D. E. Barasheva (Sevastopol State University, Sevastopol, Russian)[1]

CATEGORIZATION LEVELS AND SEMANTIC VARIATION IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN SCIENCE

Considering the integration of such dominant knowledge contexts as science, culture and language in intercultural scientific communication, it is supposed that the phenomenon of semantic variation should get its specifics dependently on categorization levels.

In cognitive linguistic perspective, people have to "tune" their conceptual systems in regard to each other in a definite context of communication to facilitate their understanding (Н. Н. Болдырев). What happens in the process of language-in-use understanding is non-linguistic representations are activated "due to prompts of the kind provided by lexical concept selection and integration" [1, p. 252], which is facilitated by perceiving an utterance in a particular organization of its linguistic elements in a certain context. When we produce and perceive an utterance, we get the meanings from a semantic network (the polysemy theory which would well correspond to a context (the context dependent meaning principle and use words which would be good representatives of the categories they correspond with (the prototype theory, the prototype effects). The specific of taxonomy is that from three levels of semantic categorization – superordinate, basic and subordinate – the basic one is "salient", and "provides the cornerstone of a taxonomy" [2, p. 46] so far as it is "appropriate for using, thinking about, or naming an object in most situations in which the object occurs" [2, p. 43].

There are though some specifics of intercultural scientific communication concerning the use of science language and cultural languages. Taking for granted the use of everyday common language, which also corresponds with the distribution of words in relations to categorization levels typical of everyday communication, scientists use the scientific language, the terminologies which are specific for particular sciences and methods, and a cultural language, herewith they are the native speakers of different languages. All these stipulate certain specifics.

1. The words relating to the basic level of categorization used as terms in scientific communication possess more degree of abstraction in comparison with their use in everyday communication. For example, *object* 'объект'. In spite of having certain similarity – something to what attention is directed – it gets specific semantics. In everyday communication it means a concrete thing (*I see an object on the horizon* 'Я вижу какой-то объект на горизонте'); in scientific communication – the field of a research, or any "thing", i.e. object, thing or phenomenon.

2. The term-words related to the basic level of categorization are the ones which often refer to the superordinate level in everyday communication. For instance, *discourse* 'дискурс'. In contrast to a scientist, a common person will hardly say "discourse between people"; instead he/she would prefer the words *talk, conversation* or *chat* 'разговор', 'беседа', 'болтовня'.

---

[1] Здесь и далее информация о городе и стране проживания и месте работы/учебы приводится в соответствие с указанием автора работы.

3. The superordinate level in scientific communication appears to be informative indeed, in comparison with everyday communication in which its informativeness is reduced ("have lower total cue validity" [2, p. 31], is not informative). Scientists also use the words (terms) relating to the basic level of categorization as certain starting points. The reason is that it is the most convenient [2, p. 43] and informative. Despite that, they have to match basic categories to the related superordinate categories to facilitate understanding; otherwise there might be a misunderstanding. For example, speaking about categorization and using the term *category* 'категория', scientists will better understand each other's conceptions if they appeal to the matches of the term with the related superordinate categories: *abstraction* 'абстракция' => structural approach; *generalization* 'обобщение' => functional; *inclusion* and *coordination* 'включение' and 'согласование' => cognitive. Or let's take *language* 'язык': *structured system* 'структурированная система' => structural approach; *function* 'функция' => functional; *ability* 'способность' => generative; *knowledge* 'знание' => cognitive.

4. The use of a cultural language may cause some discrepancies. For instance, let's take the category of the basic level *subject*. In the English language scientific discourse the term can refer to either an active conscious individual or to a particular area of study – dependently on a surrounding linguistic context: *a subject of cognition, a subject of knowledge; a subject of research, a subject of investigation*. In the Russian language there are two term-words used for the corresponded lexical concepts – 'субъект' and 'предмет': 'субъект познания', 'субъект знания'; 'предмет исследования' (*investigation* might be confused with 'расследование').

The term-words related to the subordinate level as a rule facilitate communication – for they specify the semantics of a category by representing its certain variants. For example, the semantic specification of the term-word *knowledge* 'знание' can be represented in the attributes: *encyclopaedic* 'энциклопедическое, *language* 'языковое', *knowledge what* 'знание «что»', *knowledge how* 'знание «как»'; *collective* 'коллективное', *individual* 'индивидуальное', etc.

Discrepancies in matching the basic categories to the superordinate ones ensure participants' awareness of their scientific methodological views specifics, which thus facilitates their communication – since they recognize their scientific positions, and force scientific discussions – since the discrepancies are highlighted, which stipulates arguments exchange in search for the target object and subject dipper knowledge and better understanding. So, semantic variation gets specific importance in the aspect of superordinate level of categorization as the activation of superordinate categories is necessary to facilitate communication.

REFERENCES

1. *Evans, E.* How Words Mean. Lexical concepts, cognitive models, and meaning constructions / V. Evans. – Oxford University Press, 2009. – 373 p.
2. *Roach, E.* Principles of Categorization / E. Roach // Cognition and Categorization / E. Roach, B. B. Lloyd. – Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. – 1978. – P. 27–48.