52

SPECIFIC

LANGUAGE UNITS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT OF LINGUISTICS

LAS UNIDADES LINGÜÍSTICAS ESPECÍFICAS COMO MATERIA DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN LINGÜÍSTICA

Maharramova Matanat Hidayat [1*]
E-mail: matanat.maharramova@sdu.edu.az
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3494-140X
Pashayeva Gunel Baksheyish [1]
E-mail: gunel.pashayeva@sdu.edu.az
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8854-0786
*Author for correspondence
[1] Sumgait State University, Azerbaijan.

ABSTRACT

The article explores the fundamental concepts of linguoculturology as an integrative discipline within the humanities, focusing on its basic units and categories including linguocultureme, logoepisteme, linguocultural concept, stereotype, symbol, mythologem, and archetype. The article delves into the history of linguoculturology's emergence, and its theoretical framework (object, subject, goals, objectives, principles), and highlights the developmental stages of this nascent linguistic discipline. Linguoculturology is closely intertwined with the national worldview, linguistic consciousness, and mentality. It is emphasized that linguoculturology is rooted in three main principles—anthropocentrism, cognitivism, and linguoculturology—representing a product of the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm, predominant in linguistics today. The place of linguoculturology among other humanities disciplines is also discussed, particularly its strong connections with linguohistorical fields such as cultural studies, ethnolinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, linguistic and regional studies, as well as various linguistic branches like lexicology, phraseology, and semantics. Despite being in its early stages, we believe that linguoculturology has established itself as a distinct field of knowledge with its object, subject of study, and methodology. In this regard, the article identifies several foundational principles and key tenets guiding research in this area.

Keywords: Language, culture, linguistic picture of the world, linguistic personality.

RESUMEN

El artículo explora los conceptos fundamentales de la linguoculturología como disciplina integradora dentro de las humanidades, centrándose en sus unidades y categorías básicas, incluidas linguoculturama, logoepisteme, concepto linguocultural, estereotipo, símbolo, mitologema y arquetipo. El artículo profundiza en la historia del surgimiento de la linguoculturología, su marco teórico (objeto, sujeto, metas, objetivos, principios) y destaca las etapas de desarrollo de esta naciente disciplina lingüística. La linguoculturología está estrechamente entrelazada con la cosmovisión nacional, la conciencia lingüística y la mentalidad. Se enfatiza que la linguoculturalogía tiene sus raíces en tres principios fundamentales: antropocentrismo, cognitivismo y linguoculturalogía, que representan un producto de la formación del paradigma antropocéntrico, predominante en la lingüística actual. También se discute el lugar de la linguoculturología entre otras disciplinas de las humanidades, en particular sus fuertes conexiones con campos linguohistóricos como los estudios culturales, la etnolingüística, la etnopsicolingüística, los estudios lingüísticos y regionales, así como con diversas ramas lingüísticas como la lexicología, la fraseología y la semántica. A pesar de estar en sus primeras etapas, creemos que la linguoculturología se ha consolidado como un campo de conocimiento diferenciado con su propio objeto, tema de estudio y metodología. En este sentido, el artículo identifica varios principios fundamentales y principios clave que guían la investigación en esta área.

Palabras claves: lengua, cultura, imagen lingüística del mundo, personalidad lingüística.

INTRODUCTION

Research into the evolution of language holds significant importance for a variety of reasons. It is suggested by studies that the evolution of language encompasses more than just the acquisition of speech; it also encompasses the voluntary imagination component of language, such as Prefrontal synthesis (PFS), which plays a pivotal role in the process of language acquisition (Vyshedskiy, 2022). Roberts (1992) underscores the necessity of comprehending the development of the word concept in young children, a crucial aspect for the initiation of reading instruction while other authors stress the importance of understanding the evolution of written language through the lens of constructal theory, recognizing language as a foundational element for societal cohesion. In addition, an exploration of the evolution of language can provide valuable insights into the simultaneous development of various language components, such as speech and visuospatial elements, throughout history. Additionally, the investigation of language evolution can aid in unraveling the cultural, social, and historical significance embedded within languages. This exploration can shed light on the influence of languages on different processes, contributing to a deeper comprehension of their impact on societal development (Gontier, 2018). As seen, collectively, the literature accentuates the crucial role of investigating language evolution in enhancing our understanding of cognitive development, cultural processes, and the intricate mechanisms driving the evolution of language itself.

Among the different approaches to studying language, an interesting one is linguoculturology which emerged in the 20th century and focuses on the dynamic interplay between language and culture. This interdisciplinary field finds its roots intertwined with linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, etc., as noted by Kiklewicz (2020). It delves into the study of language phenomena, emphasizing both synchrony and diachrony, pivotal for unraveling the complexities of this realm (Narmurodova, 2020). In recent years the field has witnessed a burgeoning interest, particularly evident in post-soviet nations like Russia however it has been pointed out by Mizin & Korostenski (2019) that the development of "Western" Cultural Linguistics and "post-soviet" Linguoculturology has been different which is attributed to factors such as linguistic diversity and the gradual emergence of post-soviet science on the global stage.

Linguoculturology proves indispensable in the analysis of literary works, shedding light on the intricate relationship between language and culture, especially concerning national identity and literature. Scholars such as Golubenko (2019) emphasize its vital role in exploring national cultures from an anthropocentric perspective, reshaping the landscape of linguistic inquiry. On the other hand, Ganyushina et al. (2020) underline its role in fostering intercultural understanding, crucial for global communication. Therefore, as linguoculturology continues to evolve, it remains a potent instrument for exploring the intricate and dynamic relationship between language and culture across diverse global contexts.

Taking the above as a reference, the objective of this work is to analyze the most important aspects of linguoculturology as an emerging field, aiming to shed light on the interplay between language and culture, focusing on identifying cultural elements embedded within linguistic units that convey insights into the world. This exploration involves examining how these elements are reflected in the semantics of linguistic units and refracted through the lens of the national language. Additionally, the research seeks to pinpoint the methods and techniques employed in such scientific investigations. Given the complexity of the study, we believe it requires a combination of multiple methods and approaches, including descriptive, comparative, and field research methodologies. The significance of this study lies in its alignment with contemporary linguistic trends, which place a strong emphasis on the human aspect of language. Presently, linguistics is actively exploring the concepts of cultural significance through the lens of language, delving into adjacent fields such as psychology, cultural studies, philosophy, and sociology. This expansion has given rise to specialized branches within the field of language science, including cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, and linguoculturology. In this regard, the method of counter-describing culture by examining its reflection in the national language, coupled with the interpretation of linguistic phenomena through a "deep extra-linguistic cultural component", continues to be essential in understanding the intricate interplay between "language and culture".

DEVELOPMENT

On the concept of linguoculturology

Some of the first linguocultural studies were the works of W. von Humboldt and A.A. Potebnya, who laid the theoretical foundations and gave direction to the development of modern linguoculturology back in the middle of the 19th century. In the twentieth century, the ideas of these scientists were developed by L. Wittgenstein, L. Weisgerber, J. Derrida, C.Bally, J.Vandries, F.Boas, M.Heidegger and others. At the present stage, Russian and foreign researchers are studying the problems of linguoculturology, being in our opinion among the most prominent N.I.Tolstoy, Yu.S.Stepanov, N.D. Arutyunova,

V.N.Telia, V.V.Krasnykh, V.I.Karasik, E.M.Vereshchagin, V.G.Kostomarov, V.A.Maslova, A.Vezhbitskaya and others. The most current trend in the development of science in the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries is integration. Even opposite areas of knowledge, they find their "points of intersection", from which fundamentally new scientific directions arise. Linguoculturology has traveled a similar path, which not only arose on the verge of two fundamental humanities disciplines, cultural studies, and linguistics, but also arose from the results of the interaction and interpenetration of language and culture. Thus, today, various aspects of the interaction of language and culture constitute a field of research for linguoculturologists. It should be noted that in the works of Russian, European, and American researchers, the problems of linguoculturology are understood in different ways, but the existence and constant development of this science as such is undeniable.

Today, several definitions of the concept of "linguoculturology" are widespread in the scientific world. We will use the definition of V.V. Krasnykh, who characterizes linguoculturology as "a discipline that studies the manifestation, reflection, and fixation of culture in language and discourse. It is directly related to the study of the national picture of the world, linguistic consciousness, and the characteristics of the mental-lingual complex" (Krasnykh, 2002). Scientists have been trying to identify and explore the main problems of the interaction between language and culture since the beginning of the 19th century (works of Jacob Grimm, Johann Herder, Wilhelm von Humboldt). For example, J. Herder argued that the constructive ability of language influences the formation of folk culture, psychology, and creativity. The views of W. von Humboldt (the first half of the 19th century) were the most widespread, who is considered the father of ethnolinguistics. The German linguist expressed the opinion that "culture manifests itself primarily in language, and it is language that is capable of introducing a person into a certain culture". Language also has an individual form that directly affects the nature of the consciousness of its speakers. The researcher himself defined language as a world located "between the world of external phenomena and the inner world of a person" (Maslova, 2001).

W. von Humboldt's idea of language as an activity of the spirit was developed by A.A. Potebnya, who defended the right of national languages and cultures to self-sufficient development, and emphasized their connection with the history of the people and the evolution of human thought in general. According to A.A. Potebnya, language constitutes the historical form of the national spirit, a means of encoding the vast national worldview it created in its structures. Later, the thesis about the inseparability and synergy of language and culture became the basis of the concept of neo-Humboldtianism and the famous American linguistic school of Sapir-Whorf, for which language was inseparable from cognitive processes. It was language (more precisely, its structure), according to supporters of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, that determined human thinking and the way of perceiving reality. One of the representatives of the neo-Humboldtian movement, L. Weisgerber, even argued that language is an "intermediate world" between thinking and reality.

Stages of development of linguoculturology

According to V.A. Maslova, identifying the stages of development of linguoculturology as a science is somewhat arbitrary, since the discipline itself was formed only a few years ago. Nevertheless, nowadays it is acceptable to distinguish two stages in the development of linguoculturology: (1) the stage of prerequisites for the emergence of linguoculturology (19th - late 20th century), when the works of A.A. Potebnya, W. von Humboldt and E. Sapir were produced; (2) the stage of "formalization of linguoculturology as an independent field of research" (early 90s of the 20th century - to the present day). In the future, scientists predict the emergence of another, third period in the development of linguoculturology, namely, its separation into a separate interdisciplinary area of research (Maslova, 2001).

As for the current state of linguoculturology, significant changes have occurred in the existing scientific paradigm, as a result of which several new ideas and approaches to the study of language have emerged. Among these, three basic principles implemented in further scientific research at the beginning of the 20th century should be noted: "anthropocentrism, which involves the systematic acquisition of language, its units, text, discourse through the prism of the human factor, consideration of the presence of man in language and language in man; cognitivism (language is the result of cognitive activity, a way of organizing and storing human knowledge about the world, the space of thought and spirit); linguoculturology (close connection between the language and culture of the people, understanding the development of language as a result of human creative activity) (Bogdanovich, 2004).

Linguoculturology is based on the three named principles and is considered one of the "products" of the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm, which was formed in the twentieth century and today is among the main ones in linguistics. The leading idea of the anthropocentric paradigm is the study of the subject of cognition (instead of the object), that is, "the study of man in language and

language in man" (Maslova, 2001). Language in the context of the anthropocentric paradigm is understood as a multidimensional phenomenon that arises only in human society and can be characterized as a "product of culture," its important component, and condition of existence. At the center of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics is not a person as such, but a linguistic personality.

According to Maslova's (2001) notes, at the present stage in linguoculturological studies, the following areas of research can be roughly distinguished:

1. Linguoculturology of a separate social group, or ethnic group in some culturally vibrant period, i.e. the study of a specific linguistic and cultural situation

2. Diachronic linguoculturology, i.e. studying changes in the linguistic and cultural state of an ethnic group over a certain period of time.

3. Comparative linguoculturology, studying the linguistic and cultural manifestations of different but interrelated ethnic groups.

4. Areal linguoculturology

5. Linguocultural lexicography, which deals with the compilation of linguistic and cultural dictionaries".

According to V.I. Karasik, a significant increase in interest in the problems of linguoculturology in our time may be due to the following reasons. Firstly, this is the rapid globalization of world problems, the need to take into account the universal and specific characteristics of the behavior and communication of different peoples in solving a wide variety of issues, and the need to know in advance those situations in which there is a high probability of intercultural misunderstanding, the importance of defining and accurately designating those cultural values which underlie communicative activity. Secondly, this is an objective integrative trend in the development of the humanities, the need for linguists to master the results obtained by representatives of related branches of knowledge. Thirdly, this is the applied side of linguistic knowledge, understanding language as a means of concentrated comprehension of collective experience, which is encoded in all the richness of the meanings of words, phraseological units, well-known texts, formulaic etiquette situations, etc., and this experience is the essence of the foreign language being studied, finds direct outlets in the practice of advertising and political influence, permeates the communicative environment of the mass media (Karasik, 2001).

Linguoculturology is most associated with linguistic-historical disciplines, such as cultural studies, ethnolinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, linguistic and cultural studies, translation studies, as well as linguistics (lexicology, phraseology, semantics, etc.). Linguoculturology reveals the closest connections between cultural studies and linguistics. Cultural studies study human self-awareness regarding nature, society, history, art, and other spheres of their social and cultural existence; its object is culture. One of the tasks of linguistics is the study of the worldview, which is reflected and fixed in language through the linguistic picture of the world; the object of linguistics is language. Linguoculturology studies the process and result of the constant dialectical interaction of language and culture, and its object is the synergistic unity of these two entities.

Linguoculturology studies first of all "modern linguistic facts through the prism of spiritual culture, that is, it studies only the synchronous interaction of language and culture (living communicative processes in connection with the mentality of the people)" (Maslova, 2001). Linguoculturology should study not only national cultural information but also information relating to universal human culture. The difference between linguoculturology and linguocultural studies is determined by the fact that the latter studies "its own national realities, reflected in the language; according to E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov, these non-equivalent linguistic units designate phenomena specific to a given culture" (Maslova, 2001).

Linguoculturology is not limited to the study of a set of lexical units, the cultural component in the content of which can be detected through a historical and etymological basis, and strives to explicate the cultural and national significance of the units, which is achieved by correlating their meanings with the concepts of universal and national cultures. Thus, not only linguistic units denoting culturally marked realities are culturally significant, but also those in which cultural information is contained at a deeper level of semantics. (Olshanskii, 2000).

Linguoculturology and ethnopsycholinguistics are very closely connected. The subject of the study of the latter is:

How elements of behavior associated with a certain tradition are manifested in speech activity, it analyzes the differences in the verbal and non-verbal behavior of speakers of different languages; explores speech etiquette and the color picture of the world, gaps in the text during intercultural communication, studies bilingualism and multilingualism as a feature of the speech behavior of various peoples, etc. (Maslova, 2001).

Consequently, ethnopsycholinguistics is mainly focused on the study of "external" manifestations of culture in human language and behavior.

Object and subject of linguoculturology

Modern science knows several approaches to defining the concept of linguoculturology, one of which is the approach of V.V. Vorobyov, who considers linguoculturology as "a complex scientific discipline that studies the relationship and interaction of culture and language in the process of their functioning, the unity of their linguistic and extra-linguistic (culturological) content with an orientation towards modern and cultural values". It follows from this that the main task of linguoculturology is:

to establish the mutual conditionality of culture and language depending on the cultural and linguistic competence of the person - the bearer of this language and culture, that is, linguoculturology as a science studies the interactions of language as a translator of cultural information and the person who creates this culture by using language. (Olshanskii, 2000).

Thus, the object of linguoculturology is simultaneously located on the border of "several fundamental sciences -linguistic and cultural studies, ethnography and psycholinguistics" (Maslova, 2001). According to the views of I.G. Olshansky, the object of linguoculturology is, first of all, "the linguistic picture of the world, which is not purely ethnic or national" (Olshanskii, 2000).

According to V.A. Maslova, as the subject of linguoculturological studies,

language units that have acquired symbolic, standard, figurative and metaphorical meanings in culture and which generalize the results of human consciousness itself - archetypal and prototypical, recorded in myths, legends, rituals, rites, folklore and religious discourses, poetic and prosaic literary texts, phraseological units and metaphors, symbols, and paremias (proverbs and sayings), etc. are highlighted. (Maslova, 2001).

These are units of language and discourse with the help of which we can get to the cultural-historical layer of the mental-lingual complex.

The researcher identifies several subjects of linguoculturology that exist within the framework of one object of study:

1. "Non-equivalent vocabulary and gaps, and since linguistic and cultural studies are an integral part of cultural linguistics, they also become its subject;

2. Mythologized language units: archetypes and mythologems, rituals and beliefs, rituals and customs enshrined in the language.

3. The paremiological fund of the language.

4. The phraseological fund of the language.

5. Norms, stereotypes, symbols.

6. Metaphors and images of language.

7. The stylistic structure of languages.

8. Speech behavior.

9. The area of speech etiquette.

The listed elements do not form a single system but represent a "heterogeneous totality" as the most "culture-intensive" units. The proposed list is not exhaustive; it mentions only "the main areas where language and culture actively interact" (Maslova, 2001).

The objectives of linguoculturology

The goal of linguoculturology is the study of linguistic and linguocultural phenomena in their relationships and their interaction; the manifestation of everyday cultural and linguistic competence of subjects of the linguistic and cultural community and the study of the everyday picture of the world presented in the daily speech of native speakers. According to I.G. Olshansky, the aim of linguoculturology:

consists in studying the ways that language embodies culture in its units, preserves and transmits it. Due to this concept, it is believed that in the process of interaction and mutual influence of language and culture, language performs not only a cumulative (accumulative) function but also the function of transmitting information. Language not only consolidates and stores cultural concepts in its units, it is through it that these concepts are reproduced in the mentality of a people or individual social groups from generation to generation. It is through the function of cultural translation that language can influence the way of worldview inherent in a particular linguistic and cultural community. (Olshanskii, 2000).

Maslova (2001) defines the following as the main tasks of linguoculturology:

1. Studying the role of culture in the creation of linguistic concepts.

2. Understanding the method of attaching "cultural meanings" to a linguistic sign.

3. Studying the degree of awareness and influence of "cultural meanings" on "speech strategies".

4. Studying the "cultural and linguistic competence of a native speaker, based on which "cultural meanings" are embodied in texts and recognized by native speakers".

5. Studying the "conceptosphere (the set of basic concepts of a given culture), as well as...the cultural semantics of these linguistic signs".

6. Systematizing "basic linguocultural concepts, that is the creation of a conceptual apparatus that would not only allow one to analyze the problem of interaction between language and culture in dynamics but would ensure mutual understanding within the anthropocentric paradigm".

Linguoculturology as a science and academic discipline is in its infancy, but currently, scientists identify several basic principles and basic provisions that determine the direction of scientific research in this field of knowledge (Bogdanovich, 2004):

- Language is the most valuable "source of the formation and manifestation of the mentality of the people; through it, culture is preserved and passed on to other generations.

- Being a public domain, language is appropriated by every representative of society, allowing forming oneself, one's idea of the world. The linguistic personality in all the diversity of socio-psychological roles, strategies, and tactics of communication is at the center of attention. Analysis of a person's linguistic competence is an essential parameter for describing a culture.

- Interpretation of linguistic facts from the perspective of mental linguistics. The most valuable cultural sources are phraseological units, metaphors, symbols, etc. as carriers of the cultural ideas of the people.

- Attention to cognitive semantics, to the cultural meanings of linguistic signs, to the formation of the conceptual sphere of culture.

- Study of cultural discourses, emphasis on the national and cultural specifics of linguistic consciousness manifested in communication. Analysis of models of speech behavior (stereotypes, etiquette formulas, etc.) as cultural facts" (Bogdanovich, 2004). In addition to the stated principles, we consider it necessary to dwell separately on those postulates on which modern linguoculturology is based.

- The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, the essence of which is that people who use different languages and belong to different civilizations understand the world in different ways, that is, language determines the way of thinking of its representatives, and the means of mastering the world is determined by the language in which thinking occurs.

- The consciousness of an individual is always ethnically conditioned, because, in essence, the worldview of a particular people has its own structure of subject defini-

tions, different cognitive programs, social stereotypes, etc. Personal consciousness is formed in society in the process of socialization; therefore, consciousness carries within itself the features of the difference of the society in which the formation of personality took place. At the same time, culture is a public domain that is created, preserved, transmitted, and modified by society. Thus, the formation of human consciousness occurs indirectly through culture too.

Based on the above, it should be noted that a specific circle of interdependencies is formed between language, culture, and consciousness: language - consciousness -culture - language. The original view on the nature of linguoculturology belongs to A.T. Khrolenko. The researcher defines linguoculturology as "the philosophy of language and culture", where "the object is language and culture", and the subject is "fundamental problems of changing language and its units, determined by the dynamics of culture, as well as transformations in the structure and changes in the functioning of culture, determined by the linguistic implementation of cultural meanings" (Khrolenko, 2009). Khrolenko introduced into scientific circulation the term "linguistic and cultural studies", by which he understands the field of scientific research focused on "identifying the nature of connections and relationships between language, ethnic mentality and culture". Further, the researcher notes that "cultural linguistics examines the problem of "Language and Culture" in principle, not limiting itself to a specific language and a specific culture in order to identify the mechanisms of interaction between linguistic and cultural factors using the example of different languages and cultures".

Thus, linguoculturology occupies a core place in the system of sciences, which collectively constitute linguistic and cultural studies. According to Khrolenko (2009), linguoculturology should not study "specific examples of the interaction of individual cultural phenomena with one or another linguistic phenomenon but study the mechanisms of interaction and mutual influence of two fundamental phenomena - language and culture, which determine the phenomenon of man". The main task of linguoculturology is to identify and describe "general patterns of interdependence and interaction between the linguistic and cultural practices of man and society".

Core concepts of linguoculturology

The formation of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of linguoculturology is accompanied by a certain arbitrariness in the use of most terms, unclear boundaries of categories, and confusion of concepts that are similar in form or meaning. For example, the terms linguocultureme,

logoepisteme, linguocultural concept, national stereotype, etc. are often confused. This happens because different researchers use different approaches to defining the basic unit of linguoculturology and identifying the basic categories of this science. Most scientific research is aimed at identifying such an integral linguoculturologically significant unit, which simultaneously indicates both the originality of the language and the national peculiarity of a particular culture. Due to the divergent views of researchers on this problem, in scientific circulation today not one specific concept is used, but a whole series of terms denoting linguistically and culturally significant units.

Probably the most common and meaningful term in modern cognitive linguistic and cultural linguistics studies is 'concept'. However, the definition of this concept is ambiguous and changes both in the systems and regulations of different scientific schools and by individual scientists. A concept is a meaningful unit of collective consciousness that reflects an object in the real or ideal world and is stored in national memory in a verbally defined form. The concept constitutes the main cultural environment in a person's mental worldview, the main component of the culture of certain people. At the same time, it is also a global mental unit. Concepts are ideal; they are encoded in the mind by units of a universal subject code, which are based on individual sensory images formed based on a person's personal sensory experience. T.G. Sergeeva notes that "the concept is verbalized in words. In this case, we can call it a concept word" (Sergeeva, 2002). With its meaning in speech, it represents only part of the concept, hence the need for synonymy of the word, and the need for texts that collectively reveal its content.

Khrolenko notes that:

verbalization, the linguistic representation of a concept, occurs through lexemes, phrases, and statements. This process is the focus of cognitive linguistics, which examines the various aspects, layers, and components of a concept that enter the semantic space of language. It investigates how these elements categorize the concept and in which parts of the system of a specific language the concept is situated. (Khrolenko, 2009).

A linguocultural concept differs from other cognitive units in its "emphasis on the value element" (Karasik & Slyshkin, 2001), as the concept is always centered around value, a principle that underlies any culture. An "indicator of the presence of a value attitude" towards an object or phenomenon is the use of evaluative words to describe it. According to Karasik and Slyshkin (2001), "If the members of a culture can describe any phenomenon as good, bad, interesting, tiring, etc., then this phenomenon forms a concept within that culture." We consider the linguocultureme as a narrower concept compared to the linguocultural concept. The linguocultureme specifically denotes cultural realities, incorporating non-equivalent vocabulary, mythologems, phraseological units, and national symbols as linguocultureme (Equation 1).

$$Linguocultureme = linguistic\ sign + cultural\ meaning \quad (1)$$

Logoepisteme, as defined by Kostomarov and Burvikova (2001), is "the linguistic expression of a trace of the reflection of reality fixed by public memory in the minds of native speakers as a result of their comprehension (or creation) of the spiritual values of domestic and world cultures." Behind the concept of logoepisteme always lies a specific meaning and knowledge. T.G. Sergeeva elaborates on logoepisteme, stating that it refers to multi-level linguoculturally valuable units. These units, as described by Sergeeva (2002), can be expressed through words such as "Moscow," "Oblomovshchina," and phrases like "Hero of our time" or "A man in a case." Sergeeva continues by explaining that logoepistemes, through their material forms such as proverbs, sayings, phraseological units, catchwords, and precedent texts, express knowledge, thoughts, traditions, customs, signs, and ideas of an ethnic group, as well as the features of its national character.

The concept of logoepisteme differs from linguocultureme in its cognitive nature. While logoepisteme is akin to a concept, serving as a unit of collective consciousness and correlating with cognitive processes, it focuses specifically on the comprehension of spiritual values. Unlike a concept, logoepisteme does not possess a complex, branched structure and is verbalized unambiguously. Moving on to the concept of linguistic personality, Karaulov (2010) defines it as an individual who possesses a set of abilities and characteristics. These attributes determine the creation and perception of speech works that vary in the degree of structural linguistic complexity, depth, and accuracy in reflecting reality. Additionally, a linguistic personality exhibits a certain target orientation in their linguistic expressions.

"Language competence is a system governed by specific laws of language functioning, encompassing skills and abilities in utilizing these laws. The goal of mastering language competence is the successful execution of speech (both oral and written) and mental activities" (Zhdanova, 2015). In essence, linguistic competence refers to the knowledge of a language (its code) by communication participants, particularly the rules governing the creation of correct speech structures and messages, as well as their transformations.

Another significant concept in linguoculturology, drawn from cognitive science, is the concept of mentality. Mentality represents a worldview "expressed through the categories and forms of the native language, combining the intellectual, spiritual, and volitional qualities of the national character in its typical manifestations" (Maslova, 2001). It denotes a way of perceiving the world where thought is intimately intertwined with emotion. The unit of mentality lies in the concepts of a given culture. Representatives of the linguocultural community constantly identify and exhibit mentality, as it encompasses and organizes their cultural worldview. For instance, in the Russian mentality, similar to other European cultures, consanguineous marriages or polygamy are deemed unacceptable. In contrast, the Japanese mentality allows young children (under 5 years old) absolute freedom; for them, there are no prohibitions, taboos, or punishments for disobedience. Such contrasts in child-rearing practices highlight the distinct manifestations of different mentalities across various cultures.

Let's now analyze the concepts of stereotypes and symbols. A stereotype is a schematized and one-sided image of a phenomenon, person, thing, etc., based on a small (often one) number of evaluative traits that are considered typical (exemplary) for the entire class of phenomena, things, etc. Examples:

1. in Latin America, advertising for Marlboro cigarettes does not work, because a cowboy on a horse is considered a representative of the poorest segment of the population who can smoke the cheapest and therefore bad cigarettes.

2. a Spanish company agreed with Mexico to sell a large batch of champagne corks but had the temerity to paint them burgundy, which in Mexican culture is the color of mourning, and the business deal was disrupted.

Researchers also propose to use the concept of "ethnoeidema" - "a cross-cutting image of national pictures of the world and traditions of various ethnic communities, reflected in linguistic material" (Asadov, 2012). For example, the sad, lyrical, solemn mood of the majority of Russian folk thoughts (Fly through the dark meadows like a clear falconry, and in my yard sit and fall like a gray little darling, Hum pathetically, Share my melancholy ("Sister and Brother"). Mythologem is "a stable state of social consciousness, social psychology, in which the canons of describing the existing order of things and the very descriptions of what exists and has the right to exist are recorded" (Vepreva & Shadrina, 2006). Mythologem is an image generated by mythological thinking, the basis of a myth (witch, mermaid). At the same time, myth is understood as a unique form of knowledge of reality, a poetic idea of objects and phenomena of the linguistic picture of the world. Myth adds its vision, and its own interpretation of certain facts, and expands the boundaries of our knowledge. Myths do not need to be proven or disproved. For example, the myth about the black cat, which among Russians means misfortune and failure has the exact opposite meaning in English culture (a black cat is often drawn on "Good Luck!" postcards).

A symbol on the other hand is a sign in which the primary content acts as a form for secondary content (Equation 2).

$$Symbol = image + meaning \qquad (2)$$

Archetypes are described as:

certain mental patterns, the totality of which shapes the realm of human ideas and possesses a distinct power of suggestion for the human psyche. According to K.G. Jung, a prototype or archetype represents a psychic residue of countless experiences of the same type. (Davtyan, 2007).

These archetypes serve as universal human symbols that lie at the foundation of myths, folklore, and culture as a whole, passing from generation to generation. They represent the most ancient and universal mythologems. For instance, fire embodies the idea of life; it symbolizes renewal, freedom, and victory. The concept of fire aligns with the overarching philosophical notion of an optimistic perception of reality, as encoded in the Russian mentality. It is important to note that while every archetype is a symbol, not every symbol is an archetype. The key distinction between a mythologem and a symbol or archetype is that every mythologem is rooted in a myth. In essence, the foundation of any mythologem always traces back to a myth.

On the other hand, a ritual is described as a stereotypical model of speech behavior, involving the exchange of socially accepted messages and appropriate paralinguistic means in a given situation. Its function is to stabilize relationships, exercise social control, and transfer experience (Batsevich, 2004). For instance, in English, one form of greeting is "How do you do?" which translates to "How are you?" This makes it customary to inquire about the other person's well-being during a greeting. Moving on to the concept of a "picture of the world," a significant category in linguoculturology, it is defined as an organized body of knowledge about reality that forms in the public (as well as individual or group) consciousness. The distinction between cognitive (conceptual) and linguistic pictures of the world is pertinent. Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin explain that:

the linguistic picture of the world consists of people's conceptions of reality captured in linguistic units at a specific stage of the people's development. It represents an understanding of reality reflected in linguistic signs and their meanings, encompassing the linguistic categorization of the world, the linguistic arrangement of objects and phenomena, and the information embedded in the systemic meanings of words about the world. (Popova & Sternin, 2007).

A cognitive (conceptual) picture of the world is defined as "a mental representation of reality shaped by the cognitive awareness of an individual or a collective, resulting from both the direct empirical perception of reality through the senses and the conscious reflective contemplation of reality in the process of thought" (Popova & Sternin, 2007). In contrast, the linguistic picture of the world, developed throughout the evolution of any national language, precedes the conceptual (scientific) picture of the world in its current state. As a result, the conceptual picture is not symmetrical to the linguistic picture of the world; it elaborates on the initial ideas while simultaneously supporting the components of the ethnic-cultural worldview in its foundations. This relationship implies that changes in the conceptual picture of the world can lead to alterations in the linguistic picture of the world. Consequently, the two theories of the world adapt to each other. Therefore, the fundamental concepts and categories of linguoculturology are constructed upon the comprehension of the ethnosociocultural characteristics of linguistic consciousness. Then, at the core of linguoculturology lies the pivotal concept of the linguocultural concept.

CONCLUSIONS

Linguoculturology stands as a relatively recent field of knowledge, residing at the intersection of various humanitarian disciplines including cultural studies, linguistics, psycholinguistics, and regional linguistics. The contemporary relevance of linguocultural studies is underscored by the all-encompassing processes of global globalization permeating every facet of human existence. Since the 19th century, scholars have begun to view language not merely as a tool for communication and understanding the surrounding world, but also as a distinct cultural code of a nation. This perspective on language acquisition initially emerged in the works of W. von Humboldt and A.A. Potebnya. According to the theory proposed by the German philologist, the boundaries of an individual's and a nation's worldview are delineated by language. A.A. Potebnya, in his works, specifically emphasizes the intertwining of language with a people's history and the cultural-linguistic aspects of national life. The majority of linguistic

and cultural investigations occur within the anthropocentric paradigm, whose core principle revolves around studying "the subject of cognition instead of the object, that is, the study of man in language and language in man".

Linguoculturology delves into language as a cultural phenomenon, viewing it as the "way" by which an individual enters into a specific culture. At the heart of linguoculturology's research lies the examination of specific linguistic units that encapsulate a cultural component of meaning. In this context, units such as linguocultural concepts, linguoculturemes, symbols, stereotypes, mythologems, and phraseological units, among others, are considered. These units exhibit national and cultural specificity, thereby offering a comprehensive and insightful understanding of the linguistic worldview of an ethnic group, ethnic mentality, and the national character of a culture.

REFERENCES

Asadov, Z. V. (2012). Ethnoeidemes as a way to overcome the location of ancient texts (based on the material of written monuments of the old Russian language). Current Problems in the Humanities and Natural Sciences, 10(45), 196–200.

Batsevich, F. S. (2004). Fundamentals of communicative linguistics. Academy Publishing House.

Bogdanovich, G. Y. (2004). About some terms of modern linguoculturology. Culture of the Peoples of the Black Sea Region. Simferopol: Interuniversity Center "Crimea"., 53, 65–69.

Davtyan, A. A. (2007). Updating archetypal content in personalized advertising images. Journal of "VSU Bulletin" Series: Philology, 14(2), 178–182.

Golubenko, E. A. (2019). Field organization of concerts "war" and "peace" in the modern linguistic world view. RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics, 10(1), 197-212. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-1-197-212

Gontier, N. (2018). What are the Units of Language Evolution? Topoi, 37(2), 235–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-017-9474-8

Karasik, V. I. (2001). On the categories of linguoculturology. Linguistic personality and the problems of communicative activity. Rossiya Publishing House.

Karasik, V. I., & Slyshkin, G. G. (2001). Linguistic and cultural concepts as a unit of research. In I. A. Sternina (Ed.), Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics (pp. 75–80). Voronezh: VSU.

Karaulov, Y. N. (2010). Russian language and linguistic personality. LKI Publishing House.

Khrolenko, A. T. (2009). Fundamentals of linguoculturology. Flinta Publishing House.

Kiklewicz, A. K. (2020). Cultural linguistics - ethnolinguistics - linguoculturology: Polish and Russian research experience. *Filologicheskie Nauki-Nauchnye Doklady Vysshei Shkoly-Philological Sciences-Scientific Essays of Higher Education, 2*, 3–10. https://doi.org/10.20339/PhS.2-20.003

Kostomarov, V. G., & Burvikova, N. D. (2001). Old wineskins and new wine. From observations of Russian word usage at the end of the twentieth century. Zlatoust Publishing House.

Ganyushina, M. A., Kuznetsova, L. V., Kryukova, L. S., Shashkarova, M. V., & Filonova, A. S. (2020). Linguocultural Features of Intercultural Communication. Revista Inclusiones, 7, 293–302. https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44644423

Krasnykh, V. V. (2002). Ethnopsycholinguistics and linguoculturology. Gnosis.

Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguoculturology*. Academy Publishing House.

Mizin, K., & Korostenski, J. (2019). "Western" Cultural Linguistics and "Post-Soviet" Linguoculturology: Causes of Parallel Development. *Linguistic Studies*, 7–13. https://doi.org/10.31558/1815-3070.2019.37.1

Narmurodova, G. (2020). Linguoculturology As New Branch of Linguistics. *International Journal of Research*, *7*(4), 520-525. https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/article/view/19859

Olshanskii, I. G. (2000). *Linguistic and cultural studies at the end of the twentieth century: Results, trends, prospects*. Nauka Publishing House.

Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Cognitive linguistics*. East-West Publishing House.

Roberts, B. (1992). The Evolution of the Young Child's Concept of "Word" as a Unit of Spoken and Written Language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *27*(2), 125–138. https://doi.org/10.2307/747682

Sergeeva, T. G. (2002). On the issue of determining the basic units in linguoculturology. *Bulletin of the International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature*, *38*.

Vepreva, I. T., & Shadrina, T. A. (2006). Ideologeme and mythologem: Interpretation of terms Ekaterinburg. *Scientific Works of Professors of the Ural Institute of Economics, Management, and Law*, *3*, 120–131.

Vyshedskiy, A. (2022). Language evolution is not limited to speech acquisition: A large study of language development in children with language deficits highlights the importance of the voluntary imagination component of language. *Research Ideas and Outcomes*, *8*, e86401. https://doi.org/10.3897/rio.8.e86401

Zhdanova, E. Y. (2015). Language competence as the basis for independent research work of students. *TSU Science Vector*, *2*(32), 161–165.