

Language, culture, society at the intersection of modern scientific disciplines

Olga Popova

*Candidate of Historical Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Chair of
Foreign Languages and Intercultural
Professional Communication of
Humanities of the Institute of Social
Sciences
Tyumen State University
Tyumen, Russia
popovauni@rambler.ru*

Elena Grushevskaya

*Candidate of Philology, Associate
Professor of the Department of
English Philology
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia*

Valentina Zelenskaya

*Doctor of Philology, Professor at the
Department of French Philology
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia*

Sergey Golubtsov

*Ph.D., Assistant Professor of the
Department of Foreign Languages
№2
Kuban State Technological
University
Krasnodar, Russia*

Tatiana Grushevskaya

*Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head
of the Chair of French Philology
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia*

Abstract—In this article, the author addresses the issues of mutual influence and close relationship between society, language and culture. The primary focus is on the relationship between language and culture, which is now studied by such fields of science as linguoculturology, ethnolinguistics and linguistic personology (cognitive linguistics can be also added to this list). The author asserts that the issues considered by these scientific fields are centred around a human being as a bearer of the language and culture. The relevance of the problem under study is conditioned by the modern linguistic situation in the international space in the context of globalization and consists in the discovery of modern trends in linguistics, which deepen the achievements of linguistics in the XIX and XX centuries. The revelation of language phenomenon as the basis of human civilization will be one of the greatest linguistic discoveries.

The article focuses on the actual trends in modern linguistics which are in close interrelation with culture and have the areas of common interests with other sciences, the basis of which was laid by such great thinkers as V. Humboldt, F. Saussure, A. A. Potebnya and their followers. At the present time linguoculturology, linguopersonology, cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, actively assert themselves forming the core of the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics. The study of this problem is mainly based on anthropocentric approach, including sociosphere, ethnosphere, semiosphere and biosphere, and human is the highest link in this integrative interaction. The main results of the article give an idea of close interinfluence between language, culture, human, society and ethnos. In fact, if to consider all these interactions, a spherical model enterable from any point can be envisioned. The sciences common areas discovered allow talking about knowledge integration, need to use interdisciplinary approaches to analyzing and explaining the phenomena of language and culture, further introducing the results of the research into various fields

and practices, for example, in humanitarian disciplines teaching practice.

Keywords—*society, language, culture, linguoculturology, ethnolinguistic, linguopersonology, cognitive linguistic, interconnection and interference, παιδεία (humanitas), anthropocentric approach to the problem of language personality. relevant approaches in modern linguistics, sociosphere, ethnosphere, semiosphere, biosphere*

I. INTRODUCTION

Society, language and culture are closely intertwined and continuously influence each other. Any changes in the society are immediately reflected and fixed in the culture of a civilization; cultural traditions, in turn, influence the behaviour of an individual and his/her perception of the world and determination of the individual's place in it [1, 2]. The human world is the world of culture, and this world is extremely large – it includes art, music, literature, theatre, science and religion. "Six thousand years of spiritual history of mankind lie before us," wrote O. Spengler. "Great cultures and their destinies emerge from the flow that has spread over the planet, and they actually make up history in the proper sense" [3].

The etymology of the word "culture" dates back to ancient times: it is met in treatises and letters of ancient Rome. It is well known that culture in Antiquity was founded on a system of classical education in the form of *paideia* (παιδεία). The aristocratic *ephebeia* sought to create Hellenistic culture as an absolutely inimitable phenomenon with a unique place in human history. The culture of *paideia* (παιδεία) takes its final shape in the Hellenistic period and remains unchanged for a long time [4].

Paideia (παιδεία) becomes synonymous with culture, not in its passive, preparatory meaning, but in the modern sense – as an opportunity for a person to develop spiritual and physical abilities and become a man in the full sense of the word. It is not accidental that Romans Varro and Cicero translated παιδεία as *humanitas*. With the classical upbringing and education, classical humanism of the Hellenistic era was potentially ready to create "materia prima for a higher human type" – a man endowed both with sensibility and comprehensive knowledge. The idea of a holistic personality, once born, would remain forever in human minds – even today entire education is still based on the pedagogical tradition with preference to the ideals of humanism. The humanist aspiration to bring up a holistic personality, who has not become a "slave of the division of labour", has always been considered as something of supreme value and worth; "a whole man" in the unity of body and soul, emotions and intelligence, character and spirit is an ideal of modern culture, taken out of the context of the pragmatic, utilitarian side of life.

Culture is fully actualized as a "living reality" only with the anthropological and personological approach to man and society: in history there is only a particular personality with the unique individual features, and every society is a society of unique culture.

II. METHODOLOGICAL STRUCTURE

It is well known that a great contribution to the development of views on relationship between language and culture was made by W. von Humboldt [5], who believed that the concept of *linguo-philosophy* was the core for the formation of the theory of a human being and considered the language in the broad anthropological context, studying it against the background of reasoning on historical destinies and spiritual specifics of peoples, lives of peoples in general, their deeds, thinking (mentality) and national characters.

Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) is rightly considered the founder of theoretical linguistics. His linguistic theory further develops the ideas of the classical philosophy with the use of the dialectical method, according to which the world is seen in the development as a contradictory unity of opposites. In application to linguistic studies, Humboldt develops the ideas of activity, the active principle in man, the activity of human consciousness, the unity of the conscious and unconscious in the process of cognition – all of them are part of his linguistic concept. Like other philosophers of his time, Humboldt demonstrates an intense interest in each personality, typical for Romanticism, combined with the recognition of the social nature of man and the idea of the unity of human nature.

Humboldt's theory is quite independent and original, and it still has no equal in the history of linguistics.

The complex of anthropolinguistic issues identified and partially resolved by Humboldt is highly relevant

for the contemporary Russian linguistics, which is openly anthropocentric. In contemporary sources we do not always meet references to the "continuity" of the ideas that had foreseen interest in human aspects, therefore we would like to state that the linguistic personality, studying the linguistic personality as a phenomenon of manifestation of a "human factor in the language", can be considered a specific synthesis of Humboldt's "comparative anthropology" with Humboldt's "comparative linguistics".

An significant contribution to the research of the relationship between language and culture was made by studies conducted in the mid XX century, which led to the conclusion that the relationship between language and culture is extremely complicated and multifaceted.

In spite of the fact that ideas about the personality principle were expressed, in one way or another, in the works by W. von Humboldt [5], H. Steinthal [6], W. Wundt [7], Baudouin de Courtenay [8], A.A. Shakhmatov [9], Leo Weisgerber [10], L.V. Shcherba [6], V.V. Vinogradov [11] and other scholars, a holistic concept of the linguistic personality began taking its shape only at the turn of the XXI century.

The category of "spirit of the people" (*Volksgeist*) is one of the central concepts of Humboldt's theory: "Only the spiritual power of the people is the most vital and independent principle, and the language depends on it." "The language of the people is their spirit and the spirit of the people is their language; we cannot imagine anything more identical" [5]. The language connects an individual with the native people and with all of humanity: "The language belongs to me, because it exists for me in whichever form I bring it to life; and since it is deeply rooted in the speech of our contemporaries and that of past generations (so far as it was continuously transmitted from generation to generation), it is the language itself which restrains me when I speak. But that element of the language which limits and determines me has come from the human nature, intimately close to my own; and that which is alien in the language is alien only to my transitory individual nature, but not to my original nature" [5].

The spiritual power and the language constitute a single indivisible activity of the mental power inherent in people. According to Humboldt, this genetic unity of the language and the spirit has an ontological character. The spiritual power is authentic, free, independent and spontaneous. It has always been developing by its own laws, unknown to people, and is not subject to preliminary estimates of its activity. It often arises in a manner unexpected by people. Movement is the main element of the spirit. The spiritual power is purposeful and active. Activity is an inherent property of the spirit. "The power of spirit exists only in and as activity". The spiritual power creates its works with all the tension of its focus and full concentration. It is the creative principle. Thus, according to Humboldt, the following relations are formed between the spirit and the language: influence of the spirit, as the creative principle, on the language; relative independence of the

language from the spirit; reverse effect of the language on the spirit; relationship between the spiritual activity and the language; their inseparability.

A lot of attention in Humboldt's concept is paid to the nature of relationship between the language and mental (spiritual) activity of the people – living and inseparable connection of the language and people's intelligence (thought, thinking). According to Humboldt, the language is the companion, witness and sometimes the only representation of the spiritual development of humankind. The language can indicate the current state of culture. The intellectual activity and the language are one, and they are inseparable from each other [5]. Language is the tool of thought formation. Both the language and the thought are products of the same power – the power of spirit of the people [5]. They both have the property of infinitude – the main distinction of the spiritual power. The language is essential for the thought completeness [5]. It is in the language, as the intermediary between the world and a human being, that "the act of transforming the world into thought" occurs [5], and the language's essence is in moulding the world of things and phenomena into thoughts [5]. Relations between the language and thinking, according to Humboldt, are as varied as the relations between the language and spirit of the people, but they are not identical. Humboldt speaks of the close unity and interaction between the language and thinking, but not their identity. The language gives a person prerequisites for the development of internal forces [5]; "the language raises a person to the level of intelligence of which he is capable" [5]. "The impact of the language on a person is based on his thinking and thoughtfully creative power; this activity is immanent and constructive for the language" [5]. Therefore, the true purpose of the language is to stimulate "advance of human mental power" [5], and promote "successful thinking development" [5], "to support energy activities of all human intellectual powers and serve as their major tool" [5], and to push the human spirit throughout its development to orderly activity and full use of its abilities [5].

III. DISCUSSION

Recently there have appeared works on the theory and history of linguistic science (domestic and world linguistics) [12], but the question in what connection linguistics comes into contact with other sciences remains to be a white spot. We tried to find out which sciences are currently most actively asserting themselves.

There has been a long tradition of research on the relationship between language and culture, and in Russia it has been developed in different directions. It is a subject area of both linguoculturology and ethnolinguistics, addressing similar research issues, but, in general, the principles of delimitation of their spheres of interests are now clearly understood by any scholar, as the linguoculturology is focused, first of all, on the current state of culture and its synchronous representation in linguistic entities, while the

ethnolinguistics studies the ethnic linguistic material in retrospective. According to S.G. Vorkachev, "the linguoculturology is the latest branch of the ethnolinguistics" [13]. The linguoculturology is a scientific field that studies language as a cultural phenomenon. It reflects a specific vision of the world through the prism of a national language, with the distinctive national mentality expressed through the language. It is well known that the methodological framework for the linguoculturology is the cognitive linguistics, treating language and culture as forms of consciousness [14]. These scientific fields are centred around a human being as a bearer of the language and culture. Therefore linguists today focus their attention on a human being – language speaker and representative of a national culture and certain social group, who has specific psychological, social and other features. "Language – culture – personality (ethnos-man) – self-cognition" – these are the components that define the essence of the anthropocentric approach to linguistic studies and correspond to the overall trend in contemporary humanities. In their treatment of a human being primarily as a linguistic personality with the own "linguistic worldview", contemporary scholars (N.I. Tolstoy, V.E. Goldin, Yu.N. Karaulov, I.P. Vasilyuk, M.A. Kormilitsyna and others) syncretically combine language and culture and move to a new level – the study of national personality. The national personality, as a bearer of the national world outlook and mentality, creates the own linguistic worldview. Consequently, the linguistic personality can be considered as a prototype for a bearer of national cultural values, which are in the focus of the national worldview and have various forms of linguistic expression [15]. Only the personality embodied in language can be the object of linguoculturological research, and the studies are held, according to E. Benveniste, "in terms of the trinomial of language, culture, and personality", so that linguistic culture is perceived as "a lens through which the researcher can see the material and spiritual identity of the ethnos" – Volksgeist of W. von Humboldt and H. Steinthal [16]. The national worldview is a general stable cognitive orientation reproduced in worldviews of individual representatives of the nation. Therefore, the national worldview is, on the one hand, a certain abstraction, but, on the other hand, it is a cognitive and psychological reality demonstrated in mental, cognitive activity of people and their behaviour, both physical and verbal. It is a result of cognition (knowledge) of reality, and it manifests itself as a sphere of concepts – a body of structured knowledge. The culture determines the "worldview" for us as a cognitive matrix for understanding the world. The cognitive worldview is expressed in concepts forming the sphere of concepts of a particular people. In this context the language serves as a means of access to the unified information database of a person – his/her sphere of concepts, revealing the cognitive structures. Cognitive interpretation of the results of studies on the linguistic worldview in order to describe the cognitive worldview is a linguocognitive method of studying the sphere of concepts of a particular people. The cognitive worldview and the linguistic worldview are related as the primary and the secondary, as a mental

phenomenon and a way for researchers to get insight into this phenomenon [17].

The language can be interpreted as one of the forms of culture; it is a tool and a conductor for culture, being part of the culture as one of its components, growing into it, developing inside it and expressing it. And the "concept" can be regarded as a "cultural cluster in the human mind", some form of culture becoming part of the human mental world. The linguoculturology is a branch of humanities that studies the material and spiritual culture embodied in a living national language and manifested in the linguistic processes. It helps to identify and explain how language performs one of its fundamental functions – to be an instrument of creation, development, preservation and transmission of culture. Its main objective is to study the ways in which language embodies, stores and transmits culture in linguistic units [18].

The most unique is that language is an accumulator and guardian of the accumulated knowledge in the constantly changing world and that language plays a major role in the conceptualization of the human world. The "linguistic personality" and "concept" – the basic categories of the linguoculturology – reflect the mindset and mentality of a generic native language speaker and provide this field of science with necessary tools for recreating the prototypical image of "the speaking person" [13]. We are interested in the aspect of "a person in relation to society", i.e. personality, and in terms of language (speech) of one person (idiolect), we are mostly interested in the linguistic personality of elite speech cultures. The number of studies on linguistic personology has been growing in recent years, which makes the term "linguistic personality" highly topical, despite the fact that it has already had long history in linguistic studies. The necessity to study "the speaking person" has been understood by many generations of scholars. The idea of linguistic personality has been prepared by the entire history of the linguistics development. It is well known that the first steps in developing this concept were made by V.V. Vinogradov and G.I. Bogin, and the term itself was introduced into the language of science by Yu.N. Karaulov. In our opinion, a comprehensive concept of the linguistic personality is now developed within the frames of the linguistic personology. The linguistic personology, or linguopersonology (from Lat. *lingua* 'tongue, language'; *persona* 'person'), is a field of linguistics studying the linguistic personality. The term was first used by V.P. Neroznak in the article "Linguistic Personology: Towards Definition of the Discipline Status". "The linguistic personology can be defined as an independent linguistic branch of the general personology, exploring the state of the language (individuation) both of a single linguistic personality (idiolect personality) and multiple (poliect) linguistic personality – the people" [19].

The author introduces the concept denoted by the term into the context of more general concepts: personology as a theory of personality in general and functionalism as a philosophic theory closely linked to the names of C. Renouvier and especially E. Mounier.

This wider context predetermines highlighting of relationship between an individual and a linguistic group (in other words, the issue of the individual's role in the dynamics of the language). Projecting the concept of E. Mounier into language environment, V.P. Neroznak identifies two major trends: to depersonalization and to personalization, in interaction of which a personal universe is formed. The linguistic personality in the linguistic personology becomes an object of integral linguistic studies at the junction with other spheres of human-centred research.

A new scientific field of "intercultural communication", which appeared quite recently, theoretically substantiates a new view on the interaction of culture and communication. The vast majority of academic sources (Grushevitskaya, Popkov, Sadokhin, Ter-Minasova, Gudykunst, Jandt, Samovar, Porter, etc.) define the intercultural communication through a combination of its key components – communication and culture, which is justified from a traditional point of view. However, nowadays there are many other approaches to defining the concept of "intercultural communication". The most complete definition of intercultural communication is, in our opinion, formulated by I.I. Khaleeva: "Intercultural communication is a complex of specific processes of interaction between people belonging to different cultures and languages. It takes place between the interaction partners who not only belong to different cultures but are also aware of the fact that each of them is the "other", and each partner perceives the foreignness of his/her counterpart" [20].

W. von Humboldt attached great importance to interlingual contacts in the process of language development, improvement and transformation. The invigorating influence of one language on another is ultimately determined by the fact that "strength, wealth and form of languages greatly benefit from the impact of significant, even conflicting, differences, because this way they get infused with the rich content of human existence, already embodied into a linguistic form. This is the only source from which the language can get material for its enrichment" [5].

The General meaning of linguistic and pedagogical studies in children of conflicts on ethnic or ethno-confessional grounds is the combination of teaching Russian and regional culture at one of the earliest stages of ethnofunctional mental development (carried out in educational institutions). As we have already pointed out earlier, "these phases are mandatory for the passage of both the individual and the whole ethnic group" [21]. We believe the basic principle of linguopoetic not a shallow "multiculturalism", and depth "bicultural" and bilingualism in teaching and education in secondary schools. At the same time maximally reduces the number desadaptive child, adolescent psyche ethnofunctional the unmatched items (in the conditions of growing processes of globalization).

IV. RESULTS

This allowed making the conclusion that such sciences as linguoculturology, linguopersonology, cognitive linguistics and ethnolinguistics form the core of the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics actively asserting themselves. The sciences common areas discovered allow us to talk about knowledge integration, need to use interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis and explanation of language and culture phenomena. The problem of language and culture, language and society, language and human is multifaceted and includes many aspects within the aforementioned sciences. In linguistic aspect, the influence of culture on language is indisputable. The converse proposition – the vision of the world through the prism of language – is still debatable. Each person has his own “worldview”, consisting of “concepts”. Recently, cognitive, culturological and linguopersonological approaches to the study of linguistic phenomena have become increasingly relevant. The imaginative component of the cultural concept is connected with the method of reality cognition and, as a result, represented visually and sensuously. The key concepts of culture are an integral part of collective consciousness and their research is an extremely urgent problem.

Thus, the implementation of the ideas of comparative linguistics and comparative anthropology by Wilhelm von Humboldt, who in many respects foresaw the interest of modern linguistics to human being, is undoubtedly productive and confirms the true purpose of language as a certain "means of rooting a person in reality" [5] and "a formative organ of thought", which "serves as an inspirational tool for emerging generations" [5]. For understanding does not arise because a particular word expresses the same meaning for all speakers of a given language, but because the people "strike the same keys in their spiritual instrument, so that the corresponding, but not identical, meanings emerge in the minds of each of them" [5]. The language is closely intertwined with the spiritual development of humanity and accompanies it at every stage of its local progress or regress, reflecting each stage of culture [22].

Any person is connected with his/her people, race and all humankind primarily through the language. The language is in essence "the property of the entire humankind", and "it is in the language that every individual feels most vividly to be nothing but a small part of mankind". "The language belongs to me, because it exists for me in whichever form I bring it to life; and since it is deeply rooted in the speech of our contemporaries and that of past generations (so far as it was continuously transmitted from generation to generation), it is the language itself which restrains me when I speak. But that element of the language which limits and determines me has come from the human nature, intimately close to my own; and that which is alien in the language is alien only for my transitory individual nature, but not for my original nature. [...] Like humanity itself, each language is infinitude, gradually unravelling in time" [5].

The current language policies in the post-Soviet space are aimed at the revival of vitality of constituent languages. The society, which becomes increasingly multi-ethnic due to the powerful processes of globalization, is in the centre of the tension between two opposing forces: 1) natio-petal and 2) natio-fugal. Search for the own way and development of national ideology leads to repeating the turns of the spiral of human social evolution, but at a new level of development. In addition to the on-going communication battle between the English and Russian languages, we are witnessing a surge of ethnicity in the sphere of onomastics: names with pronounced ethnic and religious associations are becoming increasingly popular. Today we can see that the contemporary onomastic space is the reflection of traces of multiple discursive processes in different language systems in case of intercultural communication, or those within the same language in case of contacts between language speakers from the same linguocultural community. The irreversibility of the processes of globalization makes it necessary to address the issues of tolerance in communicative behaviour. In any country the observed ethnic processes allow assessing its ethno-social situation, which is inextricably linked to the history of the state and its ethnic policy. In the post-Soviet space we can now see a growing number of pragmonyms derived from toponyms – such approach contributes to almost instant creation of the most vivid image of the product. In this regard, we can state that pragmonyms and ergonyms become certain symbols of the country-producer of the product or the country of origin (mother culture). However, in the multi-ethnic conditions of Russia pragmonyms and ergonyms are also used for conveying ethnic identity of the owners. In other words, popular stereotypes about the country of origin are actively used in onomastics, which demonstrates, in our opinion, the nature of relationship between the state and migrant communities (diasporas). The ergonyms used in Tyumen clearly illustrate the fact that over 150 ethnoses and sub-ethnoses live in this city: restaurants "Shinok", "Kishmish" and "Urartu", cafés "Slavyanka", "Karpaty", "Telega", "Mimino", "Pagoda", "Kitay", "Sam-Yang", etc. Such names, on the one hand, indicate the specialisation of the café or restaurant, and, on the other hand, reveal strong commitment of their owners to their ethnic identities. According to linguist I.S. Karabulatova, "proper names function as specific cultural, historical and linguistic indexes, reflecting the concepts with the highest priority for a particular lexical layer, thus creating favourable conditions for a multidimensional study of consciousness, culture and language" [23].

The conditions for the occurrence of violations of ethnolinguistic and functional development can, for example, be manifested in the fact that a child born in a modern globalizing Russian region with powerful migration processes is deprived of communication with the mythological Russian layer during the upbringing process and is oriented towards an autistic perception of the world through technotronic toys of modern civilization. This manifests an ethnolinguistic and functional violation of the sequence of stages of ethno-

psychological development, which can be interpreted in the general case as a “running ahead” and as a “return” to phylogenetically earlier stages, as experts in the field of autism and other personality development pathologies speak of.

V. CONCLUSION

The advent of civilization has not only not eradicated the dichotomous division of the world and has aggravated it by creating a multiplicity of division and opposition. Since the second half of the XX century, researchers have paid attention to human not just as a generalized subject, but recognized the importance and relevance of socio-cultural identification of a person in the discussion of various problems of the Humanities.

Based on the complex structure of the mechanism of production and perception of the text array in the information space in the current situation of polyethnic and "blurring" the boundaries of ethnicity, overgrown not only the actual intralinguistic, but also extralinguistic characteristics, modeling semantic organization is also quite a complex problem.

In modern conditions of increasing international tension due to changes in geopolitics, first of all, the events in the middle East, which led to a powerful growth of migrants to Europe, the Syrian and Ukrainian events, in which Russia was involved, the involvement in the ranks of terrorist organizations of citizens of various countries with elements of illegal migration, particularly acute is the issue of national security in the context of interaction with world powers. In this aspect, the triangle "man - culture - society" acquires a new meaning, which is important for the preservation of statehood and ethnicity.

The polyaspectness of the modern space makes us think about the choice of the language of information delivery, as well as the verbal and nonverbal component of the language of any message, since the phenomena of cultural shock, linguistic shock with intensive migration flows can enhance ethno-functional misalignment in the structure of the linguistic personality in all its polyphony of ethno-cultural sound.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. O. Malevinsky, Ahmadzai Sultan Aziz, I. S. Karabulotova, Y. V. Luchinskiy, N. Yu. Fanyan, E. S. Grushevskaya, and V. V. Zelenskaya, “Main types of values of full-numeration words”, in *Amazonia Investiga*, 2019, Vol. 8, No 21, pp. 513-521.
- [2] I. Karabulotova, Kh. Vildanov, A. Zinchenko, E. Vasilishina, and A. Vassilenko, “Problems of transformation matrices modern multicultural identity of the person in the variability of the discourse of identity Electronic Information Society”, in *Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities*, 2017, No 25 (S). Jul., pp. 1-16.
- [3] O. Spengler, *Pessimismus? In Russian*. Moscow: Kraft, 2003, p. 153.
- [4] Yu. A. Petrov, “Predstavlenie o kul'ture v jepohu antichnosti (Perception of Culture in Antiquity)”, in *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*. Tomsk: Tomsk State University, 2007, No 297, p. 99.
- [5] W. von. Humboldt, *Jazyk i filosofija kul'turyi (Language and Philosophy of Culture)*. Moscow: Progress, 1985; *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju (Selected Works on Linguistics)*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Progress, 2001.
- [6] G. Steintal, *Grammar, Logic, and Psychology (Their Principles and Their Relationships)*. V. A. Zvegintsev, *The history of linguistics of the XIX and XX centuries in essays and extracts. Part 1*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye, 1964. L. V. Shcherba, *Selected Works on Linguistics and Phonetics*. Leningrad, 1958; *Language system and speech activity*. Leningrad, 1974, 214 p.
- [7] W. Wundt, *Problems of the Psychology of Peoples (Extracts)*. V. A. Zvegintsev. *The history of linguistics of the XIX and XX centuries. Essays and extracts. Part 1*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1964.
- [8] I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Selected works on general linguistics. Vol. 1*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963; *linguistics of XIX century. Reader of the history of Russian linguistics*. 2nd ed., Rev. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1977.
- [9] A. A. Shakhmatov, *Syntax of the Russian language*. V. A. Zvegintsev, *The history of linguistics of the XIX and XX centuries in essays and extracts. Part 1*. Moscow, 1964.
- [10] L. Weisberger, *The role of native language in spirit formation*. Moscow, 1993, 451 p.
- [11] V. V. Vinogradov, *The history of the Russian literary language of the XVII-XIX centuries*. 3rd ed. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1982, 528 p.
- [12] N. S. Sharafutdinova, *Theory and history of linguistic science: textbook*. 3rd ed., rev. and cor. Ulyanovsk: UISTU, 2012, 346 p.
- [13] S. G. Vorkachev, “Lingvokul'turologija, jazykovaja lichnost', koncept: stanovlenie antropocentricheskoj paradigmy v jazykoznanii” (*Linguoculturology, Linguistic Personality, Concept: Development of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Linguistics*), in *Filologicheskie nauki*. Moscow, 2001, No 1, pp. 64-72.
- [14] I. P. Savchuk, I. S. Karabulotova, S. A. Golubtsov, V. V. Zelenskaya, and B. Z. Akhmetova, “Language features of the legend’s genre as the basis of storytelling technology in advertising discourse”, in *Amazonia Investiga*, 2019, Vol. 8, No 21, pp. 522-530.
- [15] I. P. Vasilyuk, *Lingvokul'turologicheskoe issledovanie nacional'noj (russkoj) jazykovoj lichnosti (na materiale aforistiki) (Linguocultural Study on the National (Russian) Linguistic Personality: Based on Aphoristic Material)*. Cand. Sci. Thesis in Philosophy. Moscow: Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, 2004, pp. 12-13.
- [16] E. Benveniste, *Obshhaja lingvistika (General Linguistics)*. Moscow, 1996, p. 217.
- [17] Z. D. Popova, and I. A. Sternin, “Jazyk i soznanie: teoreticheskie razgranichenija i ponjatijnyj apparat” (*Language and Consciousness: Theoretical Distinctions and Conceptual Apparatus*), in *Jazyk i nacional'noe soznanie. Voprosy teorii i metodologii (Language and National Consciousness: Theoretical and Methodological Issues)*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 2002.
- [18] V. A. Maslova, *Lingvokul'turologija: Uchebnoe posobie dlja stud. vyssh. uceb. zavedenij (Linguoculturology: Textbook for Students of Higher Education Institutions)*. Moscow: Academia Publishing House, 2001.
- [19] V. P. Neroznak, “Lingvisticheskaja personologija: k opredeleniju statusa discipliny” (*Linguistic Personology: Towards Definition of the Discipline Status*), in *Jazyk. Pojetika. Perevod (Language. Poetics. Translation)*. Collection of Academic Papers. Moscow State Linguistic University Publ., 1996.
- [20] I. I. Khaleeva, “O gendernyh podhodah k teorii obuchenija jazykam i kul'turam” (*On Gender Approaches to the Theory of Teaching Languages and Cultures*), in *Izvestija Rossijskoj akademii obrazovanija*, 2000, No 1.
- [21] Z. V. Polivara, and I. S. Karabulotova, “The Features of Speech Dysfunction in Children: A Neuropsycholinguistic Approach”, in *Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological*

and Chemical Sciences May–June 2018, No 9 (3), pp. 107-112.

- [22] O. A. Bakieva, and O. A. Popova, “Features of color mentality of the indigenous, small nationalities of the Arctic (on the example of the analysis of the traditional Khanty people costume)”, in IOP Conference, Series Earth and Environmental Science, Vol. 302, conference 1, 2019. Available at: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/302/1/012157>.
- [23] I. S. Karabulatova, “Problemy lingvojekologii v sovremennom onomasticheskom prostranstve” (Issues of Linguoecology in Contemporary Onomastic Space), in *Sovremennaja lingvisticheskaja situacija v mezhdunarodnom prostranstve* (Contemporary Linguistic Situation in the International Environment). Proceedings of the International Research and Application Conference, 11-12 March, 2010. Vol. 1. Tyumen: Omega-Print, p. 190.