

G.Yu.Amanbayeva, N.F.Yushko

Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University
(E-mail: nellyatarasova@gmail.ru)

The concept of linguistic identity in modern linguistics

The article considers a meaning of the term «linguistic identity» in modern linguistic paradigm. There is a set of the interdisciplinary nature of the term, and notes about a significance of the term appearance in linguistics. The article compares the definition and characteristics of «linguistic identity» concept in terms of the different approaches and disciplines, an attempt to compare different definitions of language and identity and highlight the similarity of their contents. On the based of the definitions and approaches analysis there are described methods for the study of linguistic identity in modern science and designated purpose of studying this concept in linguistics.

Key words: linguistic identity, anthropocentric paradigm, the structure of the linguistic identity, antropolinguistics, the human factor in language, modern linguistics.

The phenomenon of linguistic identity, acquiring science categorical status, is main to modern linguistics. Since the 90s of 20th century the notion of «linguistic identity» «... becomes the pivotal backbone of philological concept. Most researchers considered it as an integrative now, which was the beginning of a new stage in the development of linguistics — antropolinguistics» [1; 15].

Linguistic personality comes to the fore in the new linguistic paradigm, as well as an object of study of other human sciences (sociology, psychology, cultural studies, philosophy, etc.). Philosophy defines «person» as worldly and scientific terms in personality psychology is seen as «a man taken in his system of psychological characteristics that are socially determined, determine the moral his actions» [2; 377] and the identity of sociology studies in different social systems.

Usage of the term «linguistic identity» in a number of science areas (linguodidactics and psycholinguistics, cultural linguistics and stylistics of artistic speech, and communicative linguistics linguopersonology) says, that the reference to the human factor in the language is in a high demand now. The new term has gained popularity due to the fact that it reflects the integration of science and interdisciplinary studies of modern humans.

Performances of the individual nature of knowing the language appeared in linguistics in the 18–19 centuries in the works of V. von Humboldt and I.G.Herder, and later were developed in the writings of L.Weisgerber, K.Vossler, I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay, and others. The phrase «linguistic identity» was first used by V.V.Vinogradov in his work «Artistic prose» (1930), but its value was not disclosed. Understanding of the phenomenon comes clear only in present days, which is indicated by the words «linguistic identity», and that the name gets the status of the *term*.

Since the 80s the term «linguistic identity» is increasingly being used by linguists, there is a number of definitions and its characteristics. The first of them was given in 1980 by G.I.Bogin in the book «Modern Linguodidactics». He wrote that «the central concept of linguistics is linguistic identity — a man, considered in terms of its readiness to make the speech acts. <...> Linguistic identity — is the one who sets the language, that is, the one for whom language is a speech. Linguistic identity is characterized not so much by what it knows about the language, as the fact that it can do with the language» [3]. Later, in his doctoral dissertation, he added early interpretation, defining linguistic identity as a «man, considered in terms of its readiness to make the speech acts, to create and to take the work of speech» [4].

A little later, the definition of a linguistic identity was formulated by U.N.Karaulov in his book «The Russian language and linguistic identity» (1987), and linguistic identity was defined by him as «... a set (and the result of the implementation) of the ability to create and perception of speech works (texts), which differ

- a) a degree of structural and linguistic complexity,
- b) depth and accurate reflection of reality,
- c) a specific target orientation» [5; 245].

In the same monograph it is provided a fundamentally different interpretation: «... linguistic identity is a person, expressed in the language (text), and through language, it is also a person, reconstructed in its main features on the basis of language means» [5; 38].

Following U.N.Karaulov many linguists have proposed their own definitions of linguistic identity where its essence is defined by the concept of a system or set of a person properties, accented own language concepts or extralinguistic components that characterize a person. We provide a brief overview of some of the definitions of the linguistic identity:

- «Linguistic identity is considered to be a subject, who is capable to perform speech activity, using its meaning» (I.E.Klyukanov) [6; 73];

- «An individual, who is capable of producing a coded designation of the external world, serving the conceptual model of reality and enshrined codification language community, is used under the linguistic identity» (O.A.Eremeeva) [7];

- «... linguistic identity is seen... as a carrier of a certain quality of language ability, given its initially and further developed in accordance in its potential» (N.D.Golev) [8; 10];

- «Linguistic personality — is multi-dimensional, multi-level functional system, which gives an idea of language and speech degree at the level of the individual active and creative interpretation of reality» (E.V.Barsukov) [9; 5];

- «The language identity is a set of socio-psychological and cultural property rights, determining its ability to creative text activity and display a specific national language picture of the world, constructive interaction with the environment, openness to understand and adapt to a mental-language environment for the purpose of initiation to the culture of a foreign language and to determine their place in the spectrum of different cultures» (S.Yu.Godunova) [10].

With such a variety of definitions it is actual getting preferred the term «person» as a generic component definition of linguistic identity — it highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the research object: the identity (in the totality of its properties identified related disciplines), as reflected in the language.

The level of generalization in the selection of the object, which is denoted by the term «linguistic identity» varies very widely in the definitions, and in various studies. So, G.I.Bogin, speaking of the linguistic identity, involves the study of science fiction, which is abstracted from the individual differences of people and languages. This interpretation is opposed to the second definition made by Karaulov, what is focused on a specific individual speaker. And anyway «Karaulov does not clarify taken parameter, thanks to which it is possible to study the «conditional linguistic identity» (art text characters), social or national language and speech types of real individuals.

Dedicated by U.N.Karaulov abstraction levels correlate with independent values of the original term:

«Linguistic identity — is the carrier of a language, characterized by analyzing the texts they produced:

- a) As the individual and the author of these texts with its own character, interests, social and psychological preferences and settings;

- b) As a typical representative of the linguistic community and a narrower included in its speech community, or the cumulative average carrier of the language;

- c) As the representative of the kind of homo sapiens, an essential feature of which is the use of sign systems and, especially, natural language» [11; 104].

If you cannot differ the perception of the analysis object, linguistic identity «is understood as an individual or as a team, using the language as a basic channel of communication» [12].

Thus, the idea of a linguistic identity in linguistics is not only a real native speakers, but also with some scientific abstraction, simulated entity. This view is held by N.S.Trubetzkoy in his work «On the problem of Russian self-learning» (1927), where he considered the philosophical concept of the person in the unity and the opposition of its two fundamental sides — «individual» and «public», «symphony» of personality [13].

Many authors of contemporary works get such a juxtaposition of two forms of the phenomenon, so the terms «collective linguistic identity» (a community of people who speak this language) and «individual linguistic identity» (a single representative of the community) are widespread. At this moment it can be represented following points of view of different linguists:

- Following N.S.Trubetzkoy, V.P.Neroznak indicates the language of the people as «public (polilektive)» linguistic identity and its particular representative as «individual (idiolektive)» linguistic identity [14; 113].

- I.I.Sentenbergh believes that the overall linguistic identity (generalized image of the carrier of the language) and linguistic identity of the individual (the specific language of the media) — are two sides of one coin, does not exist without each other. It is noted that the overall linguistic identity varies territorial, vocational, cultural, sexual, etc. In this regard, there may be the study of the linguistic identity of the schoolboy, students, pensioners, etc. [15].

- A.A.Vorozhbitova proposes to use the term «collective linguistic identity» or «total linguistic identity» in relation to the ethnic group as a whole and in the description of the social groups to introduce the term «group linguistic identity» [16; 139].

- O.N.Shevchenko contrasts typical and individual linguistic identity. «Typical linguistic identity is characterized by properties, such as abstract, reference, collectively, the impersonality»; standard model in each case is implemented in the form of individual linguistic identity. Individual linguistic identity in the basic characteristics is the same as the standard, but at the same time it has its own characteristics [17].

Any pursuit of science tends to identify the generalizing of properties of the investigated phenomena. However, the widespread consolidation of the term «linguistic identity» as «people, talking in general» or «a typical representative of the linguistic community» are undesirable not only because of the inconvenience of use in scientific practice, but primarily due to the initial opposition of the initial concepts of «personality» and the «collective». Expanded use of the term «linguistic identity» is a part of tribute to the «scientific fashion», which reflects the important social needs of the mass consciousness. After studying various scientific approaches to the concept of «linguistic identity», we believe that the perspective is the designation according to the specific term of a native speaker. This view is held by U.N.Karaulov and D.N.Murzina and E.V.Ivantsova. In other cases, it is more about the different types of linguistic identity.

Perhaps, then, the term «collective linguistic identity» will be released from active use, while the term «individual linguistic identity» is used without an explanatory tautological definition and finally gain a foothold in linguapersonology as the main.

Variability of certain linguistic identity is also due to the different views on the subject of (aspects of) the phenomenon study. Some definitions of this area coincide with the formulation of the object of study, in others it is highlighted in a separate part of the characteristics of the concept.

An analysis of the definitions of the linguistic identity at this point, it demonstrates the processes of integration and differentiation of individual areas of linguistics in the period of its anthropocentric paradigm. Different interpretations of the individual aspects in language study are clearly correlated with separated in the last decade of the traditional linguistics new areas.

Defining of linguodidactics, where the main thing is occupied by the speech (language) rights and their ability to go back to the implementation are shown in the work of G.I.Bogin. Interest cultural linguistics to the «human factor in language» is caused interpretation linguistic identity «... mainly in the fixed base of lexical system of national and cultural prototype of vehicle specific natural language...» (S.G.Vorkachev) [18; 17]. Thus, the task of studying «etno-semantic» (collective!) linguistic identity is to identify characteristics of the national culture and mentality of a language community. Close to this understanding (but perhaps with some shift in emphasis in the sphere of cognitive and communicative linguistics) there is a definition of V.I.Karasik: «Linguistic identity — is a generalized image of the media cultural-linguistic and communicative activity-related values, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral responses» [19; 363]. Synthesis of Science and problems of sociolinguistics is seen in the definition of «model», linguistic identity — is «a typical representative of a certain ethno-social groups, recognizable by the specific characteristics of verbal and non-verbal behavior and output value orientation» [20; 99].

Communicative linguistics spawned an idea of the linguistic identity as a «communication.» According to G.N.Bespamyatnova it is «a set of distinctive personality traits, found in its communicative behavior, and providing the individual communicative personality» [21; 10].

Finally, a number of definitions related to specific native speaker highlighted the problem of linguopersonology that places the center of the study some real individuals in the dialectical unity of the individual and the collective in their language and speech, in conjunction with their language and personal in the broad sense of the word. It should be noted that the definitions of U.N.Karaulov, where the components of the structure of the linguistic identity (vocabulary, thesaurus and pragmatikon), reflects the modern view of language as a tool for learning outlook, values and motivations of man. In these definitions minimized their contain of methodological principles of analysis.

Many linguists are trying to narrow down the concept of «linguistic identity» by introducing it into a paradigmatic series of similar concepts, and replacing the original terms notation other. Thus, A.V.Puzyrev opposes linguistic identity of thought, speech and communicative personality, tying with only the first term analysis of the language development degree, its features [22]; V.V.Krasnih separates language, speech, communicative person and a speaking person [23]. It is also proposed to use the term «verbal person», filling it with different content. In some works, he is regarded as identical in meaning to common «linguistic identity», but a more accurate in an inner form; in the writings of other linguists associated with it is only one aspect of the description of the linguistic identity.

Thus, the term «linguistic identity» actively asserted in modern linguistics. His demand is primarily due to the anthropological orientation of modern linguistics. Diversity of interpretation of the term is associated with different representations of the object standing behind this notation, the degree of abstraction in the research process, exploring aspects of this phenomenon. Many of his interpretations show, on the one hand, the development of ambiguity, on the other — the desire to eliminate undesirable for terminological system polysemy.

Secondary terms (which are often sound the same are also attached to the shell unequal content) are acclimatized badly, and the primary «linguistic identity» keeps the variability of semantic content. This situation can be explained as the antinomy of the original objects, as reflected in this phrase (unity and opposed to speech and language, social and individual), and the lack of formation of terminological apparatus of the new field of scientific knowledge.

It seems that in many cases, the term «linguistic identity» is used to refer to an excessively wide band speakers. In connection with the isolation of linguopersonology, wider area of anthropological linguistics would be appropriate for securing objects of different degrees of abstraction, different terminological designations, yet to be introduced for a branch of linguistics, related to the theory of linguistic identity. The theory of linguistic identity is developed from the perspective of different approaches, using different research methods, by examining certain aspects of the problem, based on the selection of different objects for observation. Construction of a theory of person's language involved representatives of various philological schools, and both of them listened carefully to the opinions of colleagues support, the hypothesis were put forward and offered their solutions of common scientific problems.

The initial research was the understanding of a language as a specific identity of a native speaker, to understand it there was reproduced and created a text, is a person, described based on the analysis of texts produced by it in terms of the use of system resources which the language to reflect its vision of reality (U.N.Karaulov, V.V.Vorobiev). The basis for the individual characteristics of the language is assumed its three-tier structure, proposed by U.N.Karaulov, under which verbally-semantic, linguistic and cognitive and pragmatic (motivational) levels were allocated. Follow-up studies undertaken in this area the viability of ideas U.N.Karaulov have shown. Linguistic identity recognized «... integral complex object of study of young and rapidly developing areas of language science (cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics, ethnolinguistics, ontolinguistics etc.)» [24; 5]. In the future structuring of the linguistic identity Karaulov received rethinking, additions and clarifications to the works of other scholars. Thus, V.A.Maslova calls the three components that make up the content of a linguistic personality — evaluative, or worldview, cultural and personal [25]. V.I.Karasik offers an aspect Learn the linguistic identity of values, cognitive and behavioral [26]. In general, the organization of human speech isolated language ability, communicative needs, communicative competence, language awareness, verbal behavior [27].

Teaching of the linguistic identity, develop tools anthropocentric scientific paradigm, involves the use of a wide range of methods, techniques, research methods of linguistic material. Their choice is determined in each set by the goals and objectives. The following methods are most frequently used: general linguistic: observation of the object, descriptive thesaurus (ideographic description language method), a method of semantic fields (L.M.Vasilyev), the method of content analysis of the individual author of the dictionary, hermeneutics; linguokognitology methods: conceptual (L.O.Cherneyko, V.A.Dolinskiy), discursive (T.B.Alisova); linguokulturology methods: Method of linguocultural fields (V.V.Vorobyov), the method of linguistic and cultural analysis of the text (M.Freshly) [28]; a method of describing the language of the person on the basis of models offered by modern science (U.N.Karaulov, V.A.Maslova, V.I.Karasik, T.V.Kochetkova); linguopragsmatic methods (including analysis of the modalities of speech, rhetorical analysis); methods of psycholinguistics; of comparative methods; statistical method; methods of educational lexicography; experimental method.

One of the most important tasks, which is laid in the anthropocentric linguistics in the study of the language of the person — is the creation of a typology of linguistic personality, building on the basis of differences in styles of thinking, in ways of developing the communicative competence, both diachronic and synchronic view. An inexhaustible source of inspiration is the scientific study of the language of individual per-

sonalities, specific speakers, creating an individual voice portrait. Linguistic personality in some degree represents Linguacultural situation under which it works, linguistic picture of the world of the people, reflected in its personal view of the world, like a personality, «... so the universal significance of the person in need of analysis and explanation» [29; 237]. In general, the construction of an integrated theory of linguistic personality seems possible only through the efforts of many scientists and combining many scientific fields.

References

- 1 Кочеткова Т.В. Проблема изучения языковой личности носителя элитарной речевой культуры (обзор) // Вопросы стилистики. — 1996. — Вып. 26. — С. 14–24.
- 2 Николина Н.А. Новые тенденции в современном русском словотворчестве // Русский язык сегодня. — М., 2003. — Вып. 2. — С. 376–387.
- 3 Богин Г.И. Современная лингводидактика. — Калинин: Калинин. гос. ун-т, 1980. — С. 3.
- 4 Богин Г.И. Концепция языковой личности: Автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. — Л., 1982. — С. 1.
- 5 Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. — М.: Наука, 1987. — 262 с.
- 6 Клюканов И.Э. Языковая личность и интегральные смысловые образования // Язык, дискурс и личность. — Тверь, 1990. — С. 69–73.
- 7 Еремеева О.А. О понятии «языковая личность» // Лингвистика: взаимодействие концепций и парадигм. — Харьков, 1991. — Вып. 1. — Ч.2. — С. 434.
- 8 Лингвоперсонология: типы языковых личностей и личностно-ориентированное обучение / Под ред. Н.Д.Голева, Н.В.Сайковой, Э.П.Хомич. — Барнаул; Кемерово, 2006. — 435 с.
- 9 Барсукова Е.В. Языковая личность как категория исторической культурологии (на материале «Архива князя Воронцова»): Автореф. дис. ... канд. культурол. наук. — М., 2007. — 22 с.
- 10 Годунова С.Ю. Педагогические условия развития языковой личности студента технического вуза: Автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук. — М., 2008. — С. 10.
- 11 Культура русской речи: Энцикл. слов.-справ. — М.: Флинта; Наука, 2003. — 840 с.
- 12 Гронская О.Н. Языковая картина мира и языковая личность сказки: пути реконструкции // Языковая картина мира. — Кемерово, 1995. — С. 126, 127.
- 13 Трубецкой Н.С. К проблеме русского самопознания // Вавилонская башня — 2: Слово. Текст. Культура. — Чтения 2002–2003. — М., 2003. — С. 7–12.
- 14 Нерозник В.П. Лингвистическая персонология: к определению статуса дисциплины // Язык. Поэтика. Перевод. — М., 1996. — С. 112–116.
- 15 Сентенберг И.И. Языковая личность в коммуникативно-деятельностном аспекте // Языковая личность: проблемы значения и смысла. — Волгоград, 1994. — С. 15.
- 16 Ворожбитова А.А. Теория текста: антропоцентрическое направление: учеб. пособие. — 2-е изд., испр. и доп. — М.: Высш. шк., 2005. — 367 с.
- 17 Шевченко О.Н. Языковая личность переводчика (на материале дискурса Б.В.Заходера): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. — Волгоград, 2005. — С. 7.
- 18 Воркачев С.Г. Этносемантика паремии: сопоставительный анализ метафоризированных показателей безразличия в русском и испанском языках // Языковая личность: культурные концепты. — Волгоград, Архангельск, 1996. — С. 16–25.
- 19 Карасик В.И. Языковая личность: аспекты изучения // II Междунар. науч. конф. «Язык и культура». — М., 17–21 сентября 2003 г.: Тез. докл. — М., 2003. — С. 362–363.
- 20 Карасик В.И. Модельная личность как лингвокультурный концепт // Филология и культура: Материалы 3-й Междунар. науч. конф. — Ч. 2. — Тамбов, 2001. — С. 98–101.
- 21 Беспмятнова Г.Н. Языковая личность телевизионного ведущего: автореф. дис. ...канд. филол. наук. — Воронеж, 1994. — 19с.
- 22 Пузырев А.В. Общество, язык, текст и языковая личность в аспекте субстратного подхода к языку // Общество, язык, личность. — М., 1996. — Вып.1. — С. 20–23.
- 23 Красных В.В. Структура коммуникации в свете лингвокогнитивного подхода (коммуникативный акт, дискурс, текст): автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. — М., 1999. — С. 12.
- 24 Седов К.Ф. Становление структуры устного дискурса как выражение эволюции языковой личности: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. — Саратов, 1999. — 436 с.
- 25 Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. — М.: Академия, 2001. — С. 119.
- 26 Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: Личность, концепты, дискурс. — Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. — 476 с.
- 27 Тхорик В. И., Фанян Н.Ю. Лингвокультурология и межкультурная коммуникация. — М.: ГИС, 2006. — С. 258, 259.
- 28 Фрешли М. Культурные сети. — Сомбатхей, 2015. — 221 с.
- 29 Воробьев В.В. Языковая личность в лингвокультурологии // Языковая личность: Лингвистика. Лингвокультурология. Лингводидактика: Тез. докл. — Уфа: РИЦ БашГУ, 2011. — С. 234–237.

Г.Ю.Аманбаева, Н.Ф.Юшко

Қазіргі заманғы лингвистикадағы тілдік тұлға тұжырымдамасы

Мақалада қазіргі лингвистикадағы «тілдік тұлға» ұғымы мәселесі қарастырылды. Ұғымның пәнаралық сипаты анықталды және оның лингвистикадағы шығуының зор маңызы көрсетілді. Әр түрлі тәсілдемелерге және пәндерге сәйкес «тілдік тұлға» ұғымының анықтамалары және сипаттамалары салыстырылып, тілдік тұлғаның әр түрлі анықтамалары және олардың жалпы мағынасы жан-жақты зерттелді. Авторлар анықтамаларды және тәсілдемелерді талдап, қазіргі ғылымдағы тілдік тұлғаның зерттеу әдістері мазмұндап, осы ұғымның лингвистикадағы зерттеуінің мақсаттарын анықтады.

Г.Ю.Аманбаева, Н.Ф.Юшко

Концепция языковой личности в современной лингвистике

В статье рассмотрено значение термина «языковая личность» в современной лингвистической парадигме. Установлен междисциплинарный характер термина и отмечена значимость появления данного термина в лингвистике. В статье сопоставлены определения и характеристики понятия «языковая личность» с точки зрения разных подходов и научных дисциплин, предпринята попытка сопоставить различные дефиниции языковой личности и выделить общность их содержания. На основании анализа определений и подходов описаны методы изучения языковой личности в современной науке и обозначены цели изучения данного понятия в лингвистике.

References

- 1 Kochetkova T.V. *Stylistics questions*, 1996, 26, p.14–24.
- 2 Nikolina N.A. *Russian language today*, 2003, 2, p. 376–387.
- 3 Bogin G.I. *Modern Linguodidactics*, Kalinin: Kalinin State University, 1980, p. 3.
- 4 Bogin G.I. *The concept of linguistic identity: Dokt. Diss.*, Leningrad, 1982. p. 1.
- 5 Karaulov Yu.N. *Russian language and linguistic identity*, Moscow: Nauka, 1987, 262 p.
- 6 Kljukanov I.E. *Language, discourse and identity*, 1990, p. 69–73.
- 7 Ereemeeva O.A. *Linguistics: teamwork concepts and paradigms*, 1991, 1, 2, p. 434.
- 8 Golev N.D., Sajkova N.V., Homich Je.P. *Lingvopersonology: types of linguistic personality and personality-oriented education*, Kemerovo, 2006, 435 p.
- 9 Barsukova E.V. *Linguistic personality as a category of historical cultural studies based on «Archives of Prince Vorontsov»*: Avtoref. Dis., Moscow, 2007, 22 p.
- 10 Godunova S.Yu. *Pedagogical conditions of development of language personality of student technical college*: Avtoref. Diss., Moscow, 2008, 24 p.
- 11 *Culture of Russian speech: Collegiate Dictionary Directory*, Moscow: Flinta; Nauka, 2003, 840 p.
- 12 Gronskaja O.N. *Language picture of the world*, Kemerovo, 1995, p. 126–127.
- 13 Trubeckoj N.S. *Tower of Babel-2: Word. Text. Culture*, Moscow, 2003, p. 7–12.
- 14 Neroznak V.P. *Language. Poetics. Translation*, Moscow, 1996, p. 112–116.
- 15 Sentenberg I.I. *Linguistic personality: problems of meaning and sense*, Volgograd, 1994, p. 15.
- 16 Vorozhbitova A.A. *Theory of Text: anthropocentric direction*, Moscow: Vyssh. Shk., 2005, 367 p.
- 17 Shevchenko O.N. *Language interpreter person (based on discourse B.V. Zakhoder)*: Avtoref. Dis., Volgograd, 2005, p. 7.
- 18 Vorkachev S.G. *Linguistic personality: cultural concepts*, Volgograd; Arkhangelsk, 1996, p. 16–25.
- 19 Karasik V.I. *Abstracts of the II Int. scien. conf. «Language and Culture»*, Moscow, 2003, p. 362–363.
- 20 Karasik V.I. *Proc. of the 3rd Intern. Scien. Conf. «Literature and Culture»*, 2, Tambov, 2001, p. 98–101.
- 21 Bepamjatnova G.N. *Linguistic personality of television host*. Avtoref. Dis., Voronezh, 1994, 19 p.
- 22 Puzyrev A.V. *Society, language, personality*, Moscow, 1996, 1, p. 20–23.
- 23 Krasnykh V.V. *The structure of the communication in the light of Lingvokognitivnye approach (communicative act, discourse, text)*: Avtoref. Dis., Moscow, 1999, p. 12.
- 24 Sedov K.F. *Formation of the structure of oral discourse as an expression of the evolution of the language person*: Doct. Diss. Saratov, 1999, 436 p.
- 25 Maslova V.A. *Linvocultural studies*, Moscow: Publ.Center Academy, 2001, p. 119.
- 26 Karasik V.I. *Linguistic Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse*, Volgograd: Peremena, 2002, 476 p.
- 27 Thorik V. I., Fanjan N.Ju. *Cultural linguistics and intercultural communication*, Moscow, 2006, p. 258, 259.
- 28 Fresli M. *Kulturális hálózatok*, Szombathely, 2015, p. 221.
- 29 Vorob'ev V.V. *Abstracts of the conf. «Linguistic personality: Linguistics. Cultural linguistics. Linguodidactics»*, Ufa, 2011, p. 234–237.