

ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК-ГУМАНИТАРЛЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМДАР ЖӘНЕ ӨНЕП
SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES AND ART
СОЦИАЛЬНО-ГУМАНИТАРНЫЕ НАУКИ И ИСКУССТВО

IRSTI 16.21.07

J. Rau¹

¹Academy of the Leading personnel of Bundeswehr
(Berlin, Germany)

U.U. Aimbetova²

²Kazakh national academy of choreography
(Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan)

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE CONTEXT OF
LINGUACULTURAL STUDY: THE CONCEPT OF CULTURE
AND LINGUISTIC WORLD PICTURE

Annotation

The study of key issues related to the processes of the interaction of language and culture is one of the fundamental problems of language theory, as well as the theory and practice of intercultural communication.

The language in the communication process not only performs the function of encoding the transmitted information, but also plays a special role in the processes of obtaining new knowledge about the world, processing this knowledge, storing and transmitting it, which makes language the most important tool not only for learning another culture, but also for interpreting it and adaptation.

The processes of generation and understanding of a statement suggest a certain creative processing of certain areas of personal experience in order to create new meanings in the process of speech generation and recreate them in the process of understanding. The problem of organizing personal experience of an individual and the collective experience of native speakers is, therefore, one of the most important areas of linguistic science.

In this regard, the relevance of this study is determined by the fact that in the context of growing globalization and the expansion of the boundaries of the dialogue of cultures, the linguistic foundations of intercultural communication, including the linguistic picture of the world, as well as mechanisms and methods of organizing discourse, become a determining factor in the study of communicative activity, since they allow taking into account both human factor and semantic content of communication activity.

Key words: intercultural, communication, context, linguacultural, study, concept, culture, linguistic, world, picture.

Й. Рау¹

¹Бундесвер кадрлар басқару академиясы
(Берлин, Германия)

Ұ.Ө. Аймбетова²

²Қазақ ұлттық хореография академиясы
(Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан)

ЛИНГВОМӘДЕНИЕТТАНУ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕГІ МӘДЕНИЕТАРАЛЫҚ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ: МӘДЕНИЕТ ТҰЖЫРЫМДАМАСЫ ЖӘНЕ ӘЛЕМНІҢ ТІЛДІК БЕЙНЕСІ

Аннотация

Тіл мен мәдениеттің өзара әрекеттесу процесстерімен байланысты негізгі мәселелерді зерттеу тіл теориясының, сондай-ақ мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас теориясы мен практикасының негізгі мәселелерінің бірі болып табылады.

Қарым-қатынас процесінде тіл берілетін ақпаратты кодтау функциясын орындап қана қоймай, әлем туралы жаңа білім алу, осы білімді өңдеу, сақтау және беру процесстерінде ерекше рөл атқарады, бұл тілді басқа мәдениетті зерттеу үшін ғана емес, сонымен бірге оны түсіндіру мен бейімдеу үшін де маңызды құрал етеді.

Мәлімдемені қалыптастыру және түсіну процесстері сөйлеуді қалыптастыру процесінде жаңа мағыналар құру және оларды түсіну процесінде қайта құру мақсатында жеке тәжірибенің белгілі бір салаларын белгілі бір шығармашылық өңдеуді қамтиды. Жеке тұлғаның жеке тәжірибесін және ана тілінде сөйлеушілердің ұжымдық тәжірибесін ұйымдастыру мәселесі, осылайша, лингвистикалық ғылымның маңызды бағыттарының бірі болып табылады.

Осыған байланысты, бұл зерттеудің өсіп келе жатқан жаһандану және мәдениеттер диалогының шекараларының кеңеюі жағдайында өзекті мәселе болып табылады.

Мәдениетаралық коммуникацияның лингвистикалық негіздері, оның ішінде әлемнің тілдік көрінісі, сондай-ақ дискурсты ұйымдастырудың жолдары мен әдістері коммуникативті қызметті зерттеудің шеңберіне айналатындығымен анықталады, өйткені олар адами факторды да, коммуникативті іс-әрекеттің семантикалық мазмұнын да ескеруге мүмкіндік береді.

Түйінді сөздер: *мәдениетаралық коммуникация, контекст, лингвомәдениеттану, зерттеу, тұжырымдама, мәдениет, тіл білімі, әлем, әлем бейнесі.*

Й. Рау¹

¹Академия руководящего состава Бундесвера
(Берлин, Германия)

У.У. Аймбетова²

²Казахская национальная академия хореографии
(Нур-Султан, Казахстан)

МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНАЯ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ В КОНТЕКСТЕ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ: КОНЦЕПЦИЯ КУЛЬТУРЫ И ЯЗЫКОВАЯ КАРТИНА МИРА

Аннотация

Изучение ключевых вопросов, связанных с процессами взаимодействия языка и культуры, является одной из фундаментальных проблем теории языка, а также теории и практики межкультурного общения.

Язык в процессе общения не только выполняет функцию кодирования передаваемой информации, но также играет особую роль в процессах получения новых знаний о мире, обработки этих знаний, их хранения и передачи, что делает язык важнейшим инструментом не только для изучения другой культуры, но и для ее интерпретации и адаптации.

Процессы генерации и понимания высказывания предполагают определенную

творческую обработку определенных областей личного опыта с целью создания новых значений в процессе генерации речи и воссоздания их в процессе понимания. Поэтому проблема организации личного опыта индивида и коллективного опыта носителей языка является одной из важнейших областей лингвистической науки.

В связи с этим актуальность данного исследования определяется тем, что в условиях нарастающей глобализации и расширения границ диалога культур языковые основы межкультурной коммуникации, в том числе языковой картины мира, также как механизмы и методы организации дискурса, становятся определяющим фактором при изучении коммуникативной деятельности, поскольку позволяют учитывать как человеческий фактор, так и смысловое содержание коммуникативной деятельности.

***Ключевые слова:** межкультурное, коммуникация, контекст, лингвокультурология, исследование, концепт, культура, лингвистика, мир, картина.*

Introduction. The subject of this study is the fact of the mutual influence of culture and language, which in one way or another reflected in the system and functioning of the language. Such an approach to highlighting the problem of the relationship between language and culture is a logical continuation of the entire previous evolution of views on this issue.

The first stage in the development of these views is connected with the idea of V. von Humboldt about language as to be the spirit of the people. The clearly stated W. von Humboldt understanding of language as a direct reflection of culture was further developed and brought to its extreme expression by American scientists [1; 2].

It should be borne in mind that in a communicative situation, the role of language depends on the work of universal cognitive mechanisms, cultural-specific knowledge, ways of organizing information and is manifested in three possible options

- 1) For one of the interlocutors, the language of communication can be native, and for the other (others) to be foreign;
- 2) Interlocutors choose an intermediate language, but for all participants in the communication it is foreign (for example, English);
- 3) Interlocutors communicate through an interpreter; whose task is to ensure effective communication.

The action of linguistic mechanisms is common to all variants of the situation, since each of the participants, including the translator, relies primarily on its culturally specific linguistic picture of the world [3; 4].

A broad interpretation of the linguistic foundations of the communication process was characteristic of scientists who saw in linguistics not only the science of the language system, but also the sphere of research that considers language as a psychological, socio-cultural and semiotic phenomenon.

Thus, the second stage was marked by the birth of the theory of linguistic relativity, the essence of which lies in the fact that every nation, limited in its own native language, is also limited in its vision of the world [5].

The third step in the development of the idea of cultural-linguistic interaction is presented in works mutually exclusive of each other's points

of view. Relativistic theory has been confirmed in the hypothesis of a linguistic picture of the world.

On the other hand, a point of view was expressed that rejected the direct relationship between language and culture, and the idea of the universality of language gained a new strength. In works of this kind, the national-linguistic specificity was reflected in isolated facts, which in no way represented an integral and unified system.

The fourth period is marked by the rejection by linguists of the extremes of the above approaches and the desire to reveal the subtle interconnections of language and culture.

An understanding has come of such an interdependence of language and culture that cannot be unambiguously described in the framework of hitherto practiced approaches. The maximalist points of view gave way to more balanced, compromise decisions, indicating a rejection of the unambiguous interpretation of the relationship between language and culture, since language is both an instrument of cultural expression and education that itself influences culture.

This understanding of the complexity of linguistic and cultural ties led to the emergence of a new direction of linguistic research, concentrating around the triad language, national identity, culture, since “the relationship of language and culture can be adequately understood only in the context of a broader problem, which could conditionally be designated as “man and culture” [6].

In this case, we are talking about a linguoculturological approach to the study of linguistic units. The content of linguoculturological research includes the study of the linguistic expression of the lifestyle and traditions of the people. The mentality of the people as “the psychological determinant of the behavior of millions of people, as a kind of invariant of socio-cultural changes” [7] also falls into the sphere of interests of linguistic and cultural studies, as it manifests itself in the language.

Linguistic and cultural studies include purely linguistic works that enter the “extra-linguistic spheres” and are engaged in the search for cognitive, cultural and social explanations [8] to the facts of language.

This study adjoins precisely the last of the aforementioned series of works, in which the analysis of the linguistic component of the linguocultural complex is paramount.

Thus, the relevance of this study is due to the appeal to linguistic and cultural topics, the front of research of which is wide and multifaceted. Considering or starting from classical theories of the relationship and interaction of language and culture [9; 1] modern linguistic and cultural experts [10; 11; 7; 12; 3] develop, rethink, clarify the concept of language as an element of the linguistic-cultural complex and the role of language in it.

Due to the fact that the orientation of linguistic and cultural studies is so different, the objectives of this study, along with others, include the definition and identification of approaches to linguistic and cultural research. Indeed, the term “culturology” is now so widely used that it often covers various areas of research.

Accordingly, linguacultural science can be attributed to the so-called dissipative, fuzzy terms. In relation to linguistics, cultural research is often understood as belonging to ethnopsychology. In this study, linguistic specificity is paramount: orientation is made to the language as a system and product of speech activity. As shown above, linguists turned to the idea of the national specificity of the linguistic picture of the world at different stages of development linguistics.

Therefore, every time a linguoculturological study was based on various methodological premises and involved various analysis procedures. All this contributed to the development of conclusions of a diverse and multilateral nature. A real return to the idea of V. von Humboldt about language as the spirit of the people took place against the backdrop of the achievements of a communicative-functional approach, pragmatolinguistics, cognitive science, studies of the subjective factor in language, and semantic research. Such a wide front of linguistic research makes it possible to draw large-scale conclusions of linguocultural properties. On the other hand, such a versatile development of the problems of linguoculturology associated with the “semi-paradigmatic state” [13] of modern linguistics leads to an abundance of terms, their competitiveness, and different interpretations.

Accordingly, the fundamental problem that needs to be solved when embarking on linguoculturological research is the procedure for identifying facts of linguoculturological adhesions, that is, the results of the interaction of culture and language that are obvious and recorded in linguistic units.

Three promising approaches to solving the problem are seen. Perhaps a tiered study of the language system in order to identify linguacultural relationships. However, another approach is possible. Based on the distinction between the three functions of the language and, accordingly, the three formal apparatuses of the language, we believe that linguoculturological research can be carried out within the framework of three language paradigms in accordance with their belonging to the three formal apparatuses of the language: semantics, syntactics, pragmatics [14].

In addition, linguistic and cultural research can be based on the idea of the organizational structure of a linguistic personality. It is the approach from the point of view of the structure of the linguistic personality that is compositionally constitutive for this work, because it considers all the latest achievements in the field of linguistics and linguacultural studies.

National-cultural specificity as an integral feature of linguistic consciousness is becoming the subject of research in the framework of a

number of linguistic areas: linguoculturology, linguistic studies, cognitive science, sociological studies.

Moreover, each of the indicated areas has its own specific field of study of this problem, its own terminological and methodological apparatus. So, sociolinguistics aims at identifying the correspondence between language and factors of the social order.

Linguoculturology as a philological discipline that studies a pre-selected set of spiritual values and the experience of the linguistic personality of a given national-cultural community, directly focuses on the manifestations of the interaction of language and culture. Each of the above disciplines has the goal of determining both universal phenomena and the national specificity of each particular language.

At the same time, undoubtedly, the problems of the relationship between language and culture prevail in the framework of linguoculturology. It is in this vein that the present study has been completed. The identification of the cultural specificity of linguistic units determines the appeal to a linguistic personality, not only located at the intersection of the worlds of language, culture and thinking, but also being a projection of all these areas and “a certain knot in a conflict space, always inconclusive stabilization in a game of various forces” [15].

A language-specific interaction of language, culture and thinking is manifested as cultural marking. Cultural marking of linguistic units is characteristic of ethnocultural or national specificity.

The description of the abovementioned specificity can be carried out within the organizational structure of a linguistic personality. The identification of ethnocultural specificity in the structure of a linguistic personality serves to form a “cultural mentality” [16].

“Cultural mentality “develops as a result of the action of a special informational component of the linguistic unit of the cultural component. The action of the cultural component is traced at three levels in the structure of the linguistic personality: lexico-grammatical, cognitive and pragmatic-extralinguistic.

The cultural component relates to the semantics, syntactics and pragmatics of the linguistic sign. In connection with a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic and cultural strata, it is necessary to clearly verify the procedure of linguoculturological research that affects all sections of the linguistic system. This will necessarily entail a variation in research methods. It seems that significant conclusions can be obtained by combining and mutually correcting various approaches and analysis schemes. An attempt of such a multilateral study was undertaken in this work.

Moreover, many of them relied on data from a number of related sciences. Thus, R. Jakobson believed that the study of communication should be

carried out in the framework of such intersecting areas as sociolinguistics, social anthropology together with economics, ethnolinguistics, semiotics.

A similar point of view was shared by G.V. Kolshansky, who considered communication as a manifestation of the existence of individual social consciousness in language [17].

Even earlier, the complex psychological, social and cultural aspects of the processes of generation and understanding of statements were written by Humboldt, A. Potebnya.

Such an expansion of the boundaries of linguistic research is connected with the very nature of communicative activity, which, as V.A. Zvegintsev pointed out, does not “boil down to an exchange values inherent in linguistic signs”, combined in linear sequences [18].

And even text as a product of the language system cannot be considered unambiguously only on the basis of the correct choice of lexical units and grammatical structures, and in the case of oral communication and correct pronunciation schemes

In the modern theory of the picture of the world, the problem of organizing the personal experience of an individual and the collective experience of native speakers is considered as the interaction of individual pictures of the world of communicants in the communication process, which allows us to include the human factor in the attention of researchers. Many researchers believe that the picture of the world is a combination of concepts, ideas, ideas, images, associations, and in general any ideational formations that make up in the individual or collective consciousness a certain integral deal of the real world “The picture of the world” seems to be a better term, than “personal experience”, as it opens up opportunities for identifying ways and forms of organizing our knowledge and ideas, as well as for determining.

The main goal of the study is to identify and describe linguistic-cognitive mechanisms that influence the success or failure of intercultural communication in order to offer an effective model of the process of intercultural communication considering the obtained data. To achieve the goal of the study, the following research questions were set

What are the main system characteristics of the process of intercultural communication as a special type of activity, in culturally determined content?

What are cultural aspects, the study of which can help in identifying culturally determined factors in the context of intercultural communication?

Methods. The theoretical and methodological base of the study was composed by the works of leading domestic and foreign scientists on the problems of cognitive linguistics and intercultural communication.

The following research methods were used in the study: transformational analysis of vocabulary definition, component analysis of word semantics,

application of semantic metalanguage mechanisms, conceptual analysis, text-based discourse analysis, discursive-historical analysis.

Discussion. During the analyses it was obvious that the following aspects such as intercultural communication is an extremely complex phenomenon, an objective study of which involves a comprehensive consideration of the sociocultural characteristics of the conditions and participants of communication, cognitive mechanisms and communicative-behavioral strategies used in the communication process, as well as verbal and non-verbal means of achieving communication goals.

The field nature of the organization of the linguistic picture of the world and, accordingly, of the individual thesaurus of each participant in intercultural communication, as well as the presence of universal cognitive structures in the cultural-conceptual picture of the world, create the necessary grounds for comparing specific cultural and linguistic experience.

The cultural, conceptual and linguistic worldviews that form a single whole in the minds of a carrier of language and culture interact in the process of intercultural communication based on the functioning of a number of cognitive and semantic mechanisms.

In the process of intercultural communication, there are both universal cognitive mechanisms of understanding and generating discourse, as well as culturally determined factors, which include cultural-specific models of categorization of objects and phenomena of reality, reflected in language classifications, differences in background knowledge and cultural presuppositions, cultural-specific perception of the context situations and cultural-specific features of the construction of different types of discourse.

In the process of intercultural communication, background knowledge and value orientations affect the organization and understanding of discourse through cultural presuppositions, formed on the basis of the cultural and conceptual picture of the communicant's world, a culturally appropriate scenario of speech behavior, as well as attitudes to communicative behavior, which form the basis of the system expectations.

Analysis of the communicative situation, timely correction of communicative and discursive strategies in order to prevent communicative failures, assessment of their effectiveness based on the interlocutor's reaction ensures the successful implementation of communicative intentions.

According to the established point of view, the intercultural communication, in contrast to ordinary communication, is characterized by the belonging of communicants to different cultures.

Cultural differences in communication and behavior patterns, values and beliefs cause errors in the perception of a message, in other words, communicative failures.

The multidimensional nature of the content, forms and conditions led to the participation in the development of the theory of intercultural communication of representatives of the widest range of scientific disciplines of linguists, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and other specialists.

Culturological aspect of intercultural communication – is dedicated to identifying those aspects of cultural research that can help in determining culturally determined factors that influence the interaction of individuals in the context of intercultural communication. Culturally determined factors in the work are understood not only as distinctive characteristics of interacting cultures, but also certain cultural universals, providing the very possibility of interaction.

Some answers to the questions posed in the dissertation can be found in cultural and anthropological theories, which we analyze in detail in this research.

In particular, an analysis of the concept of E. Hall leads the author of the research to the conclusion that a deeper study of the context category is necessary in the context of intercultural communication.

The role of context is examined in detail by E. Hall in *Beyond Culture*.

By definition of E. Hall, contexting is the ability of the human brain to fill in missing information. Internal contextualization is based either on background knowledge or on signals supplied by the nervous system. External contextualization is information retrieved from the context of the situation. As Hall studies show, differences in contextualization methods lead to differences in behaviors. For example, in cultures of the so-called high context, an important part of the information in the communication process should be extracted from the external context of the situation or from the interlocutor's perceptions. The speaker expects the listener will understand his problems, although they are not named and not explicitly stated. In cultures of this type, there is a clear distinction between "friends" and "strangers," while within the framework of a certain social higher groups are responsible for the actions of lower ones. The communication process in these cultures proceeds economically, quickly and efficiently, but the extra time is spent on extracting hidden information. It is not what is said that matters, but the way it is said, who says and what stands behind. Low context cultures are more open to strangers, they have high hopes for the work of the "system" of created social institutions, and not for personal relationships in a group. In the process of communication, all the main information. When transmitting a message, it is contained in it explicitly [19].

The culturological and cultural anthropological theories and concepts analyzed in this section have largely contributed to the awareness of those usually unrecognized, cultural characteristics that directly affect the

success or failure of intercultural communication.

At the same time, there is at least one factor that does not hinder, but contributes to a successful dialogue of cultures, is the community of functions of culture as a whole and its universal phenomena.

It is well known that a communicative act involves the interaction of two or more individuals, each of which brings their psycho-cultural characteristics, personal experience, individual world view to the communication situation. It is important to remember that culture, on the one hand, determines the formation of an individual world view and individual behavior patterns (including communicative), and on the other hand, the degree of influence of the native culture on its representative can be different, and this depends on many factors.

The interaction of culture and the individual is usually seen through a comparison of different types of identity.

Traditionally, several types of identities are distinguished: cultural, ethnic, linguistic, gender, professional, personal, etc.

Moreover, cultural identity is understood as self-identification with a certain culture, with the forms and norms of behavior accepted in this culture, with the cultural picture of the world. Each individual who identifies himself as a member of a cultural community is the bearer of his cultural heritage.

Thus, the shortcomings of existing theories lead us to the conclusion that when studying the process of intercultural communication from the point of view of communication theory, attention should be paid to both the universal cognitive mechanisms of receiving and transmitting information, as well as the cultural-specific characteristics of all components of this process. In particular, it is necessary to consider the influence cultural picture of the participant's world of communication, his ability to extract information received through different channels, as well as the features of his communicative behavior due to native culture.

From the analysis carried out in the research, it follows that intercultural communication is an extremely complex phenomenon, the study of which involves considering many parameters within the framework of the three types of semiotic relationships: sign - object, sign - sign, sign - person these parameters are realized.

The study of these parameters should be carried out in their relationship, because only in this case can we create holistic models of the components of the process of intercultural communication and the whole process as a whole.

In order to study the above problems, in our opinion, one should turn to a number of linguistic areas of cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, communicative linguistics, ethnosemiotics, and discursive analysis.

In this case, it is necessary to consider the psychological, cultural and

anthropological characteristics of intercultural communication. Expanding the scope of research of all these phenomena will make it possible to study intercultural communication as a process of interaction between individuals and their pictures of the world.

Intercultural communication as an interaction of linguistic pictures of the world”- an analytical review of various points of view on a picture of the world as a way of organizing an individual’s cultural experience is carried out, a methodology for comparative analysis of fragments in linguistic pictures of the world is substantiated.

Conclusion. The theoretical significance of the study is to justify the leading role of the linguistic picture of the world and culturally determined discursive strategies used by individuals in the process of communication, to ensure the success factor of intercultural communication. The linguistic picture of the communicant’s world and the discursive strategies chosen by him to achieve a communicative goal are those linguistic foundations that directly affect discourse organization and interpretation

In addition, the study shows the effectiveness of a multidimensional approach to studying the process of intercultural communication, integrating data from cultural studies, communication theory, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, ethnosemiotics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics and discourse linguistics

The practical significance of the work is primarily associated with the creation of a multilevel method of discourse analysis and with the development of a comprehensive methodology for studying the units of the linguistic picture of the world. The combination of a number of methods, including the use of intercultural communication as one of the modeling methods, as well as the addition of the contextual method with translation analysis, - all this allows opening up new opportunities for deeper penetration into the linguistic picture of the world of communicants and in the organization of discourse

The results of the study can be used in the development of lectures and seminars for a number of courses, such as Introduction to the Theory of Intercultural Communication, General Linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics, Discourse Theory, and Discursive Analysis

References:

1. Sepir E. *Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies*. – M., **1992**. – 319 p. (In Russ.).
2. Whorf B. *Language, Thought, and Reality*. – Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, **1956**. – XI. – 278 p. (In Engl.).
3. Ter-Minasova S.G. *War and the world of languages and cultures*. – M, **2008**. –334 p. (In Russ.).
4. Mironov V.V. *Philosophy and metamorphoses of culture*. – M, **2005**. – 424 p. (In Russ.).
5. Zvegintsev V.L. *Language and knowledge // Questions of Philosophy*. – **1982**.

–№1. – p.71-80. (In Russ.).

6. Tarasov E.F. *Language as a means of transmitting culture // Language as a means of transmitting culture.* – M.: Nauka, **2000.** – P. 45-53. (In Russ.).

7. Vorobiev V.V. *On the status of linguoculturology // Materials of the IX Congress of MAPRYAL (Bratislava 1999): Reports and reports of Russian scientists.* – M.: **1999.** – P. 96-117. (In Russ.).

8. Kibrik A.A. *Cognitive Discourse Studies // Questions of Linguistics.* – **1994.** – No.5. – P. 126-139. (In Russ.).

9. Humboldt V. *The Character of Languages // Selected Works on Linguistics.* – M., **1984.** – 400 p. (In Russ.).

10. Vezhbitskaya, A. *Language. The culture. Cognition / A. Vezhbitskaya.* – M.: Russian dictionaries, **1997.** – 416 p. (In Russ.).

11. Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. *Language and culture.* – M., **1983.** – 269 p. (In Russ.).

12. Telia V.N. *The connotative aspect of the semantics of nominative units.* – M.: Nauka, **1986.** – 143 p. (In Russ.).

13. Kubryakova E.S. *The nominative aspect of speech activity.* – M.: Science, **1986.** – 158 p. (In Russ.).

14. Stepanov Yu.S. *Indo-European proposal.* – M.: Science, **1989.** – 248 p. (In Russ.).

15. Serio P. *The analysis of Discourse at the French school [Discourse and interdiscourse] // Semiotics: The Anthology / Comp. Yu.S. Stepanov.* – M.: Academic Project; – Ekaterinburg: The Business book, **2001.** – P. 549-562. (In Russ.).

16. Trostnikov M.V. *Translation and intertext from the point of view of poetology // Semiotics: Anthology / Comp. Yu.S. Stepanov.* – M.: Academic Project; – Yekaterinburg: Business book, **2001.** – P. 563-580. (In Russ.).

17. Kolshansky G.V. *Contextual semantics.* – M, **1980.** – 154 p. (In Russ.).

18. Zvegintsev V.A. *Sentence and its relation to language and speech.* – M.: Editorial URSS, **2001.** – 312 p. (In Russ.).

19. Hall E.T. *Beyond Culture.* – NY, Anchor Books (reissue of **1976** volume), 280 p. (In Engl.).