International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7 (4.38) (2018) 447-451

SPC

International Journal of Engineering & Technology

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJET

Research paper



Modern Philological Knowledge: Anthropocentrism and Linguistic Identity

Arkadiy Petrovich Sedykh[1], Olga Nikolaevna Ivanishcheva[2], Anastasiya Vyacheslavovna Koreneva[2], Inna Vitalyevna Ryzhkova[2]

[1]Belgorod National Research University, Pobedy St., 85, Belgorod, 308015, Russia
[2]Murmansk Arctic State University, Captain Egorov St., 15, Murmansk, 183038, Russia
**Corresponding author E-mail: sedykh.a.p@mail.ru*

Abstract

The article aims at analyzing the actual status of the "linguistic persona" category in the modern linguistic studies both in Russia and abroad. It is shown that the anthropocentric paradigm dominates in modern scientific knowledge. A linguistic persona is viewed as a certain type of linguistic identity functioning within the specific ways to exchange communicative information. The epistemology of scientific approaches and research concepts is regarded in the personological way. Universal and national and cultural ways of a person's verbalization are associated with a certain type of categorization of reality. The prospects of studying ways to verbalize the linguistic identity are viewed within the scope of the comprehensive analysis of communicative behavior based on the interdisciplinary approach. Using this method allows separating additional parameters of a linguistic persona of any type. The elements of the institutional linguistic persona are reviewed.

Keywords: *Cognition; Communicative behavior; Connotative background; Emotionality; Ethnoculturalism; Expressivity; Linguistic persona; Linguistic worldview; Nuclear seme; Semiotics of cognition and communication.*

1. Introduction

Most modern scientific schools and projects give priority to studying a person in order to improve his or her personal potential. Anthropocentrism as a principle of study holds the key position in modern paradigms of worldwide humanitarian scientific knowledge. The phenomenon of linguistic persona is studied within the scope of this principle, which presumes addressing not only the cognitive and communicative skills of an individual, but also various worldview and ethnocultural aspects of conscience and thought.

Language is studied from the point of view of its significance for a person, of how language structures can reflect the individual's inner world and serve as a means to influence people's behavior or form worldview positions.

In recent years, the interest in the personal aspect of studying a language has increased in all the language-related disciplines – not only in linguistics, but also in psychology, philosophy, language pedagogy, and even forensic science.

Traditionally, linguistic persona is understood as two capacities of an individual:

1) any specific speaker of a language-culture characterized by analyzing texts that this speaker produced as regards specific usage in these texts of system building means of this language that serve to reflect this speaker's vision and evaluation of the surrounding reality (worldview) and to achieve certain goals in this world;

2) a comprehensive means to describe the language capacity of an individual that combines the system representation of a language with its functioning in text generation processes [1].

Modern concepts of linguistic persona can also be included here:

– a collective language speaker characterized by analyzing texts that this speaker produces taking into account two "instances": language as a system and speech as its realization, pragmatics of using texts in various types of discourse being an important descriptive element [2, 3, 4];

– description of a person's language capacities in order to obtain knowledge of a person's individual characteristics [5, 6, 7, 8].

2. Preliminary Methodological Observations

In order to identify typological representatives of verbalization of linguistic persona's characteristics, a scheme of analysis is used that includes seme-connotative manifestation of an individual's personality. This classification reflects the following stages of interpreting language units:

1. Nuclear (integral) seme. Nuclear seme is a central, semantically indecomposable and inherent component of meaning that is identified in the semantic structure of utterance. To be identified, nuclear seme, as a rule, should be separated from other semes: differential (distinctive), qualifying, attributive, and peripheral. Within our concept, identifying nonnuclear semes is optional. The main criterion here is the typology of identical semes included in corresponding conceptual fields of an utterance. The set of nuclear semes of a block of utterances forms conceptual homogeneity of discourse regarding the actualization of the integral seme, the components of which can be found in each utterance.

2. Connotative background. In this article, the connotative background of language units is regarded as ideological, emotional-expressive, and thematic macrocomponents associated with stereotyped images of national language speakers, which are actualized in an utterance and define its national and cultural

Copyright © 2018 Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

specific nature in many ways. Here we mean semantics outside the lexicographical definitions of lexemes.
Language units, being contingent upon the institutional culture code, to some extent form national and cultural parameters of the discourse in their usage. Due to the connotative macrocomponent, lexemes are not only vivid expressive means of any language, but also, by functioning in speech, influence the emotional structure of personalities of representatives of national linguistic culture.
3. Identification projection. At this stage, the data obtained at the previous stages are associated with personological characteristics of an individual in question. The seme-connotative structure of a lexeme verbalizes the linguistic modus of a person's existence. Community of pragmatic goals that are realized by ideological, emotional-expressive, and thematic semantics allows using the functional and pragmatic principle as a basis for their consolidation, this principle being basic for identifying the features of linguistic personae of politicians through the prism of lexical nomination.

3. Main Part

Language has at all times been the most vivid identifying characteristic of an ethnic group. The connection between the language and the culture, the tool and capacity of which it is, remains unquestionable [9]. Nevertheless, the macrolinguistic problematics (language vs. society/culture/person) (the interest towards which reached its peak in the works of von Humboldt, Steinthal, Vossler, and Potebnija) were in the middle of the 20th century pushed back to the periphery of research, "due" to achievements of structuralism that studied language "in and for itself".
Yet, starting from the end of the last century, within the changes of the scientific humanities' paradigm, the dominating system and structural and static paradigm were replaced by anthropocentric, functional, cognitive, and dynamic paradigm that returned to a person the status of "measure of all things" and put a person back at the hub of the universe. At the new round of the cognition spiral, the focus of research expectedly shifted from the already studied center to the problematic periphery and established itself at the confluence of scientific fields: ethnopsychology, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and ethnolinguistics arise, inside which the process of interdisciplinary synthesis and symbiosis proceeds leading to separating within the latter of, for example, ethnopsycholinguistics, ethnosemantics, and even ethnophraseology.
The notion of "linguistic persona" is created by projecting the corresponding interdisciplinary term to linguistics. The meaning of this term combines philosophical, sociological, and psychological views on the socially significant collection of a person's physical and spiritual qualities that constitute the person's qualitative definition [10].
In international linguistics, Weisgerber was among the first to address linguistic persona. Weisgerber stated the dependency of the entire person's life on the native language and the interconnection of native language and spiritual formation of a person [11]. In this regard, the following statement of Vorobyov is true: "A person is the center of interconnection between culture and language, the dialectics of their development. Thus, we can speak of a person only as a linguistic person, as embodied in the language" [12].
Thus, the social essence of the language itself means that it exists, first, in the language conscience – collective and individual. Culture bearers in the language are, respectively, language collective and an individual. The collective as an ethnic group and an individual are terminal points on an indicative scale of language conscience [13]. We cannot but agree with Stepanov who wrote that "the language was created to a person's measure, and this scale is embedded in the very organization of the language; in accordance to it the language should be studied" [14].
A language itself is an integral component of the conscience, its tool and serves as an intermediary between a person and a worldview that is reflected in language forms. This is a connection between a person and a worldview reflected in a language that a person speaks, including a circle of representations, images, and notions embedded in a language. Any person growing into a language has to adopt its way of understanding the world of phenomena and spirit [11]. A language of a certain person does not exist by itself. It is formed by languages of other people belonging to one nation and having common culture and traditions.
The notion of "linguistic persona", that is, a person in its capability to make speech actions, is more and more often put in the center of modern anthropocentric linguistics. Academician Vinogradov was among the first in the Russian linguistics to form the notion of "linguistic persona" and to underline its systemically important nature that included individual and collective parameters. The linguist reached the notion of linguistic persona by studying the language of fiction. The logic of developing the notions of "author's image" and "artistic image", which had been central in Vinogradov's scientific work, led him to the issue of relation among a linguistic persona, artistic image, and author's image in a work of fiction. Vinogradov made the first descriptions of specific linguistic personae [15].
The immediate bearer of linguistic conscience is a linguistic persona, that is, a person existing in a linguistic world – in communication, in behavior stereotypes that are fixed in a language, and in the meaning of language units and meanings of texts. Studies of a linguistic persona in linguistics are associated with the name of Yu.N. Karaulov. The linguist understands this notion as "the aggregate of capabilities and characteristics of a person that condition its creation of speech products (texts)", which differ in their degree of the structural and linguistic complexity, depth, and the accuracy of reflecting reality defined by the linguistic focus [16]. This definition allows for double interpretation – static and dynamic. In the first case, we accept an individual as a person, that is, a subject of social relations having a unique combination of personal characteristics. In the second case, we presume that at a certain stage an individual is not a person yet, in other words, he or she does not possess distinguishing characteristics, which are socially contingent.
Besides, a linguistic persona can be characterized within the framework of linguistic conscience and speech behavior, that is, within the framework of linguistic conceptology and the theory of discourse. The works by A.P. Sedykh are focused in this area. Sedykh states that a linguistic persona can be regarded, on the one side, as "an imbricated concept that is verbalized in typical communicative situations within the culturally contingent scenario", and, on the other side, as "significatum (signature) of the culture, a conceptual potential of a nation's linguistic identification" [4]. A linguistic persona is defined within the framework of linguocognitive typology: "a hypothetical model of actualizing the dynamic dichotomy 'language-speech' that represents in aggregate an ideal bearer of ethnocultural characteristics during the process of realization of communication's national parameters" (ibid.).
The concept by Karassik is close to the above-mentioned approach. Karassik regards a linguistic persona as "the linguocultural type": "a recognizable identity of a certain culture's representative, the aggregate of which forms a culture of a specific society" [17, 18].
The notion of "professional linguistic persona" can also be included here. A professional linguistic persona is a part of a national linguistic persona that cannot be regarded outside the national culture and communication. A "speaking" professional, with all his/her individuality, cannot be separated from the ethnocultural parameters of a nation. Even if, due to certain circumstances, this professional has to live far from his/her ethnic mother, his/her language, as a rule, is a link to his/her origin: "linguistic competence in this case does not necessarily have to be optimal, and the internal feeling of inclusiveness with his/her heritage is enough" [19].

A professional linguistic persona has been extensively studied in linguistics in recent years. Linguistic personae of a physical training and sports specialist [20], a musician [21], a specialist of a nonlinguistic higher educational institution [22], a translator [23], a doctor [24], a bachelor in philology [2], and French presidents and businesspersons [4] have been studied.

We share philologists' opinion that "a linguistic persona of a specialist represents a potential capability of communicants to exchange professional information in a foreign language verbally and in writing, to independently search, accumulate, and expand the scope of professionally relevant knowledge within the process of natural (direct and indirect) communication with native speakers" [22].

The term "professional linguistic persona" is regarded within this article, first, in correlation to the main activity of an individual within the framework of using a national language to achieve professional goals. The immediate agent of actualization of the linguistic persona of a teacher, for instance, is the professional and pedagogical discourse.

A linguistic persona, functioning within the framework of industry's terminology, is manifested at least in two linguistic worldviews: professional and everyday. This is contingent upon partial projection of a person's professional activity upon everyday communication of an individual: a teacher remains a teacher even when he/she communicates outside his/her professional environment.

In order to analyze the semantics of professional terminology, it is important to use not only the classic concept of "linguistic persona", but also the concept of "professional linguistic persona" that possesses an arsenal of industry-specific/special information influencing the structure of an individual's linguistic conscience. We cannot but agree with the opinion of Popova that "as a linguistic persona, a person possesses individual cognitive space, that is, an aggregate of knowledge and images structured in a certain way" [25]. The conceptual field of the term "linguistic persona" is thus expanded due to introduction of an additional parameter – professional cognitive space.

The cognitive space of a teacher's persona represents a part of a specific continuum of the institutional worldview based on the knowledge of grammar, regularities of language structures, laws of technical skills, and other professional "wisdom" reflected in the language forms and ways of their functioning.

The specified parameters of a linguistic persona are based on the communicative strategies of the discourse, a set of speech characteristics and the genre laws of creating a text chronotope. The procedure of specifying the essential features of the phenomenon under consideration is based on the linguistic principles of identifying an individual's mentality.

We adhere to the concept proposed by Sedykh who underlines that a linguistic basis of a linguistic persona can be built upon the following positions:

1.A linguistic persona is manifested in a language and is a parameter of constant intensity in the communicative behavior;

2.The ethnocultural and symbolic character of a linguistic persona is contingent upon the occurrence of an ethnolect that unites all bearers of a national language based on the principle of the unity of basic cognitive and communicative parameters;

3.Study of the ethnocultural aspect of corresponding linguistic entities is preceded by their analysis as language units;

4.Linguistic methods are used to study the ethnocultural characteristics of a language and communication. Due to the fact that linguistics includes various areas (cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguoculturology, etc.), the methods of these areas are applied [26].

Building a model of a linguistic persona is based on the semiotic approach to studying factual material, as a language itself is a semiotic system in culture. This means, primarily, that significant and nonsignificant elements are specified in the linguistic reality: "Elements that do not possess meaning seem not to exist within the framework of this simulation model. The fact of their actual existence is obscured by their *irrelevance* in this simulation system" [27].

Currently, there are various approaches to studying a linguistic persona. Below are listed the most significant, in our opinion, representations of this phenomenon [26]:

1. *Polylect and idiolect personae*. Neroznak, introducing the concept of linguistic personology, specifies standard and nonstandard linguistic personae and suggests that the upper and the lower parts of a linguistic culture be united within an idiolect persona [28].

2. *Elite linguistic persona*. Sirotinina associates a concept of elite linguistic persona with a standard of speech behavior and communication, which presumes, in particular, the compliance with the ethics of communication and with the modern language and communication standards: "Bearers of elite type are people who possess all language norms and comply with the ethical and communication standards. This means not only compliance with codified standards, but also with the functional and stylistic differentiation of the standard language and standards related to using oral or written speech" [29].

3. *Russian linguistic persona*. According to Karaulov, a linguistic persona can be understood as "the aggregate of a person's capabilities and characteristics that precondition creation and perception by him/her of speech products (texts), which differ in a) the degree of structural and language complexity, b) the depth and accuracy of reflecting the reality, and c) specific goal" [16]. The author specifies three basic levels within a Russian linguistic persona: verbal and semantic, cognitive, and pragmatic.

4. *Linguistic personae of the Western and Eastern cultures*. Snitko studies a linguistic persona from the point of view of limit notions of the Western and Eastern civilizations [19].

5. *Linguistic persona as a linguocultural type*. Karassik studies a linguistic persona as a recognizable image of representatives of a certain culture, the aggregate of which constitutes culture of a specific society [13].

6. *Emotional linguistic persona*. Shakhovsky regards the category of "emotionality" as an integral part of a person and underlines the necessity of interdisciplinary approach in studying a linguistic persona. According to the linguist, emotions are "a specific form of a person's attitude towards the world and himself or herself in this world, as well as its linguistic reflection in lexicon and speech activity of a person" [30].

7. *French linguistic persona*. Sedykh regards this type as "a hypothetical model of actualizing the dynamic dichotomy 'language-speech' that represents in aggregate an ideal bearer of ethnocultural characteristics within the dynamics of realization of common French parameters of communication" [4].

In our research, we use the term "institutional linguistic persona" that represents a model of recurring speech features of a teacher in typical situations of speech communication within the framework of status-contingent speech scenario. A linguistic persona of a teacher can be regarded in its text (discourse) projection. A text projection of a linguistic persona includes two basic categories: involuntariness and iconicity [27, 31]. Involuntariness is associated with the concept of ordinary language, and iconicity – with the concept of creative language.

Regarding their essential functions (as applied to professional teacher discourse), involuntariness is based on a teacher belonging to a certain ethnic culture, and iconicity is based on an idiolect as a category of a subject of common language communication. Based on the presumption that everyday speech can possess creative features, it can be supposed that an institutional linguistic persona integrates two main types of a person: linguostandard and linguocreative: "Linguostandard is a linguistic persona, in the structure of which regulative approach to using language material and communication prevails, while a linguocreative is a linguistic persona, in the structure of which creative approach to using language material and communication prevails" [4].

This schematic reduction represents a necessary chain within the process of identifying the correlation between a standard and

creation in the communicative structure of a person, in particular, of an institutional and professional-teacher linguistic persona. We suggest that the concepts of "involuntariness" and "iconicity" be regarded as semiotic concepts verbalized as specific for each type of utterance. The task is to define the correlation, in which these elements exist within the reviewed linguistic personae and how they influence the parameters of their communication.

Simulating dynamic links between people within a process of communication is an important part of the theory of communication [32]. In this regard, the theory of communication and linguistics are integrated at the functional level. It is suggested to consider the pragmatic function as the main function of an institutional persona, that is, setting for using language means to influence by speech the conscience of a language speaker.

Institutional linguistic persona can be structured taking into account the specific nature of *ideological, psychoemotive, ethnocultural, and thematic* elements of the national language and usage. Each of the levels, at which an institutional linguistic persona functions, is briefly described below.

Ideological

This level corresponds to the system of ideas, representations, and views that characterizes sociopolitical and other beliefs of a social group, class, or political party, in relation to which a public figure positions itself. Each teacher can be a central vector of ideology and phraseology of a party he/she belongs to.

Psychoemotive

This level represents the personal parameters of a teacher's communicative behavior from the point of view of the emotional parameters of used expressions and phraseology. The emotionality of a linguistic persona's phrasemics can be defined in the terms of intensity: *neutral, average, increased*.

Ethnocultural

Each teacher is a representative of a language community he/she belongs to. The ethnocultural features of a linguistic persona's utterances are identified according to the frequency of usage, in particular, of the native language idioms.

Thematic

This level demonstrates the prevailing thematic groups of language units in speech manifestations of individuals. Using the comparative identification of dominant thematic materials within the discourse, it is possible to describe the essential features of a linguistic persona of any subject of communication.

4. Discussion

Our methodological prospects are based on the philosophical definition of 'cognition' as a result of empirical and linguistic experience and the system and pragmatist understanding of sphere of concepts, linguistic conscience, speech, and communication. The primary focus here is on the integral studying of mental and speech-communicative mechanisms of producing an utterance using the data of adjacent disciplines. The leading procedural chain of the cognitive and communicative paradigm is the linguistic analysis of the actual material, together with synthesis of cognitive and functional research methods: lexicographical and contrastive description, studying an act of speech and analyzing ordinary/creative language. The integral idea of cognition, language, speech activity, and communication is aimed at creating a comprehensive model of a linguistic persona that is mediated through the said phenomena in the ethnocultural field of their functioning.

Analyzing a linguistic persona presumes unification of methods of several sciences, the primary being linguistics and theory of communication. The aim of such unification is to overcome the traditional static character of describing a language and to integrate the idea of communicative interaction into linguistics. This approach seems to have the biggest potential to study the ethnocultural parameters of communication and build a model of a linguistic persona, which will integrate dynamically the language and communicative parameters. Unifying the achievements of linguistic and communicative theories allows solving the problem of a person in language in a comprehensive manner and provides benefits for both sciences.

National linguistic persona is rather a rigid system consisting of invariants and variative elements that reflect, on the one side, the regularities of a persona carrying out a speech process and, on the other side, modelability of this entity to achieve the linguistic ethnotype scheme. A model of a linguistic ethnotype is not a model of language or its specific subsystems, but a model of a communicant's behavior through his or her *attitude* towards the language, interlocutor, and communicative information. In essence, this model is a metamodel reflecting the ethnocultural communicative priorities of an individual. Communicative behavior is contingent upon the fact that a person is immersed in the world of meanings, problems, and relations shared by the most part of the linguocultural community.

Our study is primarily theoretical in essence, yet it can be applied in practice, for example, regarding the linguistic identification of a person or linguoaesthetic training during native or foreign language lessons. It should be noted that the communicative system and a linguistic persona within it can be described in an adequate manner only at the level of linguocultural complexes that include psychological, social, ethical, and other components reflected in a national language.

5. Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

A language worldview is a complex multilevel unity, and its analysis allows identifying the worldview system of a linguoculture. A linguistic persona should possess sufficient arsenal of lexeme (phraseological) manifestations to identify characteristic features of an individual, whose ways of actualization are carried out in any type of discourse as a communicative phenomenon.

Within the framework of the semiotic meaning of the term, a linguistic persona can be structured as a text, that is, as a system and a structure simultaneously, and can have an isomorphic field organization, that is, have a central and peripheral paradigm of relations between its elements.

We suggest that a concept of "philological persona" should be considered as an additional yet important element within the structure of a national linguistic persona. This category is associated with a linguocreative person and, in the first place, with a person of a university teacher, for example, who realizes his/her creative abilities by enriching the means of his/her native language. In this case, a philological persona can be considered within a methodological aspect aimed at the possibility to apply best examples of literary speech in order to improve speech usage and national communication.

Thus, an anthropocentric approach in recent linguistic studies has firmly established itself within the scientific community. Language is studied within the framework of its significance for a person, the language structures' capability to reflect the inner world of an individual, to influence people's behavior, and to serve as a means to create a worldview. The term "linguistic persona" represents a national persona in the most complete manner and includes psychological, social, ethnic, and other components reflected in the national language, discourse, and communicative behavior of representatives of a linguocultural community. Several levels of a linguistic persona are differentiated traditionally: verbal and semantic, cognitive, pragmatic, and communicative. The level model defines an individual as a set of distinctive features and, depending on its existential/communicative manifestation, unites functions that are specific for a situation in question.

That being said, a linguistic persona can be considered not only within the framework of the level paradigm, but also within the

framework of its manifestations through professional language and phraseology that reflect not only realities of craft, which an individual possesses, but also this individual/s worldview and a philosophical concept of life. In this regard, the tasks of classifying a professional linguistic persona should be solved regarding a specific profession. This prospect is based on the general methodological principle: an individual's behavior is based not on the object of communicative information, but on the knowledge defined by a text as semantics of the ethnic group's life and an individual within it.

References

[1] Yazykovaya lichnost: tekst, slovar, obraz mira. *K 70-letiyu chlena-korr. RAN Yu.N. Karaulova: sb. statei* [Linguistic Persona: Text, Vocabulary, Image of the World. For the 70th Birthday of Karaulov, Yu.N., Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences: Collection of Articles]. Moscow: Publishing House of the RUDN University, 2006.

[2] Vorozhbitova AA (2012), Interpretativnaya kultura yazykovoi lichnosti kak instrument izucheniya diskursivnykh protsessov: teoriya i metodika formirovaniya v lingvoritoricheskoi paradigme [Interpretative Culture of the Linguistic Persona as the Instrument of Studying Discourse Processes: The Theory and Methodology of Formation within the Linguorhetoric Paradigm]. *Vestnik SGUT i KD* 2(20), 197-200.

[3] Karassik VI (2000), O tipakh diskursa [On Types of Discourse]. In: *Yazykovaya lichnost: institutsionalnyi i personalnyi diskurs: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* [Linguistic Persona: Institutional and Personal Discourse. Collection of Research Papers]. Volgograd: Peremena.

[4] Sedykh AP (2013), *Frantsuzskaya yazykovaya lichnost. Kognitivno-kommunikativnyi aspekt* [French Linguistic Persona. The Cognitive and Communicative Aspect]. Belgorod: Belgorod Publishing House.

[5] Kryssin LP (2001), Sovremennyi russkii intelligent: popytka rechevogo portreta [Modern Member of the Russian Intelligentsia: An Attempt of a Speech Portrait]. *Russkii yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii* 1, 90-106.

[6] Nikolayeva TM (1991), "Sotsiolingvisticheskii portret" i metody ego opisaniya ["Sociolinguistic Portrait" and Methods to Describe It]. In: *Russkii yazyk i sovremennost. Problemy i perspektivy razvitiya rusistiki. Doklady Vsesoyuznoi nauchnoi konferentsii* [The Russian Language and Modern Times. Problems and Prospects of Russian Studies. Reports of the All-Soviet Union Scientific Conference]. Moscow.

[7] Parsamova VYa (2004), *Yazykovaya lichnost uchenogo v epistolyarnykh tekstakh: Na materiale pisem Yu.M. Lotmana*: avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk [The Linguistic Persona of a Scientist in Epistolary Texts: As Exemplified in Letters by Lotman, Yu.M. (Ph.D. Thesis Abstract)]. Saratov.

[8] Frumkina RM (1987), Moi uchitel A.A. Reformatskii [My teacher – Reformatsky, A.A.]. *Znanie – sila*, 7.

[9] Tolstoy NI (1997), Etnolingvistika v krugu gumanitarnykh distsiplin [Ethnolinguistics among the Humanities]. In: *Russkaya slovesnost. Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta. Antologiya* [Russian Philology. From the Theory of Philology to the Structure of Text. Anthology]. Moscow.

[10] Vorkachev SG (2001), Lingvokulturologiya, yazykovaya lichnost, kontsept: stanovlenie antropotsentricheskoi paradigmy v yazykoznanii [Linguoculturology, a Linguistic Persona, a Concept: Evolvement of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Linguistics]. *Filologicheskie nauki* 1, 64-72.

[11] Weisgerber JL (1993), Rodnoi yazyk i formirovanie dukha [Muttersprache und Geistesbildung] (Trans. from German). Moscow: Publishing House of the Moscow State University.

[12] Vorobyov VV (1998), Yazykovaya lichnost i natsionalnaya ideya [The Linguistic Persona and the National Idea]. *Narodnoe obrazovanie* 5, 25-30.

[13] Karassik VI (2007). Evolyutsiya i involyutsiya kontseptov [Evolution and Involution of Concepts. In: *Aksiologicheskaya lingvistika: problemy lingvokontseptologii i lingvokulturnykh tipazhei* [Axiological Linguistics: Problems of Linguoconceptology and Linguocultural Types]. Volgograd.

[14] Stepanov YuS (1998), *Yazyk i metod. K sovremennoi filosofii yazyka* [Language and Method. Regarding the Modern Philosophy of Language]. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury.

[15] Vinogradov VV (1980), I*zbrannye trudy. O yazyke khudozhestvennoi prozy* [Selected Works. On the Language of Fiction]. Moscow: Nauka.

[16] Karaulov YuN (2002), *Russkii yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost* [The Russian Language and the Language Persona]. Moscow: URSS.

[17] Karassik VI (2002), Yazykovoi krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs [The Language Circle: Persona, Concepts, Discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena.

[18] Karassik VI & Dmitrieva OA (2005), Lingvokulturnyi tipazh: k opredeleniyu ponyatiya [The Linguocultural Type: On Defining the Term]. In: V.I. Karassik & O.A. Dmitriyeva, *Aksiologicheskaya lingvistika: lingvokulturnye tipazhi* [Axiological Linguistics: Linguocultural Types]. Volgograd: Paradigma.

[19] Snitko TN, Predelnye ponyatiya v zapadnoi i vostochnoi lingvokulturakh [Limit Notions in Western and Eastern Linguocultures]. Pyatigorsk, 1999.

[20] Valitova N. (2007). Vospitanie professionalnoi yazykovoi lichnosti na osnove formirovaniya professionalnogo tezaurusa spetsialista v oblasti fizicheskoi kultury i sporta [Building a Professional Linguistic Persona Based on Creating a Professional Thesaurus of a Physical Training and Sports Specialist]. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoi kultury* 8, 51-54.

[21] Aznacheyeva EN (2009), K probleme tipologizatsii professionalnoi yazykovoi lichnosti muzykanta [Regarding the Problem of Classification of a Musician's Professional Linguistic Persona]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 43, 5-9.

[22] Kudryavtseva EE (2009), Yazykovaya lichnost v protsesse lingvoobrazovatelnoi podgotovki spetsialista [Linguistic Persona within the Process of a Specialist's Linguoeducational Training]. In: *Inostrannye yazyki: lingvisticheskii i metodicheskii aspekty: Mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov* [Foreign Languages: Linguistic and Methodological Aspects: Inter-University Collection of Research Papers]. Saratov: Institute of Pedagogy, Saratov State University.

[23] Bushev AB (2010), *Yazykovaya lichnost professionalnogo perevodchika*. [The linguistic Persona of a Professional Interpreter.]. Tver: OOO "Laboratoriya delovoi grafiki".

[24] Akayeva EV (2011), Yazykovaya lichnost vracha – vedushchego nauchno-populyarnoi meditsinskoi programmy [The Linguistic Persona of a Doctor – Presenter of a Popular-Science Medical TV Program]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 24, 189-190.

[25] Popova TG (2003), *Ispanskii nauchno-tekhnicheskii tekst: traditsii i sovremennye podkhody k izucheniyu* [Scientific and Technical Texts in Spanish: Traditions and Modern Approaches to Studying]. Moscow: Publishing House of the RUDN University.

[26] Sedykh AP, Baghana J & Langner AN (2010), *Russko-frantsuzskii slovar: professionalnaya i obydennaya kommunikatsiya* [Russian-French Dictionary: Professional and Everyday Communication]. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka.

[27] Lotman YuM (1999), *Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov. Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriya* [Inside the Thinking Minds. A Man – A Text – The Semiosphere – The History]. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury.

[28] Neroznak VP (1996), Lingvisticheskaya personologiya: k opredeleniyu statusa distsipliny [Linguistic Personology: Regarding the Definition of the Discipline's Status]. In: V.P. Neroznak, *Yazyk. Poetika. Perevod. Sb. nauch. tr*. [Language. Poetics. Translation. Collection of Research Papers]. Moscow.

[29] Sirotinina OB (2000), Khoroshaya rech: sdvigi v predstavlenii ob etalone [Good Speech: Shifts in Concepts of the Standard]. In: O.B. Sirotinina, *Aktivnye yazykovye protsessy kontsa XX veka* [Active Language Processes of the End of the 20th Century]. Moscow: Azbukovnik.

[30] Shakhovsky VI (1996), Natsio- i sotsiokulturnye aspekty yazykovoi lichnosti [National and Sociocultural Aspects of Linguistic Persona]. In: *Obshchestvo, yazyk i lichnost: Materialy Vseros. nauch. konf.*, Penza, 23-26 okt. 1996 g. [Society, Language and Person. Materials of the All-Russia Scientific Conference, Penza, October 23-26, 1996]. Moscow.

[31] Jakobson R (1987), Raboty po poetike [Linguistics and Poetics]. Moscow: Progress.

[32] Kassevich VB (2001), Teoriya kommunikatsii i teoriya yazyka [The Theory of Communication and the Theory of Language]. In: V.B. Kassevich, *Govoryashchii i slushayushchii: Yazykovaya lichnost, tekst, problemy obucheniya* [Speaker and Listener: Linguistic Persona, Text, Problems of Education]. Saint Petersburg.