

- Babichev, N.T., Borovskiy, Ya.M. (1982). Slovar' latinskikh krylatykh slov [Dictionary of Latin winged words]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk.
- Babkin, A.M., Shendetsov, V.V. (1981). Slovar' inoyazychnykh vyrazheniy i slov. A-J. [Dictionary of foreign language expressions and words. A-J.]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Babkin, A.M., Shendetsov, V.V. (1987). Slovar' inoyazychnykh vyrazheniy i slov. K-Z. [Dictionary of foreign language expressions and words. K-Z.]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Berkov, V.P., Mokienko, V.M., Shulezhkova, S.G. (2005). Bolshoy slovar' krylatykh slov [Dictionary of winged words]. Moskva: Russkiye slovari, Astrel-AST.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, I.A. (1956). Nekotorye obshchiye zamechaniya o yazykovedenii I yazyke [Some general observations on linguistics and language]. Khrestomatiya po istorii yazykoznaniiya XIX-XX vekov. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoye uchebno-pedagogicheskoye izdatelstvo, 220-240.
- Serov V.V. Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' krylatykh slov i vyrazheniy [Encyclopedic dictionary of winged words] <https://azbyka.ru/fiction/enciklopedicheskij-slovar-krylatyx-slov-i-vyrazhenij-serov/> [29.04.2019]
- Slovar' inostrannykh slov [Dictionary of foreign words]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk (11<sup>th</sup> ed.)

### For citation:

Grigorian, E. (2019) NEW MEANINGS OF CATCH-PHRASES: GENERAL TENDENCIES // International Scientific-Pedagogical Organization of Philologists “ WEST-EAST ” (ISPOP). Scientific Journal WEST-EAST. Vol 2/2 N1 (October, 2019). pp. 36-40. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-2-36-40>

### Для цитирования:

Григорьян, Е. (2019) НОВЫЕ СМЫСЛЫ КРЫЛАТЫХ СЛОВ: ОБЩИЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ // International Scientific-Pedagogical Organization of Philologists “ WEST-EAST ” (ISPOP) . Scientific Journal WEST-EAST. Vol 2/2 N1 (October, 2019). С. 36-40. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-2-36-40>

**Information about the author: Elena Grigorian** – Candidate of Philology, Senior Lecturer, Chair of General and Comparative Linguistics, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

e-mail: [elena\\_grigorian@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:elena_grigorian@yahoo.co.uk)

**Сведения об авторе: Елена Леонидовна Григорьян** - кандидат филологических наук, доцент, кафедра общего и сравнительного языкознания Института филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации Южного федерального университета (Ростов-на-Дону, Россия)

e-mail: [elena\\_grigorian@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:elena_grigorian@yahoo.co.uk)

Manuscript received: 06/15/2019 Accepted for publication: 09/20/2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-2-40-43>

## NATIONAL CHARACTER AND LANGUAGE PERSONALITY: CULTURAL VALUES AND TRADITIONS

**Veronika Katermina**  
**Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor**  
**Kuban State University**  
(Krasnodar, Russia)  
e-mail: [veronika.katermina@yandex.ru](mailto:veronika.katermina@yandex.ru)

**Abstract.** This article dwells on national character as a complex entity. Special emphasis is put on the national culture and national language. Such terms as “national culture”, “national character”, “language personality” are taken into account. In order to understand the character of a nation, it is necessary to study, first of all, its history, social system and culture. It is important to understand that for a language personality it is impossible to draw a direct parallel with the national character but a deep analogy between them exists. It consists in the fact that the carrier of the national principle in both cases is relatively stable in time that is invariant on the scale of the personality itself, a part in its structure which is in fact the product of a long historical development and the object of intergenerational transfer of experience. The national permeates all levels of organization of the language personality, each of them acquiring a peculiar form of embodiment, and the frozen, statistical, invariant character of the national in the structure of the linguistic personality is transformed in the language itself into a dynamic, historical component. The idea that the national peculiarities cover all levels of the organization of the language personality, on each of them acquiring a peculiar form of embodiment is considered to be the basic notion.

**Key words:** national language, national character, language personality, culture, ethnos

## НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ХАРАКТЕР И ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ: КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ЦЕННОСТИ И ТРАДИЦИИ

**Вероника Викторовна Катермина**  
**Доктор филологических наук, профессор**  
**Кубанский государственный университет**  
 (Краснодар, Россия)  
[e-mail: veronika.katermina@yandex.ru](mailto:veronika.katermina@yandex.ru)

**Аннотация.** В данной статье речь идет о национальном характере как многомерном образовании. Акцент ставится на национальной культуре и национальном языке. Рассмотрены понятия «национальная культура», «национальный характер», «языковая личность». Чтобы понять характер народа, нужно изучать, прежде всего, его историю, общественный строй и культуру. Важно понять, что для языковой личности нельзя провести прямой параллели с национальным характером, но глубинная аналогия между ними существует. Она состоит в том, что носителем национального начала и в том, и в другом случае выступает относительно устойчивая во времени, то есть инвариантная в масштабе самой личности, часть в её структуре, которая является на деле продуктом длительного исторического развития и объектом межпоколенной передачи опыта. Национальное пронизывает все уровни организации языковой личности, на каждом из них приобретая своеобразную форму воплощения, и застывший, статистический, инвариантный характер национального в структуре языковой личности превращается в самом языке в динамическую, историческую его составляющую. В статье подчеркивается, что национальное пронизывает все уровни организации языковой личности, на каждом из них приобретая своеобразную форму воплощения.

**Ключевые слова:** национальный язык, национальный характер, языковая личность, культура, этнос

**INTRODUCTION.** Each national language not only reflects but also forms a national character. In other words, if a language forms a representative of a people, i.e. a native speaker, and forms it as an individual, then it should play the same constructive role in shaping the national character.

At the same time, the very concept of a national character is rather ambiguous. I.S. Kon gives several justifications for its complexity (Kon 1968). First, the national character is objectified in culture: just as it is impossible to study it, ignoring the artistic creativity of the nation, it is impossible to study the literature and art of the people without taking into account its national characteristics. Secondly, there is an appraisal and regulatory problem, namely, the question of whether modern culture and art should preserve any national specificity or whether they are increasingly becoming cosmopolitan. As in any other dispute, there are two extreme points of view in the interpretation of a national character: either there is no community of features that could be called a national character, and national self-consciousness is something like a relic, or it doesn't just exist, being unique for his ethnic group but also binds the individual to the nation becoming a kind of rock that no one can escape.

The difficulty of the case is exacerbated by terminological confusion, in particular, by the vagueness of the term. Defining the national character, some imply temperament, especially the emotional reactions of the people, others focus attention on social orientations, moral principles.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE.** According to D. B. Parygin, "there is no doubt about the existence of psychological characteristics among various social groups, strata and classes of society as well as nations and peoples" (Parygin 1966). N. Dzhandildin proceeds from a similar view and defines a national character as "a set of specific psychological features that have become more or less characteristic of a given socio-ethnic community in specific economic, cultural and natural conditions of its development" (Dzhandildin 1971). S. M. Arutunyan, who also recognizes the existence of a national character, or "psychological mentality of a nation," defines it as "a peculiar national flavor of feelings and emotions, ways of thinking and actions, stable and national features of habits and traditions formed under the influence of material life conditions, features of the historical development of a given nation and manifested in the specifics of its national culture" (Arutunyan, 1966).

In order to understand the character of a nation, it is necessary to study, first of all, its history, social system and culture. Everyone knows that people belonging to different ethnic groups differ from each other in their temperament, customs and traditions. People usually list features that are typical, in their opinion, for their own and for other nations without much difficulty. But, on the other hand, all or almost all of these characteristics are extremely vague and subjective. As I.S. Kon rightly notes, consciously or not, we perceive and evaluate the behavior and way of life of another people through the prism of the cultural traditions and values of our own ethnic group which are defined as ethnic stereotypes on the basis of which the national character should not be based. At the same time, although each ethnic group, being considered as a whole, is unique, each of its typical features is not unique to it, but characterizes, to a greater or lesser extent, other peoples. This implies the most important methodological requirement: to take into account the relativity of any ethnic characteristics since the statements regarding the features of a national character expressed in absolute form, without specifying with whom and in what period of time this group is compared, inevitably create confusion (Kon 1968).

Indeed, those features that we perceive as specific features of a national character are the product of certain historical conditions and cultural influences. They are derived from history and change with it. And then, with a certain lag, the corresponding stereotypes change. So, the longer and more difficult the path traveled by the people, the more qualitatively different phases it contains, the more complex and contradictory its national character will be. On the other hand, there is nothing more false than turning a national character into a certain fatal force that predetermines the fate of a people.

The complexity and, in many cases, the impossibility of direct study makes the study of fiction especially important, covering national-typical features deeper and more multifaceted than scientific methods. Fiction shows the diversity of national types, their concrete class nature and historical development.

S.G. Ter-Minasova gives four groups of the sources confirming the existence of a national character:

1. International jokes based entirely on stereotypes of a particular people. These stereotypes do not so much reflect some of the most essential and typical features of a people but form them both in the eyes of other nations and in their own eyes.

2. National classical literature somewhat “tainted” as a source by individual authorship and a subjective view of the world.

3. Folklore, or oral folk art, as the most reliable source of information about the national character listed above

4. Last in order, but by no means least, the most reliable and scientifically acceptable evidence of the existence of a national character is His Majesty the national language. Language reflects and forms the nature of its carrier, it is the most objective indicator of the national character (Ter-Minasova 2000).

So, as I.S. Kon states, national character is both a myth and a reality. If it is understood to mean a certain immutable essence peculiar to all people of a certain nation, distinguishing them from all other ethnic groups and determining their social behavior, this is, from a scientific point of view, a myth. But, like any social and psychological myth, it reflects a certain historical reality: a community of psychic features and methods of action developed and learned in the course of the joint historical development reinforced by group self-consciousness. National self-consciousness has been and remains a vital aspect of personal and group identification (Kon, 1968).

**RESEARCH METHODS.** The main method is the descriptive method; methods of cognitive science were also used – the method of cognitive analysis, categorization, observation, comparison, generalization, the method of conceptual and taxonomic analysis; interpretation method; functional method; cognitive modeling method; data integration method.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.** In modern discourse, the word “personality” is rather of a secondary plan, it is an affiliation of intellectual speech; in the language, it conveyed its main conceptual content to the word “person.”

Today, there are three most natural “parameters” or “aspects” of a person – three lines of his natural parametrization or aspects present in all cultures and in many of them “conceptualized”, that is, having their own forms of expression (Stepanov 1995). These three aspects are:

1. Man in relation to “Peace”, and thus, in the same relation to “God”; in pagan cultures – in relation to higher deities and lower spirits, etc., as well as to animals.

2. Man in relation to his own kind, to his family, clan, tribe, in general, in relation to “us” and “them”.

3. Man in relation to society.

The last two aspects allow us to assume that the ratio of self and some other group plays a very important role in identifying oneself as an individual.

In addition, in the concept of “personality” the component “free” is present from the very beginning. E. Benveniste showed that the social designations of collectives of people and nations in the semantic field in question are divided into two large groups – “Free” and “Slaves”. Designations of slaves in the Indo-European languages do not have a single term and in each area there are special ones dating back to the name of the people from whom mainly prisoners and slaves were obtained in wars in this area. Thus, the concept of “slave” is every time a synonym for the concept of “alien”, “prisoner”.

On the contrary, the designations of the notion “free man” are quite united and may be referred to several words that follow the same semantic principle: each time it is the designation of “own people”, “us” as people growing together. The main words go back to the Indo-European root of the verbal semantics \*leudh- – “grow”. From it, on the one hand, the Old Slavonic and Old Russian word Lud, Germanic Gothic leodes “people”, Old English leod were formed; on the other hand, through derivatives Latin liber “free”, Greek \*leudheros “free man”. Here the social origins of the concept of “free” are exposed. The initial is not the meaning of “liberated” but the meaning of belonging to an ethnic group indicated by a plant metaphor. This affiliation gives a person privileges that a foreigner and a slave do not have (Benveniste 1974). The concept of the “Us” and “Them” dichotomy is directly connected with the interpretation of the reality of a linguistic personality

Yu.N. Karaulov gives the following ways of interrelationship between a language personality and a national character: when it comes to a language personality, its intellectual characteristics come to the fore. Intellect is most intensely manifested in the language and explored through the language. But the intellectual properties of a person are clearly observable not at any level of language proficiency and language use. Applying knowledge about the structure of the language personality, it becomes clear that it does not start from the zero (verbal-grammatical) but from the first, linguistic-cognitive (thesaurus) level, based on a fairly representative set of texts of unusual content suggesting the isolation and analysis of a variable part in the picture of the world, the part that is specific to a given person and unique. On the other hand, for a person, the diachronic parameter is turned off, since psychologically both the past and the future are experienced by them as the present. In other words, existing and developing in the current time (changeable part), an identity is identical with itself, appears as a timeless essence (its stable part). What we call the timeless and invariant part in the structure of the language personality is a distinct stamp of national coloring (Karaulov 1987).

And in fact, everything that is usually associated with national character and national specificity has only one temporal indicator – the historical, national which is always diachronical. The historical coincides with its invariant part and thus we equate the concepts of “historical”, “invariant”, “national” in relation to the language personality.

It should also be borne in mind that when discussing the content of the concept of an ethnos and ethnic self-consciousness, linguists usually rely on several basic features, namely common origin; common historical fate; common

cultural values and traditions; common language, emotional and symbolic connections; common territory. As it can be seen, this entire set of complementary characteristics is diachronic through and through. On the other hand, in order to reveal the concept of an ethnos, people sometimes use the concept of common mentality for individuals constituting a given ethnic group, and a mental structure or national character can be considered both along with the above listed features and above them as an integrating superconcept directly correlative with the ethnic group. However, in any consideration of it, the interpretation of the very essence of the national character remains controversial. Ethnologists are aware of the decisive importance of the historical roots, the diachronic foundations of the folding and existence of a national character (Bromlej 1973).

**CONCLUSION.** It is important to understand that for a language personality it is impossible to draw a direct parallel with the national character but a deep analogy between them exists. It consists in the fact that the carrier of the national principle in both cases is relatively stable in time that is invariant on the scale of the personality itself, a part in its structure which is in fact the product of a long historical development and the object of intergenerational transfer of experience. The national permeates all levels of organization of the language personality, each of them acquiring a peculiar form of embodiment, and the frozen, statistical, invariant character of the national in the structure of the linguistic personality is transformed in the language itself into a dynamic, historical component. National character is determined not only by the language since along with it one of the most important signs of a people is a community of cultural values and traditions (Karaulov, 1987).

#### LIST OF REFERENCES

- Arutyunyan, S.M. (1966). Naciyaieyopsixicheskijsklad[Nation and its psychological entity]. Krasnodar: Izd-vo Krasnodar. gos. ped. un-ta.
- Benveniste, E. (1974). Obshhayalingvistika[General linguistics]. Moskva: Progress.
- Bromlej, Yu.V. (1973). E'tnosie'tnografiya [Ethnos and ethnography]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Dzhandildin, N. (1971). Prirodanacional'nojpsixologii [Nature of national psychology]. Alma-Ata: Kazaxstan.
- Karaulov, Yu.N. (1987). Russkijazy'kiyazy'kovayalichnost' [The Russian language and language personality]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Kon, I.S. (1968). Nacional'ny'jxarakter – mifilireal'nost'? [National character – myth or reality?]. Inostrannayaliteratura,(9), 215–229.
- Parygin, D.B. (1966). Obshhestvennoenastroenie [Social mood]. Moskva: My'sl.
- Stepanov, Yu. S. (1995). Al'ternativny'jmir, Diskurs, Faktiprincipprichinnosti[Alternative world. Discourse. Fact and Principle of reason. ].Yazy'kinaukakonca XX veka: sbornikstatej / RAN, Institut yazy'koznanija RAN. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvenny'j gumanitarny'juniversitet, 35–73.
- Ter-Minasova, S.G. (2000). Yazy'kimezhkul'turnayakommunikaciya [Language and intercultural communication]. – Moskva:Slovo.

#### For citation:

Katermina, V. (2019) NATIONAL CHARACTER AND LANGUAGE PERSONALITY: CULTURAL VALUES AND TRADITIONS // International Scientific-Pedagogical Organization of Philologists “ WEST-EAST ” (ISPOP). Scientific Journal WEST-EAST. Vol 2/2 N1 (October, 2019). pp. 40-43. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-2-40-43>

#### Для цитирования:

Катермина, В. В. (2019) НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ХАРАКТЕР И ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ: КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ЦЕННОСТИ И ТРАДИЦИИ // International Scientific-Pedagogical Organization of Philologists “ WEST-EAST ” (ISPOP) . Scientific Journal WEST-EAST. Vol 2/2 N1 (October, 2019). С. 40-43. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-2-40-43>

**Information about the author: Veronika Viktorovna Katermina** - Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kuban State University (Krasnodar, Russia)

e-mail: [veronika.katermina@yandex.ru](mailto:veronika.katermina@yandex.ru)

**Сведения об авторе: Вероника Викторовна Катермина** - доктор филологических наук, профессор Кубанский государственный университет (Краснодар, Россия)

e-mail: [veronika.katermina@yandex.ru](mailto:veronika.katermina@yandex.ru)

Manuscript received: 05/02/2019 Accepted for publication: 09/20/2019