Sources of Linguocultures and Linguoculturological Field
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ANNOTATION

In this article described the concept of lingvokulturema and the analysis of the definitions given to it by scientists. The linguocultural field and its units are covered.
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A great contribution to the improvement of the terminological apparatus of linguoculturology was made by V.V. Vorobyov, who proposed the term linguocultureme, understanding it as a complex interlevel unit, “which is a dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic (conceptual or subject) content”. Linguocultureme goes back to the concept of cultureme, understood by A. Vezhbitskaya as a complex interlevel unit, the form of which is the unity of the sign and linguistic meaning, and the content is the unity of linguistic meaning and cultural meaning.

Gak considers a cultureme as “a certain sign of culture, which also has a linguistic expression, while in culturemes that have a linguistic expression, the linguistic sign is denoting, and the realia is denoted (realia in this case means everything related to culture: objects, functions, customs, facts of behavior, etc.)”. Drawing relationships between these terms, V.V. Vorobyov notes that a cultureme is an element of reality (an object or situation) inherent in a certain culture, and a linguocultureme is a projection of a culture element into a linguistic sign.

In the understanding of V.V. Vorobyov's linguocultureme is a combination of the form of a linguistic sign, its content and the cultural meaning that accompanies this sign: the word-signal awakens in a person the whole set of "cultural halo". He pays special attention to the issue of perception of a linguocultureme, the deep meaning that potentially exists in the meaning as a component of its content, believing that the "immersion" of words in culture more fully reflects their linguistic and extralinguistic semantics, helps to better understand the national specifics of cultural values.

It should be noted that the boundaries of the content of the concept of linguocultureme vary from the word to the whole text: poetic or prosaic.

As sources of linguocultures V.V. Vorobyov names folklore, monuments of history and social thought, statements of famous people, fiction and journalism, famous people as a model of the Russian national
personality, thoughts and judgments of foreigners about the Russian nation and culture. The linguocultureme realizes its potential in the linguoculturological field, the structure of which includes the core, intension and extension of the field, center and periphery.

Field units are connected by paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, while, as noted by S.A. Pitin and L.A. Shkatov, “linguoculturological field appears as the knowledge of a researcher, and linguoculturemes are used as a metalanguage, which have a common classification character and potential capabilities in compared languages (archiculturemes).

Ideas V.V. Vorobyov were quite widespread, but V.A. Maslova finds this term “very vague, because it does not reveal the mechanisms of where and how cultural information is attached in a linguistic sign”. From the position of V.A. The Maslova subject of linguoculturology is "mythologized linguistic units, as well as figurative and ritual forms of culture, legends, customs, beliefs, enshrined in the language in phraseological units, proverbs, figurative and metaphorical units", which are usually based on, mythologeme or archetype.

When studying these culturally marked units, it is important to note their inclusion in a literary text. Accumulating the ideas of V.V. Vorobiev and V.A. Maslova, G.A. Kazhigalieva creates a classification of textual linguocultures, which is based on the structural principle. The researcher emphasizes the obligatory conditions for the implementation of the system of linguistic cultures in the "atmosphere of a verbal artistic text". Let's represent the classification:

Proposed by V.I. Shaklein's term lingvoculturologema is a unit that is a component linguocultural universe and linguocultural situation. Through consideration of the operation of the mechanism of nomination and predication of linguistic units of the lexical level, the postulate about the evaluative and axiological factor of modeling the situational worldview is proved.

Stereotypicality and conformity of the individual's behavior to his ethno-mental features of culture are considered by Y.E. Prokhorov, suggesting to share the concept of a national socio-cultural stereotype into two components. As an intraethnocultural stereotype he considers the proposed V.A. Ryzhkov communicative unit of this ethnic group, capable of "through the actual presentation of social sanctioned needs, to provide an inciting typed impact on the consciousness of the personality of the socialized individual, forming in appropriate motivation”.

Under external ethno-cultural stereotype, he understands "a nationally specific image (concept, model) of a communicative strategy, based on taking into account the national-cultural stereotyping of the process communication of each ethnic community, and used to achieve intercultural communication”. Yes, for the Soviet parents in relation to the child, situations of “well-behaved to lead” and “to eat well”, which is not typical for the English tradition: “Come on, Tony, come here. Tell us how you behave, how you eat?

Summarizing these considerations, we note that all concepts, one way or another, otherwise reflect the relationship between language and culture, while the semantic the content of each term is unique, due to the complexity and the uncertainty of the very concept of culture. Choice of one or the other concept is influenced, first of all, by the level of implementation of linguocultural units (A - mental, B - linguistic, C - cultural).

Realizing itself in the text space, the linguocultureme performs a number of functions:

- text-forming, formal and meaningful forming the body of the text, ensuring its integrity, connectedness, completeness;
contact-setting, consisting in establishing a link between the citing text and the source text quotes, which ensures their dialogue, the ability to read one text through the prism of another text;

cumulative, associated with storage and transmission information that reflects linguocultural experience and reinforces linguistic and cultural values;

aesthetic, involving the ability to figuratively think, get aesthetic pleasure from decoding, deciphering the linguocultureme, understanding its metaphorical the meaning needed to interpret the entire text;

cumulative, associated with storage and transmission information that reflects linguocultural experience and reinforces linguistic and cultural values;

password, acting as a "code", sorting "us" and "them", confirming belonging the reader to the socio-cultural group to which the author belongs;

pragmatic, influencing the addressee for the purpose of consistency of the perlocutionary effect, implementation of the intentions of the author's intention, its adequate perception by the reader;

ludic, focused on the game effect with modifications of linguistic cultures;

evaluative, associated with the expression through linguistic cultures of the author's assessment of a phenomenon, image, event;

emotionally expressive, appealing to the emotional sphere readers.

Linguocultureme is an interlevel unit, reflecting through linguistic signs the phenomena of culture in literary texts. Thus, the linguistic culture includes precedent phenomena, idiomatic units, proverbs, speech clichés and stamps. As the main functions of the linguocultureme, we single out text-forming, contact-setting, cumulative, pragmatic, password, ludic, evaluative, aesthetic, emotional and expressive function.
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