



Labeling of Information in Communicative Discourse According to Culture

Aziza Islomovna Kamalova

Samarkand state institute of foreign languages Teacher of the department of English philology

Abstract: this article deals with the culturological labeling of information in communicative discourse as well as given several notions about discourse and culture. In addition, author provides issues about interrelation of discourse and culture, cultural space, cognitive space cited by prominent scholars.

Keywords: morphosyntactic phenomena, discourse, linguoculturology, intercultural, cognitive, cultural space, cognitive space, cognitive base, culture-bearing, logoevisteme.

Discursive phenomena are studied in linguistics in two main aspects. Firstly, discourse can be studied as such, including as a structural object. Secondly, linguists are interested in discourse not by itself, but as a central factor influencing morphosyntactic phenomena (for example, the order of words in a sentence can be explained on the basis of discursive factors that lie outside of this sentence). It is generally believed that the concept of discourse was introduced by the founder of transformational and distributional analysis by Z. Harris in 1952. Today, the category of discourse, one of the main ones in communicative linguistics and modern social sciences, like any widely used concept, allows for various scientific interpretations and therefore requires clarification, especially in relation to the related terms text, speech and dialogue

Communication from a linguistic point of view is understood as the exchange of thoughts, ideas, and information through language [1]. Communication involves the interaction of people, and therefore has a two-way character. The two-way nature of communication, which determines the equal importance of both products and perception mediating the process of speech perception [2], makes it natural to conclude that the use of language as a single code implies that communicants have a common fund of knowledge that provides understanding. Understanding of the fact that representatives of one linguistic and cultural community are connected by a single communicative space [3], their consciousness is characterized by the presence of a “basic stereotypical core of knowledge, repeated in the process of socialization of an individual in a given society and rather stereotypical (at the level of ethnic culture, not personality), [4], or a nationally determined system of symbols, associations, and information [5] has long been reflected in studies on linguoculturology and intercultural communication (see also [6]). At the same time, the specific form of existence and organization of this “invariant part in the structure of the linguistic personality” is of interest at the moment [6]. For this purpose, the terms “cultural space”, “cognitive space” and “cognitive base” are introduced into research on intercultural communication [7]. Cultural space is proposed to be understood as “the form of the existence of culture in human consciousness” [8]. In this space, the center and the periphery stand out. The center of the national cultural space is formed by phenomena that are the property of almost all members of the national cultural community [8]. “The cultural space includes all existing and potentially possible ideas about cultural phenomena among members of a certain national-cultural community. At the same time, each person has a special, structured set of knowledge and ideas in a certain way. We call such a set an individual cognitive space. At the same time, there is a certain set of knowledge and ideas that all representatives of a particular society (professional, confessional, generational, etc.) possess, which we define as a collective, cognitive space. In a certain way, the structured set of knowledge and ideas possessed by all representatives of a particular linguistic and cultural community is defined by us as a

cognitive base” [8]. In contrast to the cultural space, the cognitive base, in the view of D.B. Gudkov, is formed with the help of invariants of ideas about certain phenomena. And these invariants are stored in the cognitive base in a minimized, reduced form [8]. From the point of view of D.B. Gudkov, “it is the possession of knowledge and ideas that are part of the cognitive base and have a transpersonal invariant character that allows an individual to navigate in the space of the corresponding culture and act according to its laws” [7]. Sharing the essence of these views on the definition and differentiation of these phenomena, I would like to make some terminological changes. We are talking about the term “cognitive”, the use of which, it seems, involuntarily brings associations with cognitive activity and the cognitive level of language. The use of the term “cognitive base” in such a broad sense is certainly possible. However, in this case, the line between cognitive activity as such, activity aimed at cognition of the surrounding reality and the specifics of the cognitive level of the organization of representations, formed in the form of the cognitive level of a linguistic personality, is lost and eventually disappears. The term “cognitive”, in our view, primarily covers phenomena related to categorization, conceptualization, and classification of objects, that is, processes mediating cognitive activity and constituting the essence of the cognitive level of a linguistic personality. Due to the fact that the term “cognitive” belongs to a completely different field of linguistic knowledge, we consider it inappropriate to use it to describe linguistic phenomena related to cognition in a broad sense. It seems rational to assign a cognitive base in the understanding of D.B. Gudkova name “unified information base”. At the same time, the statement of A.A. Leontiev becomes a reference, who interprets the communicative community as “a similar information level of interlocutors, similar communication experience in the past, reliance on well-known information” [3]. The unified information base is characterized as a transpersonal, informational structure that allows an individual to function in accordance with the laws of a given linguistic and cultural community. Synonymously with a single information base, it is proposed to use the term “knowledge fund”.

The next step should be to determine the structure of a single information base. In this regard, it is rational to use the structure of the general knowledge base of native speakers generally recognized in cognitive linguistics. The latter includes: “1) language knowledge; a) knowledge of the language; b) knowledge of the principles of speech communication; 2) non-linguistic knowledge: a) about the context and situation, knowledge about the addressee (including knowledge of the goals and plans presented by the addressees, his ideas about the speaker and the environment, etc.); general phonetic knowledge (that is, knowledge about the world)” [9]. The linguo culturological perspective of this study requires to single out from the general knowledge base those that are marked by a culturological component and are related to the level of culture. In this sense, it seems that a single information base, or a common knowledge fund, includes: (1) knowledge of the language in a pragmatic aspect; knowledge of the principles of speech communication; (2) knowledge of the surrounding world, including knowledge of the totality of situations of speech communication.

The task of competent and successful communication, as well as the need to localize the cultural component, requires more detailed coverage of both groups that make up the common knowledge fund, or a single information base.

The first group, assuming knowledge of the language and knowledge of the principles of speech communication, by virtue of operating with the term “language”, it seems possible to call linguistic. The second group, the group of knowledge of the “cultural fund” in the terminology of Y.E. Prokhorov [4], which assumes the need for knowledge about the surrounding world, that is, what is beyond the boundaries of the language itself, can be assigned the name of extralinguistic knowledge.

The linguistic knowledge necessary to construct a message and carry out communication, in addition to specific language forms, includes “(1) verbal reactions in specific cultural spheres and conditions; (2) general tendencies (constants) of linguistic behavior that manifest themselves independently of the cultural sphere and reflect both general patterns of utterance construction in a given language and the rules of speech production peculiar to a given society” [10]. The verbal aspect of linguistic knowledge is manifested in the practical level of proficiency in the norms of oral and written language, the skills of their situational variation, the skillful use of expressive means of language. Practical mastery of

normative speech, which is one of the aspects of the culture of speech [11], involves meeting the requirements for the pronunciation, lexico-grammatical and structural components of the utterance. The pronunciation, lexico-grammatical and structural components of the utterance represent the verbal aspect of linguistic knowledge. The verbal aspect of linguistic knowledge correlates and is conditioned by the nonverbal aspect. In this case, we are talking about the constants of linguistic behavior and the principles of speech production. Both the first and the second form a single whole and leave the system of discourse, that is, the system of communication adopted in this linguistic and cultural community. A discourse system is a general concept, a kind of discourse construct, which is implemented in practice in the form of discourse models. Thus, the discourse model is interpreted as a concrete manifestation of a certain system, adjusted for the method of construction. The method of construction determines the form of discourse and depends on the concepts of personality and interpersonal relations accepted in society. In addition, the model of discourse is colored by additional specifics as a result of the choice of the type of discourse, that is, the kind of discourse depending on the socio-cultural parameters of the communicants. And finally, the model of discourse is influenced by the modus factor caused by the official or unofficial style of communication.

The main conclusion of this section of the work can be presented in the form of confirmation of the hypothesis put forward by us about the linguistic and cultural analysis of models of communicative discourse (stereotypes, etiquette formulas, etc.). Discourse as a “culture-bearing” fact is based on the interaction of language as a translator of cultural information and the person who creates this culture using language. A native speaker or a linguistic personality, has information about the goals of communication in this situation, communicative etiquette, owns a certain set of cliched phrases and models of discursive behavior in a situation of cultural contact. The culturological marking of the nationally determined discourse and its constituent aspects and components is determined by the cultural requirements imposed on communication in a particular language. These requirements are manifested in the system of discourse through the choice of forms and prioritization of a particular model of discourse. The system of discourse presupposes the existence of a certain construct of discourse, implemented in practice in the form of a particular model. The form of discourse actualizes the way it is constructed. The system of discourse creates the basis for the linguistic and cultural unity of communicants. The basis for this unity is a communicative community, represented as a similar information level of interlocutors (in this paper it is considered as the presence of a single information base), similar communication experience in the past, reliance on well-known information. The nature of this communicative community has the character of precedent. Precedent is understood as the presence of a quantum of culturally marked background knowledge in the linguistic experience of members of the linguistic and cultural community due to their reproducibility. In this capacity, the logoepesteme acts in the discourse. It is used for the linguistic designation of precedent phenomena that occupy a very specific place in the cultural life of society. Precedent phenomena cover precedent texts, precedent pseudo-texts, precedent statements, precedent names, precedent facts, precedent “buzzwords”, precedent situations, precedent genres.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Колшанский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка. - М.: Наука, 1984.-175 с.
2. Красных В.В. Основы психолингвистики и теории коммуникации. - М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2001. - 270 с. 169
3. Леонтьев А.А. Психология общения. - М. Смысл, 1997. - 365 с.(267-270)
4. Прохоров Ю.Е. Национальные социокультурные стереотипы речевого общения и их роль в обучении русскому языку иностранцев. - М.: Изд-во ИКАР, 1997.-228 с.
5. Hirsh 1987 Hirsh E.D. Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. -Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987. - 251 p.
6. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. - М.: Наука, 1987.- 262 с (116)

7. Гудков Д.Б. Межкультурная коммуникация. Лекционный курс для студентов РКИ. - М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2000. - 120 с.
8. Красных В.В. Виртуальная реальность или реальная виртуальность? (Человек. Сознание. Коммуникация). - М.: Диалог-МГУ, 1998. - 352 с.
9. Гак В.Г. Языковые преобразования. - М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1998. - 768 с.
10. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. - М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2002. - 284 с.
11. Львов М.Р. Риторика. Культура речи. - М.: Издат. центр «Академия», 2002.-272 с.