

**TYPOLOGY OF CULTURALLY-MARKED VOCABULARY  
IN JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH  
AND BELARUSIAN**

**Шевцова Алеся Константиновна**

заведующий кафедрой романо-германской филологии  
учреждения образования «Могилевский государственный уни-  
верситет имени А.А. Кулешова»;  
кандидат филологических наук, доцент

*The article studies the types of cultural-specific words in the English and Belarussian linguistic cultures. Non-equivalent vocabulary and connotative vocabulary prevail in both languages. However, the total number of the identified ethno-specific vocabulary is wider represented in the Belarussian language.*

At the present time the term «journalistic discourse» is often used in the Humanities. Journalistic discourse is an important element of the mass media discourse. This type of discourse is related to real events and phenomena that occur in the life of society and therefore is of constant interest to modern researchers [7; 8; 9]. It reflects specific actions in a certain period of time. Journalistic discourse implies a dialogue between the addressee and the recipient, because it influences, convinces and directs communication in a certain direction. In addition, this type of discourse reflects the cultural characteristics of a particular country.

It is a carrier and translator of the cultural code of a certain ethnic community.

Cultural-specific words contain significant information about the culture, customs, and national character of native speakers of a given language, so they require special attention. This is also due to the fact that they can cause language and cultural interference. Each language has its own principles of categorization and conceptualization of the surrounding world, objective reality. This explains the inconsistencies, in particular, in the lexical systems of different languages. As a part of spiritual culture, a language cannot fail to reflect it and thus influence native speakers' understanding of the world [1, c. 127]. It can be assumed that the specifics of culturally marked vocabulary are not recognized by native monolinguals, since they do not have a special linguistic status. However, this specificity is understandable for representatives of other cultures and is determined precisely when comparing languages. In the system of another language, there is often no equivalent concept, so it is more difficult to find adequate correspondences of culturally marked units [5, c. 35].

In modern linguistic literature, culturally marked vocabulary is divided into three groups: non-equivalent, background, and connotative words [2; 4]. Non-equivalent vocabulary includes ethnospecific realities. Background vocabulary – «words or expressions that differ from equivalent foreign words by some additional content and accompanying semantic or stylistic shades that overlap with its main meaning, known to speakers and listeners belonging to a given language culture» [3, c. 169]. Connotative vocabulary is the vocabulary that carries the designation of its distinctive properties, through associations, and not just indicates the subject. These words can denote items that do not differ from their counterparts in comparable cultures, but have received additional meanings in this culture based on cultural and historical associations that are unique to a particular culture. In the culture-specific connotative words there is some additional information, which is a connotation. The connotation implies a different kind of assessment of emotional-expressive elements that characterize the word.

According to V.N. Telia, cultural connotation is the most general interpretation of denotative or figuratively-motivated aspects of meaning in the category of culture. V.N. Telia concludes that the content of the national-cultural connotation is the correlation of language meanings with a particular cultural code, which gives a culturally significant marking of the language structure. Based on this, there are two types of culturally marked units: units in which culturally significant information is embodied in the denotative aspect of meaning (the realities of material, spiritual, and social culture); units that carry culturally significant information in the connotative aspect of meaning [6, c. 214–215]. In our research we use the above mentioned terms and concepts to refer to identified culturally-marked vocabulary in the journalistic discourse.

150 popular science articles have been reviewed by our selection. Analyzing the reviewed articles, 78 units of culturally marked vocabulary have been identified. In the Belarusian language, we identified 46 units of culturally marked vocabulary, and in English – 32. Let's look at some examples that relate to non-equivalent vocabulary: *Адной з папулярных беларускіх страў з яўляеца мачанка; Дзеці схпілі бондачку і пабеглі на вуліцу; Маладыя людзі ў сваім узросце заўсёды згарусяць*. Among the identified examples of Belarusian culturally marked vocabulary, the majority (54%) is non-equivalent vocabulary: *Мясныя шэдэўры беларускай кухні – вантрабянка; Суседзі скошваюць бульбоўнік перад уборкай бульбы*.

Now we will consider some examples of connotative vocabulary, i.e. vocabulary that is characterized by certain emotional associations. Connotative vocabulary accounts for approximately 32% of the total number of culturally-marked lexical units selected. For example: *Работнікі будаўнічай службы адталі пад абрус будаўніцтва жылога дома. Класі пад абрус* – postpone something indefinitely. Another vivid example of connotative vocabulary: *Да навукі ён не браўся, быў дурны, як даўбешка*.

Background vocabulary is the rarest in terms of frequency of use – only 14% of the total number of culturally marked words. Let's look at some examples: *Калі хто-небудзь прыходзіў да гэтай жанчыны, яна заўсёды распядала падабайкі. Падабайкі –*

these are some made-up stories. *Ён ніколі не любіў скалку на сале. Скалка* – this is the accumulation of fat on some dishes or food. *Кій дарожны выразаецца з дрэва, якое не баіцца марозу не захлынаецца ў завею, не хмялее ад траў нецвярозых і не ўцякае ад сабачай зьягі. Зьяга* – this is a persistent request or demand. All these examples may indicate that each culture has its own lexical background.

Analysis of the English-language popular science articles has revealed 32 culturally marked units. The distribution by types of culturally marked vocabulary is characterized as follows: non-equivalent vocabulary – 42%, connotative vocabulary – 35%, background vocabulary – 23%. Let's discuss some examples: *We have a fraternity of former press secretaries, we get together a club; The 30 photographs depicting grungy Chicagoland hot dog stands were appropriately exhibited at City Gallery; He was on the right way he has Lifemanship*. In these examples, the lexical units *fraternity* (students' community), *hot dog* and *lifemanship* (ability to live) are vivid examples of non-equivalent vocabulary.

Let's move on to the background vocabulary: *Her hair smelled like vanilla milk, the skin of sweat and woman. Vanilla milk* – milk with vanilla, varenets. This phrase has a different lexical background. Moreover, it transmits culturally significant information from generation to generation. We refer this example to the background vocabulary, since it has analogs in the compared languages, but differs in some national features of functioning. *The more important township officials are a moderator, a board of selectmen, a clerk, a treasurer and a superintendent of schools. Township officials* – selectmen.

As for connotative vocabulary, we can refer the following examples to this category: *I wouldn't speak to that man for all the tea in China. All the tea in China* – no way in the world. *When John's bride gave a birth to the child he was in the seventh heaven. Be in the seventh heaven* – to be extremely happy. *He works only two years but he has already reached the top of the tree in his profession. The top of the tree* – to achieve growth in the career. *Each person is given equal right to participate, as illustrated by the idea of a circular layout referred to in the term round table*.

In general, summing up the results of the research, we can conclude that identical types of culturally marked vocabulary prevail in both linguistic cultures – non-equivalent vocabulary and connotative vocabulary. However, the total number of identified ethno-specific vocabulary is represented in a larger number in the Belarusian-language popular science articles. Perhaps this is due to the need to revive the national language and introduce a wider range of recipients to the culture of the Belarusian land.

#### Список использованной литературы

1. Верещагин, Е. М. Язык и культура. Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного / Е. М. Верещагин, В. Г. Костомаров. – Москва : Русский язык, 1983. – 269 с.
2. Комарова, Л. И. Культурологическая маркированность лексических единиц в тексте / Л. И. Комарова // Вестник ТГУ. – 2010. – № 1(81). – С. 181–188.
3. Кувалдина, М. М. Культурный компонент лексики английского языка / М. М. Кувалдина // Альманах современной науки и образования. – 2011. – № 8(51). – С. 168–169.
4. Леонова, А. В. Безэквивалентная и фоновая лексика: к проблеме об определении понятий / А. В. Леонова [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <https://conf.grsu.by/alternant2014/index-117.htm>. – Дата доступа: 04.10.2020.
5. Степанов, Ю. С. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип Причинности / Ю. С. Степанов // Язык и наука конца 20 века : сб. статей. – М. : Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т, 1995. – С. 35–73.
6. Телия, В. Н. Русская фразеология: Семантический, прагматический, лингвокультурный аспекты / В. Н. Телия. – Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1996. – 284 с.
7. Шевцова, А. К. Диахронический аспект функционирования белорускоязычного публицистического дискурса в контексте глобализации / А. К. Шевцова // Русский и белорусский языки в контексте глобализации : материалы Междунар. науч.-практ. конф., Москва, 30 мая 2019 г. / редкол.: Н. П. Баранова (отв. ред.) [и др.]. – Минск : МГЛУ, 2020. – С. 191–196.
8. Шевцова, А. К. Социокогнитивный план вербализации русскоязычного публицистического дискурса / А. К. Шевцова // Современный дискурс-анализ ; гл. ред. Е. А. Кожемякин. – № 3(24). – 2019. – С. 38–44.
9. Shevtsova, A. Stylistic features of British newspaper headlines in the diachronic aspect / A. Shevtsova // Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT. – Volume 5 : Viewpoints and perspectives in Discourse studies. – Shumen : Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen, 2019. – P. 66–76.