

# System of Russian Linguocultural Types: Problem Statement

Mandrikova G.M.  
Department of Philology  
Novosibirsk State Technical University  
Novosibirsk, Russia  
mandricova@mail.ru

Dubrovskaya E.M.  
Department of Philology  
Novosibirsk State Technical University  
Novosibirsk, Russia  
schitat.do.sta@gmail.com

**Abstract**—The paper substantiates the necessity to describe / model the linguocultural types of the Russian worldview. The theory of linguocultural types proposed by V.I. Karasik is actively developing in modern linguistics in line with linguopersonology as one of the domains within the theory of linguistic person. However, the majority of the types already described and being modeled are mostly associated with English / American linguocultures. The types of other linguocultures (including Russian) are presented less completely and non-systematically. Researchers have no doubt that the linguocultural type as a bearer of important national characteristics provides the key not only to understanding of the national worldview, but also to some of its features associated with a specific time (history), social structure in different periods, ideological / value attitudes, etc. Thus, concentrating the attention of scientists on the description of the system of linguocultural type relevant for Russian culture seems an important and urgent task, especially important considering the search for the identity of modern Russian society.

**Keywords**—*linguocultural type, linguopersonology, linguocultures, national characteristics, Russian types, personality*

## I. INTRODUCTION

While the branch of linguistics referred to as linguoculturology is known to almost every philologist / linguist and no longer considered dubious, linguopersonology is known rather to narrow specialists studying such phenomena as language / speech personality and linguocultural types. The emergence of the theory of linguistic person is usually attributed to the publication of the book by Yu. N. Karaulov “Russian language and linguistic person” (1987), in which the author identified the so-called **all - Russian language type** and named its main features in his linguistic person model:

1) at the lexicon level: these are the systemic and structural features of the language that despite being subject to certain processes of evolution throughout the historical time are refracted in the mind of native speakers in some invariant way and enable them to somehow recognize the “Russianness” of a text, phrase or individual word;

2) at the semantic level: this is a common basic part of the worldview typical of all Russian language speakers. It is expressed in the understanding of the common traditions of the Russian people, similar attitudes to values, etc. (for example, the celebration of the New Year and the Old New Year,

nationwide celebration of May the 9<sup>th</sup>, the love to tea-drinking ceremonies, etc.);

3) at the pragmatic level: these are the common communicative features and needs that are typical of all Russian language speakers (for example, peculiarities of greeting and parting, conversational etiquette, behavior in official situations, etc.) [1].

Inspired by the work of Yu. N. Karaulov, numerous subsequent studies have developed a certain system of ideas about specific individuals who are bearers of various characteristics (ideological, cultural, social, intellectual). These ideas enable forming an opinion about the national worldview.

Another significant concept of linguopersonology is linguocultural type (LCT), the central object of the theory of linguocultural types. According to T.V. Bondarenko, “linguocultural types represent a generalized linguistic person which is distinguished in linguistic cultures by recognizability and frequency and marked by a certain social attitude which may vary depending on different socio-cultural reasons” [2].

Thus, research carried out within the framework of linguopersonology, and especially in the field of studying and describing linguocultural types, allows considering, studying and describing the national worldview from different perspectives, which provides a more adequate image of the country and its people.

## II. METHODS AND MATERIALS

We applied the descriptive and analytical method to solve the issue of systemic description of linguistic cultural types which are characteristic of the Russian worldview. Within our research, this method allowed conducting consistent study of all LCT modeling procedures existing at present in the research literature: from choosing the sources of the material to analyze a certain type to the principles of the type description and presentation as the phenomenon of a certain linguistic culture. Approximately 150 LCTs, which have already been described as possessing different classification characteristics, were used as the research material. The analysis of the extensive research material has shown the need for new approaches to systematization of the Russian LCTs. This article sets the ground for implementing a series of experimental studies employing the linguistic construction method to attain the goal.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In our opinion, linguocultural type has two important, characteristics:

- Firstly, it always acts as a bearer of features which are important for its linguoculture. These features influenced the linguoculture formation and give a key to understanding the social structure peculiarities;

- Secondly, different linguocultural types display different features which are emphasized as important for the understanding the mentality of the people. Notably, linguocultural types reflect the attributes of both real people and characters of fiction, theater and cinema.

Even the names of a particular LCTs to some extent reveal it for experiencing and understanding. The described British and American linguocultural types can serve as an example of this (Table I).

TABLE I. BRITISH AND AMERICAN LCTS DESCRIBED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE LINGUOCULTURAL TYPES THEORY

English LCTs	American LCTs
English Eccentric (O.A. Dmitrieva)	American Superman (V.I. Karasik)
English Butler (T.V. Bondarenko)	Hollywood star (L.P. Seliverstova)
dandy (L.I. Makarova)	American cowboy (M.V. Mishchenko)
British Queen (I.A. Murzinova)	American pioneer (A.V. Valiybob)
British Prime Minister (L.A. Vasilyeva)	American lawyer (E.V. Gulyaeva)
British lord (V.A. Reznik)	American president (S.A. Belyavskova)
English knight (E. Yu. Skachko)	Uncle Tom (P.G. Bulanov)
English pirate (A.V. Assadullaeva)	
English vicar (L.N. Brovikova)	
English snob (A.Yu. Korovina)	
English businessman (M.S. Ilyukhina)	

Even reading the descriptions of the above mentioned types, it is possible to make definite conclusions about the variety of features of the national character, world outlook, and development of society, its structure, values and the historical development of the English linguoculture representatives. In this respect, particularly convincing is the research by O.V. Dmitrieva, who believes that linguocultural types are generalized personality types and a kind of mental formations in the worldview. They “have different social and historical roots and are differently represented in the linguistic mind of contemporaries and bearer of modern linguoculture” [4]. The author considers the linguocultural types of Russia and France of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and singles out “hussar”, “Cossack”, “decembrist” and “secular Muscovite” LCTs in the Russian linguoculture; and “French mod”, “bourgeois”, “grisetite”, “secular Parisian” in the French one. According to O.V. Dmitrieva, the description of these particular types “facilitates a better understanding of the Russian and French national characters” of that time: thus, Russian LCTs show the qualities that constitute the value basis of the Russian national character: daring, strength, willingness to self-sacrifice, hospitality, etc.; and French LCTs show the dominants of the French national character: rationality, optimism, gallantry, ability to live [4, 5].

A similar study of one national character in comparison with another is presented in a “highlander” (N.M. Nepomnyuschikh)

;and a “teacher” LCTs in Russian and American linguocultures (P.S. Erkovich). Definitely, there are descriptions of linguocultural types “solely” representing the country: French LCT “héros combatant” (hero-fighter) (E.O. Omelichkina), “Chinese physician” (A.A. Roshchyna), “Hispanic” (I. Yu. Ufayeva), “Irish emigrant” (G.I. Lushnikova, T.V. Startseva).

Significantly, there is a certain set of types, such as, for example, “Kudar” (A.U. Kachmazova), “Kalmyk aristocrat” (N. Ts, Boschayeva) and, unfortunately, an incomplete type “Bulgarian skater”, which, apparently, are precedent for a certain and, presumably, not a very large group of people, but seem to be very significant for a certain linguoculture as a whole.

A number of types created by researchers does not represent a specific linguoculture judging by a name; nevertheless, upon closer examination, these types are the brightest representatives of the culture of a particular nation and markers of national peculiarities, and sometimes stereotypes, for example: “mother of a family” (A.Yu. Solovyova), “holy fool” (I.G. Chebotarev), “young magician” (A.S. Shkotova), “poor creature” (I.V. Shcheglova).

The types describing the Russian worldview are given in Table II.

TABLE II. RUSSIAN LCTS DESCRIBED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE LINGUOCULTURAL TYPES THEORY

LCTs containing the word "Russian"	LCTs that do not contain the word "Russian", i.e. describing the linguocultural types that exist in the Russian language mind proper
Russian intellectual (V.I. Karasik)	football fan (A.V. Karasik)
Russian merchant (V.I. Karasik)	housewife (O.V. Kombarova)
Russian official (V.I. Karasik)	hacker (A.V. Lutovinova)
New Russian (E.Ya. Shmeleva)	official (I.V. Shcheglova)
Soviet spy (M. Trendovich)	rocker (M.B. Voroshilova)
Russian politician (E.V. Gulyaeva)	aristocrat (T.A. Ivushkina)
Russian European (M.A. Lappo)	livestock breeder (T. Esepova)
	school teacher (S.V. Popova)
	glamorous bitch (V.A. Kukharenko)
	detective (A.V. Gvozdeva)
	Bohemian man (E.M. Dubrovskaya)
	holy fool (I.G. Chebotaryov)

Comparing the types of English / American (Table I) and Russian linguocultures (Table II), it is noteworthy that the LCTs in the presented list will be associated with specific events, national traits, traditions, history, culture for any person who has at least the slightest knowledge about England. This generally allows differentiating and recreating a certain image of the country of the studied language. Unfortunately, this can not be said about the types of Russian culture, judging by the list presented in Table II. In our opinion, Russian linguocultural types rather fragmentarily represent the national worldview, “snatching” individual parts from it, which does not allow forming an idea of the country as a whole.

As a possible systematization means of the described and potential Russian LCTs, it is proposed to use the thematic classification of linguocultural types developed by E.M. Dubrovskaya:

1. type - profession
2. type - hobby
3. type - mindset
4. type - stereotype
5. type - an implicit precedent
6. type - prototype
7. geographically oriented type
8. type - historical character
9. type - concept [6].

The next important stage of LCT systematization can be the creation of a dictionary of Russian linguocultural types. Following the authors of the linguistic-cultural dictionary "Russian Cultural Space", it is believed that the description of the linguistic-cultural object should include not only vocabulary and encyclopaedic information, but also the knowledge that the bearers of national culture have about this object [7]. In addition, the authors agree with the need to take into account what is called urban culture. The main thing is that the description of the type corresponds to the representation that is present in the linguistic consciousness of our contemporaries.

The microstructure of such a dictionary can be presented in the following form:

1. Heading unit (LCT), its pronunciation and grammatical characteristics.

2. Semantic characteristic of SE:

1) Under the number 1 a generalized description of the type is given, formed on the basis of the analysis of encyclopedic sources, in which the described type is mentioned, accompanied by an illustration (from modern literature);

2) Under number 2 the most frequently encountered in reality way of presentation of type is described, accompanied by illustration (from modern literature);

3) The number 3 suggests the conditions of using LCT in media discourse (illustrations from the media).

3) Characteristics of the described type in terms of formal indicators. This characteristic contains 5 zones:

1) Typicality of this image for the Russian mentality;

2) stereotypicality / individuality (relative) for native speakers;

3) Presence of emotional coloring;

4) direct value / portable value / use as a precedent phenomenon;

5) Place of type in LCT classifications.

As an example, let us give a dictionary article of the linguistic-cultural type "bohemian girl":

**BOHEMIAN GIRL**, -s, fem.

1. Feminine lifestyle as a generalization of a certain way of life: 1) creative intelligence (mainly actors, musicians, artists, writers), 2) lack of stable financial position, 3) disorderly lifestyle, 4) carelessness and frivolity, 6) bourgeois society.

*She was already wasted. Many people did not lag behind her. Someone was drinking from the neck, someone was laughing drunk, someone was pinching the other one's chest, and the music was thundering over the desert dunes, champagne was pouring out, a blacksmith was dancing, all picking up the falling sheet, and dancing on the peacock sheet; the village shopkeeper was complaining to him, looking around, every now and then squealing - a little hysterically, as it seemed to me. - Boheme," I explained to Algis, as if justifying the whole thing. - Yes, artists," he nodded and took me by the shoulder with his right hand, "he had a glass in his left hand. (N. Klimontovich "The Road to Rome")*

2. The desire to conform to the image of a Bohemian in the mind:

*When Colombina woke up on an immense bed, which had never become an altar of love, it was still a long way off in the evening. She lazed on the down featherbed, telephoned to the ground floor to bring coffee, and drank it without cream and sugar to mark a new, refined life. It was bitter and tasteless, but bohemian (B. Akunin "The Lover of Death").*

3. In modern Internet sources (and after them) in the minds of native speakers of the language there is a substitution of the image of "bohemian girl" in the image of "glamorous girl":

*Bohemian girl is the least interested in traffic jams at peak times, prices for bagels in hypermarkets and political perturbations. Another question is what she still lives in, because you can not lie down all day long in restaurants with hookahs, shine at exhibitions every day, and during breaks you can keep a blog with an elegant MacBook, where every new post starts with the phrase "God, how we got drunk yesterday with...". (Internet magazine news.butik.ru)*

4. It is not typical for Russian culture in this way (1); it does not act as a stereotyped notion of a person (2); it is neutral and emotional (3); it can be used ironically (4); it refers to real and modern types (according to V.I. Karasik), dispersed (according to V.I. Karasik), ideological and social (according to V.A. Reznik), has a socio-cultural significance (according to V.I. Karasik), and belongs to the type of mind (according to E.M. Dubrovskaya) [8].

There is a problem of finding out which linguocultural types are very important for understanding Russian character, worldview, mentality, Russian history, fiction, jokes and stereotypical images that exist both in Russia and abroad. It can be solved by addressing the Russian language speakers, i.e. by conducting a sociolinguistic experiment. The pilot study showed that the following LCTs can be counted as potential ones:

- Russian soldier
- Russian hero
- Russian writer
- Russian woman

Russian oligarch  
 Russian grandmother  
 Ivan the fool  
 Down-to-earth, happy-go-lucky guy  
 Party official  
 Armchair critic  
 Turgenevian girl, etc.

It is clear that if the idea of creating a Russian LCT system is to be implemented into a research project, the selection of the components of this system should be carried out first.

The theory of linguocultural types has gradually developed the procedure of their description / modeling which includes the identification of their conceptual, figurative and evaluative characteristics.

Conceptual characteristics are the most dominant and constitutive features that allow singling out a specific linguocultural type from a number of similar ones and differentiating it on the basis of vocabulary definitions. The compliance with all marked vocabulary characteristics allows making a conclusion whether a person can belong to the type of the research. Importantly, the volume of the conceptual component description in different linguocultural types may vary significantly. Often this situation is directly related to the socio-cultural status of the individual / personalities underlying the described LCT: the higher the person's status, the more specifying details will be required to distinguish this person from a number of similar, but not identical ones.

For example:

The conceptual characteristics of the dispersed character of "Bohemian person»:

- 1) a young man / girl (21 to 35 years old; but the boundaries are undoubtedly conditional),
- 2) a creative person who, however, is not fully understood by society, but has a group of followers and / or imitators,
- 3) usually without a fixed kind of employment, or having a creative profession that does not imply any limits or restrictions,
- 4) bad habits and addictions are nearly obligatory,
- 5) belongs to some kind of closed community, be it just a certain friendly circle, or some circles or associations driven by "interest",
- 6) prone to excessive drama and theatrical effects.

Figurative and perceptual characteristics reflect the associations and images that are born in the minds of certain linguoculture representatives in relation to the linguocultural types. In contrast to conceptual characteristics which are expressed very clearly and concisely, the figurative-perceptual characteristics are rather descriptive notes and contain the conclusions and comments fixed in culture by observing the representatives of linguocultural types.

For example:

The most important figurative and perceptive features of the linguocultural type "Bohemian person" are:

- 1) a young man or girl who has a special style, original clothing, hairstyle, accessories,
- 2) a creative person, but an "unrecognized genius", a Bohemian man rarely feels a fulfilled person, always lacking recognition or popularity,
- 3) a person seeking to attract attention to himself by any means available: from appearance to the use of manipulative techniques in communication,
- 4) despite the age, a sufficiently infantile and poorly adapted to life,
- 5) "Bohemian person" has habits and addictions, but they are perceived not as vices, but as part of his personality.

The evaluation characteristics, in turn, are brief culturological notes about the place that the type modeled by the researcher occupies in modern linguoculture and what is the attitude of the culture to it, namely: how their actions are assessed, how typical / atypical they are for a particular culture, how much the type in question is distinguished from other linguocultural types similar to it. For example, a "Bohemian person" clearly differs from "Soviet dandies" and a modern "party-goer", although some similar features of the LCTs clearly exist.

For example:

From evaluation point of view, the LCT of a "Bohemian person" causes rather a neutral attitude towards himself if others see that this is precisely "Bohemian person" and not an imitator, i.e. the one who wants just to seem a Bohemian person, but copies only the worst features and peculiarities. In this case, the attitude is rather negative. Such types are often perceived in society as something strange, not always clear, but interesting, attracting attention and forcing people to take a closer look at them. Perhaps the strangeness and difference from others is what attracts imitators.

It seems plausible that the procedure of linguocultural types modeling, which has already secured itself in scientific research of linguistic person, should not be limited to the range of materials typical for this type of research: dictionaries, fiction texts, etc. Such sources are obviously not enough, especially if we are interested in the existence of a definite linguocultural type in the ideas of modern Russian society (especially among the youth).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Speaking about the need to create a system of Russian linguocultural types the authors argue that the figurative and conceptual features of many characters that exist in Russian history and literature and have made a major contribution to the formation of some characteristics of Russian linguoculture can be presented in a simplified and even distorted form. Thus, their study / description / modeling within the framework of linguocultural types theory (and more broadly, in linguopersonology) could provide an opportunity to see the real understanding of this linguocultural type in the Russian culture.

Notably, a part of linguocultural types has clearly defined the benchmarks of behavior, which to certain extent are

guidelines for certain segments of society, while there is no systematic description of the value attitudes of such linguocultural types, although the need for this is rather great.

The authors argue that there is a pressing need to create a system of Russian linguocultural types as the key not only to understanding the national worldview, but also some of its peculiarities associated with a certain time (history), social structure in its different periods, with ideological / value attitudes, etc. The authors consider it absolutely necessary to turn to the collective linguistic mind, that is, to conduct a series of experimental studies aimed at:

a) recognition of a linguocultural type modeled by researchers in artistic, journalistic and other texts (including in Internet sources) by modern linguoculture representatives;

b) identification of the features of the linguocultural type in the minds of native speakers.

Thus the main methods used in the construction of the linguocultural type are related to obtaining data from the carriers of a certain linguistic culture: a questionnaire aimed at recreating the linguocultural type; an experiment aimed at confirming the recognition of the linguocultural type; and a sociolinguistic experiment. Given the nature of the fact that linguistic cultural types must necessarily exist and function in the linguistic consciousness of native speakers, it is believed that it is necessary to turn to experimental research on linguistic types. This is necessary to see if there is a type of linguocultural type of research in the linguistic consciousness of our contemporaries and what characteristics it has.

An experimental study in the modeling of linguistic types is intended to prove or disprove the following hypotheses:

1) a modern native speaker of the Russian language is able to determine the linguistic and cultural type and its peculiarities by a fragment of text;

2) despite the fact that the peculiarities of the linguocultural type can vary depending on the time period in which it exists, the type still remains recognizable, because, undergoing transformation, it retains its main features and characteristics.

3) informants (regardless of age, gender and level of education) are able to describe the type of person under study and to give appropriate examples of people from life and literature.

For an objective analysis of the perception of linguistic and cultural type by native speakers, the research should be conducted in two stages.

At the first stage, which the authors call the experiment on type recognition, informants should determine their attitude to people, the description of which is offered in different

fragments of literary texts. It is important for the researcher to choose the most accurate fragments that contain explicit and hidden descriptions of behavior, character, speech and other features of the lingua-cultural type under consideration.

At the second stage, the informants are offered to answer the questions of the questionnaire, the purpose of which is to reveal the notions about the considered linguocultural type on the basis of personal associations and notions of descriptive and evaluative character in relation to this type.

It is on the linguistic level that a person has the opportunity to express his or her attitude to the surrounding reality in all its diversity in the most vivid and figurative way, i.e. to evaluate it. Thus, the language assessment is an anthropocentric category focused on the reflection of human interests and does not exist in isolation from them. Quite often, evaluative judgments can take the form of language reflection on direct and indirect questions of researchers, revealing the opinion of native speakers about any language facts. The authors consider it absolutely necessary to conduct a sociolinguistic experiment (in this case, a questionnaire) within the framework of type construction. Such an experiment is important for obtaining the data testifying to the fact that the type under study exists and is embodied in the consciousness of modern native speakers.

Each linguocultural type as a component of the system of Russian LCTs discussed in this work can be described in the dynamics of its formation / development and taking into account various transformations associated with the change of cultural attitudes of Russian society in different periods of its existence.

## References

- [1] Yu.N. Karaulov, "The Russian language and linguistic persona," Moscow: Nauka, 1987.
- [2] T.V. Bondarenko, "Linguo-cultural type "English Butler"," author's abstract of the candidate dissertation, Volgograd, 2009.
- [3] O.A. Dmitrieva, "Linguocultural type and image," Language. Culture Communication: Proceedings of Intern. scientific conf. 4.2. Volgograd, 2006, pp. 206-211.
- [4] O.A. Dmitrieva, "Linguocultural type "French bourgeois"," Axiological linguistics: linguocultural types: Collected Essays, V. I. Karasik, Ed. Volgograd: Paradigma, 2005, pp. 74-88.
- [5] V.I. Karasik and O.A. Dmitrieva, "Linguocultural type: to the definition of the concept," Axiological linguistics: linguocultural types. Volgograd: Paradigma, 2005, pp. 5-25.
- [6] E.M. Dubrovskaya, "Linguocultural type: dynamics and transformation (on the example of "Bohemian man")," Novosibirsk: NSTU, 2019.
- [7] I.S. Brilyova, N.P. Volskaya, D.B. Gudkov, I.V. Zakharenko and V.V. Krasnykh, "Russian cultural space: Linguocultural dictionary," Moscow: Gnozis.
- [8] E.M. Dubrovskaya, "Dictionary of linguocultural types: to the problem of microstructures," Minsk, 2019 – in press.