

# Chinese Digital Linguoculture: Transformation Of Cultural Codes In The Era Of Multimodal Communication

Jamoliddin Vakhabov

University of World Economy and Diplomacy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 02 November 2025; **Accepted:** 25 November 2025; **Published:** 30 December 2025

**Abstract:** This article examines the transformation of linguocultural categories in the context of China's digital communication. The study aims to explore how traditional cultural meanings are preserved and reinterpreted through multimodal online practices such as internet memes, digital idioms, and symbolic imagery. Drawing on linguocultural, cognitive, and multimodal methodologies, the research analyzes a corpus of digital texts from major Chinese platforms (Weibo, Bilibili, Douyin) collected between 2020 and 2025. The findings reveal that Chinese digital linguoculture functions as a dynamic system of cultural resilience, where classical values — harmony (和), diligence (勤), fate (命), and the path (道) — are expressed through irony, playfulness, and visual creativity. Language, image, and cognition merge into hybrid forms of expression that reflect both the continuity and transformation of national identity. The study concludes that digital communication does not erode cultural tradition but extends it into new semiotic dimensions, illustrating how linguoculturology provides a powerful framework for understanding the mechanisms of cultural adaptation in the digital age.

**Keywords:** Chinese linguoculture, memes, multimodality, cultural code, digital identity, cognitive linguistics.

**Introduction:** Human beings, as inherently social creatures, have always possessed a fundamental need to communicate and remain informed about the events occurring in their environment. Over time, the methods of information exchange have undergone significant transformation. In antiquity, communication was primarily conducted through handwritten correspondence and the use of messengers. In subsequent historical periods, newspapers and television emerged as dominant channels of mass communication. However, with the rapid advancement of digital technologies, the modes of information exchange have become increasingly sophisticated and instantaneous.

Today, the Internet has evolved into a central element of daily life, serving not only as a medium for communication but also as an indispensable component of work, education, commerce, and social interaction (Ашыракунова, А. А. 2025). In many cases, the boundaries between the virtual and the physical realms have become increasingly porous, leading to a convergence of digital and real-life

experiences. This merging is reshaping human perception of reality in profound ways (Мифтахутдинов, Р. Т. 2025).

While digital platforms have facilitated remote education and professional collaboration, virtual communication has also exerted a notable influence on social behavior, intergenerational relationships, and linguistic norms. The Internet now constitutes a fundamental part of domestic life, fostering new patterns of interaction and leisure (Морозова, О. П., & Розенберг, Н. В. 2025). Furthermore, the global reach of online communication enables intercultural dialogue and the rapid dissemination of linguistic innovations. The proliferation of youth slang in social media environments is not only altering everyday language but also reshaping cognitive frameworks, value systems, and behavioral norms among younger generations. In the era of digitalization, language transcends its conventional role as a tool of communication, emerging instead as a cultural code that reflects and reinforces societal transformations. China is currently one of the most dynamically

developing countries in the world and, in certain sectors, has established itself as a global leader. Among these, the cyber industry stands out for its rapid development and its distinctive linguistic and cultural features. Modern Chinese digital culture diverges fundamentally from the globally dominant, Western-centric model, giving rise to a unique linguo-cultural ecosystem. In China, the majority of user communication practices are centered on national, multifunctional platforms—most notably WeChat (微信), Weibo (微博), Douyin (抖音), and Bilibili. These platforms are not merely communication tools but serve as integrated systems that combine social networking, messaging, payment services, news dissemination, and avenues for cultural expression. This nationally bounded digital infrastructure fosters the emergence of local norms of interaction and behavioral models. Within these platforms, users construct social identities, maintain in-group dynamics, regulate information access, and express cultural values, often independently of global digital ecosystems (Montag, C., Becker, B., & Gan, C. 2018).

Chinese digital linguoculture is not merely characterized using the Chinese language online; rather, it constitutes a synergistic system in which language, platform design, and cultural norms reinforce one another, creating a culturally encoded digital reality. Despite its growing significance, the linguistic and cultural dimensions of China's digital sphere remain insufficiently studied. As He, Y. notes, most academic research continues to focus on Western platforms, leaving Chinese digital culture underrepresented in global discourse (He, Y. 2024). This imbalance not only limits our understanding of how digital identity is formed within non-Western communicative models but also narrows the theoretical horizons of linguoculturology as a global discipline. Hua, N. describes the Chinese internet language as a "living cultural ecosystem" that reflects the collective emotions and social values of its users (Hua, N. 2021). Furthermore, recent studies reveal that Chinese internet memes have become a site of multimodal creativity, blending traditional cultural symbols with new digital forms of expression (De Groot, F. O. 2025). Therefore, the study of Chinese digital linguoculture presents promising opportunities for rethinking the interrelation between language, culture, and digital identity, particularly from a non-Western perspective.

As V. N. Telia observes, language is not merely a tool of communication but a medium for preserving, interpreting, and transmitting cultural meanings (Телия, В. 2013). This view implies the need for a systematic analysis of how these cultural forms evolve

over time and across different socio-cultural contexts. Similarly, V. A. Maslova emphasizes that linguoculturology explores language as a space where the national mentality, system of values, and collective representations of a people are reflected (Маслова, В. А. 2001). These foundational approaches provide the theoretical basis for analyzing digital linguoculture, within which the interaction of verbal, visual, and symbolic elements gives rise to new models of cultural identity. In the context of rapid digital transformation, these ideas acquire particular significance, since it is within the online environment that traditional cultural codes are being reinterpreted and adapted to modern forms of communication.

The aim of this study is to identify and describe the ways in which cultural and cognitive codes of Chinese digital linguo-culture are represented through Internet memes.

To achieve this aim, the research sets out the following objectives:

1. To formulate the theoretical foundations of the concept of *digital linguo-culture* within contemporary linguistics and cultural studies;
2. To analyze the specific features of Chinese Internet memes as a form of multimodal communication;
3. To identify key cultural and philosophical concepts—道(dao) – the path, 和(hé) – harmony, 勤(qín) – diligence, and 命(mìng) – fate—in their semantic and visual representation;
4. To describe the interaction between linguistic and visual elements in the construction of digital identity;
5. To examine memes as a medium for preserving and transmitting national cultural values within the digital environment.

The scientific novelty of this research lies in its comprehensive interpretation of Chinese digital linguoculture as a system that integrates traditional cultural archetypes with modern multimodal means of communication. Unlike previous studies, which have largely focused on linguistic or sociological aspects of Internet discourse, the present work approaches digital space through the lens of linguocultural regularities. The study draws upon F. O. De Groot's concept of multimodality and digital creativity, as well as N. Hua's idea of the Chinese Internet language as a "living cultural ecosystem" that mirrors collective emotions and social values. Methodologically, the research is grounded in qualitative linguocultural analysis and multimodal interpretation of digital texts, which together provide tools for revealing how linguistic and visual elements construct cultural meanings online. At

the same time, the proposed interpretation extends these approaches by applying them to the analysis of specific linguocultural codes represented in Chinese digital discourse.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in the expansion of linguoculturology's methodological framework through the inclusion of digital communication forms within its analytical domain. The practical significance of the research consists in the possibility of applying its findings to the development of academic courses in intercultural communication, Internet linguistics, and modern Chinese culture, as well as to the analysis of cultural adaptation processes in the digital age. Furthermore, the results may be of value to scholars in adjacent disciplines such as media studies and digital anthropology.

Thus, the present study seeks to achieve a deeper conceptual understanding of the mechanisms governing the interaction between language, culture, and digital forms of communication. In doing so, it contributes to the broadening of the disciplinary boundaries of modern linguoculturology and opens new perspectives for examining national identity in the era of digital globalization.

### **The Emergence of Linguoculturology as a Discipline**

Linguoculturology is a relatively young yet rapidly developing branch of the humanities that has emerged at the intersection of linguistics, cultural studies, and cognitive science. Its formation reflects the broader intellectual effort to bridge the gap between language as a structural system and culture as a sphere of meanings.

The philosophical roots of the discipline can be traced to Wilhelm von Humboldt, who described language as "the organ of thought" shaping a nation's worldview (Von Humboldt W, 1985). Later, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity emphasized that the structure of language influences habitual patterns of perception and reasoning (Sapir E, 1921; Whorf B. L, 1956). Franz Boas viewed language as a reflection of the ethnographic experience of its speakers, arguing that linguistic forms encode cultural knowledge (Boas F, 1911). These ideas laid the foundation for the humanistic study of the interaction between language and culture.

### **The Russian School of Linguoculturology**

Linguoculturology emerged as a distinct discipline within Russian scholarship in the latter half of the twentieth century. E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov introduced the concept of *linguistic and cultural studies* (*lingvostranovedenie*), defining language as "a mirror of national consciousness" (EM

Vereshchagin, VG Kostomarov, 1990). V.N. Telia emphasized the interpretive and cultural functions of language, calling it "a repository of cultural meanings" (Telia V. N, 1996). Building on these ideas, V.A. Maslova conceptualized linguoculture as "a dynamic system uniting language, cognition, and values" (V.A. Maslova, 2001). V. Karasik described the *concept* as "a unit of collective consciousness" that holds culturally significant information (V. Karasik, 2004), while V.V. Krasnykh linked linguistic meaning with the national character and collective memory (V.V. Krasnykh, 2006).

### **International Parallels**

Similar ideas appeared in international scholarship. Clifford Geertz viewed culture as "a web of meanings spun by man himself," positioning language as a key interpretive instrument (Geertz C, 1973). In the twenty-first century, Farzad Sharifian's *Cultural Linguistics* integrated cognitive linguistics and anthropology, defining language as a repository of *cultural cognition* (Sharifian F, 2017). Edward Hall (Hall E. T, 1973) focused on non-verbal and contextual communication, introducing the distinction between *high- and low-context cultures*. These approaches share the idea that language serves as a living form of collective cultural knowledge.

### **Core Concepts of Linguoculturology**

The conceptual framework of linguoculturology rests on five key categories — *linguoculture*, *cultural code*, *concept*, *value*, and *national worldview*. According to Telia, *linguoculture* represents "a set of linguistic means reflecting a people's system of cultural values" (Telia V. N, 1996). Lotman introduced the notion of *cultural code* as a mechanism translating cultural experience into semiotic form (Lotman Y. M, 2000). Karasik and Maslova defined the *concept* as a mental construct combining knowledge, emotion, and value (V. Karasik, 2004; V.A. Maslova, 2001), while Krasnykh emphasized *value* as the axiological nucleus of linguistic meaning (V.V. Krasnykh, 2006). The idea of a *national worldview*, developed by Apresyan, connects linguistic semantics with the collective perception of reality (Apresyan Y.D, 1995). Together these categories form the methodological foundation for analyzing language as a cultural phenomenon.

### **Contemporary Trends: Digitalization and Multimodality**

In the twenty-first century, linguoculturology has expanded to include digital linguoculture — a hybrid sphere where linguistic, visual, and technological codes interact. As Kress and van Leeuwen observed, modern communication is inherently *multimodal*, combining text, image, and sound into cohesive semiotic systems (Kress G, Van Leeuwen T, 2020). F.O. De Groot defines

digital linguoculture as “a multimodal ecology of identity construction” (De Groot F. O, 2025), while N. Hua interprets the Chinese internet vernacular as “a living cultural ecosystem reflecting collective emotions and values” (Hua N, 2021). In this sense, digital communication reproduces the essential mechanisms of traditional culture, but in a new, technologically mediated form. As Henry Jenkins notes, online communication fosters *participatory culture*, in which users not only consume but also co-create cultural meanings (Jenkins H, 2009).

Thus, the key principles of linguoculturology — anthropocentrism, value orientation, and the cultural conditioning of meaning — remain relevant. They continue to evolve in digital and multimodal environments, allowing the discipline to explore how culture adapts to new communicative realities.

### Core Concepts of Linguoculturology and Their Role in the Digital Context

#### Conceptual Foundations and Theoretical Significance

Contemporary linguoculturology faces the need to redefine its conceptual framework in light of the digital transformation of communication. As V.N. Telia (1996) noted, language is not merely a mirror of culture but an *active mechanism for generating cultural meaning*. In the digital age, this statement gains new relevance: communication is increasingly multimodal, combining text, image, sound, and visual design within a single semiotic space. Y.M. Lotman (1992) anticipated this development when he described culture as “a mechanism for producing texts.” In the digital sphere, this mechanism manifests in an intensified form — memes, emojis, and hashtags have become new types of cultural texts encoding collective experience. Hence, the systematization of linguocultural categories is not a formal exercise but a methodological necessity for understanding *new modes of cultural expression*.

According to V.A. Maslova (2001) language is “a living space of cultural meanings.” Today, this space has shifted into the digital domain, where symbolic and visual forms are integrated into linguistic practice. F.O. De Groot (2025) emphasizes that digital communication gives rise to *multimodal forms of cultural identity*, where language and image interact in meaning-making processes. Chinese online communities, for instance, use memes and stickers as “hybrid cultural forms” that blend humor, philosophy, and traditional symbolism.

The theoretical significance of this perspective lies in viewing the classical categories of linguoculturology — *linguoculture*, *cultural code*, *concept*, *value*, and *national worldview* — as methodological tools for analyzing digital phenomena. They help reveal how

national meanings — such as the Chinese concepts of 道 (dao, the path), 和 (he, harmony), and 勤 (qin, diligence) — are recontextualized in online environments.

#### Core Categories of Linguoculturology

##### 1. Linguoculture

Introduced by Telia (1996) and later elaborated by Maslova (2001), *linguoculture* unites language, cognition, and culture within a single communicative system. In the digital era, the notion expands to include networked and visual forms of meaning. De Groot (2025) defines digital linguoculture as an “ecosystem of shared meanings,” where users collaboratively construct cultural identity.

In Chinese online spaces such as *Weibo* and *Bilibili*, visual symbols perform this role: the panda (熊猫) represents national “soft power,” while the “Little Pink” (小粉红) community embodies the patriotic youth identity. Thus, *linguoculture* evolves into a multimodal phenomenon, merging linguistic and visual codes of cultural expression.

##### 2. Cultural Code

As Lotman (1992) described, the cultural code is a mechanism for translating collective experience into sign-based communication. In digital culture, the code becomes hybrid and participatory. According to Kress and van Leeuwen (2020) meaning now emerges through the interplay of modes — text, image, sound, and color — that together create a new “grammar of communication.”

In Chinese online discourse, the numeric expression “666” (liù liù liù) signifies approval or admiration — an instance where a number operates as a cultural-emotional code. Similarly, color symbolism retains its traditional associations: red conveys luck and festivity, gold prosperity and honor. Digital culture thus continues the Chinese semiotic tradition while transforming its mediums of expression.

##### 3. Concept

Following Karasik, the *concept* is a “unit of collective consciousness” integrating knowledge, emotion, and value. In the digital sphere, concepts acquire visual-semantic form. For instance, the meme “佛系青年” (fóxì qīngnián, ‘Buddhist youth’) expresses the cultural concept of *serenity and detachment*, derived from Zen philosophy but reinterpreted through digital irony. This transformation illustrates how ancient philosophical ideas survive as cultural concepts — reframed through the aesthetic and humorous codes of online communication.

#### 4. Value

Values constitute the axiological core of linguoculture (Maslova, 2001). In the Chinese digital environment, traditional values such as *harmony* (和), *diligence* (勤), and *filial piety* (孝) reappear through contemporary, often ironic expression. The meme “躺平” (tǎng píng, ‘lying flat’) reflects fatigue with overwork yet resonates with the Daoist ideal of *non-action* (无为) and inner balance. Thus, digital communication does not destroy traditional values — it reframes them as forms of cultural self-reflection.

#### 5. National Worldview

The concept of *national worldview* originates from Humboldt (1985) and Apresyan (1995), who saw language as a repository of collective perception. In digital contexts, this worldview becomes distributed and dialogic (Sharifian, 2017, pp. 23–25): users co-create cultural meanings through shared participation. Chinese memes referencing Confucius or quotations from *Dao De Jing* often combine reverence and irony — continuing the national worldview of *balance* and *the path* (道), yet adapting it to contemporary media. Hence, digital communication functions as a new arena for articulating national identity through hybrid semiotic expression.

#### Transformation of Categories in the Digital Context

The migration of linguocultural categories into digital space entails not the loss but the expansion of their functions. *Linguoculture* becomes an ecosystem of online meanings; *cultural code* — a process of collective meaning production; *concept* — a visual metaphor; *value* — a subject of self-irony; *worldview* — a polyphonic narrative distributed across users and platforms.

As Hua (2021) observes, Chinese digital culture does not dismantle tradition — it creates “new ecosystems of cultural emotion,” where humor, patriotism, and philosophy intertwine. Memes featuring Buddha, Confucius, or the character 命 (fate) transform classical ideas into accessible network imagery. The specificity of Chinese digital linguoculture lies in its ability to preserve cultural continuity through transformation of form.

#### Interdisciplinary Methodological Perspective

Modern linguoculturology increasingly integrates insights from cognitive linguistics, semiotics, and multimodal communication theory. This interdisciplinary convergence stems from a recognition that language today functions as a multi-layered semiotic system, combining verbal, visual, and interactive dimensions.

#### Cognitive perspective.

Building on Sapir (1921), Whorf (1956), and Sharifian (2017) this approach views language as a repository of *cultural cognition*. In Chinese online culture, memes such as “内卷” (nèijuǎn, ‘involution’) act as cognitive models representing collective attitudes toward work, competition, and harmony.

#### Semiotic perspective.

Drawing on Lotman (1992) and Heath, S. (1977), culture is interpreted as a system of interacting texts. In Chinese digital discourse, memes and hashtags function as *micro-texts* that link mythology, politics, and irony — the digital form of what Lotman called “dialogue between texts.”

#### Multimodal perspective. \

According to Halliday (1978) and Kress & van Leeuwen (2020), meaning is generated through the interaction of modalities. The Chinese tradition of aesthetic synthesis (诗画合一 — “unity of poetry and painting”) naturally extends into digital communication, where text, sound, and imagery merge into a cohesive expressive act. De Groot (2025) suggests that digital texts are “hybrid forms of cultural expression,” in which cognitive schemas, visual patterns, and emotional cues converge into unified structures of meaning. This interdisciplinary synthesis — which can be described as *cultural-cognitive multimodality* — provides a methodological foundation for analyzing how Chinese digital culture retains traditional archetypes through innovative expressive forms.

Thus, the core categories of linguoculturology — *linguoculture*, *cultural code*, *concept*, *value*, and *national worldview* — undergo transformation in the digital sphere while continuing to carry collective memory and cultural meaning. Their multimodal evolution enables us to view digital discourse not merely as a technological phenomenon but as a new medium of cultural identity. It is upon this methodological foundation that the following analysis is built. The next section turns to a concrete examination of Chinese digital linguoculture — one of the most illustrative cases in which the dialogue between tradition and innovation becomes particularly vivid.

Through the study of internet memes, digital symbols, and online narratives, we will explore how cultural values, emotions, and cognitive models are reinterpreted and sustained within China’s networked communicative landscape.

#### Chinese Digital Linguoculture: Case Study

The preceding section outlined how linguocultural categories — *linguoculture*, *cultural code*, *concept*,

value, and *national worldview* — evolve within digital environments while preserving their cultural essence. Building upon this theoretical framework, the present section applies these concepts to the analysis of Chinese digital linguoculture, one of the most dynamic and symbolically rich ecosystems in contemporary global communication.

China provides a particularly revealing case: its digital environment merges deep cultural continuity with rapid technological transformation. Internet platforms such as *Weibo*, *Bilibili*, and *Douyin* have become spaces where users collectively reinterpret traditional values through humor, visual play, and multimodal expression. Analyzing these practices through the lens of linguoculturology allows us to explore how cultural memory is adapted to the rhythms and aesthetics of digital life.

### Research Design and Materials

This study adopts a qualitative multimodal approach, combining linguocultural, cognitive, and semiotic analysis (Telia, 1996; Sharifian, 2017; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2020).

The corpus includes approximately 100 Chinese memes and digital expressions circulated between 2020 and 2025, selected from major social media platforms (*Weibo*, *Bilibili*, *Douyin*, *Zhihu*). The material was chosen based on three criteria:

- (1) frequency of circulation;
- (2) cultural representativeness (relation to shared social values);
- (3) multimodal expressiveness — cases where verbal and visual elements are integrated.

Each item was interpreted in terms of its linguistic form, visual code, and cognitive function, revealing how it reflects enduring cultural archetypes within a modern communicative setting.

### Linguistic Level: Digital Vernacular

Chinese digital vernacular (网络语言) has become a vivid manifestation of collective emotion and moral reflection. Expressions such as “内卷” (nèijuǎn, ‘involution’), “躺平” (tǎng píng, ‘lying flat’), and “摆烂” (bǎi làn, ‘let it rot’) encapsulate the social experience of overwork and exhaustion in China’s competitive society. However, these neologisms also resonate with classical cultural notions:

- *勤* (*qin*, *diligence*) — transformed into ironic self-awareness;
- *命* (*ming*, *fate*) — expressing acceptance of inevitability;
- *和* (*he*, *harmony*) — now evoked as sarcastic balance amidst chaos.

As Hua (2021) observes, the digital lexicon of modern China functions as “a living emotional archive,” where humor and moral reflection coexist. This linguistic creativity illustrates linguoculture as a process — not a static structure but an ongoing negotiation of identity, deeply rooted in shared cultural memory.

### Visual-Semiotic Level: Symbols and Meme Imagery

Visual communication in Chinese digital space reveals the resilience of cultural codes through transformation. Iconic figures such as Confucius, Buddha, and even the panda are reinterpreted through memes that blend irony with reverence. The meme of the “*Laughing Confucius*” exemplifies this duality: the sage appears with modern captions expressing frustration, love, or sarcasm — yet the image still carries the cultural weight of wisdom and composure.

Color symbolism remains deeply embedded: red denotes luck and collective spirit, gold prosperity and pride, while blue often connotes digital melancholy and fatigue. Similarly, numeric codes like “666” (liù liù liù) convey admiration and positivity — a modern parallel to ancient numerological semiotics.

According to De Groot (2025) Chinese memes exhibit “a synthesis of aesthetic heritage and self-ironic commentary,” turning tradition into a language of play. Here, the *visual code* does not replace linguistic meaning; rather, it amplifies it — forming a multimodal space where national identity is re-enacted through irony, emotion, and imagery.

### Cognitive-Cultural Level: Conceptual Frames

At a deeper level, digital communication activates traditional **conceptual frames** — condensed models of worldview that guide cultural perception. Concepts like 道 (*dao*, *the path*), 命 (*ming*, *fate*), and 和 (*he*, *harmony*) are reinterpreted through everyday digital discourse. For example:

- “佛系青年” (fóxì qīngnián, ‘Buddhist youth’) captures a sense of peaceful detachment — the modern echo of Daoist non-action (无为).
- “996” (the work schedule 9 a.m.–9 p.m., six days a week) functions as a cultural metaphor for 勤 (*qin*, *diligence*) reimagined under capitalist strain.
- The humorous phrase “随缘吧” (‘go with fate’) embodies 命 (*ming*) as a collective coping mechanism.

In these examples, cognitive schemas derived from classical philosophy are recontextualized through irony and digital brevity. As Sharifian (2017) notes, cultural cognition operates through shared metaphors — in China’s case, metaphors that continue to circulate across linguistic and visual modes, sustaining collective

worldviews even in fragmented online spaces.

### Integrative Discussion: The Semiotics of Digital Identity

Across all levels — linguistic, visual, and cognitive — Chinese digital linguoculture demonstrates continuity through transformation. Digital users act as *co-authors of meaning*, reworking national symbols into collective expressions of humor, critique, and belonging. Traditional cultural codes are not discarded but translated into new semiotic systems — memes, emojis, hashtags — that preserve their associative energy while adapting to new communicative logics. As Lotman (1992) argued, culture does not vanish when media change; it simply “alters its codes of expression.” Chinese digital identity exemplifies this principle: ancient values such as harmony, effort, and fate persist, but they now circulate through multimodal creativity and communal reinterpretation. In this sense, digital culture functions as both a *mirror and a mediator* of national consciousness — a dynamic archive where laughter, tradition, and philosophy coexist.

### Summary of Findings

Chinese digital linguoculture integrates verbal and visual forms into a coherent multimodal system of expression.

1. Traditional values — *harmony* (和), *diligence* (勤), *fate* (命) — remain central, though reframed through irony and brevity.
2. Internet memes operate as linguocultural condensations, uniting humor and heritage.
3. Cultural identity in digital China is built not on imitation of the past, but on *creative reinterpretation*.
4. The analysis confirms the methodological relevance of linguoculturology as a tool for understanding cultural resilience in networked societies.

### CONCLUSION

The present study has explored the transformation of linguocultural categories within the context of Chinese digital communication. By integrating linguocultural, cognitive, and multimodal perspectives, the research demonstrated that digital discourse functions as a living continuation of national culture, not its rupture. Through linguistic innovation, visual symbolism, and collective creativity, Chinese users reinterpret traditional values — *harmony* (和), *diligence* (勤), *fate* (命), and *the path* (道) — in ways that sustain their cultural relevance in a globalized and media-saturated environment.

The analysis revealed that linguoculture in the digital age is characterized by hybridity, irony, and multimodality. Memes and digital idioms act as *cultural condensations*: compressed forms where emotional, moral, and philosophical dimensions of identity intersect.

Rather than signaling cultural decay, this process illustrates cultural resilience — the capacity of language to preserve collective cognition through new media codes.

Methodologically, the research confirms the potential of linguoculturology as a framework for analyzing online communication. The combination of cognitive and semiotic methods enables a deeper understanding of how cultural meanings are constructed, circulated, and reinterpreted in digital environments. In particular, the Chinese case demonstrates that multimodal creativity can serve as a form of national self-reflection, translating ancient archetypes into contemporary media languages.

In conclusion, digital linguoculture should be understood as an evolving ecosystem of meaning where tradition and innovation coexist. It is not a break from cultural continuity, but a transformation of its expressive form — a new chapter in the dialogue between language, identity, and technology. The study thus opens avenues for further interdisciplinary research on how linguistic and cultural patterns adapt to the changing semiotics of the digital world.

### REFERENCES

1. Ашыракунова, А. А. (2025). ИНФОРМАТИКА: РОЛЬ В ПОВСЕДНЕВНОЙ ЖИЗНИ ЧЕЛОВЕКА. *Вестник науки*, 1(10 (91)), 438-445.
2. Мифтахутдинов, Р. Т. (2025). Сохранение политической субъектности в условиях цифровизации. *Философская мысль*, (4), 26-41.
3. Морозова, О. П., & Розенберг, Н. В. (2025). Цифровые медиа в повседневной жизни российских семей: практики использования и восприятие ценности. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ НАУЧНО-ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ* Учредители: Индивидуальный предприниматель Соколова Марина Владимировна, (5).
4. Montag, C., Becker, B., & Gan, C. (2018). The multipurpose application WeChat: a review on recent research. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2247.
5. He, Y. (2024). Exploring linguistic innovations within Chinese internet slang in language and social media. *Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies*, 3(1), 29-34.
6. Hua, N. (2021). Memes, communities and continuous change: Chinese internet vernacular

explained.

7. De Groot, F. O. (2025). Multimodal creativity and identity in digital discourse: meme practices in China. *Multimodal Communication*, 14(1), 37-51.
8. Телия, В. (2013). *Русская фразеология. Семантический, pragmaticеский и лингвокультурологический аспекты*. ЛитРес.
9. Маслова, В. А. (2001). *ВЫСШЕЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ ВА МАСЛОВА ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ УЧЕБНОЕ ПОСОБИЕ* Для студентов высших учебных заведений.
10. Humboldt, W. (1999). On language: On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species. Sapir E. An introduction to the study of speech //Language. – 1921. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 15.
11. Sapir, E. (1921). An introduction to the study of speech. *Language*, 1(1), 15.
12. Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language, thought, and reality: selected writings of....(Edited by John B. Carroll.).
13. Boas, F. (1911). *Introduction [to Handbook of American Indian Languages]* (No. 677). US Government Printing Office.
14. Vereshchagin, E. M., & Kostomarov, V. G. (1990). Language and culture. *Russkiy Yazyk, Moscow, Russia*.
15. Telia, V. N. (1996). Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects.
16. Маслова, В. А. (2001). *лингвокультурология* (pp. 208-208). Издательский центр "Академия".
17. Карасик, В. (2002). Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс.
18. Красных, В. В. (2006). Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология..
19. Geertz, C. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures. | New York: Basic. GeertzThe Interpretation of Cultures1973.
20. Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2017). *Advances in cultural linguistics*. Singapore: Springer.
21. Hall, E. T. (1973). *The silent language*. Anchor.
22. Лотман, Ю. М., & Лотман, М. Ю. (2000). *Семиосфера* (Vol. 7). Искусство-СПб.
23. Апресян, Ю. Д. (1995). Лексическая семантика//Избранные труды. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1, 14-15.
24. Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2020). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
25. Jenkins, H. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century* (p. 145). The MIT press.
26. Lotman, Y. M. (2004). Semiosfera. St. Petersburg, Искусство-СПб. 704 p.
27. Karasik, V. I. (2002). Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. *Volgograd: Peremena*, 477.
28. Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2020). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
29. Halliday, M. A. (1978). *Language as social semiotic* (p. 136). Arnold: London.
30. Heath, S. (1977). *Image-music-text*. Fontana, London..
31. Sharifian, F. (2017). Cultural linguistics.