

PECULIAR FEATURES OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC UNITS AND THEIR  
CLASSIFICATION

Ramazonova Z.Y

Ramazonova Zebuniso Yashinovna

*senior teacher*

**Abstract:** *this article analyses linguoculturemes as cultural units, defines its types. It emphasizes the analysis of lexico-semantic units and linguoculturemes, compares their similar and differentiating features.*

**Keywords:** *linguocultureme, linguoculturology, culture-specific units, lexico-semantic units*

One of the basic notions of linguoculturology is a linguocultureme. This term was introduced by V.V. Vorobyov. This is a complex inter-level unit, which is a dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic content. V.V.Vorobyov defines a linguocultureme as a combination of the form of a linguistic sign, its content and the cultural meaning that accompanies this sign. He attaches great importance to the understanding of a linguocultureme to the deep meaning that is potentially present in the meaning as an element of its content. This term seems to us very vague, because it does not reveal the mechanisms of where and how cultural information is attached in a linguistic sign, how it “works” in a language, but only indicates the fact of its presence in a linguistic sign, which has been known since the time of V. Humboldt (Vorobyov, 2008).

According to W. Durham and P. Weingart’s point of view, a cultural unit must have at least three properties. First, it “should exist at the level of concept,” i.e., affect behavior and artifacts through processes that are cultural counterparts of “epigenetic processes” that link genes and phenotypic effects. Secondly, “a true unit of culture must have a tradition of dissemination in society”, since, according to most definitions, culture is socially transmitted information. Thirdly, the unit of culture must be an integral element of a larger conceptual system, which in fact is "culture" itself. In other words, it must maintain integrity and exist independently, and also function as an integrated part of some system. To this they add the following properties of the ability for self-reproduction highlighted by Dawkins: 1) the ability for successful reproduction; 2) viability, i.e. the ability to survive through self-reproduction; 3) the adequacy of reproduction or the ability to accurately reproduce (Alefrenko, 2010).

In contrast to the word and lexico-semantic variant (LSV) as linguistic units proper, linguocultureme includes segments not only of language that have linguistic meaning, but also of culture that contain extra-linguistic cultural meaning, represented by the corresponding sign. Being a complex inter-level unit, linguocultureme is more "deep" in its essence than the word. The word correlates with the referent (denotation), "refers" to it while linguocultureme reveals its content as a concept (class of objects):

word (LSV): sign - meaning

linguocultureme: sign - meaning - concept/subject.



Hence, the linguoculturemes:

1) have connotative meanings and become signs, 2) may have several connotative signifiers, 3) may either be actualized or not actualized in the minds of perceivers, 4) actively "live" as long as the ideological context that gave rise to them actively "lives." 5) outstanding personalities as a model of the national personality; 6) the thoughts and judgments of foreigners about the nation and culture as a comparative background that sets off the specifics of everything related to the nation.

Linguoculturemes really exist as units of the field, and their hierarchical relationships outline its structure as an interaction of elements at the paradigmatic and syntagmatic levels. Unlike the word, linguocultureme includes not only language (which acquires linguistic significance), but also culture (non-linguistic cultural meanings) segments. There are different types of linguocultureme according to the way of expression in the language. It can be a single word, a phrase, a paragraph, or even a whole text.

The structure of linguocultureme is more complex than other language units: it shows both linguistic impression and non-linguistic environment (situation, reality). Thus, in a person who knows the language well, any word is accompanied by a cultural aura, without which it is difficult and in some cases impossible to interpret the text correctly. The process of culturalization of language units leads to the creation of a complex of networks of cultural associations within one or another nation. (Vorobyov V.V, 2008).

U.Q.Yusupov recommends interpreting linguocultureme as follows: “Linguocultureme is a language or speech unit that reflects a part of culture in its semantics. They can be a word (root, artificial, compound and complex words), word combinations, phrases, sentence, paremia, complex syntactic whole, text, etc” (Yusupov, 2010).

V.A. Maslova divides linguoculturemes into 9 different types: 1) non-equivalent lexicon of the language - realias (includes national costumes, food, ceremonies and holidays, traditions, names of some culture-relevant items) and lacunae; 2) mythologemes - archetypes, legendary characters, images, ceremonies and customs, rituals; 3) paremiological foundation of the language (includes proverbs and sayings); 4) phraseological fund of the language; 5) standards, stereotypes, symbols; 6) metaphors and images (symbols); 7) stylistic layers of different languages (literary/non-literary forms, etc.); 8) speech ethics and character; 9) speech etiquette (Maslova, 2001).

Thus, as a result of the analysis of the theoretical literature, we can come to the conclusion: a) linguoculturology is a new direction in linguistics that studies the relationship between language and culture; b) the main linguistic unit of linguoculturology is linguocultureme, which is manifested through various linguistic units.



REFERENCES:

1. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Лингвокультурология. // М.: Флинта, Наука, 2010.
2. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология. // М.: "Издательство Российского университета дружбы народов", 2006.
3. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. // М.: Издательский центр Академия, 2001. 208 с.

