

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Nafisa Karayeva

Teacher of Philology and teaching language department at the International Innovative University

Abstract: In this article, the forms of linguistic and cultural approach to discourse analysis in intercultural communication, their forms in language units, applied methods and meaning are revealed. In addition to the above, the opinions of scientists who contributed to the development of this field were also analyzed. The fundamentals of the linguistic and cultural science, which has become one of the most urgent issues in modern times, have studied the problem of interdependence of language and culture.

Key words: linguoculturology, linguoculturological analysis, discourse, linguistics, culture, communicative linguistics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics.

The cultural charge of the general fund of knowledge is primarily conditioned and predetermined by the marking of extralinguistic component. Verbal mentions of names, common sayings, and literature pertaining to the cultural sphere of a particular ethnosociety serve to clearly and visibly express the culturological component. The verbal component of general knowledge, which got the naming background knowledge mentioned above, is distinguished by priority.

The most crucial aspect of background knowledge is precedence, which enables us to view background knowledge from a linguocultural perspective as connecting the ethnosociety, its defining paradigms of sociocultural behavior, and mental-linguistic perception. The statement that "background knowledge" has a varied semantic interpretation in linguistics, needs to be qualified. It combines two elements: knowledge and comprehension of the current communication situation (what might be called "situational specifics," changing K.N. Gorelov's [11,104] term somewhat), and in addition, possession of more general knowledge of the world as a result of the person's adherence to a particular national-cultural tradition. In the strict sense, knowledge pertaining to comprehending contextual specifics might be referred to as background knowledge. The second component listed below presumes the presence of a cultural and linguistic code (at the same time, the cultural-linguistic code involves the fusion of features of language and culture, exclusive to a certain national-linguistic community). Isolation of this type of background information is a result of a comprehensive approach to the topic being studied. Such a dual (wide and restricted) concept of background knowledge does not at all conflict with the linguistic understanding of this phenomena that has already been established. Although there are differences in terminology (see "vertical context" by O.S. Akhmanova [12,47-54], "presupposition" by V.A. Zvegintsev [13,312], G.V. Kolshansky [14,149]), to the determining background knowledge has several characteristics, including that it (1) is characterized by non-verbalization, which is a nonverbal component of communication, (2) that mutual knowledge of this non-verbal component communication determines the success of the communication process, and (3) that related to knowledge of culture, history, geography, and pragmatics.

It is important to set a goal to identify the cultural component of background knowledge, that is, to choose those pieces of background knowledge from the entire volume that are distinguished by the presence of a cultural component. This is because background knowledge in the broadest sense of the word unites all carriers of the same cultural and linguistic code. In this regard, the information provided below is fascinating: (1) the nature of this kind of background knowledge, (2) the nature of cultural components: what actual objects served as its source, (3) the linguistic representation of the cultural component: units of what level of the linguistic hierarchy function as transmission of cultural information. Identification of the various culturally marked background knowledge types that are used the most frequently in communication, might be part of the process of analyzing the cultural plan.

The culturological element is most pronounced in relation to reality. *Realia* is the word given to actual things, occurrences, and ideas that are directly related to a historical era. The names of famous people (anthroponyms), geographical names with cultural and historical connotations (toponyms), literary and artistic works, historical facts and events in the history of the nation, names of public and private institutions, etc. are all examples of realities. Geographical terminology designating particular aspects of a location's flora and fauna, a few phrases (including well-known terms) relating to the state, the nation's political system, law, art, the educational system, and manufacture.

As verbalized information of the outside world, which is widely distributed in this cultural and linguistic community, can be used as the source of the cultural component. Knowledge of features of the everyday way of life of the cultural and linguistic community are decisive for the understanding of the following statement: *They agreed in nothing but their perfect neatness, their display of the whitest linen, and their storing up, wheresoever the existence of a drawer, small or large, rendered it possible, of quantities of rose-leaves and sweet lavender*. The book's reviews indicate that housewives put the lavender and rose petals specified in the text in linen chests of drawers for smell. Additionally, the cultural component may indicate prior knowledge that is not ethno- or national-centric but rather reflects aspects of the history of world civilization and culture while also being widely disseminated among this group of people who share the same language and culture. The widespread use of biblical terminology in English-speaking nations, and consequently, in culture and literature, might serve as an illustration of this argument. The Day of Judgment, the Revelations, Methuselah—the eldest of the patriarchs, whose name became a sign of longevity—and other topics are covered in this series.

E.g. - but if he was to come to our house, with his great shining lumpy forehead, night after night, till he was as old as Methuselah. I wouldn't have anything to say to him .

The mention of general understanding could make people wonder if it is appropriate to include it in a study of national individuality. But in this case, we completely concur with D.B. Gudkov's viewpoint. As "they will occupy their special position in each individual national cultural space" [15,42] and, I would like to add, "they have its own range of associations and connotations, and therefore their own reading," he believed that the "common human" components of background knowledge of a culturological order are nationally determined.

One can distinguish the cultural component from the background knowledge, which was derived from facts of a social nature relating to age, profession, and socio-stratification of personal characteristics, as well as phenomena, objects, and concepts of an ethnocentric nature and related to the field of world civilization. So, in the example "*Which he wishes to know what the shilling ware for*", the help of an extra "*which*" is characteristic of the syntax of illiterate English.

The use of lexical units, such as the Beatles, Disneyland, a Chautauqua, foot, pound, etc., indicates background knowledge, which is characterized by the existence of culturological components. Additionally, background information can be included into the text's organization and discourse via

different language devices. They can be statements that reference historical and sociological facts in full or in part.

Being fixed in a given knowledge of linguo-cultural code and ideas of a cultural and historical nature entails presence in language experience communicators. Phenomenon precedence includes a broad range of culturological component manifestation and application in the context of previous knowledge. You can organize and combine representations about several events into a single block of culturally marked background information using precedent as a linguo-cultural feature.

Researchers in the fields of intercultural communication and linguoculturalogy have long been interested in the precedent-setting nature of the units found in the general knowledge reservoir of native speakers. Yu.N. Karaulov highlighted the need to discover and study corpus of precedent texts as the initial step in this direction. Additionally, in Yu.N. Karaulova's opinion, text identification is carried out in a broad meaning. Any utterance or series of utterances that belongs to one communicator is conceived under the text. For the pragmatic purposes of the study, we feel that the object of linguocultural research should be a precedent, leaving the term "precedent text" for the linguistic portion of the study. This method enables for the expansion of the research base. Thus, the text receives a different narrower interpretation and correlates with a number of similar events. All together they are summed up under the general category of precedent phenomena. This interpretation sets apart the methodology used by entire research teams. D.B. Gudkov "understands those" cultural things under prior phenomena, concepts about which are contained in the cognitive basis" [15,53]. The nationally defined reduced representations—which, according to D.B. Gudkov, are cognitive units—are associated with precedent phenomena. Above, we previously discussed how we feel about the term "cognitive" in the context of linguocultural studies. The logic of this study assumes that prior phenomena are cultural items that are a component of the cultural sphere or cultural fund of a specific linguocultural community. In light of the aforementioned, we continue to hold the belief that the logoepistem is a language construction that expresses the concept of prior occurrences. In the interpretation of Yu.N. Karaulova, it is also thought to be possible to characterize precedent phenomena or phenomena by extrapolating the properties of the precedent text. These properties include: (1) significance in cognitive and emotional attitude; (2) fame to a wide range of people; and (3) repetition in discourse representatives of the linguo-cultural community. A cultural-historical order's background knowledge is formed on a solid foundation of precedent phenomena, which are different language designs with a wide range of entity sources. It is possible to differentiate between precedent texts, precedent circumstances, precedent statements, precedent names (anthroponyms and toponyms), precedent "words", precedent pseudotexts, precedent genres, and precedent facts depending on the source of origin, or carrier precedents. The fact that some of these terms are already used in classifications must be underlined. Logoepistema, which goes back to precedent text (hereinafter: PT), suggests "finished and self-sufficient product of speech-cognitive activity, a predicative unit, a complex sign, the sum of the values of the components of which is not equal to its meaning; PT is well known to any average member of the linguocultural community, the cognitive base includes an invariant of its perception, reference to it is repeatedly renewed in the process of communication through utterances and symbols associated with this text.

The reproduction of structural organization may also affect the meaning of the text or its elements. Therefore, Time Safari, INC., a marvelous travel firm that advertises, reflects logoepisteme in R. Bradbury's novel, rising to the level of the earlier advertising text. (*You name it, you 've got it*):

You name the animal.

We take you there.

You shoot it. Due to the logoepistem, which recreates the PT, credibility is achieved, reality of presentation. When producing the equivalent logoepisteme in newspaper text, use the advertisement

text, which is typically encountered on public transportation: Break glass and shout "social security" in case of a political emergency , which adds to the comedic effect.

E.g. Margery and Minnie were very different from each other. Why young maidens? Who hunt in couples and invariably dress alike should differ as much in character and temperament as Boadicea and Mrs. Hemans afford a speculation as fantastic as it is futile. Indeed, the distinction between the two signals' intentions is crucial: the poetess Felicia Dorothea Hemans belonged to the romantic movement and hasn't gained much notoriety, but Boudicca was known for her courage and decisiveness.

The following sentence contains a reference to a prior name of a toponymic nature:

E.g. To the south an aerospace mogul has gussied a Norman pile complete with drawbridge and watertower, which the surfers ... call Camelot. A logoepistem that makes mention of Camelot, the legendary court of King Arthur, generates a notion of exclusivity.

The list of previous phenomena is still available and subject to revision in light of the growing resource base. How can one come to the conclusion that all these historical phenomena form the foundation of a native speaker's cultural baggage and that, as logoepistems, they represent a crucial component of the linguocultural code? It can be said that cultural literacy of the person speaking implies recognition of precedent phenomena in the process of using the language because "every aspect of our linguistic activity - both established and the speech we perceive is filled with blocks-quotes from the previous language experience". Cultural marking of logoepistems and the precedent phenomena behind them is obvious. They involve not only acquaintance, but also awareness of realities and potentialities of linguo-cultural code of a given national-linguistic community.

References

1. Alefirenko N. F. Linguistic culture as a scientific and educational discipline // Alefirenko N. F. Linguistics. The language of value-semantic space. - M., 2010. - S. 44.
2. Alefirenko N.F., Semenenko N.N. "Phraseology and Paremiology", M.: Flint: Nauka, 2009. - C. 269
3. Rozin V.M. Culturology. - M.: INFRA-M, FORUM, 2002. - p. 282-283
4. Humboldt 1985: Humboldt W. background Language and culture of philosophy. M., 1985. - 60c.
5. Sapir E. Works on linguistics and cultural studies. – M.: Progress, 1993.- 60c.
6. Maslova V.A. Introduction to linguoculturology. Tutorial. - Moscow: Heritage, 1997. - 38c
7. Maslova V.A. Linguistics: Proc. student allowance _ textbook institutions - M : Academy, 2001. - 208 p.
8. Teliya VN Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguistic and Cultural Aspects. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1996. - 288 p.
9. Whorf, Benjamin. 1956. Language, Thought and Reality. Cambridge UP: MIT Press. Edited by J. Carroll.
10. Фрумкина Р.М. Концепт, категория, прототип / Р.М. Фрумкина //Лингвистическая и экстралингвистическая семантика. – М., 1992. – С. 28-43
11. Горелов К.Н. Невербальные компоненты коммуникации. - М.: Наука, 1980.-104 с
12. Ахманова О.С., Гюбенетт И.В. Вертикальный контекст как филологическая проблема // Вопросы языкоznания. - 1977.- № 3. - С. 47-54.
13. Звегинцев В.А. Предложение и его отношение к языку и речи. - М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. - 312 с (213-309)
14. Колшанский Г.В. Контекстная семантика. - М.: Наука, 1980. - 149 с

15. Гудков Д.Б. Межкультурная коммуникация. Лекционный курс для студентов РКИ. - М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2000. - 120 с.