


УДК 81'22

DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2021-7-3-0-2

Arkadiy P. Sedykh 

Linguistic identity, national archetypes and sociocultural environment of their formation

Belgorod State National Research University
85 Pobedy St., Belgorod, 308015, Russia
E-mail: sedykh@bsu.edu.ru
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-6604-3722

Received 18 August 2021; accepted 10 September 2021; published 30 September 2021

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the current state of the categories “linguistic identity” and “national archetype” in correlation with the socio-cultural environment. The national and cultural values of any ethno psychological group are reflected in the language serving a real-life community of people. National archetypes are the semiotic basis of linguistic identity, which is formed within a certain socio-cultural context, an inalienable instance of the psychophysical structure of a person. It is argued that the essential characteristics of the national linguistic identity can be detected already at the level of identifying the semantic features of the language units of the utterance in discoursing. The next steps to reconstruct the linguistic personality are associated with modelling the logical-semantic structure of the utterance, due to the presence of ethnocultural traces at all levels of the subject's discourse behaviour. The discourse behaviour of an individual is the essence of his communicative activity and worldview. It was found that behavioural models, modal and nominative ways of reflecting reality are ethnoculturally determined not only by language, but also by immanent preferences in accordance with the logic, semantics and pragmatics of the communicative act. It is suggested that the verbalization of Russian identity (the magic of Russian vocabulary) is preferably carried out within the framework of contact strategies (direct means of expressing thoughts) and in correlation with the values of the national community, and the intellectual parameters of the French language are implemented in line with distant communication strategies (indirect means expressions of thought) and the priority of individual values. Prospects for the application of the method of reconstructing new knowledge in the mainstream of identifying the dominant features of a national linguistic personality in languages of different structures are outlined.

Keywords: Linguistic identity; National archetype; Sociolinguistics; Lingvo-semiotics of meaning; Type of culture; Ethnocultural dominant

How to cite: Sedykh A. P. (2021). Linguistic identity, national archetypes and sociocultural environment of their formation. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, V.7 (3), 15-27, DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2021-7-3-0-2

УДК 81'22

DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2021-7-3-0-2

Седых А. П. 

**Языковая идентичность, национальные архетипы
и социокультурная среда их формирования**

Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет,
ул. Победы, 85, г. Белгород, 308015 Россия
E-mail: sedykh@bsu.edu.ru
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-6604-3722

*Статья поступила 18 августа 2021 г.; принята 10 сентября 2021 г.;
опубликована 30 сентября 2021 г.*

Аннотация. Цель статьи – проанализировать актуальное состояние категорий «языковая идентичность» и «национальный архетип» в корреляции с социокультурной средой. Национальные архетипы являются семиотическим базисом языковой идентичности, которая формируется в рамках определённого социокультурного контекста, неотторжимой инстанции психофизической структуры личности. Утверждается, что сущностные характеристики национальной языковой идентичности могут быть обнаружены уже на уровне выявления семантических особенностей языковых единиц высказывания на первом этапе когнитивно-коммуникативной интерпретации дискурса. Следующие шаги по реконструкции языковой личности связаны с моделированием логико-семантической структуры высказывания, обусловленной наличием этнокультурных следов на всех уровнях дискурсного поведения субъекта. Дискурсное поведение индивида – суть его коммуникативная активность и мировидение. Обнаружено, что модели поведения, модальные и номинативные способы отражения действительности этнокультурно детерминированы не только языковыми, но и имманентными предпочтениями в соответствии с логикой, семантикой и прагматикой коммуникативного акта. Высказывается предположение о том, что вербализация русской идентичности («магия русской лексики») предпочтительно осуществляется в рамках контактных стратегий (прямые средства выражения мысли) и в корреляции с ценностями национального сообщества, а интеллектуальные параметры французского языка реализуются в русле дистантных стратегий коммуникации (косвенные средства выражения мысли) и приоритете индивидуальных ценностей. Намечаются перспективы применения методики реконструкции нового знания в русле выявления доминантных признаков национальной языковой личности в разноструктурных языках.

Ключевые слова: Языковая идентичность; Национальный архетип; Социолингвистика; Лингвосемиотика смысла; Тип культуры; Этнокультурная доминанта

Информация для цитирования: Седых А. П. Языковая идентичность, национальные архетипы и социокультурная среда их формирования // Научный результат. Вопросы теоретической и прикладной лингвистики. 2021. Т.7, N3. С. 15-27. DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2021-7-3-0-2

1.1. Introduction

From the point of view of modern linguo-semiotics and explicative linguistics, the “speaking person” is considered in correlation with the category of “linguistic sign”, moreover, many linguists interpret the linguistic personality as a sign, linguistic symbol or concept in the dynamics of its projection into the discourse space of communication. A linguistic personality (identity) in this sense is structured as a linguistic sign that has an ethnic substrate (trace) in its semantics, which is realized as a reference point for the individual's behavioural attitudes. We are talking here, in essence, about linguistic behaviour, which embodies the national character, psychology and mentality.

A number of scientists position the linguistic personality as a “species-specific universal”, within the framework of which “conditions are created for the complementary use of the dominant systemic-structural model of describing language as an external object and an actual model of language within a person”, and the observed behavioural facts are proposed to be considered as initial “for constructing hypotheses about psychodynamic processes with the variability of the socio-communicative environment” (Shaposhnikova, 2021: 279). At the same time, the national language is the key vector and an absolute episteme for the reconstruction of the conceptual identification model.

Language as a virtual structure realizes its potential in the speech behaviour of the speakers of a given language, which is due to the typological characteristics of the collective consciousness of a particular social organism. So, Yu.M. Lotman notes the gravitation of the Western European way of thinking towards the sign (semiotic) type and the tendency of the Russian towards the symbolic (unconventional) type of mentality (Lotman, 1999: 357-379).

It is known that different cultures and different languages have different structures: “Cultures, like languages, can be both more

open (like Russian) and more “closed” (for example, French). National identity, national psychology are reflected in the language, in the nature of its relations with other languages” (Skvortsov, 1996: 16).

O. Mandelstam, speaking about the rationalism of Western cultures (language) and the “boundless” element of the Russian language, writes: “Russian nominalism, i.e. the idea of the reality of the word as such, gives life to the spirit of our language and connects it with the Hellenic philological culture not etymologically and not literary, but through the principle of inner freedom, equally inherent in both of them” (Mandelstam, 1987).

Each language each time in its own way (and in a new way) segments reality, that is, reality is mediated in different ways by different languages: “People (...) are largely influenced by that particular language, which is a means of communication for a given society ... (...) The “real world” is largely unconsciously built on the basis of the linguistic norms of this group ... We see, hear and perceive in one way or another certain phenomena mainly because the linguistic norms of our society presuppose this form of expression” (Sapir, 1993).

In one sense, the concept of norm is associated with the literary norm, in terms of a high sample of language use, as the correct, pure speech of educated people, to which it is necessary to strive for compliance.

In our research, this term is used in a more specific sense – it is that constant, common in the language, thanks to which people understand each other, “the norm in this aspect is completely objective, always with us, whether we want it or not. It is a reality that is homogeneous enough for speakers to feel its unity. This is an intralingual attribute” (Shaposhnikov, 1998: 8).

The concept of a linguistic norm is associated with the peculiarities of the rhetorical ideal of each nation. So, according to A.K. Mikhalskaya, the main distinguishing feature of the Russian rhetorical ideal is

“dialogical content (...) in which genuine subject-subject relations are realized between the speaker and the addressee”. Whereas “the Western type of culture is characterized by individual isolation and competitiveness of sovereign individuals, and the motive of individualism is inevitably associated with rationalism, with the primacy of logic” (Mikhalskaya, 1996: 173-174).

The lexico-semantic structure of a natural language determines a certain picture of the world for each language and is not reduced to a simple relationship between signs and the outside world. The meanings of the overwhelming number of words and grammatical units are associated with speech situations and native speakers. One cannot but agree with the opinion of A. Wierzbicka and E.V. Paducheva that meaning in natural language is *anthropocentric*, that is, it reflects the general properties of human nature; moreover, it is *ethnocentric*, that is, it is oriented towards a given ethnos (Wierzbicka 1991, Paducheva 1996). The semantics of the language, thus, concentrates certain national and cultural features.

1.2. Theoretical provisions of the research

This study identifies the correspondences between the language of specific societies (Russian and French) and their cultural values, perception system and behavioural characteristics. To identify the specifics of the linguistic behaviour of each national-cultural community, a comparative analysis of linguistic uses associated with a certain system of linguistic forms is carried out. The latter, in our opinion, are cultural components in the structure of the language and “affect in a completely predictable and definable way on the linguistic behaviour of the members of the collective, remaining, as a rule, in the area of sub- or over consciousness. The regularity of this “influence” is so great that a linguist can construct a description of the linguistic structure on the basis of a rather limited number of observations” (Bock, 1999: 116).

The communication process is viewed as an active, creative process of its participants. A speech utterance is a complex unity, the decoding of which is due to the presence of both a linguistic and a general model of behaviour. Interpretation of what is communicated in this key cannot do without taking into account the *connotative* meanings of the speech message. We believe that the following definition of the term *connotation* is the most successful: the sum of emotional-evaluative components accompanying denotative meaning in a real speech act and influencing the final meaning of the perceived utterance.

The importance of taking into account connotative meanings when decoding speech utterances is enhanced. Since the connotation manifests itself most often as a speech rather than a linguistic phenomenon, its isolation and interpretation are determined by the behavior model of the linguistic personality of a particular linguocultural community, in particular, Russian and French.

The linguistic personality is viewed as a category of discourse, that is, as “the reality of speech” (Benveniste, 2010). This reality functions within the framework of an abstract model, in all its parts defined and determined by the model of the use of the national language in the act of speech. Tendencies of speech use are considered within the framework of the so-called “symptomatic” method (more / less; more / less), when knowledge of the spoken usage allows us to highlight the most characteristic features of the linguistic behavior of representatives of two ethnic groups. To identify ethnocultural characteristics, the work uses the method of contrastive description both in terms of detecting the corresponding semes (component analysis) and at the level of textual use of bilingual linguistic material (contextual analysis).

1.3. Research methodology

Consideration of behavioral characteristics through the prism of language represents a certain degree of conventionality, when the general typology of semantic

characteristics (features) of linguistic units is “organized” within the framework of a single picture of the world with accentuation of the dominant features of the national worldview. In this sense, language as a self-organizing and self-regulating system is interpreted as a semiotic analogue of a person in the dynamics of discourse (speech) activity.

One of the most frequent ways of verbal response is the use of communicative “blanks”, which include standard formulations, speech patterns and clichés. However, a person is inherently creative, since communication with his own kind is “built” on the foundation of the initial creative potential of the individual. We can say that the subject is always in an alternative state between the conventionality (fixedness and rigidity) of the language and the creative activity of his creative nature. Linguistic behaviour is actualized within the framework of the constant reversibility of consciousness: **quality↔quantity; performer↔tool**. The organic nature of the communication process depends on these two interpenetrating “substances”.

The term “linguistic behaviour” is traditionally included in the conceptual field of the term “communicative behaviour” by E. Sapir, who writes that “language is the most explicit of the known types of communicative behaviour <...> language is mainly a communicative process” (Sapir, 1993: 211).

Linguistic identity is formed and developed in the conditions of real communicative practice within the framework of recurrent topics and situations of communication adopted in a particular national linguistic community. The national linguistic community is integrated into the national cultural space, which is filled with ethno-cultural meanings, in other words, the individual is involved in the semantic fields of culture as the word “involved” in the wide context of the discourse product: statements, text, narrative. Cultural narratives have an active generating potential for their deployment in the linguistic consciousness of an individual undergoing certain

transformations under the influence of linguistic forms of the national language.

One of the central methods of identifying the role of linguistic structures in the ontogenesis of communicative competencies is cognitive-communicative reconstruction of the models of linguistic behaviour of the subject of speech. This process covers both the statics and dynamics of language functioning. In comparative terms, the cognitive-communicative methodology is based on identifying semantic features and conceptual signs of verbalization in compared languages, for example, Russian and French. We are talking about the cross-cultural symptomatology of the results of a psycholinguistic experiment.

The grammar and vocabulary of a language (at least Indo-European) “guide” the speech behaviour of an individual, since any communication model is based on the phenomenon of conventionality, in other words, on the conventions of grammatical and lexical semantics, the same conventions as national-cultural stereotypes of the worldview. The grammatical and lexical semantics “shape” the perceived world and make it “ours” for native speakers of a particular language (“alien” for a foreign language). So, markers of the past gender of a verb in Russian are irrelevant for the French language (*sdal-sdala-sdalo = j'ai rendu*).

Along with the category of relevance, let us single out two more semantic key categories for identifying the essential characteristics of linguistic identity: the **mobility** of semantic configurations and **associability**. The first category is mainly associated with lexical meaning, and its functioning is determined by the degree of differentiation of the conceptual fund of linguistic culture. The semantic configurations of the vocabulary of the national language to a large extent “govern” the categorical choice of the priorities of the worldview. For example, in French there are two verbs with nuanced semantics of possession of knowledge: *connaître* and *savoir*. These verbs encourage French

speakers to use an alternative type of categorization. The epistemological system of Russian lingvoculture, possessing one verb “to know”, does not carry out such a differentiation, reducing the “double” semantics to a uniform type of classification.

As far as the degree of associability of linguistic material is concerned, it does not coincide in different languages, and is associated with a different degree of imagery (abstractness / concreteness) of parts of speech. For example, scholars note “the greater abstraction of the French verb in comparison with the Russian verb” (Gak, 2018). We are talking here about the mismatch of perceptual constructs (conceptual algorithms) that precede the inception of a speech act, in other words, “information carried equally by visual and linguistic modalities” (Jackendoff, 1984). The semantic field of culture in this sense correlates with the national picture of the world, part of which is the autochthonous conceptual sphere, verbalized by the national language.

1.4. Results and discussion

In most cases of its representations, the term “national picture of the world” in one of its definitional components contains the key idea of “linguistic mediation”, that is, it essentially implies “relativity of linguistic perception (Likhachev, 1993). In this sense, the semantic structure of a natural language and the extra-linguistic reality, which the language is intended to reflect, are in a contractual type of relationship. The average native speaker is not aware of the existence of such a preliminary “agreement”, since this type of inference requires the efforts of a reflexive-research tessitura.

Non-linguistic reality is interpreted through the prism of language as a set of external referents correlated with the selectivity of semantic configurations. At the same time, referring to external objects, semantics does not rely on the relations of causality, since the causality here of a different plan is semiotic. Semiosis of culture as an act of generating a sign substance

essentially creates its own rules of perception and interpretation in the process of communicative activity, in other words, external reality is assigned a service role.

Each ethnic group has at its disposal a set of objects and facts that are not fully comparable with the nomenclature of phenomena of another ethnic group, which results in differentiated statistics of quantitative and qualitative parameters of the nominees. So, the natural environment is specifically refracted in the peculiarities of national mentality and methods of communication: the severity and mildness of the climate, the peculiarities of flora and fauna are reflected in the language and speech realizations. This phenomenon is characteristic not only of mobile lexical semantics, but also of the statics of the grammatical level.

The desire and intentions of communication are actualized (satisfied) in verbal and non-verbal models of behavior based on the acquired linguistic competence in the process of human socialization. It is clear that communicative needs exist in connection and thanks to the semantic paradigm of the language in which the individual speaks from childhood. The traditional Saussurean division “language / speech” works here only in the sense of the synergetic interaction of these instances, as well as as various hypostases of the interpretative reconstruction of the linguistic personality. Let us recall the concept of “pre-language readiness for communication” by the French linguist Yulia Kristeva. The scientist writes about “underlying linguistic structures” that organize and structure nationally “colored” communication algorithms (Kristeva, 2020).

Communication algorithms are implemented in certain behavioral tendencies inherent in most speakers of a particular language, and are conditioned by the dominants of the general psycholinguistic and cognitive phenomena of the ethnos. The main mechanisms of communication function in line with the permanent comparison of the

cognitive baggage of the individual with the conceptual schemes of collective consciousness. Subjective meanings do not always coincide with collective representations of reality; therefore, the speaker corrects his behaviour and perception of the world, striving for a balance of conceptual data and linguistic knowledge. We are talking about a kind of overcoming of subjectivation in order to achieve objectification and adequacy of communicative behaviour through language as a “dissipative system”. Dissipative structures, in particular of language, are by definition mobile and unstable, but in speech they acquire fixity and relative stability due to the “conventionality” of linguistic semantics (Prigogine, Stengers 2020).

It is important to emphasize precisely the procedural nature of semantic configurations that are interpreted by linguists at the intersection of ethnopsychology and cognitive linguistics. The relative homogeneity of the usage is achieved due to the dialectical synergy of the psyche and thought, in fact, as a result of the sublimation procedure, the removal of internal linguistic tension (the need for communication) by redirecting empathic energy to acceptable forms of communication. Apparently, national linguistic communities “survive” precisely because of the above mechanisms of the human psyche, structured like a language.

Cognitive activity, as a product and activity in the dialectic of interaction, is induced with the help of elements of the mythological space, projected or sublimated through the toolkit of linguistic models of a particular linguistic culture. Myth is one of the key modes of existence of a collective consciousness that coexists in the synergy of the individual and the public. Through the procedures of mythologization, a person comprehends both the world around him and his inner universe, organizes and categorizes all forms of reality and unreality. All types of social and individual practice are engulfed in mythologization. Any human activity is served by a specific type of discourse:

politics – institutional discourse, education – academic discourse, treatment – medical discourse, etc. Each type of discourse correlates with a specific mythology for a given activity, filled with stereotypes (clichés) and conditioned by the original archetypes functioning at the subconscious level.

According to some scholars, modern archetypes were themselves once clichéd linguistic structures: “The archetype cannot be isolated; it is elusive because it only appears in the very movement of awareness. Neither the cliché nor the archetype remain fixed long enough to allow a categorical definition; moreover, this has no interest because these two words only serve to situate two stages of the same process)” (Blanchard, 1974: 6).

We propose the following scheme for the linguistic measurement of the evolution of mythological consciousness: **archetype** → **myth** → **cliché**. These stages reflect the mechanisms of collective and individual assimilation of the created mythological reality. Universal archetypes form a semiotic basis for generating not only universal human myths, but also for the specificity of the mythology of the unique existence of a nation. So, each nation has its own mythologemes about the national language, which, as a rule, are reduced to four basic positions: a) the most ancient roots of the native language; b) the exceptional wealth of the native language and culture; c) the difficulty of studying it by foreigners; d) the presence of a permanent threat to the purity and correctness of the language. Regardless of nationality, most of the speakers of the national language, for example, realize and inevitably accept for granted the fact of the antiquity and richness of their native language.

Myth as a “communication system, message” according to R. Barthes (cit. according to Timofeev 2019), in which the potential of a special state of consciousness of the subject is realized within the framework of the specifics of mental paradigms, legitimizes the worldview of a person. One way or another, any discourse product has the

parameters of a mythological substance, which is not only a vector of the ethnocultural code, but also a concept-forming core of an utterance (message).

The synthesis of the conservatism and creativity of the myth is the basis for the activity of culture in the formation of a cultural field of communicative interaction, since the central task of myth-making is to consolidate and develop a specific scale of values of the nation. For the process of creating mythological meanings, the role of clichéd expressions is great, such as: *otnyne i vpred'* (from now on); *po mestu trebovanija* (at the place of demand) (semantically redundant phrases), *avec armes et bagages* (lit. 'with weapons and luggage' = with all their things – a metaphorically erased expression), in fact (in fact), by the way (by the way), in reality (in reality = words-parasites), up to hackneyed toponyms or quotes – *Insidious Albion; la coupe amère du plaisir* ('bitter cup of delight').

The modalities of formation, existence and semantic wear out in the collective consciousness are diachronically distributed as follows: the archetype as a matrix of potential deployment (alternative) makes the transition into myth (binarity), in order to ultimately turn into a cliché (erased semantics). If the archetype is alternative, and the myth is bipolar, then the clichéd construction has the properties of both, but with an almost neutralized (“tired”) semantics. In this perspective, the erased speech performs the function of an interface, in the language of computer science, before moving to the archetype of a new format. Thus, the archetype “parents” is refracted into the national archetype of “mother” or “father”, it becomes a symbolic figure of one or the other, in order to finally be fixed at the level of phraseological unity of the type: *koli est' otec i mat', to rebjonku blagodat'* ('if there is a father and mother, then grace to the child'), *chto mat' v golovu vob'et, to i otec ne vyb'et* ('what the mother will knock in the head, then the father will not knock out'), *otec*

nakazyvaet, otec i hvalit ('father punishes, father praises').

Language, as a semiotic bond of a nation, is itself an integrative element of mythological representations reflecting ethnic identity (belonging). Each language has a set of practically equivalent designations for the native location: *état-nation* (nation-state), *mère-patrie* (mother country), *pays natal* (native country); *rodnaja zemlja* (native land), *rodina-mat'* (motherland), *rodnaja storona* (native side), *malaja rodina* (small homeland), etc. When pronouncing these phrases, native speakers activate the mechanisms of a special state of consciousness, a symbolic continuum, according to M. M. Bakhtin's “ethnocultural chronotope” (cit. by Baraboshina 2020). We are talking about a single mental field of a group (society), a conscious and unconscious way and place of residence of the individual and culture.

Personality, language and culture are in a state of constant interchange at the level of collective linguistic constructs, cultural canons, dogmas of archetypal values associated with myth and metaphor, which exist in active synergy. Metaphor is one of the key creative linguistic categories with a high differentiating potential that forms the national figurative picture of the world. Mythological thinking is ethnoculturally coloured, and its essential parameters can be comprehended and discovered in the process of reconstruction of semantic and semantic structures and the associative complex of linguistic signs. As noted by M.M. Makovsky, a word is “a semiotic sign, symbol, semiotic formula of this or that mythopoetic image, which appears before us only in the word. The world (or different worlds) is presented to a person through the prism of his culture, and, in particular, language, which is an integral element of culture” (Makovsky, 2013: 20).

An important component of the national myth is the evaluative component. Axiological meanings are ethnocultural pragmatics that prioritizes value based on the principle of core and periphery. In fact, it is not the objects or attributes of the object that

determine the uniqueness of the mythological consciousness, but the semantics of the sign directs the semantic configurations of the myth. According to K. Jung's concept, "the fundamental myths of the nation, (in particular, of the Russian and French ethnoses), are reflected in the semantic structure of the linguistic material and in its speech implementation <...> national myths are the implementation of universal human archetypes" (Jung, 2020).

Androgynous archetypes (female-male / asexual) are universal prototypes of humanity. Two-faced demiurges are denoted by different terms in different cultures: yin-yang, uroboric mother, red husband / white wife, Chaos and Erebus, half-woman man, Baal and Astarte. We hypothesize that the archetype of the uroboric (Primitive) mother is differentiated in Russian and French culture (at the level of the collective unconscious) in the following symbolism: the key figure of the Mother for the Russian symbolic continuum, the central figure of the Father for the French symbolic paradigm.

The "comfortable" archetype of the mother (the taste of milk, the warmth of the hands, the native smell) functions in the sphere of the "real", not directly related to rationality, and is not subject to satisfaction as a banal need. The driving force of the psyche of the Russian world is structured through "symbolic merging with the body of the Mother" (Johnston, Malabou, 2013). The comfort of the maternal archetype is due to the performance of a set of stereotypical functions in relation to the child: bearing, feeding, protective instincts and life stability. Emotions and will of Russians, but in our opinion, are "subordinated" to the causality of the Mother archetype.

The symbolic figure of the Father is responsible for the regulatory authorities in culture. Socialization and culturologization of the personality is carried out through this stable model. Mother's paradise (symbiosis of mother and child) is to some extent overshadowed by the presence of the Father. A benevolent father creates a feeling of

mental stability, contentment. An unfriendly father induces a feeling of threat, dissatisfaction. The symbiosis of these qualities forms the individual's primary image of rationality, orderliness, and fixation of a social role. The archetype of the Father, in our opinion, is more significant for the collective unconscious of the French national continuum.

We also assume that the main qualitative characteristics of these archetypes are actualized in the tendencies of the speech pattern of each nation and are specifically refracted within the framework of the socio-cultural environment in which the nation's linguistic identity and basic communication components are formed.

The most important mechanism for the formation of national methods of communication is the historically formed complex of sociocultural and psychological attitudes in society. Thus, the social environment of most Russians is formed from tradition, the dictate of custom, which requires from a person not individualization, but rather assimilation into life in a team. Russians are inclined to largely accept someone else's attitude, and often show lack of independence in their choice of decisions. A spontaneous mental act, in most cases, depends on a kind of set of rules and concepts about "decency", "good taste", developed by the so-called habitat. For a Russian, personal freedom is almost always freedom within the collective: the autonomous action of the individual requires the sanction of the group.

One of the basic categories of personality formation in any culture is the family. The Russian family, according to the psychologist V.N. Druzhinin, is "a crazy mixture of orthodoxy and paganism". Recently, this model has been modified due to the devaluation of the father figure (wars, military conflicts, alcoholism), which allows us to speak about infantile forms of male behavior. Overloaded family problems, "Russian women are destined for the role of either an unhappy victim, or the role of a heroine, who performs both maternal and paternal functions" (Druzhinin, 2007: 85).

There is no need to talk about raising a full-fledged, harmoniously developed personality. The age-old Russian principle operates here: the closer we are to each other, the more chances of survival. Value attitudes: personal initiative is punishable, responsibility for actions is shared by members of the community (group) to which the individual belongs, competition is undesirable, personal achievements are the essence of the achievements of the collective.

The French also depend on society, but this dependence is of a different kind. National traditions and customs are respected, but not prevalent. In the first place are individual personality traits. The personality is independent from individuals within the framework of social rules and is responsible for any of its manifestations. At the same time, the fundamental principle operates in the collective consciousness and behavior of the French: *la liberté des uns s'arrête où commence la gêne des autres* (literally, 'the freedom of some ends where the awkwardness of others begins').

The family is also of great importance to the Frenchman. According to the psychologist O.I. Makhovskaya, the French family is built according to the "child-centered" type, in which the principle of harmony, balance, which came from antiquity and was taken up in the Renaissance (Makhovskaya 2004), is embodied. In it, power and responsibility are distributed between husband and wife, with the priority of male responsibility. By the way, the balance of responsibility in the relationship between father and mother continues, as a rule, after divorce.

French parents believe that they are the best educators for their children. This belief is not without foundation. The French constantly instill in children a sense of high self-esteem, the ability to stand up for themselves and independence in setting and solving any problems. This concerns the solution of social and professional problems, planning the future, the ability to negotiate with peers, to defend their rights, in other

words, the independent and conscious implementation of existential choices. Value priorities: personal initiative, individual decision-making and responsibility for them, personal goals and self-reliance, competition, individual achievements.

So, the Russian family is based rather on the formation of group or collective values in the child, while the French one prefers the development of individual personality traits in its responsibility for the possible social consequences of their actions.

The active socialization of an individual begins from the moment he enters educational institutions (for Russia: school, institute, university, for France: elementary school, college, university, etc.). This period is also marked by the formation of certain dominant behavioral traits among members of each of the lingvocultures under consideration.

Russian schoolchildren and students are rightfully considered the most wards in the world. The emotional distance between Russian schoolchildren and students is very small. Typically, they study in the same class for ten (now eleven) years and become almost like brothers and sisters. School (student) friendship continues after graduation from school (university). The dominant feature of interpersonal relationships is informal relationships of mutual sympathy, friendly, often loving and family relationships. In everything, one can feel the latent emotional affective support of the collective, without which the individual feels lost, falls into depression. The contactness of relations is also due to the rigid hierarchy of relations between the student, teacher and administration in Russian educational institutions. The main didactic task in Russian educational institutions is the formation of the skills and abilities of mastering the material within the framework of a particular academic discipline, that is, the training of the student's intellectual abilities.

In France, the psychological distance between classmates is quite large. Yesterday's graduates, at best, nod to each other when they meet. Interpersonal relations in the

classroom are distinguished by correctness, non-interference and independence. This formal structure dominates the possibility of informal relationships in the team. Implicit emotional support of the collective is excluded. The discipline is high, but it is determined, first of all, by the teacher's professional competence, and not by his social status. This does not exclude the possibility of a friendly relationship between student and teacher, but familiarity is completely absent.

The teacher is the number one figure in French educational institutions. The hierarchy of teacher-head teacher-director ends at the stage of paperwork when applying for a job. Despite the apparent rigidity of relations in this area of human relations, this system of distribution of responsibility between the family and the school contributes to the formation of the child's responsibility for their own decisions, tempering from life's adversities and twists of fate. The French tradition of education is focused more on the development of the potential of the individual than on the training of the intellect.

Thus, the process of socialization in Russian educational institutions is aimed at the formation of contact communicative relations. The French communication model is characterized by an orientation towards distant strategies of behavior.

We have touched on only some aspects of the socio-cultural environment of the formation of communicative behavior in Russia and France as basic social institutions for the storage and transmission of ethnocultural information from generation to generation. These categories are conservative by definition despite natural / unnatural historical modifications. We can say that the school and the family are variable in their invariance and are carriers of core concepts that reflect the essential characteristics of the ethnos.

The modern ideological state of these social structures reflects the current state of consciousness of each nation, including the national and cultural features of linguistic

thinking, since it is difficult to imagine the process of education without the participation of the national language. In this sense, each culture supports certain aspects of linguistic reality. Using the terminology of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachev, we can say that Russian culture valorizes the "magic" side of the language, and French – the "intellectual" (Likhachev, 1993: 61). The magical side of the language reflects, first of all, its instrumental characteristics and is associated with the effect that the word produces on others. The intelligence of the language assumes a two-way communication in the process of communication and correlates with the transmission of the speaker's thoughts and views.

We put forward the assumption that the "magic" of the Russian word is "realized in line with contact communication strategies and assimilation with the group (collective) and the "intellectuality" of the French word is manifested in the distant type of strategies and individualization of communicative information. Each of the considered phenomena is associated with the national and cultural specifics of the use of linguistic material in the expression of thoughts (indirect / direct means) " (Sedykh, Ivanishcheva, Koreneva, Ryzhkova, 2018). Children's linguistic individuality as the basis of "adult" linguistic identity, in this sense, is formed on the basis of the nationwide linguistic usage within the framework of the environment of functioning of society specific to each lingvoculture.

1.5. Conclusion

So, language is interpreted as an analogue of a person in the process of communicative activity. The conventionality of semantics is due to the universal laws of language development and is associated with the peculiarities of the functioning of cognitive structures in the process of communication. The linguistic competence of a linguistic personality is formed in line with the implementation of communicative attitudes. Speech action can be viewed as a mythological substance endowed with an

ethnocultural code. The qualitative characteristics of universal archetypes are actualized in the tendencies of the nation's communicative behavior in the ethnocultural refraction.

Speech usage has pronounced ethnocultural characteristics. It is conditioned by a complex of national axiological dominants of the sociocultural environment and is dynamically refracted in the process of communication, the individual psychological character of the implementation of preferred behavioral models. The choice of the orienting signs of usage correlates with the rhetorical ideal of the nation, which reflects the ideal ideas of the speakers of the national language about the methods of successful communication.

In view of the fact that the communicative act is a type of language game, the rules of which are subject to the historically established ethnocultural traditions of the worldview, the prospects for further study of the chosen topic are seen in a comprehensive consideration of the dominant features of national discourses of discourse. It is supposed to analyze national methods of linguistic conceptualization in correlation with a certain type of categorization of reality on the basis of distant languages.

References

Baraboshina, N.V. (2020). Boundary phenomenon Bakhtin's philosophy, *Aspirantskiy Vestnik Povolzhiya*, 20 (3-4), 41-47. (In Russian)

Benveniste, E. (2010). *Obshhaja lingvistika* [General linguistics], Librokom, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Blanchard, G. (1974). La galaxie des clichés selon McLuhan, *Communication et langages*, 5-15. (In French)

Bock, F.K. (1999). The structure of society and the structure of language, *Foreign linguistics*, Moscow, Progress, 115-129. (In Russian)

Druzhinin, V.N. (2007). *Psihologija sem'i* [Family psychology], Peter, SPb, Russia. (In Russian)

Gak, V.G. (2018). *Sopostavitel'naja leksikologija (na materiale francuzskogo i ruskogo jazykov)* [Comparative lexicology:

Based on the material of the French and Russian languages], Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Jackendoff, R. (1984). *Semantics and Cognition*, MA: THE MIT Press, XIV, Cambridge, UK. (In English)

Johnston, A. and Malabou, C. (2013). *Self and emotional life: philosophy, psychoanalysis, and neuroscience*, U.S.: Columbia University Press, New York. (In English)

Jung, K.G. (2020). *Man and his symbols*, Institute of General Humanitarian Research, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Kristeva, J. (2020). *Dostoïevski. Les auteurs de ma vie*, Buchet/Chastel, Paris, France. (In French)

Likhachev, D.S. (1993). *Stat'i rannih let* [Articles of the early years (collection)], Tver branch of the Russian Cultural Foundation, Tver, Russia. (In Russian)

Lotman, Yu.M. (1999). *Vnutri mysljashhih mirov : Chelovek-tekst-semiosfera-istorija* [Inside thinking worlds. Man-text-semiosphere-history]. Languages of Russian culture, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Makhovskaya, O.I. (2003). *Russian women and children in France*, available at: http://www.owl.ru/win/womplus/2003/02_07.html (Accessed 25 July 2021). (In Russian)

Makovsky, M.M. (2013). *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' mifologicheskoi simvoliki v indoevropskix jazykax : Obraz mira i miry obrazov* [Comparative dictionary of mythological symbolism in Indo-European languages. Image of the world and worlds of images], Vlados, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Mandelstam, O. (1987). *Slovo i kul'tura* [Word and culture], Sov. writer, Moscow, USSR. (In Russian)

Mikhalskaya, A.K. (1996). *Russkij Sokrat: Lekcii po sravn.-ist. ritorike* [Russian Socrates: Lectures on comparative historical rhetoric], Academia, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Paducheva, E.V. (1996). *Semanticheskie issledovanija : Semantika vremeni i vida v rus. jaz. Semantika narrative* [Semantic research (Semantics of time and type in Russian; Semantics of narrative)], Languages of Russian culture, Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Prigogine, I.R. and Stengers, I. (2020). *Vremja. Haos. Kvant* [Time, chaos, quantum], Moscow, Russia. (In Russian)

Sapir, E. (1993). *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniju i kulturologii* [Selected works on

linguistics and cultural studies], Publishing group Progress, Univers, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Sedykh, A.P., Ivanishcheva, O.N., Koreneva, A.V. and Ryzhkova, I.V. (2018). Modern Philological Knowledge: Anthropocentrism and Linguistic Identity, *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE)*, 7 4 (38), 447-451. *(In English)*

Shaposhnikov, V.N. (1998). *Russkaja rech' 1990-h : sovremennaja Rossija v jazykovom otobrazhenii* [Russian speech of the 1990s. Modern Russia in linguistic representation], MALP, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Shaposhnikova, I.V. (2021). Integrating role of the conception language personality in the development of the theory of language, *Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Theory of language. Semiotics. Semantics*, 12 (2), 279-301. *(In English)*

Skvortsov, L.I. (1996). *Jekologija slova, ili Pogovorim o kul'ture russkoj rechi* [Ecology of the word, or Let's talk about the culture of Russian speech], Education, Moscow, Russia. *(In Russian)*

Timofeev, A.A. (2019). Theory of the text in Roland Barthes' S/Z and academic musical performance, *Bulletin of Vaganova Ballet Academy*, 3, 228-239. *(In English)*

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, N.Y. *(In English)*

Конфликты интересов: у автора нет конфликта интересов для декларации.

Conflicts of Interest: the author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Седых Аркадий Петрович, доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой немецкого и французского языков, Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет (НИУ БелГУ).

Arkady P. Sedykh, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of German and French, Belgorod State National Research University.