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Abstract. Communication is a multilateral process that includes interaction - interaction, perception and knowledge of each other - perception, as well as information exchange - communication itself. Communication in human society means communication, exchange of thoughts, knowledge, feelings, patterns of behavior, etc. The word exchange in this case is a metaphor. In fact, if we “exchange” ideas, “exchange” words, then we mutually enrich each other's ideas. Communication is a semantic aspect of social speech interaction.

Within the framework of communication, intercultural communication is highlighted, the purpose of which is to establish communication with representatives of different nationalities in the dialogue of cultures. Its origin is connected with the works of E. Hall, R. Brislin, J. Berry, D. Lansis, W. Lonner, S. Thing-Tumi and others. The term “cross-cultural communication” itself appeared in the 70s of the XX century in American linguistics. This is such communication, the success or failure of which is determined by the cultural differences of the communicants. Studies of the cultural condition of communicative behavior are carried out, as a rule, in the framework of cross-cultural analysis; moreover, each culture has its own rules of conversation, closely
related to culturally determined ways of behaving in a given situation.

As the goal of teaching a foreign language, readiness for intercultural dialogue, for intercultural communication is recognized. This implies the need to develop new teaching technologies, including attention to the non-verbal component of the communication act, which is due to a new approach to the interpretation of interactive interaction, represented by both verbal and non-verbal components.
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**Introduction**

The problem of communication is quite fully investigated in psychology (B. Ananyev, A. Bodalyov, L. Vygotsky, M. Kagan, I. Kon, M. Lisina, A. Leontyev, S. Rubinstein and others), pedagogy (A. Belenkaya, A. Bogush, I. Zotova, I. Kon, I. Lutsenko and others) and other sciences.

**Subject and Purpose of Research**

The purpose of this report is to show that communication is a semantic aspect of social speech interaction. Therefore, successful communication involves the knowledge of its participants of a certain set of cultural phenomena as a necessary condition for understanding, hence the attention to intercultural communication, which suggests that everyone studying a foreign language should have a certain amount of knowledge, values of the linguoculture being studied.

**Methodology and Methods**

The methodological basis was the general scientific methods of inductive analysis and generalization, as well as special methods of cross-cultural analysis.

**Results**

Communication itself, as you know, is a complex phenomenon; it is a multifaceted interaction between people (interpersonal) and groups (intergroup); it is a multilateral process that includes
interaction, perception and cognition of each other which is perception, as well as the exchange of information, communication itself (G.M. Andreeva). This is both an environment, and a channel, and a means of resources, and a way of transmitting culture. Without going into a detailed discussion of the essence of this phenomenon, we only say that the American scientists F. Dance and C. Larson analyzed 126 definitions of the term “communication” (Dance F., Larson C., 1976) last century. Now there are many more.

Modern society is becoming increasingly dependent on communication: “communication is the channel and the way through which the community manifests itself, communicates and transforms” (Krasnykh V.V., 2015: 11).

The communication of representatives of one or another communicative culture is based on certain cultural values, determination and identification of which is one of the priority areas today not only of linguoculturology, ethnosemantics, ethnography of communication, contrastive pragmalinguistics, etc., but also the theory of intercultural communication. It is also important to pay attention to the language material, which testifies to the differences in the ways of verbalizing certain moments in the communication of different peoples.

In connection with the enthusiasm for the communicative approach, an important and dangerous trend has emerged which is the absorption of linguistics by the theory of communication.

An indirect proof of this can be several new original theories born in the mainstream of communication theory, which are still of great interest in linguistics. They are the theory of speech acts, the theory of speech genres, the theory of language games, and the theory of intercultural communication.

A common thing for them is an active approach to communication and the language as a whole with its idea of the unity of communicative and non-communicative human activity. Each of these theories in its own way solves the problem of personal communication in the social environment, and each of them has its
own fate. For example, the fate of the theory of speech genres was not as successful as the theory of speech acts. The theory of genres created by M.M. Bakhtin in the 50s (i.e. even earlier than the theory of speech acts), for almost 50 years was unclaimed. But, since the 70s, the theory of speech genres has become extremely popular, and it has enormous scientific potential. The theory of intercultural communication is no less popular. Thus, the theory of communication, indeed, absorbs linguistics. We are observing this now. This is not only dangerous, but also wrong, and therefore this process cannot be successful, although it can be quite long.

Indeed, N. Khomsky also wrote that language is not so well adapted for communication, but exists mainly for structuring thinking, i.e. internal processes. Therefore, works on the theory of communication increasingly discuss “communicative pits”, i.e. failures in understanding, although the phrases themselves are built correctly. The communicative principle cannot be recognized as the main one also because communication is not only intercommunication (exchange of information), but also interaction (exchange of actions), perception (mutual perception). The modern theory of communication cannot take into account much that happens in language. For example, the fact that the same phrase can serve different purposes, solve different problems. So, the phrase *growing old is no fun* can be both reproach and justification, and comfort and censure, and statements of fact, and coquetry, etc.

Communication theory is not able to comprehend another important aspect of language - the deep aspects of language. Prominent thinkers of the past century (for example, L. Wittgenstein in the “Logical and Philosophical Treatise” (Wittgenstein L., 1958)) wrote that there is a special meaningful area that cannot be comprehended discursively, it is revealed to a person in an image. L. Wittgenstein believed that it was “unspoken, mystical”. I. Kant wrote about the “sphere of vague notions”, T.V. Chernigovskaya wrote about the “uncalculated strata”. If we
remove mysticism from these statements, then at the bottom line also remains a lot: based on the account of in-depth knowledge, disinformation and manipulation techniques are built. This is facilitated by well-known Western political correctness. For example, *I almost died* = *passed a life-affirming test*, *mass dismissal* = *staff optimization*. If the description says: *possesses extremely high qualifications*, then you should read: *until now he hasn’t done a lot of stupid things*. *He has an unlimited potential* = *you won’t be able to dismiss him till retirement*, etc.

This is so-called indirect communication, by which we mean “meaningfully complicated communication, in which the understanding of the utterance includes the meanings not contained in the utterance itself, and requires additional interpretative efforts by the addressee” (Dementiev V.V., 2010: 5). The following are synonyms for this term: “implicit content”, “implicitity”, “indirect speech act”, “indirect communicative unit”.

Intercultural communication, as already mentioned, arose within the framework of communicative linguistics as a purely applied direction in order to establish communication with representatives of different nationalities in the dialogue of cultures who came to the USA after World War II. The USA was at that time a unique multicultural training ground.

The origin of the discipline is associated with the works of E. Hall, R. Brislin, J. Berry, D. Lansis, W. Lonner, S. Ting-Tumi and others. The term “intercultural communication” itself appeared in the 70s of the twentieth century in American linguistics. This is such communication, the success or failure of which is determined by the cultural differences of the communicants. It uses the achievements of many sciences such as linguistic anthropology (linguoculturology), sociology, cognitive linguistics, communication theory, social psychology, ethnolinguistics, etc. Until now, the American cross-cultural school is the main developer of the intercultural direction in the social sciences and humanities.
The first work on intercultural communication in the USSR was also of an applied nature. These are the works of the psycholinguistics field of the USSR Academy of Sciences (80s). Since 1996, series No. 19 “Linguistics and Intercultural Communication” appeared in the magazine Vestnik MSU, a theoretical understanding of this phenomenon has begun; the first university textbook on intercultural communication was written at Moscow State University (Ter-Minasova S., 2000. 624 p.). The fact is that two national cultures (for example, native culture and the culture of the language being studied) never completely coincide, i.e. they have both universal for most peoples and national. What more? Of course, universal. Moreover, the set of coinciding and different units for each pair of languages studied will be different.

Therefore, the problem of learning the language in the dialogue of cultures, in the context of culture, in the linguoculturological aspect arises. At the same time, it is necessary to answer the question: what is primary in the opposition “language – culture”. This raises a purely methodological problem: how to build a model of language learning – “language – goal, culture – means or “culture – goal, language – means”. We have supporters of both models. We share the second point of view, but we see a great motivation and substantial potential behind the culture phenomenon.

There are language units and texts that, without penetration into a specific culture, are not understood at all. Such is almost all phraseology: arrive at one’s finger-end. In Russia, soft rolls were baked with a handle, which they then broke off and threw away. These handles were picked up by beggars and eaten, i.e. arrive at one’s finger-end means to become impoverished, to go down.

We believe that in many ways it can help linguoculturology, which has grown from linguistic and regional studies; it studies the totality of cultural values in their linguistic representation. Cultural and national is hidden in a kind of proposition created just by equivalent vocabulary (in linguistic and regional studies, the
emphasis was on equivalent vocabulary), but with a specific manifestation of the combinatorial properties of its units. For example, lack of culture for a Russian person is cultural backwardness, and an epithet uncultured person is given to a person not cultured enough who, at the same time, can be kind, intelligent and have many other positive features; for a Pole, nie kulturalni is equal to anathema. Understanding of intercultural communication as a process of interaction of cultures has led to the fact that in most works on this issue, the study of cross-culture becomes more important, i.e. means of their culture, attracted to know someone else's. In this way, new knowledge is formed both about one's own and foreign cultures.

As the goal of teaching a foreign language, readiness for intercultural dialogue, for intercultural communication is recognized. This implies the need to develop new learning technologies.

When a child masters his native language, the formation of his linguistic personality begins with a communicative level - communication at the level of emotions, a non-verbal nature, then a speech personality is formed as an understanding of verbal standards, and then linguistic knowledge is formed into a certain system. When teaching a foreign language, the process begins with the transfer of language knowledge, bypassing the emotional factor and completely ignoring the non-verbal code. This entails difficulties entering intercultural communication. It seems that in the study of a foreign language there is a phenomenon of synergy, when in the process of intercultural communication there is a clash of two different cultures, two collective cognitive spaces (the term of V.V. Krasnykh), and the result is not just enrichment, but the formation of a third, new, linguistic and cultural space. The teacher's task is to connect the emotional factor and a non-verbal one.

A few words about its importance. I.N. Gorelov expresses the opinion that the non-verbal component of communication is the basis of speech utterance. According to the author, the non-verbal
components of communication are primary, that “in the act of a person’s speech behavior, non-verbal communicative means are first shown, and then - if their resource is insufficient for mutual understanding - verbal means, the flow of speech in the national language” (Gorelov I.N., 1890: 15). Ignorance of important gestures for communication can lead to a cultural shock. So, for example, you need to know that in Japan, speaking of oneself, a person does not point to his chest, but to his nose.

Conclusion
Thus, intercultural communication is represented by two main types: verbal and non-verbal. In both cases, a significant part can be indirect communication. The main indicators of indirect communication include the indirect method of information transmitted; the presence of semantic gaps - implicit meanings that must be decoded and translated into an explicit state; unpredictability of reactions of the addressee, since it is the addressee that derives the meaning of an indirect statement; the intentionality of the speaker's words.
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