

LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN THE BILINGUAL CONTEXT OF THE NATIONAL LINGUISTIC WORLD PICTURES

Raysa Khayrullina^{*}, Flyuza Fatkullina^{**}, Eugenia Morozkina^{***}, Alfira Saghitova^{****}, Almira Suleimanova^{*****} and Vladimir Vorobiov^{*****}

Abstract: The aim of the article is the study of the socio-cultural and linguistic trends in the formation of the national language personality in the light of intercultural communication, as well as the characteristic features of the bilingual's language picture of the world. The authors used linguistic, cultural and cognitive methods to identify mental and linguistic processes in the language consciousness in bilingual communication in each language and in the process of interaction of languages, whose carrier is a bilingual person. In the multicultural space of communication intellectual activity of the bilingual is influenced by a number of factors – the social status of languages spoken by the individual, the level of proficiency in each language and language application. The article reveals socio-cultural and cognitive features of interaction of language pictures of the world of the bilingual language personality, describes the forms of inter-language interaction in the speech and intellectual activity in the conditions of natural and artificial bilingualism. If in the Russian society natural bilingualism has a long history and functions as a usual communicative environment for many people, artificial bilingualism for the subject is associated more with the predominant role of the native national picture of the world than with the picture of the world of the people being a carrier of the target language. The most frequent linguistic and cognitive processes in bilingual speech are a superposition of the two national language pictures of the world, transition from one cultural code to another, interference phenomena and intercalation.

Keywords: Bilingualism, language personality, context, cultural code, world view.

INTRODUCTION

The modern epoch is marked by the active inter-language interaction due to intercultural communication in different spheres of life. Effective interpersonal contacts between representatives of different lingua-cultural communities are possible, as we know, only in the process of mutual access to cultures represented by the communicants. Socio-cultural conditions of communicative processes

^{*} Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Department of Russian Language at Bashkir State Pedagogical University of M. Akmulla, Ufa, Russia. *Email: rajhan@mail.ru*

^{**} Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Russian and Comparative Philology at the Faculty of Bashkir Philology and Journalism of Bashkir State University, Ufa, Russia

^{***} Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Linguodidactics and Translation Studies at the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology of Bashkir State University, Ufa, Russia

^{****} Candidate of Philology, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Russian Language at Bashkir State Pedagogical University of M. Akmulla, Ufa, Russia

^{*****} Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Russian Language and Literature of Ufa State Petroleum Technological University, Ufa, Russia

^{*****} Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Russian Language at the Faculty of Law of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia

have a noticeable influence on the trends in the development of modern linguistic science.

In the multicultural environment the problems of comparative study of languages alongside with other aspects in the framework of linguistics of intercultural communication, general and comparative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, theory of discourse, translation studies are prioritized. The whole experience of comparative method development in native and foreign linguistics allows to define this method as a leading one not only for the methodology of teaching languages, but also for the theory of language since the identification of differences between languages makes them easier to understand, harmonizes interethnic relations, allows to see and describe the underlying language mechanisms for representing reality in different languages.

Today the study of human language as a universal phenomenon and national languages as a system of national linguistic worldview by the bi- and multilingual linguistic identity is closely related to the formation of linguistic tolerance, understanding of the equivalence of native and “foreign” languages in the global society. National world view is expressed “first of all in the specificity of language (verbal) articulation and expression of reality” (Khayrullina, 2012, p. 14), which does not diminish cultural values of a separate language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The overall questions of comparative research of languages were dealt with in the works of N.D. Arutunova (1999) and A. Vezhbitskaya (1996). Various linguistic phenomena and facts serve as a subject of contrastive studies: for example, the system of phraseological images as an expression of national outlook (Khayrullina, 2014), the development and functioning of national languages in the multicultural environment in the media (Fatkullina, 2014, Fatkullina & Morozkina, 2015a), intercultural dialogue and its representation in translated texts (Morozkina & Nasanbaeva, 2014). Currently, the problem of contrastive study of languages is closely connected with the study of language personality and its communication activities in the multi-ethnic environment. Theoretical principles of the structure and intellect activity of language personality are well represented in the works of V. V. Vorobiov (2014). Great interest in scientific research is connected with the language identity of the bilingual.

As it is generally known, the concept of bilingualism was first theoretically proved in the fundamental work of U. Weinreich (1953), the American linguist, one of the founders of sociolinguistics. The works of G. Vogt (1954), A. Martinet (1952) and J. E. Alatis (1970) also indicate that bilingualism is a linguistic reality that exists in a multicultural society and which is a mixture of language structures. In Russia research of bilingualism was due to the multiethnic composition of the

population and functioning of the Russian language as a language of interethnic communication. In this regard bilingualism in the Russian science was widely studied (Scherba, 1974) and the problem of multilingual language identity formation has become a realm of interest for scholars quite recently. This is due to the fact that modern society becomes multilingual and different languages expand their field of functioning. With the introduction of the concept “language world picture” a new theoretical problem raises - the description of the mechanism of interaction of the national language pictures of the world as expressions of cultural and language codes, as systems of understanding the world of bilingual or polylingual language personality within the framework of united communication process. As A. A. Leontiev (2005) noted, to be bilingual means “to be able to carry out speech activity, taking into consideration, depending on the nearest social environment, the purpose of communication, awareness of the interlocutor and similar linguistic means of two not one but two languages, having more or less free choice of communication language” (Leontiev, 2005, p. 252). As we can see, A. A. Leontiev (2005) calls socio-cultural factors as the causes of bilingualism.

In Russian linguistics the study of the problem of bilingual language personality is closely related to applied purposes, they are considered in “the context of the methodology of teaching the Russian language as a means of interethnic communication, Russian as a foreign language” (Fatkulina, 2011, p. 704). Revealing the cognitive mechanism of inter-language interaction contributes to the development of innovative technologies of language teaching, creation of computer programs for independent learning of the languages studied as well as prevention of interference errors in the process of communication.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research presents the description of extralinguistic and linguistic factors of formation of bilingual language personality, its self expression in the prism of the national language picture of the world, which is understood as a totality of verbalized knowledge and understanding of the members of the linguistic community about the world in its cultural and historical development. The use of lingua-cultural and lingua-cognitive methods as leading methods gives the possibility to determine the reasons for the transition from one language to another in the speech of bilingual (ethnocultural aspects) and characteristics of mental adjustment in the language consciousness within the communication process (cognitive aspect). Under the lingua-cultural method in our research we mean the study of languages in their close interaction with the cultures of the peoples, their carriers, with the aim of identifying universal and ethnic in the structure and semantic environment of the languages and also the ways of their synthesis in the discourse of language personality.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is known that one of the significant forms of interaction of language and culture in the society is the personality (linguistic personality) serving as a focus of creation, perception and evaluation of cultural values expressed in the language. Language personality as a social and ethical category that expresses spirituality is a generalization of the characteristic features of individuals of a particular national society. National language personality is not only a cultural and psychological, social and linguistic phenomenon, but all its material and cultural context in the linguistic and cultural understanding. "National personality more, but not less than human, has generic features of man in general and there are still features of the individually national", wrote Russian philosopher N. Berdyaev (1990, p. 96), noting the characteristic features of national personality. To understand national personality, to give it theoretically expanded definition in its unity, necessity, and contradiction is a means to express the essence, the regularity of this phenomenon in a logically coherent system of concepts of language and culture. To achieve this goal is possible only in case if the very foundation of the subject of knowledge is found, the development of which is nothing but national personality. The society and the people serve as a basis for contributing to the existence of the individual in the national definiteness.

In the light of cultural approach it can be argued that personality is not only an external sign of the society, but its internal necessary attribute thanks to which human society acquires essentially new, qualitatively higher form of its existence and specificity. "National personality is a real, structurally rich and complex relationship of the individual with the society, including socio-economic, territorial and domestic, socio-political, linguistic, spiritual and socio-psychological aspects" (Vorobiov, 2014, p. 10).

The national personality of the individual is primarily represented in the unique for all nations and peoples elements, combination of the system of relations and values. National combination in the person is individual and unique, but precisely in its concreteness it must contain and express in one form or another, something international, universal. In other words, culture is national and universal, world culture is a mandatory context of communication processes in a multicultural society (Carey, 1989). Therefore, in the study of national identity it is inadmissible to underestimate and overestimate especially specific, inherent only to it features, as well as general, universal characteristics (Morozkina & Nasanbaeva, 2014, p. 72).

The national identity is its self expression in the national language picture of the world. In a multicultural environment, a person is deliberately or spontaneously attached to foreign languages and cultures, influenced by foreign systems outlook. As a result, "for many centuries the picture of the world of different peoples and eras overlapped each other, assimilated, acquired ethno-cultural worldview" that

could not fail to affect both the structure and content of the holistic linguistic picture of the bilingual world (Khayrullina, 2014, p. 97). Each representative of the ethnic group in the linguistic consciousness formed own images of the world, which are conditioned by the material environment of the people, mentality and psychology. G. D. Gachev (1988) in his work on the national images of the world writes that “on the crossroads of languages the clash of lifestyles and material and spiritual cultures is expressed most acutely, but this is a clash occurring not just in life, but at the level of consciousness and understanding of life” (Gachev, 1988, p. 36).

Understanding the realities of the world in the context of its own existence and lifestyles is accompanied by “experiencing” of certain concepts which are one of the most important in the world view of people. Universal images of the world are reflected in all national language pictures of the world and specific national images due to the historical and cultural development of the people are not always clear to other cultures. In this case, either a wrong interpretation of these images appears within person’s own world picture or their substitution by the images of the world of the own people. The picture of the world as a collection of objects of reality, from which we can extract information about the realities of the world, is the basic concept of philosophy and particular sciences, including linguistics. However, the language picture of the world embodied knowledge about the world obtained throughout the whole development of mankind (Fatkulina et. al., 2015a, p. 72). It is naive (unscientific) and popular science knowledge, and even the result of human imagination, fantasies, experiences and evaluation. Philosophical (methodological) picture of the world is based on the conceptual picture of the world which is a set of vital concepts. The content of these concepts is mostly free from human experiences. This is the methodological nature of the studies in universal and national language features.

Watching the processes of ethno linguistic development in the world, the researchers note a trend of active formation of bilingual language personality and a new type of language personality - multilingual personality that reflects the characteristics of inter-language contacts due to various socio-cultural, political and economic factors. The phenomenon of mass bilingualism and multilingualism has become the norm of communicative environment in the modern society. Knowing the mother tongue and guided by its linguistic picture of the world, the individual at the initial stage in the process of learning another (stranger to him) language automatically uses his own system of outlook. And later in the case of free language learning the individual begins to perceive a foreign language not as the only means of communication but a system of worldview and storage of people’s culture.

The orientation of national states on the equal functioning of the Russian (both native and foreign), native and foreign languages determines the formation of the multilingual language personality that speaks different languages at different levels from basic up to fluent. At the present stage of studying bi - and multilingualism

in science is of great interest to study the features of interaction of languages as communicative systems of the bilingual in the context of different national linguistic world pictures. Modern linguistic paradigm is focused on the individual as “homo loquens” and “homo lingualis” that activates the study of the human factor in language and language picture of the world as a whole. The description of the body and soul of man, his/her thoughts and emotions, tastes and preferences, and much more in the field of life, the process of understanding the world and its comprehension by the people through the language allows to identify not only the image of a man through the eyes of its speakers but the features of their world. And this is a clear imprint of the ethnic understanding of the being and the person.

Today, “homo loquens” is characterized by speech peculiarities, on the one hand, for the global multinational community, and on the other hand, for a particular state. According to scientists, the imposition of the linguistic worldview of the native and Russian languages takes place and it causes certain processes in the linguistic consciousness of bilinguals. “The search for the new ways of research, writes N. Ufimtseva (2000) which led to the formation of the notion of intercultural analysis of the ontology of ethnic consciousness and the consciousness of one ethnic culture are analyzed in the process of contrastive association with the images of the consciousness of another culture” (Ufimtseva, 2000, p. 267). National linguistic consciousness is socially meaningful and structured mental results of perception, understanding and evaluation of existence of the matter (including the human), obtained in the course of historical and cultural development of the people and expressed in the form of graphic or vocative-acoustic system of informative signs. Since the consolidation of the experience of knowing the meaning (semantics) of individual words and ending with complex forms of symbolization of concepts in the lexicon, the aphorism, literature and spiritual culture in general, language (linguistic world picture) the information is encoded by transformed human consciousness about the world and man.

The research of the mechanism of “crossing” linguistic and mental bilingual space, presented as a set of two or more systems of the world, the problem of detection of interference or transposition, intercalation, and inter-language borrowing becomes not so important as the problems of blending different national language picture of the world in the process of intellectual activity of bi- or multilingual language personality. The study shows that the discourse of such language personalities in the process of imposing national pictures of the world is transition from one linguistic (and therefore cultural) code to another, from one semiotic system to another (Fatkullina et. al., 2016, p. 10081). In the case of language fluency, the communicant is not experiencing difficulties in this transition because his/her intellectual activity is characterized by automaticity. The so-called natural bilingualism is formed in the environment of language contact in a multicultural environment (for example, Russian national bilingualism in Russian). In the study

of alien (foreign) language automaticity playback is missing and there may be the influence of the native language in the form of copying models of the utterance. Russian speakers who are not proficient in foreign language, for example the English language, translate the phrase to give a new meaning to anything in English literally: *To give a new sense to something*, where as in English it reads - *To read a new meaning into something*.

Along with the natural bilingualism, and special learning of foreign languages as languages of intercultural communication, there is another interesting phenomenon of the interaction of languages and the imposition of the national language picture of the world as a result of assimilation of language personality with one or another linguistic and cultural environment. This often results, according to T. A. Znamenskaya (2014), “in the loss of self-identity with native culture and society” (Znamenskaya, 2014, p. 43). As a result of mixing the linguistic systems and cultural codes in communication of such a language personality there is a lack of confidence in the construction of statements, choice of the correct grammatical forms, selection of data relevant for the speech situation of the words in our native language (“What will it be in Russian?”). Intercalation or involuntary automatic replacement of Russian words occurs in English.

For example: Ja nashla rumejtku – I found a roommate (Eng. roommate – person sharing a room for living together in a rented room). Mne prishlos platit cashem _ I had to pay in cash (cash – ready money, paper bills and coins). Ja ne khochu zhyt v living room – I do not want to live in the living-room (living room - common room). Mne pridetsa brat brejk – I should take a break (a break – a break in training). Moreover, grammatical registration of the English words in speech happens according to the norms of the Russian language. Thus, bilingual is combining the elements implicit or explicit of linguistic systems and cultural codes (Tuksaitova, 2005, p. 198).

However, this phenomenon may be not only the result of the mixing of languages due to automatic transition to another language code with the active communication in a foreign language, but also a way of self-expression of bilingual language personality, equally fluent in different languages. This is often the case in a casual speech in the Russian language of representatives of the national culture, for example, Bashkir. In social networks the deliberate inclusion of the native language words into the Russian context is observed to give it an ethnic expression and the expression of ethnicity of the speaker. For example: Write a play! Samyj shulaj budet!!! – It will be just the thing!!! (Shulaj – Bashkir. exactly; is equivalent to: it will be!). Bashlyk himself attended the event. – The chief visited this event himself. (the Bashlyk – Bashkir. chief). Hey, it’s a celebration of unity! Grab your friends and davaj inde jedinyatsa! – Grab your friends and let’s already gather together. (inde – Bashkir. particle already). No, I will not go out in such a slippery weather!

Kurkak beryot! – I am afraid! (kurkak – Bashkir. to be afraid). And whether you want to criticize at all? Nurzno, dustar! – Yes, friends! (dustar – Bashkir. friends).

The study of bilingual discourse is not only of scientific interest but also is important for the research of ethnic and cultural processes in the society at large, as “it surely provides an opportunity to identify semantically valuable language environment, the peculiarities of the speech behavior of the person and the mentality not only of certain social groups of native speakers, but people in general,” characterize the features of the modern discourse (Khayrullina & Minigulova, 2012, p. 1523).

Another important aspect of studying the overlap of different language pictures of the world is the study of the literary bilingualism. Creation of the text by the bilingual using other than native language is characterized by the preservation of the national system of literary images, forms of linguistic expression (Zecoh, 2010, p. 98). Literary bilingualism can be studied using the works of V. Nabokov (works in English), S. Maugham, O. Wilde (works in French), and creative works by national writers of Russia writing in Russian.

CONCLUSION

Thus, it can be argued that the formation of bilingual and multilingual language personality reflects the modern processes of language development. Factors influencing the changes in the content and structure of language consciousness are primarily objective in nature: if the way of thinking of the people is closely associated with the lifestyle, it may be clearly said that scientific and technical progress, development of migration processes, cultural interaction of peoples in different regions, formation of global information environment, on the one hand, unify the way of life of the people and accordingly the language picture of the world and on the other hand promote assimilation of linguistic worldview of other peoples in the process of intercultural communication.

Linguistic consciousness of bilinguals in the process of thinking and communication in different languages is always accompanied by the processes of interpenetration of language systems, superposition of two (three) linguistic pictures of the world, which results depend primarily on the level of language proficiency. The individual that speaks multiple languages, able to move in the process of communication from one language to another, can use in his/her interaction (intercalation), may speak one language using specific features of another language. But the controllability or automatic speech processes depend not only on the knowledge of language and its conscious use by the language personality, but also on different socio-cultural processes in the society, personal priorities of language personality, linguistic and cognitive mechanism of the interaction of languages and cultures.

Acknowledgements

The work was performed within the framework of research projects of Russian Foundation for Humanities No. 16-04-00097; No. 16-04-00042.

References

- Alatis, J.E. (1970). Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological and Sociological Aspects. 21st annual round table. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, N 23. Washington: Georgetown University.
- Arutyunova, N.D. (1999). Language and world of man. Moscow: Language of Russian culture.
- Berdyayev, N.A. (1990). The origins and meaning of Russian communism. Moscow: Science.
- Carey, J.W. (1989). Communication as Culture. Boston: Unwin Human.
- Fatkullina, F.G. (2011). Reflection of ethnicity and culture in the conceptual sphere of languages of different structures. In: *Russian language in modern world – traditions and innovations in teaching Russian as a foreign language*. Moscow, 704.
- Fatkullina, F.G. & Morozkina E.A. (2015a). National language picture of the world in the hermeneutic model of translation. In: *Professionally-oriented teaching foreign language and translation at the university*. Moscow: RUDN, 72.
- Fatkullina, F., Morozkina, E. & Suleimanova, A. (2015b). Modern higher education: problems and perspectives. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 214: 571-577.
- Fatkullina, F., Morozkina E., Suleymanova A. & Khayrullina R. (2016). Terminological Multifaceted Educational Dictionary of Active Type as a Possible Way of Special Discourse Presentation. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(17): 10081-10089.
- Gachev, G.D. (1988). National images of the world. General questions. Moscow: Soviet writer, 36.
- Khayrullina, R.H. (2014). Factors of formation of national world picture. In: *Reflection of the national world picture in the realities of Bashkortostan*. Ufa: BashGU, 97.
- Khayrullina, R.H. (2012). Linguophilosophic: peculiarities of the national language consciousness. Ufa: BGPU, 14.
- Khayrullina, R.H. & Minigulova, G.Z. (2012). Linguistic and cognitive analysis of Russian and Bashkir phraseological units with destructive semantics. *Herald of BSU*, 17, 3(1): 1523.
- Leontiev, A.A. (2005). Psycholinguistic units and generation of verbal statements. Moscow: URSS, 252-254.
- Martinet, A. (1952). Diffusion of language. *Romance Philology*, 1: 7.
- Morozkina, E.A. & Nasanbaeva, E.R. (2014). The national language picture of the world in the hermeneutic circle the process of translating. Ufa, 59.
- Scherba, L.V. (1974). Language system and speech activity. Leningrad: Science. Leningrad department.
- Tuksaitova, R.O. (2005). Literary bilingualism: general definition. *News of Ural State University*, 39: 198-206.
- Ufimtseva, N.V. (2000). Language consciousness and image of the world. Moscow, 267.
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (1996). Language. Culture. Cognition. Moscow: Russian dictionaries.

- Vogt, H. (1954). Contacts of languages, *Word*, 10(2-3), 365-374.
- Vorobiov, V.V. (2014). Comparative and applied aspects of cultural linguistics. In: *Comparative cultural linguistics: theory and principles of analysis of language units*. Ufa: BSU, 10.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York.
- Zekoh, Z.Z. (2010). The issue of bilingual basics literary text. *Herald of Adyghe State University. Philology, art, history*, 2(4): 97-100.
- Znamenskaya, T.A. (2014). Problems of bilingualism and its impact on linguistic identity. *Innovative projects and programs in education*, 3: 42-46.