CULTURAL CODE: DEFINITION, CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES AND MANIFESTATIONS IN THE COMMUNICATIVE SPACE

Evgeniya V.Kuznetsova

PhD, Associated Professor Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus Senior Researcher Belarus, Minsk

***Corresponding author:** Evgeniya V.Kuznetsova

PhD, Associated Professor Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus Senior Researcher Belarus, Minsk

Abstract

The author of the paper analyzes the definition of cultural code, which has been significantly actualized by political, economic and socio-cultural processes of recent decades. According to E.V. Kuznetsova's opinion there are specific characteristics in cultural code's definition: functional purpose, communicativeness, artificial nature, encryption of information, symbolism, subjectivity. The author reveals these characteristics by means of morphological method, structural and functional one. The author presents the following cultural code's verbalized manifestations: precedent phenomena (text, statement, situation, name), idioms, ethnocultural stereotypes. She bases her point of view on the distinguished characteristics and on the statement that communication plays a key role in the manifestation of cultural code. She uses here typological and comparative-historical methods. The author illustrates all the considered manifestations by examples from European and Slavic cultural and communicative space (folklore, classical literature). At the end of the article she comes to the conclusion that precedent phenomena, phraseological units, set expressions, various metaphorical entities adequately reflect cultural code of the people, and if cultural code is unique, these manifestations are also unique.

Keywords: *cultural code, ethnocultural stereotypes, language, phraseological units, precedent phenomena.*

Introduction

The events of recent years, often expressed in armed conflicts of a geopolitical nature, demonstrate that forecasts by famous futurists S. Huntington and F. Fukuyama come true: the world is entering the stage of a "clash of civilizations". Therefore, the problem of cultural code and its decoding under the conditions of the information society has a particular importance for preservation of cultural identity of the people and marking the boundaries of a communicative space. Cultural code of nation ensures viability of culture, its formation and development. Cultural code is a kind of

matrix that contributes to the formation of consciousness of a historically formed linguistic and cultural community and the definition of ethnocultural identity. Cultural picture of any subject is always based on spiritual values, moral ideals, guidelines that are historically embedded in the mentality of the people. Cultural code models this picture of the world and its manifestations, transmits them to next generations. The purpose of the article is to reveal cultural code's characteristic features and examine its manifestations in the communicative space on the material of European and Slavic culture.

Theoretical Framework

Cultural codes are universal, capable of self-generation, and are based on a verbal and conventional sign system. These characteristics explain the fact that contemporary humanitarian discourse has a lot of research in the field of cultural code, but there is no correct well-established formulation of this concept. In general, we can identify the following research landscapes in the explication of the category of "cultural code".

The first approach to the consideration of this category can be called philosophical and sociological. Here we deal with concepts of structural functionalism and neofunctionalism (T. Parsons, N. Luhmann, J. Alexander), structuralism (K. Levi-Strauss), postmodernism (J. Derrida, J. Baudrillard), post-Marxism (M. Castels), structural constructivism (P. Bourdieu), symbolic interactionism (I. Hoffman). All these scientists focus their attention on various distinctive features of cultural code. Structural functionalists and neo-functionalists distinguish social functions of cultural code, its place and role in the communication system; structuralists also mark social labels of code in the process of interaction; postmodernists interpret cultural code as a paradigm in culture; in theories of post-Marxism and structural constructivism an ideological side is important; in symbolic interactionism a code is interpreted as a kind of collection of conventions, rules in a social community. But none of the concepts can be called comprehensive as they are too broad (in works by T. Parsons and N. Luhmann) or have an exclusively functional orientation (in works by M. Castells and P. Bourdieu).

We present the second approach as a semiotic-communicative one, demonstrated in works by famous foreign and Russian-speaking semiotics and philologists: W. Eco, F. de Saussure, R. Jacobson, R. Barth, C. Pierce, Y. M. Lotman. For them the concept of cultural code is associated with symbols and signs, while language is sometimes categorically not recognized as code due to the fact that it is a natural phenomenon with its own history, and hasn't an artificial formation (Lotman, 2000). The German philosopher E. Cassirer examines the whole culture as a sign system, a product of "symbolic thinking and human behavior" (E. Cassirer, 2001). For him, everything created by mankind can be interpreted as a symbolic reality, and symbolic forms of various kinds are peculiar ways of cultural space's encoding.

The Italian writer, philosopher and semioticist W. Eco creates a semiotic concept of culture as an "iconic universe". In his opinion, code is an indispensable condition for communication, a model that represents a number of conditional simplifications "made in order to ensure the possibility of transmitting certain messages". The whole communication process is a "signal world", but when a "human interpreter" enters it, a "signal world" becomes a "world of

meaning" (Eco, 2004). Cultural codes fill communicative act with content and direct it. The Russian philologist and cultural critic Y.M. Lotman presents his concept of "semiosphere" as a space that includes culture, language as a function, and various semiotic structures. Cultural code acts as a means of interpreting semiosphere and all the phenomena that enter it (Lotman, 2000).

Despite the fact that semiotics try to reveal the meaning of the category of cultural code their interpretations emphasize exclusively communicative and symbolic character of cultural code, reducing it to "semiosphere". Meanwhile, cultural code as a scientific category is much broader, in our opinion, and includes not only symbolism, but also ambiguity, subjectivity, mythological and axiological features.

The third linguoculturological approach allows us to explicate the concept of cultural code by means of the works by famous linguoculturologists: S.M. Tolstaya, V.N. Telia, V.A. Maslova, V.V. Krasnykh, E.S. Kubryakova, Y.E. Prokhorov, V.A. Ryzhkov, Y.A. Sorokin, J.F. Richard. From their point of view, cultural codes appear as conceptual entities filled with value and semantic content. Cultural code reflects national structure of knowledge, its axiological content, framed in language and manifested in verbal and non-verbal communication by means of precedent phenomena, ethnocultural stereotypes, stable metaphorical expressions, symbols, standards, canons. The investigation of phraseological units, precedent phenomena, and ethnocultural stereotypes reveals a number of key concepts that make up the cultural picture of the people's world, contributes to the understanding of phenomena and artifacts representing their identity and increasing the degree of effectiveness of interaction between subjects at mono- and intercultural level (Kubryakova, 2004). This approach demonstrates that cultural code is a natural result of many historical, geopolitical, socio-cultural processes, it forms the basis of the mentality of a particular nation, but only in the context of its verbalized manifestations, without researching artistic and musical works, traditions and customs.

Thus, we can conclude that none of the approaches allows us to reveal the essence of the category of "cultural code" because of its complexity and heterogeneity, and for the completeness of its research it is necessary to use theoretical provisions and methods of analysis proposed by each of the approaches. Only interdisciplinary investigational optics of philosophers, culturologists, linguists, ethnopsychologists, cultural anthropologists can help in explicating this scientific category under conditions of a contemporary civilization. Basing on our analytical review and morphological and typological methods we can define the following significant features (characteristics, attributes) in the interpretation of the concept of "cultural code".

Methods and Materials

Firstly, cultural code can be interpreted from the point of view of its functional use. Let us recall the interpretation by R. Barth: "fragments of cultural memory", which have a "concentrated character". According to his point of view, almost any cultural artifact can be considered as cultural code (Barth, 2004). According to the theory of the Russian culturologist P.S. Gurevich cultural code helps us to understand the transformation of definition into meaning, it's "a set of signs (symbols), meanings (and their combinations) contained in any object of material and

spiritual human activity" (Gurevich, 1984). In other words, cultural code allows us to establish a correspondence between the phenomenon and its meaning or content that is embedded in it.

Secondly, communicativeness is connected with signs as manifestations of cultural code, because one of the functions of cultural code, as a rule, is the transmission of the information about certain cultural phenomena of the past, and it's always realized within cultural and communicative space. At the same time, forms of expression of this information can be verbal and non-verbal. Cultural code expresses messages about culture in rites, rituals, and works of art.

The third cultural code's attribute is quite controversial, but we have to admit it. It's an artificial nature of code. So, Y.M. Lotman believes that the concept of code already presupposes some kind of artificiality (Lotman, 2000). Cultural code for him is a construction that retains its strength for centuries and has an identity. Another Russian philosopher and cultural critic M.M. Bakhtin states that code is generally a technical means of decrypting information, a "mortified context". He supposes that codes are secondary sign systems (Bakhtin, 1975). Interpretation by U. Eco also reveals cultural code as a kind of structural model, and R. Jacobson considers code to be as a set of sign systems, and it proves artificiality in any code (Eco, 2004; Jacobson, 1996). But at the same time, by artificiality we can also understand a certain "inventiveness", "fiction", when, for example, our ancestors composed myths, fairy tales, epics and fixed all their ideas about the world at that moment.

Cultural code is a source of encrypted information. This is its fourth feature. As this fact is obvious, we have to pay attention to methods of encoding and decoding, ways of transition from signs and symbols into meanings. In the industrial society any text was perceived as a direct source of information. The whole world was presented in texts. The development of literary creativity in various directions opened up new perspectives and opportunities for people to explore and describe world and consolidate knowledge in a symbolic form. For example, R. Barth builds his understanding of cultural code on the basis of text as a phenomenon (Barth, 2004). And we find this interpretation of cultural code in linguoculturology. But in the information society a special type of thinking has been formed – a visual one. And a modern person not only thinks visually, he is ready to recode all available information from the traditional text format into a visual one. Today we can talk about the formation of "screen code" as a new kind of cultural code.

The fifth attribute of cultural code is its symbolism. In linguoculturology cultural code is always interpreted as some semantic meaning of a word transformed into its cultural meaning. The Russian philologist E.S. Kubryakova presents the idea that cultural code is a kind of a "container" where various linguistic entities are filled with different cultural content (Kubryakova, 2004). This content is cultural code. Moreover, codes can include units those are not cultural signs in themselves, but, when they enter mental space of code, they become cultural signs: for example, we differentiate "a pipe" as a smoking accessory and "a pipe of peace" as a symbol of reconciliation. The Russian philologist V.N. Telia believes that cultural codes must include culturally significant features of the worldview (Telia, 1996). According to V.N. Telia, cultural codes are realized, as a rule, in

sacred texts, parodies, metaphors, phraseological units, as they have an increased degree of symbolism. But these manifestations, from our point of view, should be considered to be only the most important manifestations of the cultural code, while phonetic system, grammatical structure, syntactic structure of the language also reflect specifics of cultural history of the people and the formation of mentality (Telia, 1996). And we agree with the definition of cultural code given by V.V. Krasnykh which continues Kubryakova's and Telia's ideas: cultural code is a "grid" that culture "throws" on the world, divides it, coordinates, organizes, evaluates (Krasnykh, 2003). According to V. N. Telia, language is not just a collection of signs, but a symbolic system in which different subjects interact: "a thinking individual and speaking individual (his communication partner)", "world" and "linguistic means", reflecting code and logic of thinking (Telia, 1997). This statement reveals another characteristic feature of cultural code – its subjectivity, which should be highlighted in its explication.

It is known that national and cultural division of the world is one of the features that helps to distinguish one language from another, if we don't take into account grammatical structure, phonetic structure and lexicon. This division correlates with objective level of meanings and forms a cultural picture of the world. "The word is the collective memory of native speakers, a cultural monument, a mirror of the life of the nation" (Sapir, 2002). So, we have to mention Sapir-Whorf's hypothesis about the connection between culture and language. E. Sapir and B. L. Whorf write that language is a symbolic key to culture, they prove that the type of the language determines the type of the culture and the vision of the world (Sapir, 2002). We aren't so categorical about language and culture's role. But it's obvious that language can be called a cultural code. Language is the basic code system for understanding the cultural essence of the nation. Cultural artifacts are fixed in the consciousness of the people and manifested, first of all, in the communicative behavior of its bearers. But cultural code is broader than language, and it would be wrong to equate these concepts, because cultural code can be non-verbal and can be manifested in various kinds of rituals, festivals, architectural and musical forms, etc. Summarizing all above mentioned attributes, we can give the following definition of the concept of "cultural code". It is a system of signs and symbols formed in a specific historical period, containing in an encrypted form verbal or non-verbal kinds of the meaning of certain cultural phenomena, moral guidelines, spiritual values, reflecting the structure of the subject's mentality and manifested at the level of cultural and communicative practices. A subject should be understood as a nation, a social group, or an individual.

Cultural code's model

Cultural code's explication on the basis of the morphological and modeling methods as well as the comparative historical method, allows us to construct a model of cultural code with the allocation of core and peripheral features. As we have analyzed already cultural code is interpreted by various researchers as historical memory, "collective unconscious", ideology, language, values, symbols, social norms and rules. From our point of view, the "core" or the basis of the cultural code is language, because the whole cultural and creative human activity is expressed in language, language forms a cultural picture of the world. We define attribute archetypal attitudes as peripheral features, because

they reflect our "collective unconscious", form historical memory, ethnocultural images, various verbalized manifestations. For example, among the East Slavic peoples, the key archetypes include the archetype of Mother Earth, the archetype of Tree, the archetype of water (and its reservoirs), totems of animals. Mythological representations reflect one more peripheral feature. These ideas determine peculiarities of mental behavior and mental stereotypes. For example, synthesis of paganism and Christian dogmas determines the dominance of the emotional perception of the world among Belarusians, Russians and Ukrainians over the rational one.

Results and discussion

We have to admit that cultural space is a communicative space, and communication, from our point of view, is an important mechanism for the formation of cultural code. Cultural artifacts are stored in the mind of every person (Triandis, 1994). Often this cultural content is not recognized by its native speakers and not reflected, but it is clearly fixed in the language and linguistic consciousness, it manifests itself in the communicative behavior of its individual speakers. We accept the statement that language is the basic code system for understanding the cultural essence of people. Natural language isn't just a set of signs, but it's also a set of meanings, a set of information developed by people about the world around them, about themselves in this world. Language is a kind of "core", of collective memory of the nation, or, in another way, its cultural code (Danesi, 2007).

Precedent phenomena (kinds, functions, attributes). The so-called precedent phenomena are striking examples of archetypes reflecting cultural code. If we interpret precedents as behavioral models existing within national communities, forms of their worldview, moral attitudes and ideals, then precedent phenomena in their verbal form express their essence, fix their meaning (V.V. Krasnykh, S. Moskovichi, A.E. Suprun, E.F. Tarasov, I.I. Tolstoy, E. Hirsch). Precedent phenomena are popular in their linguistic and cultural community, they have frequent references in speech of representatives of this community, and they are relevant in cultural and communicative terms. Linguistic and cultural community can be limited by a scope of one nation (then we are deal with national precedent phenomena), by a community of Christians or Muslims (religious precedent phenomena) or can present all the humanity (universal precedent phenomena).

Among precedent phenomena we single out a precedent text, a precedent statement, a precedent name, a precedent situation. A precedent text is a text that has an important spiritual, cognitive, and emotional significance for a particular linguistic and cultural community. As a rule, it's very popular in this community, it's implemented in classical literature and folk art of the people, but it can also be expressed in modern short advertising texts and slogans (Krasnykh, 2003). This text should be well known to the audience as, for example, Russian fairy tale about Kolobok (round cookie), and must be a masterpiece (W. Shakespeare's plays and poems in English and European linguistic and cultural community), the creation of the text should be preceded by a real event: for example, E. M. Remarque's novels about the 1st World War. A precedent statement is a vivid quote, a "winged expression", repeatedly reproduced in speech by native speakers ("to rain cats and dogs", "when Queen Ann is dead") and it's very popular in a specific cultural and linguistic space ("to wash one's hands", thirty pieces of silver", Pandora's box", "Vox Populi – Vox Dei"). A precedent name should include an individual name associated with the text interpreted as a precedent one (for example, Anna Karenina), or with a situation equally known to all native speakers and acting as a precedent (Napoleon Bonaparte), this name is a kind of a symbol. A precedent situation is a kind of "ideal" situation with certain connotations, reproduced and perceived by specific differential features. For example, the situation with abuse of a husband towards his wife and his numerous marriages is called the behavior of a "Bluebeard" by the analogy with the behavior of the eponymous fairy-tale character or we can define a man who can turn any woman's head as "Casanova", "Don Juan".

But there are no hard boundaries between precedent phenomena. All these phenomena are closely interrelated with each other, and when one of them is updated, several other precedent phenomena can be updated also. All precedent phenomena, being an integral part of the cognitive base of the corresponding linguistic and cultural community, perform certain functions allowing them to participate in the formation of cultural code of the people. At the same time, the functions are closely interrelated with each other, and one function "follows" from the other. The first function is a mythological one. Many researchers in their works state that there is a close relationship between language, culture and myth (M. Eliade, E. Neumann, A.F. Losev). Myth, according to a number of scientists, "reveals" archetypes developed in the distant past and reflect mental characteristics of the national perception (Eliade, 1985). Mythological function of precedent phenomenon can be demonstrated by the example of the use of precedent names, which reflect and determine spiritual orientations of the linguistic and cultural community, form characters who become bearers of some characteristic or action. Moreover, these characters can have positive and negative connotations. So, the name "Anna Karenina" from L. Tolstoi's novel is associated exclusively with her death under the wheels of a train, and the name of Rodion Raskolnikov from F. Dostoevskii's novel is associated with the murder of an old woman. And nobody tries to understand the motives of these actions, the stories of the characters. Another essential function realized by precedent phenomena is a cognitive one. Different linguistic and cultural communities have different cognitive bases, these bases are connected with peculiarities of cultural pictures of the world, different classification of the surrounding reality. Precedent phenomena reflect characteristic features of each culture, and their knowledge makes our intercultural communication more effective. Next function implemented by precedent phenomena is a symbolic one. Symbol in culture always means the connection of the environment with human consciousness. E. Kassirer writes that man lives not only in the real universe, but also in the symbolic one, filling it with linguistic meanings, religious ideas and mythological meanings (E. Cassirer, 2001). From the point of view of S. Moscovici, the ideas behind precedent phenomena correlate with "collective ideas" (Moscovici, 1998). These ideas are embodied in certain cultural patterns, rituals, and signs and symbolize some events. For example, the name of Don Quixote has become a symbol of nobility and the struggle for justice, sometimes meaningless. Every precedent phenomenon also implements an axiological function, as it expresses collective ideas and values. Values formed during the development of the linguistic and cultural community receive their direct expression in the language and precedent phenomena.

The analysis of precedent phenomena, their examples and functions allows us to identify the following attributes of precedent phenomena. The first attribute is the reference of any precedent phenomenon to a particular historical event occurred in reality. Moreover, this event becomes a kind of benchmark for all other events of this kind. For example, when Russians pronounce the phrase "Mamai's massacre", they mean the extreme degree of destruction. Any precedent phenomenon is well known to many members of the linguistic and cultural community. And knowledge of precedent phenomena means knowledge of culture of this community. It's the second attribute. The third feature is symbolism (associativity, "reference" of precedent phenomena). At some moment each precedent phenomenon begins to symbolize something or someone, or it's associated with some kind of action, event, quality. For example, Francis Skaryna's name has become a symbol of enlightenment in the Belarusian linguistic and cultural community. The fourth characteristic feature of precedent phenomena is value labeling of each precedent phenomenon. On the one hand, precedent phenomena determine the system of values of the linguistic and cultural community, on the other hand, values themselves form precedent phenomena in the form of certain judgments and assessments. The fifth feature is the verbalization of precedent phenomena. Precedent phenomena exist only in our speech, being expressed in set expressions, "catch phrases": "money does not smell", "Pandora's box".

Phraseological units (set phrases: essence, attributes). So, we can conclude that precedent phenomena in any form of their existence are necessary for effective communicative contacts. Creation of cultural patterns, their cognition, preservation and transition from generation to generation determines the common consciousness of the actors of this process. Communication is always a symbolic interchange, when its participants associate the same images with the same symbols. Phraseological units, as well as precedent phenomena, form an important part of communication. In contemporary linguistics and linguoculturology there is a point of view according to which a linguistic unit is just a signal that should awaken human consciousness and affect concepts that can respond to this signal (A.A. Potebnya, A.A. Leontiev, L.V. Shcherba). Language, according to these authors, is nothing more than a tool for encoding and broadcasting culture. The source of culture is text containing encoded information, broadcasting it and causing appropriate associations in the audience. Phraseological units only perform a function of a cultural signal (Leontiev, 1986). But phraseology, from our point of view, cannot be reduced to a signal. Phraseology is a part of the text, a source of a specific information, and, therefore, acts as a keeper of cultural content and participates in the formation of an ethnocultural picture of the world (Kubryakova, 2004). The principle of the emergence of phraseological unit allows us to understand how set expressions preserve and transit cultural information. First prototypical situation goes, and the literal meaning of the phraseology is formed. Then rethinking takes place: an image of a phraseological unit is "launched", being based on primary meanings of words in the initial situation. The image of phraseological unit actually contains key information, realizing a connection with culture. Set expressions reflect the peculiarities of the worldview of its bearers according to their national and cultural specifics. And we agree with the definition given by V.N. Telia: phraseological units are figuratively motivated secondary names that reveal associative connections, culturally significant frames and specific images of abstract concepts (Telia, 1997). This definition helps to identify characteristic features of phraseological units as keepers and carriers of cultural information. Phraseological units or idioms preserve the most important information about the mentality of the people and their cultural creation in the form of legends, myths, customs, traditions, acting as exponents of cultural signs. Phraseological units help to convey a large amount of knowledge about culture and at the same time save linguistic resources. Reification, cultural and national connotativity, the ability to form linguistic cultural codes are their distinctive features or attributes. And they don't only reflect the essence of phraseological units, but also determine their place in cultural code of people. Reification is a figurative materialization of a concept. It expresses, as a rule, characteristic features of mentality of people and their inner world. For example, in Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian languages there are many expressions with the concepts of "soul", "spirit", "heart". It indicates the fact that these nations are characterized by a sensual and emotional perception of the world. Connotation plays a similar role, it's a cultural marker in the language. Thus, phraseological units contain and broadcast significant cultural content.

Ethnocultural stereotypes (essence, functions, brief classification). We observe a similar purpose in the so-called ethnocultural stereotypes. Being firstly introduced by W. Lippman in 1922, "stereotypes" means the following: culturally determined preconceived opinions that control the process of perception, i.e. "pictures in our heads" (Lippman, 1989). The polish researcher Y. Bartminsky says that stereotyping is a kind of mythological thinking, because stereotypes as sociocultural phenomena correlate with prejudices and superstitions (Bartminsky, 2005). Nowadays many researchers agree that stereotype is a value–marked unit of mental and linguistic complex of a representative of a certain ethno-cultural community, reflecting a certain fragment of the surrounding reality in minds of representatives of this space (U. Kvasthoff, E. Bartminsky, I. Panasyuk, S.M. Tolstaya, J.F. Richard). Stereotypes form a set of associations and determine our communicative behavior. Being similar to precedent phenomena, they nevertheless have a number of differences from them. Stereotypes, in comparison with precedents, function as stamps and they're surrounded in the context of their use by a number of stamps; and a precedent phenomenon reflects a specific event or character; it's very difficult to detect a historical origin of a stereotype, and a phenomenon can have this historical origin; stereotypes are nationally determined, precedent phenomena are nationally determined, too, but they can have a universal character, as we have already pointed out above. Being a significant phenomenon in the communicative process, especially in intercultural interaction, stereotype implements a number of functions. Their integrative function is expressed in stereotype's maintaining the unity of some ethnic group; protective function of stereotypes is realized in the fact that they contribute to preservation of the system of traditional values; communicative function provides information and discursive interchange in native community and between representatives of native community and "strangers"; cognitive function helps to form a cultural picture of the world and helps to understand mechanism of its formation; manipulative function uses ethnocultural stereotypes as a powerful means of propaganda influencing on public consciousness for political purposes. The high degree of stereotypes' dissemination in communication, their mythical and irrational nature help them to retain their cultural content, despite time and enormous civilizational changes. Ethnocultural stereotypes can be called,

from our point of view, the most resistant to transformations of various kinds in comparison with all other manifestations of cultural code in communicative space. Various kinds of cultural images, formed in paganism, keep these features in folklore and literary characters, which are reflected in set expressions. For example, the image of a cat in many cultures has always been mysterious and ambiguous. Cat is considered to be the patroness of the hearth, but according to superstitions that have come down to our days to meet a black cat (the bearer of a demonic, "dark" principle) is a bad omen. Cats are curious, independent, tricky. The verbalized manifestations of these features of the stereotypical image reflect them quite accurately. We deal with proverbs: "when the cat's away, the mice will play"; "cat after kind"; "curiosity killed the cat".

According to stereotypes' attributes we can make their brief classification: a stereotype-image, here we deal with a vivid image that represents the corresponding cultural space by certain actions and features(a cat, a crow); a stereotype-character, it's similar to a stereotype image, but in the first case we find this image in the cultural space of a particular nation unlimited by folklore or classical literature, and in the case of a stereotype character, we deal with a literary character (Cheshire Cat); a stereotype-expression, here we mean set expressions that include "lexical shell" of stereotypes-images and stereotypes-characters, at the same time, these expressions reflect different characteristic features of their images: "a white crow", "a cat that walks by itself".

As we see, because of different attributes and functions, ethnocultural stereotypes play an essential role in a contemporary intercultural communication, without knowing stereotypes-images, stereotypes-characters, stereotypes-expressions of the cultural space of other peoples, it is extremely difficult to form an adequate idea of a particular culture and establish effective interaction with its representatives. The examination of stereotypes is a key for understanding culture of other linguistic and ethnic communities (Trompenaars, 1993). Thus, they can be considered to be as certain symbols in the ethnocultural space, carriers of "cultural code" of the people.

Conclusions

The whole cultural experience that we receive during our life is formed by cultural codes and by means of cultural codes. Images in our memory, behavioral attitudes, and moral stereotypes are preserved in consciousness with the help of an "imprint" (Rapaille, 2006). K. Rapai, the contemporary researcher of marketing theory, states that our cultural picture of the world is determined by a combination of such "imprints". And we can add here, that this combination is expressed in precedent phenomena, phraseological units and ethnocultural stereotypes.

The whole world around a person is an artificially created reality expressed in signs and symbols. It is possible to broadcast these signs and symbols and decode them only in a communicative process. If cultural code is an ideal formation, then its verbalized manifestations are of a material nature. Precedent phenomena, phraseological units, idioms, metaphorical entities reflect the existing cultural identity preserved in various artifacts and samples. Cultural code, accumulating the entire cultural and historical experience of the people and the system of its spiritual coordinates, is unique for each nation, therefore, the collection of its linguistic

embodiments is also unique. The specificity of the cultural picture of the world of the people is always reflected in the linguistic originality. Any text, whether it is a classic literary work, a sample of a folklore genre or a modern advertising slogan, always demonstrates the peculiarities of the culture of the people within which this text has been created. The research of linguistic representatives of cultural code gives us as much information about the mentality of the people as the examination of fundamental architectural monuments or musical works. Precedent phenomena, phraseological units, ethnocultural stereotyped images reflect all those processes to which the linguistic and cultural community has been exposed at different historical stages of its existence.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M.M. (1975). *Questions of Literature and Aesthetics. Research of Different Years*. Moscow: Artistic Literature, 504 p.
2. Barth, R. (2004). *The Empire of Signs*. Moscow: AST, 425 p.
3. Bartminsky, E. (2005). Stereotype as a subject of linguistics .*The linguistic image of the world: essays on ethnolinguistics* (pp.133–157). Moscow: Dobrosvet.
4. Cassirer, E. (2001). *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. St.Petersburg: University book, 272 p.
5. Danesi, M. (2013). *A Guide to Semantic Theory and Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 324 p.
6. Eco, U. (2004). *The Missing Structure. Introduction to Semiology*. St.Petersburg: Simposium, 544 p.
7. Eliade, M. (1985). *The Sacred and the Mundane*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 716 p.
8. Gurevich, P.S. (1984). Culture as an Object of Socio-philosophical Analysis . *Questions of Philosophy, 5, 53-63*.
9. Jacobson, R. (1996). *Language and the Unconscious: Works of Different Years*. Moscow: Science, 280 p.
10. Krasnykh, V.V. (2003). *"One's own" among "strangers": myth or reality*. Moscow: Gnosis. 375 p.
11. Kubryakova, E.S. (2004). *Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in understanding the world.* Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture, 560 p.
12. Leontiev, A.A. (1986). *Signs of coherence and integrity of the text*. Moscow: Science, 160 p.
13. Lippman, W. (1989). *Public Opinion*. New York: Anchor Books, 356 p.
14. Lotman, Y.M. (2000). *Semiosphere*. St.Petersburg: Art, 720 p.
15. Moskovici, S. (1998). *A Machine that Creates Gods*. Moscow: AST, 454 p.
16. Rapaille, C. (2006). *A Cultural Code: An Ingenious Way to Understand Why People Around the World Live and Buy as They Do*. New York: Crown Business, 420 p.
17. *Sapir, E, Irvine, J. (2002). The Psychology of Culture: A Course of Lectures. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.*
18. Teliya, V.N. (1996). *The Connotative Aspect of the Semantics of Nominative Units*. Moscow: Science, 143 p.
19. Teliya, V.N. (1997). *Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 356 p.

20. Triandis, H.C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 320 p.
21. Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture.* London: Economist Book, 349 p.