

- Keywords to Understand China*. 2018. Beijing: New World Press.
- O'Brien, Robert C. 2020. *Chinese Communist Party's Ideology and Global Ambitions*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/chinese-communist-partys-ideology-global-ambitions/>. (22 November 2020.)
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2003. *The Rule of Metaphor: The creation of meaning in language*. London: Routledge.
- The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2020. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hermeneutics/> (23 October, 2020).
- Yan, Xuotong. 2018. *Chinese Values vs. Liberalism: What Ideology Will Shape the International Normative Order?* *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 1(11). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-22.

Revisiting the of cultural and language identity of the bearer of two closely related linguocultures

Irina P. Zaitseva

*Head of World Languages Department
Vitebsk State University named after P. M. Masherov*

One of the key categories of modern linguistics and interdisciplinary areas with a pronounced linguistic component is the concept of “language personality”, which was especially actively developed at the turn of the XX – XXI centuries following Yu. N. Karaulov, who devoted a number of studies to this problem. Of course, in each specific scientific field, this category is comprehended with emphasis on various aspects, however, in principle, its structure, as well as a number of basic manifestations, remain quite stable.

One of the characteristic manifestations of a linguistic personality in the communicative processes carried out by it is **cultural** identity and the most closely interconnected with the latter **language** identity. The term “identity”, which is included in the terminology fund of many modern scientific directions, does

not have an unambiguous interpretation in the research literature and is usually defined with an emphasis on the aspect (aspects) most significant for a particular science, and in these cases it is often used in several meanings.

So, in the context of issues relevant to the theory of intercultural communication, this concept turns out to be significant from the point of view of several existing approaches, which is reflected in the “Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms” (2013), which notes four meanings of the term “identity” used in various scientific fields, with which this interdisciplinary field is especially closely linked (sociology, communication studies and psychology) (Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms 2013: 244).

The well-known Russian researcher of the problems of intercultural communication O. A. Leontovich also points to the ambiguity of the interpretation of the concept of “identity”, focusing primarily on work of J. N. Martin & T. K. Nakayama (Martin & Nakayama 1999). In her opinion, at least three approaches to the definition of this phenomenon can be distinguished: **sociopsychological** (identity is created partly as one’s own “I”, partly – depending on group affiliation, and therefore is a “multifaceted” concept); **communicative** (more dynamic compared to the first: identity arises on the basis of one’s own “I” and in the process of exchanging communication with other individuals) and **critical** (when identity, which is a dynamic entity, is attributed to an individual even before birth) (Leontovich 2007: 145). At the same time, representatives of all approaches agree that the basis of cultural identity in all cases is, in the words of P. S. Adler, “the image of oneself, merged with culture, in the integral perception of reality by the individual” (Adler 1974). “The means of expression of identity can be the so-called “key symbols”: emblems, flags, clothes, hairstyle, gestures, artifacts, etc. **The leading place among other means is undoubtedly taken by the language**, which reflects ethnic, national, geographic and other affiliation personality” (emphasis added. – I. Z.) (Leontovich 2007: 147).

In the process of communicative interaction, especially intercultural interaction, an extremely important role is played by the inherent **cultural** identity of the individual (one of the varieties of identity in principle), which is expressed in the recognition of the cultural specificity and national originality of cultures of the communicants and “is determined by means of language, vocabulary, discourse models” (Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms 2013: 125). **Language** identity, or rather, the awareness of one’s belonging to the speakers of a certain language, is included in cultural identity as one of the components, and is a particularly significant factor for the process of verbal communication.

In the process of communicative-speech interaction with other members of society, especially a society that unites representatives of different cultures, any person almost always demonstrates in various amounts own cultural and language identity, which, in our opinion, is legitimate to combine with the concept of **linguocultural** identity. Linguocultural identity finds expression in the linguistic “design” of the communicative-speech process, and not only in the choice of the actual language of communication, but also in the nature of the use of figurative means, in intertextual references (for example, in preference for precedent phenomena that are important for a particular linguocultures), etc.

In this case, we are interested in the question of the qualification of the linguocultural identity of a bilingual language personality – a person who constantly lives in the conditions of closely related bilingualism and, accordingly, in the socio-cultural context of the interaction of two closely related cultures. As a result, this bilingual language personality also turns out to be a bearer of two cultures simultaneously (although, as a rule, with a predominance of one of them).

Specifically, we are talking about the Ukrainian and Russian linguocultures, which are very actively and diversely in contact on the territories of a number of regions of modern Ukraine. The

cultural and linguistic context of a similar nature has developed in the regions, which in the process of interaction of two related cultures – Ukrainian and Russian – have formed historically. The core of these cultures is naturally closely related (i. e., showing the highest degree of kinship) Ukrainian and Russian languages, which, together with the Belarusian language, are included in the East Slavic subgroup of the Slavic group of the Indo-European language family.

Despite the fact that modern Ukraine, without a doubt, is a multi-ethnic state (which naturally implies a multi-lingual population), the only state language in the country, in accordance with the Constitution, is Ukrainian. This fact is clear evidence of the authorities' desire to approve monolingualism at the state level.

However, in spite of the efforts made by the authorities, the main languages used by the citizens of Ukraine in the process of communication remain two – Ukrainian and Russian, as evidenced by numerous studies of sociologists, culturalologists, psychologists, etc. In this regard, the actually existing language situation (more specifically, cultural-language) that has arisen in a number of territories of the Ukrainian state (primarily in the southern and eastern parts) can be qualified as **homogeneous** (since closely related languages are in contact in it) and, at the same time, **non-equilibrium** (“with idioms-components with unequal demographic and functional capacity” (Glossary of Sociolinguistic Terms 2006: 150).

The cultural-language policy pursued in the state, as you know, not only significantly affects the nature of the language situation in the country as a whole and in its individual territories, but also determines the characteristics of the bilingualism that has formed in these spaces, which can be **balanced** or **unbalanced**, **co-ordinate** or **subordinate**, etc.

The language policy implemented at the state level practically nullifies the possibilities for the existence of **co-ordinative** bilingualism in Ukraine – bilingualism, in which “the first and second languages of the bilingual are autonomous in his

mind and do not mix in his speech practice” (Glossary of Sociolinguistic Terms 2006: 97). The rights of the population, for whom Russian is their native language, to freely use their native language for a long period (almost thirty years) have been systematically limited, and often infringed upon. In the same way, there are no conditions for yet another type of bilingualism with a positive component – **balanced**, “in which a person is equally fluent in two languages, can use them in all spheres of activity, while one language does not influence the other, that is, the situation characterized by equal levels of bilingual language competence” (Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms 2013: 44).

As a result, in most Ukrainian regions with a compact population, for which the native language is Russian, there is actually **subordinate** bilingualism, “in which one of the languages plays a more important role than the other, while there is significant interference of one language when using another” (Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms 2013: 45), or **functional** bilingualism, “in which a bilingual uses a second language mainly in a certain area of communication, for example, only in the workplace” (Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms 2013: 46).

The regions of Ukraine, where at present there is an obviously bilingual situation, belongs to the southeastern part of the country, which includes the Donbass. The cultural-language identity of the population of this territory for many decades has been formed on the basis of the coexistence of two closely related languages on this territory, which are key components of no less closely related cultures – Russian and Ukrainian. Through much of the twentieth century, in the second half of the century, this coexistence was not only consistent, quite harmonious, a lot of times – mutually enriching.

Residents of Donbass, who were often reproached and continue to be reproached for neglecting Ukrainian culture, have never been such. This can be judged, in particular, by the

significant body of works created by Donbass writers and poets, which in one way or another reflect the achievements that the world owes to the representatives of Ukrainian culture. Among these writers are prose writers Boris Gorbatov, Taras Rybas, Nikita Chernyavsky; poets Vladimir Sosyura, Pavel Besposhchadnyy, Vasily Goloborodko and many others. This is, finally, the world-famous lyrical poet and military journalist Mikhail Matusovsky, who was born and lived part of his life in the easternmost city of Donbass – Luhansk.

All of these and many other representatives of the Russian culture of Donbass not only perceive the colorful Ukrainian culture as part of the common culture of the Eastern Slavs and have repeatedly confirmed that they appreciate it at its true worth, but also often creatively interpret this culture in their artistic concepts, emphasizing the continuity of the resulting cultural “composition”. Evidence of this is the frequent appeal to personalities significant for the Ukrainian and universal culture (such as, for example, prominent Ukrainian writers Mikhail Kotsyubinsky or Ivan Franko), references to works of art (paintings, architectural masterpieces, imaginative literature works, etc.) and others precedent phenomena that have been created within the framework and traditions of the national Ukrainian culture.

In the literary and artistic works written by the writers of Donbass in Russian, various types of Ukrainianisms (words, phraseological units, text fragments) are often included, giving the imaginative literature work a special, based on biculturalism, flavor and originality. This confirms the validity of the observation of V. V. Naumov, who noted that the second language is often used by a bilingual “as an additional, more expressive means of expressing thoughts, the mental state of the writing individual, although it is generally known that an increased emotional background finds a more accurate verbal expression in the native language” (Naumov 2006: 88).

What has been said testifies to the fact that the majority of the representatives of Donbass perceive Ukrainian culture as an

organic part of their creative and life context. However, at the same time, they are not at all inclined to abandon their native Russian culture, which was absorbed by them, figuratively speaking, with their mother's milk, in the process of mastering their native Russian language. In the overwhelming majority of cases, these individuals speak quite definitely about their language identity (in particular about the priority for them of the Russian language as their native language), thereby confirming the opinion of V. V. Naumov: "Fundamentally one language can still be native, since the linguistic consciousness of an individual cannot accommodate equally two different language systems. The second, non-native, bilingual language should be more tightly controlled by thinking, which sooner or later may fail" (Naumov 2006: 85).

It seems that in cases similar to those described by us, it would be more correct to interpret the linguocultural identity of a language personality as formed on the basis of a kind of "fusion" of two closely related cultures – Russian and Ukrainian, the nuclear components of which are the languages that embody them. The main, basic condition for the formation of an identity of a similar character of personality is the absence of antagonism in the interaction of contacting cultures in the context of which this person exists. Their combination should be complementary, which, of course, does not exclude the possibility of some contradictions, but in general this cultural interaction should be carried out quite smoothly and quite harmoniously, and mutual influence should be predominantly positive.

References

- Adler, Peter S. 1974. *Beyond Cultural Identity: Reflections on Cultural and Multicultural Man*. Honolulu: East – West Center.
- Glossary of Sociolinguistic Terms. 2006. Moscow. (In Russian).
- Dictionary of Intercultural Communication Terms. 2013. I. N. Zhukova, M. G. Lebedko, Z. G. Proshina & N. G. Yuzefovich; M. G. Lebedko & Z. G. Proshina (eds.) Moscow: FLINTA: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Leontovich, O. A. 2007. *Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: Gnosis. (In Russian).

- Martin, J. N. & Nakayama, T. K. 1999. Intercultural Communication in Context. 2nd edn. Mayfield, California: Publishing Company Mountain View.
- Naumov, V. V. 2006. Linguistic identity of personality. Moscow: ComCniga. (In Russian).

Metaphor and Archetype as a Transcendent Unit of a Literary Text Based on the Material of A. Alimzhanov's Prose

Bagdagul N. Zhanibekova

Doctoral Student

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian national University, Kazakhstan

Abstract

Kazakh Russian-speaking is not a new phenomenon, but it is relevant to this day and has a half-century history. Anuar Alimzhanov's prose acts as the reality of the writer's linguistic picture of the world. In the process of reading and understanding a prose work, the reader crosses the language picture of the world of the author and the reader. The artistic speech of writers is individual and has an aesthetic property, screening the surrounding reality in a figurative form. Language means in artistic speech construct an individual author's text and in the scientific field of activity are called tropes. For Kazakhstan, the dialogue of cultures is important through the study of intercultural relations that contribute to the preservation of the literary heritage of the Kazakh people in Russian, which is based on an aesthetic interest in «not like your own» (N. L. Leiderman) and a tolerant attitude to foreign cultures. In the composition of a work of art, metaphors perform an important function: they draw the dynamics of the characters' relationships, mark the culmination point in their history. The metaphorical nature of the narration gives the text individuality and colorfulness.

Key words: *artistic text, metaphor, metaphorical expression, interpretation of artistic text, archetype, transcendent unit.*