



The Peculiarities Of Intercultural Dialogue In The Context Of The Study Of World Literature

**Rahimova Sevara Durdiyevna,
Muhammadiyeva Shahlo Ganiyevna,
Yusupova Aziza Abdudjamilovna**

**Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after
Muhammad al Khwarizmi Uzbekistan
muxammadievashaxlo9@gmail.com**

Abstract: The concept of a dialogue of cultures is now firmly established in world scientific thought; it has been adopted by international organizations as a fundamental one. The article deals with the issues based on analyzing the specifics of intercultural dialogue in the context of the study of world literature.

Key words: dialogue of cultures, communication, cultural experience, traditions, nations, humanitarian knowledge.

The dialogue of cultures is possible only if each of the participants in the dialogue is fully aware of its own national specificity, identifies itself as a representative of a particular national culture. Following communicatively theoretical positions, the basis of each dialogue can be determined by the following conditions: the presence of two or more parties, i.e. a certain amount of differences; mutual exchange of information, i.e. conditions for equal freedom of expression on all sides; willingness and ability to understand information, or the point of view of the other side and an attempt to see oneself from the side.

The idea of a dialogue of cultures as a subject of scientific understanding is widely represented in the philosophy and history of culture (A.F.Losev, D.S.



Likhachev), in aesthetics (M.S. Kagan), literary criticism and semiotics (M.M. Bakhtin, Yu. Lotman, V. Zhirmunsky, A. Averintsev, M. Lakshin), linguistics (S.G. Ter-Minasova), pedagogy (V.S. Bibler, Yu.Yu. Desherieva, A.A. Polyakova, A.O. Kurganov) . The problems of dialogue were dealt with in sociolinguistics (L. Scherba, L. Yakubinsky), in literary and philosophical hermeneutics (H. Gadamer), phenomenology (H. Husserl, M. Mamardashvili), fundamental ontology (M. Heidegger), in the basics of communication (A .Mol, V. Borev). In historical and ethnological terms, L. Gumilyov, etc., comprehended the dialogue. The interaction of cultures was studied by K. Levi-Strauss, G. Khershkovets, S. Artanovsky, S. Arutyunov, B. Yerasov, L. Ionin, N. Ikonnikova and others. K.A. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, A.G. Asmolov, A.N. Leontiev, B.F. Lomov, S.L. Rubinshtein, D.I. Feldstein and others, while comprehending the role of intercultural dialogue in the development of man, consider communication as a leading factor in the development of personality, as an activity on the assimilation of the norms of human relationships.

Intercultural dialogue, being the subject of serious thoughts of many scientists, makes you think about the questions: “Is a conflict of cultures inevitable? Is their development possible through mutual enrichment? How to overcome serious differences in culture and language in the hope of mutual understanding of cultures? ” The dialogue of cultures is considered both as a condition for understanding one’s culture, and as a necessary characteristic of the consciousness and thinking of modern man.

The conceptual approach to the problem at the methodological level was implemented on the basis of the ideas of dialogic culture, outlined in the theory of humanitarian thinking by M. M. Bakhtin: “The very being of a person (both external and internal) is the deepest communication. To be means to communicate ”[13, p. 330]. This approach was implemented in the principles of building a school of dialogue of cultures, the results of a theoretical generalization of the experience of “pedagogy of cooperation”, a humanistic approach, which can be clearly seen in the



writings of V.S.Bibler, V.N. Toporova, D.S. Likhachev and others. Thus, although dialogue is understood as a form of communication, these concepts (dialogue and communication) do not enter into direct synonymous relations, i.e. communication and communication are not identical to each other, since not every interaction of people has the form of communication, although formally it can also take the form of dialogue.

Having analyzed the spectrum of interpretations of these terms, Russian researchers came to the conclusion that there are two main types of communication between people: 1) information transfer; 2) joint coexistence of people. The first type is called “communication”, and the second - “communication”. Following M.S.Kagan, we distinguish “communication as a process of transferring information by a subject to a certain object (person, animal, computer) - and communication as a practical and spiritual interaction of subjects, that is, an activity during which each of its participants addresses to another as a subject, as an equal to himself, free and unique being ”[5, p. 117]. The distinction between communication and communication is especially important for the interaction of cultures. These positions are fundamental for intercultural dialogue, as involve the interaction of cultures.

Intercultural interaction should “understand the phenomenon of public life, in which representatives of various cultures come into contact, regarded as carriers of the norms of morality and law, worldview, knowledge in all kinds of areas of human activity, traditions and customs; possessing a certain intellectual, moral, aesthetic level of development, emotional-volitional and value attitude to people around them, work, communication, etc .; owning methods and forms of activity, communication with the outside world. Note that the most important feature of intercultural interaction as a sociocultural phenomenon, in addition to a given practical function, is that it is aimed at mutual knowledge, enrichment of cultural and spiritual development by experience ”[2]. In the process of intercultural interaction, if it is based on a dialogical principle, there is a mutual understanding of representatives of different cultures, in which none



of them lose their own cultural identity. As V. Boldyrev rightly points out, “a dialogue of cultures becomes possible only when we not only get acquainted with the fact of a foreign culture, ... but we accept it as one of the possible options” [2, p.135].

In modern Western philosophy, the dialogical direction is associated with the name of M. Buber. M. Buber considered the dialogue not a collision of two communicative flows, but a community arising in consciousness as a result of a meeting of "I" and "the other." It should be noted that at the same time, both a consensus and a desire to defend one's point of view in front of foreign cultural influence arise in the dialogue. Dialogue contributes to the movement of conflict into the intellectual sphere and is thereby a productive alternative to war. One of the key topics of M. Buber's philosophy is the problem of interpersonal communication. “In connection with this there is a need,” writes T. Lifintseva, to define one of the most important concepts of his philosophy (as well as many currents of “post-classical” philosophy) - the concept of “Other”. The other is that which I am not, different in relation to me, and at the same time similar to me, an equal subject to me, possessing personality traits ”[76].

M.M. Bakhtin understands culture as a form of communication between people of different cultures, a form of dialogue. For him, “culture is where there are two (at least) cultures, and that the self-awareness of culture is a form of its being on the verge of a different culture” [6, p. 85]. He was sure that each holistic culture was characterized by “ambivalence”, in the sense of a simultaneous appeal to other cultures and internal reflection. M. Bakhtin believed that “contact with any cultural object becomes questioning and conversation, that is, dialogue”. Dialogue, from the point of view of Bakhtin, is a way of interaction of consciousnesses. Understanding, in his opinion, arises where two consciousnesses meet. Understanding is generally possible provided that there is another, understanding consciousness. “Dialogue relations cannot be understood in a simplified and one-sided way, reducing them to contradiction, struggle to dispute, disagreement.

Dialogic relations are much wider than dialogic speech in the narrow sense of the word,” the researcher writes [3, p. 321]. According to Bakhtin, alien consciousnesses cannot be contemplated, analyzed, defined as things - you can only communicate with them dialogically. “Dialogue lines cross the entire field of living human thinking” [3, p. 316]. M. Bakhtin believed that dialogic relations are an almost universal phenomenon that permeates all relations and manifestations of human life. He was sure: where consciousness begins, dialogue begins there. Humanitarian thinking is dialogical in nature, it is directed at a person as a cultural subject and, ultimately, focused on meaning. It was M. Bakhtin who outlined the new methodology of humanitarian knowledge, affirmed the central importance of dialogue in culture, the special role of the polyphony of cultures. E. Golovleva notes that M. Bakhtin also “expressed the idea of out-of-home: we ask other culture questions that she didn’t ask herself, because an individual of one culture understands another culture based on his own cultural experience” [3, p.27].

V.S.Bibler deepened, expanded, clarified the very concept of a dialogue of cultures developed by M.M.Bakhtin. V.S.Bibler feels M.M.Bakhtin as his conspiratorial minded. He, agreeing with him in his views on culture, writes: “culture not only is understood, but also arises (as a culture) in attempts to answer (to oneself, to one’s deeds and creations) the question of man-made forms of “otherworldly being” in other pre-imagined cultures. In M. Bakhtin: “The culture does not have its own territory” [7, p. 37]. The phenomenon of culture, wrote V. Bibler, “All the decisive events of life and the consciousness of people of our century” [7, p. 261]. He believed that "every culture is a kind of" two-faced Janus. “Her face is as intensely turned towards a different culture, to her being in other worlds, as well as inward, deep into herself, in an effort to change and complement her being ”[7, p. 37]. The dialogue of cultures is “a situation of a collision of fundamentally irreducible “cultures of thinking, various forms of understanding” [7]. Reflecting on the essence of such a concept as a “cultural phenomenon”, V. Bibler does not consider it separately from the dialogue,



because in dialogue with predecessors, contemporaries and descendants, the scientist believes, one can understand the true meaning of culture. V. Bibler warned against a primitive understanding of dialogue and argued that “in the dialogue of cultures we are talking about the dialogism of truth itself, that understanding another person requires mutual understanding.

The dialogue understood in the idea of culture is not a dialogue of different opinions or ideas, it is always a dialogue of different cultures ” [2; p.132-133]. In his works, he argued that any culture is formed and revealed only in the dialogue between the past and the future. It was also significant for V.S.Bibler that, outside the dialogue, culture “dissolves” in the consciousness of its separate carrier and, thereby, loses its unique features. The originality is revealed only in the dialogue.

Thus, M. Bakhtin used the principle of dialogism of cultures in terms of literary criticism, V. Bibler developed on this basis a pedagogical concept. These studies are especially relevant for the entire modern school as a whole, including the national school.

The principle of dialogue, permeating the sphere of intercultural communication, means respect and recognition of all national cultures in the structure of modern world culture. The importance of dialogue in this regard is not accidental. “Dialogue is considered not only as a heuristic device for assimilating knowledge, but also as a factor determining the essence and meaning of the transmitted information” [6, p. 243]. It is also important that the dialogue gives practical meaning to the interaction of cultures and is the basis for the development of such interaction. V. Lukov notes that the emergence of intercultural communication as a special branch of knowledge is one of the examples of concretizing the idea of a dialogue of cultures, which is so relevant in the context of globalization and multiculturalism.

In the process of coexistence and collision of various cultural worlds, the modern meeting of cultures creates the need for joint and compatible knowledge of other cultures, which allows you to remove possible negative stereotypes and cliches. In this



regard, great attention is paid to tolerance - a sense of tolerance and respect for the culture and opinions of other people, the willingness to accept others as they are and to interact with them on the basis of consent, but without prejudice to their own interests. Because of this, the priority goals and objectives of modern education is to educate citizens of a legal democratic state with high morality and tolerance - national and religious tolerance, respect for the languages, traditions and culture of other nations, the formation of a culture of peace and interpersonal relations. It is based on a positive image of its cultural group with a positive value attitude to other ethnic groups.

Dialogue is the most important methodological principle of understanding culture. The problem of the contact of two different national worlds, their repulsion and attraction is not simple, therefore, a dialogue of literature helps to educate not just national tolerance, but respect for another people through its culture. The dialogue of cultures is a constant factor in almost all spheres of human activity, modern life. But the urgent task is to establish a successful and productive intercultural dialogue in all areas of life.

The inclusion of students in the dialogue of cultures is very important from the point of view of their education and upbringing, since “the formation of a culture person, a spiritual person always occurs due to a dialogue of cultures - native and foreign” [7, p. 43]. It is essential for us that dialogue, at the same time, is a means of forming and developing intercultural competence, which is formed precisely in the process of dialogical communication.

References:

1. Bogdanova, O.Yu. Leonova S.A., Chertova V.F. Methods of teaching literature. A textbook for university students enrolled in pedagogical specialties. M.: Academ. A, 1999
2. Boldyrev V.E. Introduction to the theory of intercultural communication, lecture course. M.: Russian language, 2009
3. Galskova N.D., Gez N.I. Theory of teaching foreign languages: Linguodidactics



and methodology: Textbook. manual for students of Linguistic Universities and foreign language departments of higher pedagogical educational institutions. M. : Academy, 2004

4. Gachev G. Mentality of the peoples of the world. M., Eksmo, 2003
5. Leontovich O.A. Intercultural transformation of personality. // Intercultural communication: research and teaching paradigms: Materials of an international scientific-practical conference. Krasnoyarsk: RIO KSPU, 2003
6. Likhachev D.S. The future of literature as a subject of study. New World No. 9, 1969
7. Mankevich I.A. Literary communications and cultural knowledge. Questions of Philology 2006, No 1