

УДК 008+81:165.242.1:17.035.3:172.15

Shynkaruk Vasyi

Doctor of Philology, Professor,
Dean of the Faculty for Humanities and Pedagogy
of the National University of Life and
Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0001-8589-4995
vashyn2010@ukr.net

Kharchenko Svitlana

Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Journalism
and Language Communication
of the National University of Life and
Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0001-9336-1259
lucynka@ukr.net

Zavalnyuk Inna

Doctor of Philology, Professor,
Dean of the Mykhailo Stelmakh Faculty
of Philology and Journalism
of the Mykhailo Kotsyubynskyi Vinnytsia
State Pedagogical University
ORCID 0000-0002-3993-9555
zavalniukinna@gmail.com

"LANGUAGE-CULTURE" DYCHOTOMY IN FORMATION OF THE MENTAL SPHERE OF ETHNIC CONSCIOUSNESS AND SPECIFICITY OF NATIONAL WORLD PERCEPTION

Purpose of the study. The purpose of the proposed *article* is to clarify the essence of "language-culture" dichotomy, outlining the specificity of the interconnection and the interaction of its components in the projection to the mentality of the reception of national constants. **Methodology** of the study. The methodology of the research is based on the ideas of anthropocentricity (V. von Humboldt, O. Potebnya, E. Sepir, B. Whorf, M. Heidegger, etc.) and the main provisions of linguocultural studies, which confirm the necessity of studying language and culture as a space of interiorization and exteriorization of mental representations of linguistic and cultural knowledge (L. Wittgenstein, S. Yermolenko, V. Labov, V. Uzhchenko, H. Yavorska, etc.). The cultural-semiotic method, the method of synchronous sections and the systematic approach have formed the basis of the research strategy. **The scientific novelty.** "Culture-language" dichotomy plays a leading role in shaping the mental sphere of the ethnic consciousness and defines and shapes the specifics of the national worldview. It has been confirmed that the most active verbal symbolization as a factor of national-cultural self-identification manifests itself in the spheres of semasiology and onomasiology. But the peculiarities of implementation at the syntactic level in the superficial structure of the semantic components of the deep structures of the sentence are the inherent features of the syntax of the national language, which constructs the human mentality and, in part, its cultural self-consciousness. It has been observed that the processes of cultural uplift, national revival, development of the Ukrainian literary language are interdependent and mutually conditioned. **Conclusions.** Thus, the "culture - language" dichotomy appears as two similarly organized sign systems that function equally, are fundamentally related. An important factor in the formation of ethnic culture is the language that captures, preserves and translates the ways of categorizing and conceptualizing the world and the internal reflexive experience of the people. The linguistic consciousness of the people appears as a form of its cultural expression, of civilization, in the conditions of world globalization, and the phenomenon of language is the identification code of the ethnic consciousness, of the mentality and specificity of the national world perception.

Key words: culture; language; ethnic consciousness; national worldview; ethnic culture.

Шинкарук Василь Дмитрович, доктор філологічних наук, професор, декан гуманітарно-педагогічного факультету Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України; Харченко Світлана Василівна, доктор філологічних наук, доцент кафедри журналістики та мовної комунікації Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України; Завальнюк Інна Яківна, доктор філологічних наук, професор, декан факультету філології й журналістики імені Михайла Стельмаха Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського

Дихотомія «мова – культура» у формуванні ментальної сфери етносвідомості й специфіки національного світосприйняття

Мета роботи – з'ясувати сутність дихотомії «мова – культура», окресливши специфіку взаємозв'язку і взаємовпливу її компонентів у проекції на ментальність рецепції національних констант. **Методологія** дослідження ґрунтується на ідеях антропоцентричності (В. фон Гумбольдт, О. Потебня, Е. Сепір, Б. Уорф, М. Хайдеггер та ін.) та основних положеннях лінгвокультурології, що утверджують необхідність дослідження мови і культури як простору інтеріоризації та екстеріоризації ментальних репрезентацій лінгвокультурного знання (Л. Вітгенштейн, С. Єрмоленко, В. Лабов, В. Ужченко, Г. Яворська та ін.). Основу стратегії дослідження склали культурно-семіотичний метод, метод синхронних зрізів і системний підхід. **Наукова новизна.** Дихотомія «культура – мова» відіграє провідну роль у формуванні ментальної сфери етносвідомості і визначає та формує специфіку національного світосприйняття. Підтверджено, що найактивніше вербальна символізація як чинник національно-культурної самоідентифікації виявляє себе у сферах семасіології та ономасіології, однак особливості реалізації на синтаксичному рівні в поверненій структурі семантичних складників глибинних структур речення становлять іманентні риси синтаксису національної мови,

який конструює ментальність людини та частково її культурну самосвідомість. Спостережено, що процеси культурницького піднесення, національного відродження, розвитку української літературної мови взаємозалежні і взаємозумовлені. **Висновки.** Дихотомія «культура – мова» постає як дві подібним чином організовані знакові системи, що однаково функціонують, є принципово спорідненими. Важливим чинником формування етнічної культури слугує мова, яка фіксує, зберігає і транслює способи категоризації й концептуалізації світу та внутрішнього рефлексивного досвіду народу. Мовна свідомість народу постає формою його культурного самовираження, цивілізаційного увиразнення в умовах світової глобалізації, а феномен мови – ідентифікаційним кодом етносвідомості, менталітету й специфіки національного світосприйняття.

Ключові слова: культура; мова; етносвідомість; національне світосприйняття; етнічна культура.

Шинкарук Василь Дмитриєвич, доктор філологічних наук, професор, декан гуманітарно-педагогічного факультета Національного університету біоресурсів і природоиспользования України; Харченко Светлана Васильевна, доктор філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри журналістики і мовної комунікації Національного університету біоресурсів і природоиспользования України; Завальнюк Інна Яковлевна, доктор філологічних наук, професор, декан факультета філології і журналістики імені Михайла Стельмаха Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського

Дихотомія «язык – культура» в формуванні ментальної сфери етносознавання і специфіки національного мировосприяття

Цель работы – описать сущность дихотомии «язык – культура», очертив специфику взаимосвязи и взаимовлияния ее компонентов в проекции на ментальность рецепции национальных констант. **Методология** исследования основана на идеях антропоцентричности (В. фон Гумбольдт, А. Потебня, Э. Сепир, Б. Уорф, М. Хайдеггер и др.) и основных положениях лингвокультурологии, утверждающих необходимость исследования языка и культуры как пространства интериоризации и экстериоризации ментальных репрезентаций лингвокультурного знания (Л. Витгенштейн, С. Ермоленко, В. Лабов, В. Ужченко, Г. Яворская и др.). Основу стратегии исследования составили культурно-семиотический метод, метод синхронных срезов и системный подход. **Научная новизна.** Дихотомия «культура – язык» играет ведущую роль в формировании ментальной сферы этносознавания, определяет и формирует специфику национального мировосприяття. Подтверждено, что активно вербальная символика как фактор национально-культурной самоидентификации проявляется в сферах семасиологии и ономасиологии, однако особенности реализации на синтаксическом уровне в поверхностной структуре семантических составляющих глубинных структур предложения являются имманентными чертами синтаксиса национального языка, который конструирует ментальность человека и частично ее культурное самосознание. Установлено, что процессы культурного подъема, национального возрождения, развития украинского литературного языка взаимосвязаны и взаимообусловлены. **Выводы.** Дихотомия «культура – язык» представляется как две похоже организованные знаковые системы, одинаково функционируют, и одновременно есть принципиально родственными. Важным фактором формирования этнической культуры служит язык, который фиксирует, сохраняет и транслирует способы категоризации и концептуализации мира и внутреннего рефлексивного опыта народа. Языковое сознание народа возникает формой его культурного самовыражения, цивилизационной выразительности в условиях мировой глобализации, а феномен языка – идентификационным кодом этносознавания, менталитета и специфіки національного мировосприяття.

Ключевые слова: культура; язык; этносознавание; национальное мировосприяття; этническая культура.

Introduction. The man-centric approach to studying the phenomena of reality, in particular the dichotomy "language – culture", becomes the determining factor in modern scientific research. Similarly, the idea that language forms, models and their explored values should be studied on the background of the general socio-cultural context is gradually becoming axiomatic, fundamental, and methodological in many scientific studies. In the end, one cannot learn the person outside the culture, outside his/her language.

The undeniable fact that the solution of the problem of the interaction of language and culture as special semiotic systems is now outside the boundaries of country studies as a discipline. Involvement of theoretical and practical results of studying this interaction in the anthropological paradigm has developed a lingual-cultural analysis of dichotomy "language – culture".

Literature review. In the late XX - beginning of the XXI century, fragments of the national-language picture of the world, cultural-national stereotypes of linguistic consciousness, interrelations of language and culture more and more often enter the range of scientific interests of Ukrainian linguists, in particular, B. Azhnyuk, V. Voitovych, H. Hrymashevych, P. Hrytsenko, V. Zhaivoronok, M. Kalko, V. Kononenko, T. Kosmeda, L. Lysychenko, V. Moiseenko, O. Palchevska, T. Semashko, M. Stepanenko, V. Shynkaruk and others.

The purpose of the proposed article is to clarify the essence of dichotomy "language-culture", outlining the specificity of the interconnection and the interaction of its components in the projection to the mentality of the reception of national constants.

Methodology of the study. The methodology of the research is based on the ideas of anthropocentricity (V. von Humboldt, O. Potebnya, E. Sepir, B. Whorf, M. Heidegger, etc.) and the main provisions of linguacultural studies, which confirm the necessity of studying language and culture as a space of internalization and exteriorization of mental representations of linguistic and cultural knowledge (L. Wittgenstein, A. Vezhbytska, S. Yermolenko, V. Labov, V. Uzhchenko, H. Yavorska, etc.). The cultural-semiotic method, the method of synchronous sections and the systematic approach have formed the basis of the research strategy.

Theoretical basis and results. The initial stage for studying any aspects related to the interaction of language and culture is the interpretation of language as a significant cultural factor that has the ability to display, store and accumulate cultural information. The researchers seek to answer the question: how culture as a universal, timeless category acts in the language of its contemporary carriers, how archetypes, mythologized stereotypes [11] arise and live in the language and cultural consciousness of people. On the other hand, in the dichotomy "language - culture" the language is no less important: it constructs the mentality of man, his/her cultural self-consciousness.

The language appears to be an exponent of culture and mentality, a powerful source of the energy code of the ethnic group. The ethno-world picture has its own, special representation in every national language. Verbal symbols belong to the important factors of national-cultural self-identification, since they are original retranslators of archetypal images; they encode the memory of words in its multifunctional cultural contexts.

Most actively verbal symbolization manifests itself in the spheres of semasiology and onomasiology, where the speech-thinking process is usually directed either to the choice of the ready-made notation that exists in the language, or to the creation of a name that most adequately reflects its essence [10].

For example, in the national interpretation of Ukrainians there are about a thousand types of green plantations. Many of them have been given the original names, taking into account the most typical signs inherent in plants. In addition, Ukrainian peasants in the course of everyday practice were well aware of the vegetative cycle of many plants, their chemical and pharmacological qualities.

All knowledge was based on many years of experience, folk beliefs, national specificity of humor, etc.: *common yew*, or *non-woody tree* have folk names such as *nehnyyuchka* (*thorns*), *chervone derevo* (*mahogany*), *zelenytsia* (*greenery*), *royal tree*, and *white sycamore*, *maple* is called *klen yavir*; *biloklen*, *evir*, *klen bilyi*, *Izheyavor*, *raina*, *sycamor(a)*, *yaver*, *yavor*, *yavorenko*, *yavoryn*, *yavoryna*. The name of the *gladiolus*, which in translation from Latin means "*sword*" and due to the fact that the leaves of the *gladiolus* resemble blades, appeared in folk etymology as a *kosaryk* (*scyther*) (from the "*scythe*" – *kosa*, *kosy*, *zakosychuvaty*), obviously, in view of the appearance (plant height, leaf shape, etc.).

Often the representatives of the linguistic picture of the world are ethno-psycholinguistic phenomena, *linguo-culturemes*, which are the units that accumulate language representations proper and are closely related to the out-of-mouth cultural environment. The cultural code, of course, serves as a factor in forming the value orientations of the nation.

In modern interpretations, the cultural code appears as the quintessence of suitable, demand-driven, effective cultural practices that, in new geo-sociopolitical conditions, actualize, form the core of a new thinking and cultural strategies of the nation. The core of the cultural code is a combination of elements interconnected and mutually conditioned by archetypal connections. In them, we reckon, among other things, inheritance, folk traditions and customs, language, family, lifestyle, folk holidays. In this regard, Oksana Zabuzhko rightly notes in her article "Language and Power": "This language performs, among other things, a very important philosophical-worldview function: it binds the ethnos to their natural environment, to the landscape, to that consanguineous, meaningful habitable cosmos, with vegetation and animals inclusive, which forms the inorganic body of the people ... Every language is "prescribed" in a completely certain earthly space and therefore, moving to another terrain, changes, adapting to new natural conditions ... But the language and the person fit into a clearly defined spatial-temporal continuum - makes its carrier local, wherever from he/she may come" [2].

Each of the elements is obligatory; it has its purpose, inherent only to its constructive possibilities and makes value as an independent cultural phenomenon. Loss or modification (under the influence of another cultural phenomenon or values) of any of them leads to the weakening of national memory and the destruction of the genotype of the people. It should be noted that the restoration and/or strengthening of traditional national values for the Ukrainian people (traditions, national holidays, ceremonies, crafts, etc.), the formation of new ones are vital for the self-identification of the individual and for the self-preservation of the nation.

The well-known, long-standing argument that the basis of culture is a language that is indispensable, stable, a condition for the formation of a nation, its unity. As Lesya Ukrainka noted in her time, "the nation must defend its language more than its own territory," and long before the Romans spoke: "Cujus regie, ejus lingua" ("Whose realm, his language").

Language is the universe that covers and encodes the entire multifaceted culture that unites man and the environment. The language creates, develops, stores and translates cultural information, so it is natural that one of the universally recognized functions of the language is culture bearing.

Cultural code forms based on national images, language, spirituality, traditions and values of the people. It reflects cultural mentality, defines the genotype of a nation, as well as a complex of national-cultural stereotypes, absorbed by linguistic means.

Language captures, accumulates in itself the specific features of national mentality. It is not only a result and an instrument of knowledge, perception and development of living space, but also a "snap", a picture, a code of the real world. Language reproduces the attitude of man to this world, serves as a means of culture in shaping personality, which, assimilating the linguistic experience of previous generations, builds his/her own view on the ethnos, its culture and language. On the one hand, "language is a guide, becoming more and more important as a focal point in the scientific study of culture" [8, 261]. On the other hand, it provides eternity of culture, because it connects the culture of the ethnos into one continuous process from the past through the present to the future; and the stronger position in society is, the more reliable prospects of culture are ... " [3, 142].

All material and spiritual culture is embodied in the living national language. For each nation, it is their own, which causes the specifics of verbal names, their unequal sound, writing, motivation of the internal form, etc. in different languages. For example, there is only one word for Ukrainians to refer to such a con-

cept as *snow*, and in the language of the Eskimos there are about thirty. Let us compare the motivation of some Ukrainian words with their counterparts in the Russian, Polish and German languages: a) (Ukr.) *likarnya* – *hospital*, *khvoroba*-illness, *bil*-pain; (Russ.) *bolnitsa* – *hospital*, *bolezn*-illness, *bol*-pain; (Pol.) *szpital*, *choroba*, *ból*; (German) *das Krankenhaus*, *die Krankheit*, *der Weh*; b) (Ukr.) *osvita* – *education*; (Russ.) *obrazovanie* – *education*; (Pol.) *wyksytalcenie*, *oswiata*; (German) *die Bildung*; c) (Ukr.) *obrazotvorche mystetstvo* – *fine arts*; (Russ.) *izobrazitelnoe iskustvo* - *fine arts*; (Pol.) *sztuki plastyczne*; (German) *die Bild-erkunst*.

Nationally determined specifics of society through language, traditions lead to a difference in the linguistic behavior of representatives of ethnic groups. They respond differently to the same events, and interpret the same facts differently. For example, the indirect question *Could you tell me what time it is now* the Ukrainian will perceive as inducing the answer, and will offer it (for example, *six-twenty*). Instead, the Englishman will interpret the proposed statement as a general question, and so will answer *Yes, I can* or *No, I don't know*.

Mastering the language, a person inherits the way of dealing with the world, which offers a certain linguistic tradition.

"The language of the people is their spirit, and the spirit of the people – this is their language," - in his time von Humboldt stated [1, 88–89]. Language, in fact, is the main form of expression and existence of national culture, a means of its objectification. On the other hand, the language influences the culture, modifying the ontological and functional properties of language.

Some linguoculturalists believe that cultural information has four ways of presenting language and speech, in particular: 1) the cultural semes as elements of the meaning of nominal units that denote cultural realities; 2) the cultural background as an ideologically marked cultural content of nominative units; 3) cultural concepts – relatively stable representations formed in a certain culture on the basis of relevant value orientations and socio-historical experience of culture carriers; 4) cultural connotation as evaluative, emotional, expressive and functional-stylistic shades of meaning of linguistic units, determined by cultural priorities and attitudes [6, 34–35].

In the course of daily life, which is one of the external factors of identity formation, a person perceives, interprets and understands the world, reflected in a certain way at the level of thinking operations and speech implementations. In addition, the perception of the world is largely influenced by conceptual system as if built into the human consciousness, which involves the presence of non-verbal and verbal models. Conceptual system is a collection of human knowledge about the world, acquired because of cognitive activity. The structural component of this system is the concept actively explored by linguists who are interested in the problems of cognitive linguistics. Concepts, cultural and national stereotypes never fully match the concepts or cultural and national stereotypes of other languages, as the history of the formation, establishment and development of specific nation (native speakers) is unique, unimitable.

Unlike cognitive concept the way of its studying, going from individual consciousness, self-awareness to culture, exploring linguo-cultural concept is based on the culture and approaching individual consciousness [12].

Concepts are mainly studied, involving the lexical, derivative and phraseological sections. However, in the last two decades, linguists have been increasingly focused on the structural patterns of sentences using linguo-cognitive and cultural-semiotic approaches. The study of syntactic concepts in various languages is directly related to the theory of N. Khomsky about the deep (invariant) and surface structure of the sentence. In other words, the deep structure of the sentence is semantic, that is, it represents the semantic components of the sentence, which are implemented in different ways at the syntactic level in the surface structure. For example, a sentence (1) *A girl draws a picture* – (2) *A picture is drawn by a girl* explicate the deep syntactic structure "Agent – action – patience" but the sentence (2) belongs to the periphery, because it resulted from a passive transformation, whereas sentence (1) – active construction – fundamental, invariant. A structural scheme construed by the sentence of active type (1) is an immanent feature of the syntax of the Ukrainian language, and the structural scheme construed by a sentence of the passive type (2) – of Russian language.

The type of thinking – active or passive – reflect the genres of literary creation as well. Let us compare the texts of unofficial anthems of Ukraine ("Prayer for Ukraine") and Russia ("Prayer of Russian people", the anthem of the Russian Empire), *Oh, almighty, one and only God, save us Ukraine, with rays of freedom and light will Thou sign and elucidate it* (O. Konysskyi); *Oh, God, keep the Czar! Thou, strong, state-ly, reign for glory, for glory to us!* (V. Zhukovskiy).

The comparative analysis of the stages of works on the historiography of Ukrainian culture and the Ukrainian literary language has revealed the interdependence and interconditionality between the processes of cultural uplift, national revival, and development of the Ukrainian literary language. Ukraine in the twentieth century is a vivid confirmation of this [4, 296–298; 9, 99–112], in particular:

1. Having started as a "cultural" trend in the 18th century, the Ukrainian national renaissance moved into ideological, and later - into the political stage, reaching its height during the period of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917-1921 in the XX century and the creation of a Ukrainian state. During the 20-30's of the XX century Ukrainian national culture received a temporary, but unique, opportunity for more or less normal devel-

opment throughout the Soviet period. The level of cultural "revival" was marked by a change in cultural paradigm. During this period, the Ukrainian language gradually consolidates the position of a language capable of satisfying the communicative needs of speakers in all spheres of public life. It acquires the status of a language with a complete paradigm of social functioning. However, the 30s of the twentieth century were marked by a radical change in the cultural-linguistic paradigm, mass terror and the destruction of a large part of the national intelligentsia.

2. The period of the late 50's and 60's of the twentieth century is also characterized as a "cultural" trend among the "men of the sixties", it is politicized in this environment, reaching the level of political programs. In the official political space, it is implemented as a cautious, loyal "autonomism" of the party elite.

This time, the time of Khrushchev's "thaw" and the weakening of repressions against the Ukrainian intelligentsia, is marked by increased attention to the culture of the Ukrainian literary language, while the question of its Russification, interference with the internal structure of the Ukrainian language was raised. The development of the Ukrainian literary language of the 50's and 60's of the XX century was characterized by the approach of its structure to the structure of the Russian language.

L.T. Masenko's opinion seems to be a good idea, who, studying the *surzhyk* in contemporary fiction, draws attention to the fact that the Ukrainian village, even after the terrible devastations of the 30's and 40's of the XX century still preserved its national spirit. However, in the 1970s, it began to spiritually degrade and undergo depopulation under the influence of Soviet linguistic and cultural strategies through the introduction of Ukrainian-Russian forms of speech, transitions to Russian monolingualism, under the pressure of decomposition processes spreading from Russified cities [5, 26].

This period ends with a pogrom of the early 70's of the XX century. However, a dissident movement is present in the "latent form".

3. The second half of the 80's and 90's of the XX century begins primarily as a "cultural movement", reaches the level of political programs and is implemented in the form of an independent Ukrainian state. In the cultural and linguistic spheres, postmodernism is gradually developing.

"The language of the authorities' representatives, the higher spiritual culture, the language of the theater, the glorious preachers, the speakers, the professors, etc., is usually a model for the listeners," - wrote at the beginning of the twentieth century S. Smal-Stotskyi. A high level of individual culture, a high level of insider language proficiency influences the level of culture and language of ordinary citizen, and through them, positively affects the general level of culture and language. Such positive changes take place under the influence of a combination of factors: on the one hand, the accumulation of internal (unused, unrealized) resources, the potentials of the national culture (in the broadest interpretation of this concept) and language, and on the other hand, provided many of the external (mostly favorable) factors coincide. The internal and external factors are mostly complementary, as, for example, it was in Ukraine in the 20's and early 30's of the XX century, in the 60's of the XX century, etc., when the national-language and national-cultural systems of values were actively restored and developed. External factors can also become a catalyst for active domestic change, as in Poland in the early 80's of the XX century, in Ukraine - in the early 90's of the XX century, in 2004 and 2013.

However, culturologists and linguists on the verge of the XX - XXI centuries are increasingly talking about some general primitivization of the language, which affects the reduction of the level of culture initially of the individual, and later - the general level. First, this tendency is related to such a concept as the new language that began its forming, for example, in Poland in the 70's of the XX century, in Ukraine - in the mid-80's of the XX century as the language of politics, whose syntactic features are called simplified syntax, the predominance of connecting constructions, declarative or prescriptive expressions. New language as an official sub-language for the majority is a model, it is copied, quoted, and therefore distributed; it is fashionable, it is used because it is prestigious, modern or original. The media only intensify this process. Nowadays the new language as a simplified, vulgar version of the literary language (and, first of all, on the syntactic and lexical levels) penetrates the media, which reduces the complexity of information messages, cultural and entertainment programs, adapting them to the perceptive capabilities of the audience [9, 48]. Scientists also point out that on the Internet the written spoken language is noticeably reduced.

These processes in the language result in reduction of worldview, level of needs, accordingly, determine the appearance of a request for a reduced cultural product. Obviously, predicting the possibility of such tendencies, von Humboldt back in the nineteenth century, when he examined various languages and their influence on the spiritual development of man, warned that "the limits of the language of my nation determine the limits of my worldview" [1, 305].

The scientific novelty. Dichotomy "culture-language" plays a leading role in the formation of the mental sphere of the ethno-consciousness, defines, and forms the specifics of the national worldview. It is confirmed, that the most active verbal symbolization as a factor of national-cultural self-identification manifests itself in the spheres of semasiology and onomasiology. But the peculiarities of implementation at the syntactic level in the surface structure of the semantic components of the deep structures of the sentence are the inherent features of the syntax of the national language, which constructs the human mentality and, in part, its cultural self-consciousness. It is observed that the processes of cultural uplift, national revival, development of the Ukrainian literary language are interdependent and mutually determined.

Conclusions. Thus, the dichotomy "culture - language" appears as two similarly organized sign systems that function equally, are fundamentally related. The notion of "language of culture", "culture in language", "language – consciousness – culture" correlate, interact, combining language and non-language (cultural) content with the help of systematic methods oriented on modern priorities and cultural social values.

In ethno-texts, live spoken language of the ordinary members of the verbalization society, the constancy of culture is experienced as components of the mental sphere of the ethno-consciousness, containing cultural value information. An analysis of their internal forms leads to the creation of a coherent picture of the cultural influence on language and speech in view of the systematic representation of the units of language and culture in their interaction and at the same time the projection of the national reception of the material and spiritual culture of the people.

An important factor in forming the ethnic culture is the language, which "fixes, preserves and translates the ways of categorization and conceptualization of the world and the internal reflexive experience of the people" [7, 280]. The linguistic consciousness of the people appears as a form of their cultural expression, civilizational distinctiveness, in the conditions of world globalization, and the phenomenon of language is the identification code of the ethnic consciousness, of the mentality and specificity of the national world perception.

References

1. Gumboldt, V. (1984) O razlichii stroeniya chelovecheskikh yazykov i vliyaniya na dukhovnoe razvitie chelovechestva (1830–1835). Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniiyu. M.: Nauka [in Russian].
2. Zabuzhko, Oksana. Language and power. Retrieved from <http://exlibris.org.ua/zabuzko/r02.html> . [in Ukrainian].
3. Ivanyshyn, V., Radevych-Vynnytskyi, Ya. (1994). Language and nation. Drohobych [in Ukrainian].
4. Kasianov, H. V. (1999). Theories of the nation and nationalism : monohrafiia. K. : Lybid [in Ukrainian].
5. Masenko, L. (2011). Surzhik in contemporary fiction. Dyvoslovo. 6, 25–30 [in Ukrainian].
6. Oparina, Ye. O. (1999). Lingvokulturologiya: metodologicheskie osnovaniya i bazovye ponyatiya. *Yazyk i kultura: sb. obzorov*. M. : INION RAN, 183–187 [in Russian].
7. Selivanova, O. O. (2008). Modern Linguistics: Directions and Problems. Poltava : Dovkilla-K [in Ukrainian].
8. Sepir, E. (1993). Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniiyu i kulturologii: Per. s angl. M. : Izdatelskaya gruppa «Progress», «Univers» [in Russian].
9. Kharchenko, S. (2017). Syntactic norms of the Ukrainian literary language XX - beginning of the XXI century : monohrafiia. K. H. Horodenska (Ed.). K. : Milenium [in Ukrainian].
10. Shynkaruk, V. D., & Kharchenko, S. V. (2017). Metodyka linhvistychnoho opysuvannia nazv zelenykh nasadzen. Scientific Herald of National university of life and environmental sciences of Ukraine. Series: Philological Sciences. K. : Milenium, 276, 71–78. [in Ukrainian].
11. Shynkaruk, V.D., Salata, H.V., & Danylova, T.V. (2018). Myth as the Phenomenon of Culture. National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald, 4, 17–22. DOI:doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.4.2018.152938 [in Ukrainian].
12. Shynkaruk O. V., & Shynkaruk L.V. (2017) Social and cultural bases of educational services provision and labor market ensuring. National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald, K. : Milenium, 4, 42–47. [in Ukrainian].

Література

1. Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и влияния на духовное развитие человечества (1830-1835) // Избранные труды по языкознанию. М.: Наука, 1984. 450 с.
2. Забужко Оксана. Мова і влада // <http://exlibris.org.ua/zabuzko/r02.html>
3. Іванишин В., Радевич-Винницький Я. Мова і нація. Дрогобич, 1994. 228 с.
4. Касьянов Г. В. Теорії нації та націоналізму : монографія. К. : Либідь, 1999. 352 с.
5. Масенко Л. Суржик у сучасній художній літературі // Дивослово. 2011. № 6. С. 25–30.
6. Опарина Е. О. Лингвокультурология: методологические основания и базовые понятия // Язык и культура: сб. обзор. М. : ИНИОН РАН, 1999. С. 183–187.
7. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями і проблеми: підручник. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. 712 с.
8. Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии: Пер. с англ. М. : Издательская группа «Прогресс», «Универс», 1993. 656 с.
9. Харченко С. Синтаксичні норми української літературної мови ХХ – початку ХХІ ст. : монографія ; [відп. ред.. К. Г. Городенська]. К. : Міленіум, 2017. 417 с.
10. Шинкарук В. Д., Харченко С. В. Методика лінгвістичного описування назв зелених насаджень. // Науковий вісник Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України. Серія: Філологічні науки. К. : Міленіум, 2017. Вип. 276. С. 71–78.
11. Shynkaruk V.D., Salata H.V., Danylova T.V. Myth as the Phenomenon of Culture // Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв. 2018. № 4. С. 17–22. DOI: doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.4.2018.152938
12. Shynkaruk O. V., Shynkaruk L.V. Social and cultural bases of educational services provision and labor market ensuring / O. Shynkaruk, L. Shynkaruk // Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв: наук. К. : Міленіум, 2017. № 4. С. 42–47.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 14.11.2018 р.