities. The purpose of persuasive communication is to evoke certain feelings in the interlocutors and form moral values; convince of appropriate cooperation strategies; is to make the interlocutor agree with himself. The expressive type of communication is carried out with the aim of forming a psycho-emotional mood in a partner, conveying feelings, excitement, and directing the necessary social action. The targeted type of communication is carried out with the aim of having a strong influence on changing the partner's behavior, updating rules and values. The ritual type of communication is carried out with the aim of strengthening and maintaining conditional relationships, managing the social psyche in groups, maintaining the ritual traditions of a company or corporation (Vəliyeva, 2018: 337-338).

The vocabulary of a language is a well-developed macrosystem or system of systems, in which all types and categories of general and special vocabulary are interconnected and well balanced. A terminologist-linguist who studies concepts and notions is forced to turn to ontology, logic, informatics and subject knowledge, and a terminologist-discipline specialist is forced to seriously deal with linguistics in addition to these subjects.

Realis, like all linguistic terms, are studied in the field of lexicology of language. Afad Gurbanov rightly noted: “Problems of lexicology have become the most actual issues of modern linguistics. These issues have received more attention, especially in 20th-century linguistics, and much research has been carried out. The lexical system of almost most of the world's languages has been researched and studied to one degree or another on a scientific basis. Despite the great work done, the main problem of lexicology - the problem of words - has not received adequate coverage in world linguistics” (Qurbanov, 1989: 200-201). He believed that the word is the basic unit of vocabulary.

In the book “General Linguistics” A.Gurbanov explains it in such way: “The most productive, functional unit of communication in language is the word. The word is also the central unit of language elements. Because the spoken sounds of each language are combined in the word composition, the largest speech unit of the language, word combinations and sentences are also formed from words. From these, it can be concluded that the word is the main speech unit in the

lexical system of the language. They even subjugate the entire language itself to the word and call it the language of words; because the characteristics of the language are clearly manifested in the word, which consists of a system of signs. Phonemes and morphemes enter into a logical connection with each other in the composition of the word, the connection between speech and thinking, language and reality is clearly reflected, and the characteristics of their mutual relations are revealed. Finally, the word is the main tool that reveals the different aspects of different languages and language groups. All this shows that the word should be studied as the main unit of the lexicon, its boundaries should be determined, and all its signs and characteristics that manifest themselves in the language should be revealed. So far, linguists have not been able to come to a unanimous opinion on revealing the true nature of the word. This shows that the word has a complex and unique inner nature” (Qurbanov, 1989: 200-201).

It should also be noted that since the 20th century, the terminologically developed languages are mainly filled with special vocabulary; its comprehensive study is of great importance. Specific vocabulary cannot be studied on the same basis as general vocabulary because it is systematically and thematically organized differently. Its study includes its own methods and styles, which only partially overlap with those used in the study of general vocabulary. Suffice it to say that to analyze the terms used in one of the languages of different systems, knowledge in the fields of Turkology, on the one hand, and Romance studies or German studies, on the other hand, is not enough. At the same time, any linguistic description that ignores special vocabulary is incomplete and flawed, because it reflects the vocabulary of the language in a reduced form, with broken connections between separate lexical layers.

As is known, linguists-scientists classify the vocabulary based on the contrast of the main vocabulary (stylistically neutral, without connotative meanings) and stylistically marked words - informal and official vocabulary. One of the criteria for distinguishing the style of the dictionary is giving the connotative meanings of the dictionary. Foreign linguists propose two criteria for the classification of lexical units - dialect and register. Michael Halliday, the founder of systemic-functional linguistic theory, and his colleagues suggest that dialectical variation of lexical units is related to the characteristics of the participants of communication, while register-level variation is associated with the use of certain lexical units in different communication situations. At the same time, dialect variation includes not only the description of lexical units depending on the area of use, but also the differentiation of vocabulary depending on the social characteristics of the communication participant, that is, the education, social class, gender and age of the language users. Proponents of dialect variation of lexical units form the so-called standard language, which corresponds to the literary norm of the language and is characterized only by lexical and grammatical aspects. The lexicon of this category used in the mass media is studied and generally accepted by both native speakers and foreign language learners. However, linguists point out the impossibility of precisely defining the boundaries of a standard language. This is due to the fact that the literary form of the language applies to oral and written speech, to various communication situations (formal and informal). So, Halliday's systemic functional linguistics undertsands texts as pieces of communication constructed for sosial purposes. M.Halliday believed that register is a “functional variant of language”, a form of language change resulting from the change of situational context.

Stephan Gramley offers a personalized approach to English vocabulary classification. Taking into account the communication situation, he created his classification based on the register of lexical units. Stephan Gramley is the author of a number of scientific works in English. According to him, language contact is the main factor in language change; contact with other languages and other dialects of the same language provides a source of alternative pronunciation, grammatical structures and vocabulary. He considers that long-term language contact, that is, verbal communication, usually leads to bilingualism or multilingualism. Stephan Gramley and his colleagues note three main parameters of the register: the sphere of communication, the means (forms) of communication, and the style of communication. In addition, they highlight such a

register setting as a communication function implemented at the synthetic level (*Gramley, Pätzold, 2004: 416*).

The analysis of the classifications of the vocabulary proposed by foreign linguists shows the impossibility of a universal stylistic classification of the variability of lexical units. This is related to the variety of situations, forms and spheres of communication, different attitudes and intentions of communication participants, as well as different degrees of manifestation and perception of the emotional background and other parameters of speech interaction depending on lexical combinations. It should be noted that in any language there are numerous lexical units that express historical and cultural events specific to a certain nation. Investigating the vocabulary of a foreign language culture, especially when it comes to the multidimensional analysis of language units, it makes sense to conduct a separate study dedicated to unique objects and names that have distinctive characteristics of a specific culture or language community. A number of terms are traditionally applied to such lexical units, whose meaning and function are determined by belonging to a specific culture: “non-equivalent dictionary”; “exotic vocabulary” or “exoticisms”; “barbarisms”, “local words”; “ethnography”; “alienisms”; “background words”; “connotative words”, “words with a cultural component”, “gaps”, “realis” (Vlakhov, Florin, 1980: 36). We accept these terms as conditional synonyms, since the meaning of each of them contains specific characteristics and properties determined by the material and subject of the study.

Some researchers call realis “exoticisms”. For example, A.N.Abregov, A.I.Dolgikh, G.L.Zelenin, A.Y.Suprun, B.A.Sheojeva, V.V.Miteva, M.M.Lebedeva and others. B.A.Sheojeva and E.A. Sokur in the article “Features of the development of the exotic vocabulary corpus in the modern Russian language” note: “exoticisms are the national names of household items, special national costumes, traditions, rituals and beliefs of a certain people or a country. In the target language, exoticisms often retain national language features and function as designations of unique, non-equivalent concepts” (Sheozheva, Sokur, 2016: 143). In such kinds of words the unbreakable connection between language and culture is reflected, and the cultural and historically significant associations contained in them constitute the cultural component of the semantics of language units. These units are realis. Currently, the study of realis as a linguistic phenomenon is of great interest and is the object of research not only in linguistics but also in cultural studies, country studies, regional studies, and other sciences.

The explanatory translation dictionary edited by L.L.Nelyubin offers a structured meaning of realis: 1. Words or phrases expressing objects, concepts, situations that do not exist in the practical experience of people speaking another language. 2. Various factors studied by foreign linguistics and translation studies, for example, the government structure of a certain country, the history and culture of a given people, linguistic relations of speakers of this language, etc. from the point of view of their reflection in a particular language. 3. Material objects of culture, which are the basis of the nominative meaning of the word. 4. Words expressing national characteristics of life and lifestyle (Nelyubin, 2016: 320). This definition reveals one of the main dilemmas facing modern linguists and translators. We are talking about mixing the concepts of “realis as the word” and “realis as thing”. An overly broad approach to this issue in the translator dictionary significantly limits the functionality of the term. A.A.Kretov and N.A.Fenko created a linguistic theory of realis (Kretov, Fenenko, 2013: 7-13). As a continuation of the idea of the semantic trinity “object – concept – the word”, a system of terms with three meanings was presented: 1) Realia as an object of reality (natural fact, artifact) – R-realial; 2) Realia as an ideal equivalent of the social environment (concept) – C-realial; 3) Realia as a means of promoting a cultural concept – L-realial (Kretov, Fenenko, 2013: 10). It should be noted that even if there is a clear difference between the exact expressions “realia-words” and “realia-things”, it is impossible to avoid the similarity of meanings. If the terminological base of realis is based on the idea that there are “special national words and phrases that exist in the everyday life of a certain people and therefore do not have an equivalent in the languages of other peoples,” then we lose sight of one of the integral features of modern culture and, therefore, language (Sobolev, 1952: 281).

In non-cognate languages, realis realize everyday knowledge, historical and political facts; knowledge of cultural norms and values; folk knowledge about weather, art, and natural phenomena. Various impressions, which first permeate oral speech and then stabilize in the lexical structure of the language, are stored in memory along with the names of realis. Thus, the existence and widespread use of the above-mentioned paradigms of various realis in the Azerbaijani language is not accidental, but, on the contrary, is completely understandable and justified. The transition of the words from the category of realis to active use is associated with the development of foreign language lexical meaning in the Azerbaijani language. In new dictionaries, some ethnic lexemes of general cultural significance also lose their local component, for example: “speaker, deputy, mayor, parliament, flash mob, cheesecake, doner, lahmacun, lavash, pizza, barbecue, shish kebab, shashlik, kabob, London broil” etc. Based on these facts, we can conclude that the process of deethnoleximization of ethnolexemes is active. Analyzing the experience of foreign linguists, it becomes clear that a single, generally accepted terminological base for defining or distinguishing between “realis-words” and “realis-objects” has not yet been formed. At the same time, realis in the foreign tradition often become the object of study not only by linguists and translators, but also by anthropologists and ethnographers, which indicates the interdisciplinary nature of these lexical units. This refers to intensively developing intercultural connections and, to some extent, the fact of cultural convergence, characteristic of the modern stage of history and development of society, because the transfer of original events and objects from one community to another, following general requirements, contributes to the dynamics of the development of intercultural relations. The degree of diagnosis of exoticisms in different periods of activity reveals extralinguistic and cultural difficulties in their adaptation to different fields in the era of globalism. In the context of growing intercultural dialogue, a new look at the problems of unifying exotic lexemes in the context of comparison and consistent study of all exolexemes in specific terminological systems is very relevant (Sheozheva, Sokur, 2016: 143).

Investigating the problem of the interaction of foreign languages and different cultures in the context of Azerbaijan we must take into the consideration the culture of Europe. According to A.V.Akhutin, “what is called Europe is a way of existence that is not connected ethnically, nationally, politically, or confessionally. The only thing that gives Europe an internal connection is culture, and this culture in the essence of its being is determined by philosophizing. Empires can arise and fall here, epochal breaks, confessional splits, political divisions, and wars can occur, but there is something in which these heterogeneous - ethnically, nationally, mentally, confessionally, epochally - worlds are communicated to each other. What forms Mediterranean Europe, what connects it with North German Europe, what communicates Western Europe and Eastern Europe, the old and the new world, is a philosophical disposition that creates European culture as a self-communicated being (Akhutin, 2011: 15).

The process of globalization, covering various spheres of life, is universal, as for thousands of years separated, remote to some extent, differential events - national or regional peculiarities, habits, complexes strongly influenced by modern technologies, approaching each other with incredible speed and combine as a result of multifaceted economic, socio-political, moral and ideological ties, limiting the kind of peculiarities, lead to the events and processes happening in the world. Today a rapid growth of the prestige of the English language is observed in the modern world, as well as in Azerbaijan and this can be explained by, at least, two reasons. The first: there exists a necessity for a universal means of communication, a common language for the whole of mankind. The second: the advantages of the English language in comparison with other international languages in gratifying this need.

The destiny of the Azerbaijani language in a globalizing world depends on several factors: ensuring the development of Azerbaijani as a state language on the territory of the Azerbaijan Republic; dissemination of literary and standard quality of the Azerbaijani language as the main medium of communication among the Azerbaijanis of the world; at least, the growing interest in the Azerbaijani language in the world. In fact, these factors have the necessary conditions to enhance

the status of the Azerbaijani language. It depends on the potential of the population, the intellectual and cultural opportunities of the people and quite the perfect language policy of the independent Azerbaijan Republic. Learning foreign languages gives the learners insight into the people, culture and traditions of other countries and helps them to understand their own language and culture. Language is the means of the forming, developing, and keeping of the culture. Language and culture are closely interrelated. Culture is the foundation of communication. Cultures provide people with ways of thinking, seeing, hearing and interpreting the world. Thus, the study of cross-cultural communication is fast becoming a global research area. As a result, cultural differences in the study of cross-cultural communication can already be found.

In present time intercultural communication is an inseparable part of progressive mankind's life. Every cultural dialogue has taken a new meaning in the context of globalization and current international climate in politics. Thus it is becoming a vital meaning of maintaining peace and world unity. I think we must pay a great attention to the integration of the Azerbaijan Republic into Europe and vice versa and devise a new cultural policy agenda for development and mutual understanding. Analyzing global context a great role plays a changing cultural landscape, new socio-cultural fabrics, trends of standardization of cultural patterns at the global level and cultural diversification at the local level, relating cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue: a virtuous cycle, rethinking cultural policy design, key objectives and strategies, and the two-tiered approach to rethinking cultural policy for development and mutual understanding. In modern society intercultural dialogue is not a conversation between two cultures, but a close interaction of them. Intercultural dialogue is a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange of interaction between individuals, groups, and organizations with different cultural backgrounds or world views. Intercultural dialogue is the communication between the representatives of the various cultures from different countries. In a multicultural society several cultures live together and co-exist. We also pay attention that the Azerbaijan Republic is really multicultural as it is the acceptance and encouragement of many cultures in a society. In our multicultural society one can find people of different backgrounds or religions living together (Valiyeva, 2013: 1). Paying attention to the multilingual education system in Azerbaijan and taking into account realis characterized by national, cultural or historical overtones, teachers and translators of foreign languages must have a background and extralinguistic knowledge in order to adequately decipher, understand and explain the realis in the process of teaching and translating foreign languages. In cognitive linguistics, the emotional load of realis is determined by the complex interaction of denotative, motivational and evaluative components. The interpretation of their components is based on cultural characteristics. The vocabulary of the modern Azerbaijani language is enriched due to internal capabilities, borrowings, and translated literature. The use of realis in modern speech of the Azerbaijani language is a certain tendency of manifestation of modern cultural tradition. The linguistic landscape of the world is represented in the Azerbaijani language through realis. Those lexical units losing their nationality and diversity, with the expansion of the intra-verbal paradigm, become a series of borrowings. However, in addition to the tendency towards deethnoleximization of acquired vocabulary, there is a significant increase in the number of non-literary ethnolexemes in forms of oral speech. Such an event occurs under the influence of the media. It is necessary to study and systematize this process. All existing realis carry certain historical and cultural information, which helps to study the functional characteristics of the semantic factor in various areas of linguistics.

Conclusion

It is an undebatable fact that the close connection and the interaction of the languages influenced on the ways of the expression of the borrowings. Mutual influence among the world languages and the borrowings – all these processes has happened very often. So, it gives the reason to analyze all these processes. The education system in Azerbaijan is being transformed, various reforms are being implemented, and many innovations are being introduced to bring it in line with

international standards. In the context of multiculturalism, it is important to be fluent in foreign languages in order to politically combat discrimination on ethnic and religious grounds. This is a modern requirement. The communicative role of different system languages in bringing different cultures closer to each other is great and their mutual influence is undeniable. Taking into account the high interest in foreign languages in countries around the world, in this research work we gave examples of realis and interpreted them from a linguistic point of view.

References

1. Coccyur, Ferdinand de. (1977). Kurs obshchei lingvistiki. M.: Progress, 432 s.
2. Katsnel'son, S.D. (2015). Soderzhanie slova, znachenie i oboznachenie. M.-L.: Nauka, 112 s.
3. Ivanenko, A.A. (2022). Filosofiya istorii filosofii. SPb: Izd-vo S.-Peterb.Un-ta, 392 s.
4. Maslova, V.A. (2011). Lingvokul'turologiya. M.: Akademiya, 208 s.
5. Hacıyev, T.İ. (1991). Milli ədəbi dil və onu törədən faktorlar. Azərbaycan ədəbi dili tarixi. Bakı: Elm, 283 s.
6. Vəliyeva, N.Ç. (2018). İzahlı Azərbaycanca-İngiliscə-Rusca Kommunikasiya Terminlər Lüğəti. Bakı: Vətənoğlu, 352 s.
7. Qurbanov, A.M. (1989). Ümumi dilçilik. Bakı: Maarif, 2 cildə, I c., 568 s.
8. *Gramley, S., Pätzold, K.M. (2004). A Survey of Modern English. London – New York.: Routledge, 416 p.*
9. Vlahov, S.; Florin, C. (1980). Neperevodimoe v perevode. Realii. M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 343 s.
10. Sheozheva, B.A., Sokur, E.A. (2016). Osobennosti razvitiya korpusa ehkzoticheskoi leksiki v sovremennom russkom yazыke. ISSN 2410-3489, Vestnik AGU, Vypusk 4 (187), s.141-146.
11. Nelyubin, L.L. (2016). Tolkovyi perevodovedcheskii slovar'. Moskva: Flinta, 8-e izd. 320 s.
12. Kretov, A.A., Fenenko, N.A. (2013). Lingvisticheskaya teoriya realii. Vestnik Voronezh. gos. un-ta. Ser.: Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya № 1., s. 7-13.
13. Sobolev, L.N. (1952). Posobie po perevodu s russkogo yazыka na frantsuzskii. M.: Izdatel'stvo Literatury na inostr. yaz., 402 s.
14. Akhutin, A.V. (2011). Filosofskoe sushchestvo evropeiskoi kul'tury. Poeticheskaya ideya kul'tury M.: Arkheh-6, s. 15-57.
15. Valiyeva, N.Ch. (2013). Some Aspects and Peculiarities of Intercultural Communication in the Process of Globalization. International Business Service d.o.o., Cooper Green Advertising d.o.o., Belgrade: Publishing House: Jovsic Printing Centar d.o.o., 242 p.

Received: 02.04.2024

Accepted: 17.05.2024