

CrossRef DOI of original article:

1 Language, Culture and Emotions in Communication: Semiotic 2 Dimension

3 Iskhakova Zemfira Zulfugarovna

4 *Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970*

6 Abstract

7 Language and culture are inseparable: it is impossible for a language to exist that is not
8 immersed in the context of culture, and a culture that does not have a structure like a natural
9 language in its center. Within the framework of the study of the emotional sphere of a person
10 in a crosscultural aspect, a linguistic personality appears in such a significant image as Homo
11 Sentiens, or an emotional person. Reflecting in language, emotions acquire the status of
12 emotiveness. The results of the linguo-semiotic cross-cultural analysis are accumulated in the
13 content of the invariant emotive-indicative field.. Generally, linguo-semiotics, including
14 emotive semiotics, occupies a central place in the "family of sciences", since without receiving,
15 storing and transmitting information, human life is impossible, including the dialogue of
16 cultures.

17
18 ***Index terms***— homo sentiens, culture, language, semiotic system, cognition, emotions, invariant emotive-
19 indicative field, emotive codes.

20 1 Introduction

21 chieving mutual understanding in crosscultural emotional communication is possible if we consider this issue
22 from perspective of the science of language, namely, such areas as linguoculturology, linguosemiotics, emotiology,
23 while language and culture are considered as systems with represented semiotic models. So, culture is represented
24 by that sign system, which is organized in a certain way. Indeed, the main feature of culture is seems like the
25 moment of organization, which manifests itself as a certain amount of rules, restrictions imposed on a given
26 system, since "culture is a historically formed bundle of semiotic systems (languages), which can be formed into
27 a single hierarchy (supra-language), but can represent itself the symbiosis of independent systems" 1 .Culture is
28 the most perfect mechanism created by mankind that transforms entropy into specific information. According to
29 the authoritative opinion of Yu. M. Lotman, "culture is a generator of structure, and by this it creates a social
30 sphere around a person, which, like the biosphere, makes life possible" 2 . However, in order to fulfill this role
31 ?? Lotman Yu.M. Inside thinking worlds. (Human -Text -Semiosphere -History). -M .: Languages of Russian
32 culture, 1999. -S. 398. ?? Lotman Yu.M. Inside thinking worlds. (Human -Text -Semiosphere -History). -M .:
33 Languages of Russian culture, 1999. -S. 488.

34 of the generator of structurality, culture must have a structural "stamping device" within it. The function of
35 orderliness in the cultural system is performed by natural language. It would be appropriate to emphasize that
36 in real-historical functioning, language and culture are inseparable: it is impossible for a language to exist that
37 is not immersed in the context of culture, and a culture that does not have a structure like a natural language in
38 its center.

39 Thus, the ordered structuring of culture is due to the sign system of natural language, which acts as the center
40 of all semiotic systems of culture. In turn, the centrality of the natural language in the cultural system makes it
41 possible to represent culture as a set of communicative systems.

42 As for the study of the national and cultural specifics of a linguistic sign, here it should be taken into account the
43 civilizational component of culture, which implies "the results of the economic activity of people in accordance
44 with the passage of various stages of technical and technological development of a given community." ?? So,
45 studying the typology of cultural spaces, Yu.M. Lotman notes the influence of the landscape on the culture of

1 INTRODUCTION

46 the people, including written language. The space between the Balkans and North Africa, the Near and Middle
47 East, the Black and Mediterranean Seas, according to the scientist, is a "pot of constant mixing of ethnic groups,
48 continuous movement, collision of different cultural and semiotic structures"⁴, which creates the preconditions
49 for the creation of a single written language, due to the ontological tendency of the language for functionality.
50 Consequently, in the course of researching linguocultural and typological directions, it is important to take into
51 account the belonging of the cultures to a single civilization.

52 According to the research carried out by the famous cultural scientist R. Lewis, the main civilizations of the
53 modern world are divided into Western and Eastern in terms of the priority of the individual and the principle of
54 collectivism. In addition, R. Lewis divides the world into monoactive, polyactive and reactive from the standpoint
55 of using time. If in monoactive cultures it is customary to plan their lives, and in polyactive cultures peoples are
56 mobile, sociable and accustomed to doing many things at once, then in reactive cultures the greatest importance
57 is attached to politeness and respect, the ability to listen to the interlocutor silently and calmly ?? .

58 Despite the existing difference in the cultural characteristics of the former imperial states, England and France,
59 it is obvious that the priority of the individual plays a significant role in the French and English linguocultural
60 communities. In addition, some similarities in languages, the historical development of the French and English
61 peoples, the geographical position divided by the English Channel testify to the belonging of the former European
62 colonial states to a single civilization.

63 French and English are classified as Indo-European languages. Despite the fact that the French language is
64 lively, accurate, logical, while the English language is filled with ambiguity and uncertainty, nevertheless, these
65 languages are quite comparable. The peoples of Great Britain and France speak languages that belong to a
66 single European civilization. It seems necessary to emphasize the unity of the civilizational background of these
67 linguocultural communities.

68 On the whole, from the point of view of a linguist, it is more expedient to speak of culture as "a mechanism that
69 creates a set of texts, and texts as the realization of culture." culture can be viewed as a hierarchy of particular
70 semiotic systems, as the sum of texts and a set of functions correlated with them, or as a device that generates
71 these texts. Culture can be understood, by analogy with an individual memory mechanism, as a kind of collective
72 device for storing and processing information. The semiotic structure of culture and the semiotic structure of
73 memory are functionally similar phenomena located at different levels. It corresponds to the dynamism of culture:
74 being, in principle, a fixation of past experience, it can act both as a program and as an instruction for creating
75 new texts.

76 Semiotic systems of culture create a semiotic space, or cultural space, which appears to the researcher as a
77 multi-layer intersection of various sign systems (for example, language, painting, architecture, theater), which
78 together form a certain layer, with complex internal relationships. In fact, the semiotic space fills the boundaries
79 of culture and is a condition for the work of individual semiotic structures and, at the same time, their generating.
80 In this case, natural language is no exception. Moreover, functioning in the cultural space, it is the main "rotating
81 wheel" of culture.

82 5 Lewis R.D. Business cultures in international business (From collision to mutual understanding). -M :
83 "Delo", 1999.

84 Thus, a natural language has its own semiological space, understood as a set of linguistic sign systems.
85 However, any language is a "bundle" of semiotic space, which turns out to be immersed in cultural space, and
86 only because of its interaction with this space, it is able to function. In this regard, it is important to emphasize
87 that an indecomposable working mechanism -a unit of semiosis -should be considered not a separate language,
88 but the entire semiotic space inherent in a given culture, called the semiosphere, according to Yu.M. Lotman 6 ,
89 Thus, the semiosphere is understood as a common cultural and linguistic space.

90 If no natural language can work without being immersed in a cultural space, then no cultural space can exist
91 without a natural language as an organizing core. Consequently, it seems inappropriate to study separately two
92 semiotic spaces, cultural and linguistic. At the same time, the semiosphere is characterized by heterogeneity,
93 since its space can be occupied by various cultural (western and eastern) and subcultural (for example, age,
94 professional, gender) spaces, as well as semiotic systems of languages that are different in nature, which relate to
95 each other in the spectrum from complete mutual translatability to equally complete mutual untranslatability.

96 It is necessary to emphasize the coding structure of sign systems that fill the space of a natural language.
97 According to the close relationship of cultural and linguistic spaces, the coding structures of a natural language
98 are aimed at decoding cultural and linguistic information. In this regard, the linguistic space is presented as
99 a set of semiotic systems of a coding structure aimed at deciphering cultural and linguistic phenomena in a
100 given society and at a given time. At the same time, the texts of different cultures, as a rule, require for their
101 deciphering not a single code, but a complex system of codes, sometimes hierarchically organized, and sometimes
102 resulting from the mechanical connection of various, simpler systems.

103 Within the framework of the dialogue of cultures, it seems possible to consider a person as an emotional one,
104 broadcasting cultural and linguistic codes. Then the obvious question is: what are emotions?

105 The famous American psychologist Carroll E. Izard notes that it is very difficult to identify the essence of
106 the concept of "emotion", and therefore "a laconic definition will not be able to reveal its essence fully" 7 .
107 Nevertheless, he gives a short definition of emotion, which, in his opinion, "can by no means be considered
108 complete" 8 : "emotion is something that is experienced as a feeling that motivates, organizes and directs

109 perception, thinking and actions” 9 . Emotions play an important role in human life, since ”human culture
110 began to differ from the social instincts of animals, primarily with the formation of the emotional beginning.” 10
111 Obviously, the study of emotions is extremely difficult so much so that until now they were considered simply not
112 amenable to scientific research.

113 However, all these difficulties cannot force scientists to remove the task of defining and studying the content of
114 a person’s emotional sphere. In this sense, an integrative description can become the key to solving the problem,
115 since without the study of individual aspects of emotionality as a problem by various sciences, it is impossible to
116 get an adequate picture of this object.

117 In general terms, the relationship between the world, man and emotions can be represented as follows: there
118 is a world (object) and a man (subject) as a part of the world capable of reflecting it. Emotions regulate this
119 process of reflection, expressing the meaning of the objects of the world for a person. Emotions as a mental
120 phenomenon reflect in the mind of a person his emotional attitude to reality. These emotional relationships,
121 although subjective, are socially conscious and therefore more or less typified. Thus, emotions always have a
122 cause, a subject and an object.

123 Expressed by L.S. Vygotsky at the beginning of the XX century, the following thought serves as the quintessence
124 of the theory of emotional thinking: ”Whoever tore thinking from the very beginning from affect, he forever closed
125 his way to explain the reasons for thinking itself.” 11 This point of view remains relevant for the beginning of
126 the XXI century. Emotions are the driving motives of consciousness, and this must be taken into account when
127 studying its nature. The ontology of consciousness provides for the differentiation of the concepts of ”emotions”
128 and ”feelings”. Emotions are part of the psychological structure of feelings, while feelings are a more complex
129 form of reflection, peculiar only to humans, which includes not only emotional, but also conceptual reflection.

130 Consequently, feelings are conscious emotions that are defined ”in the range of an approving or disapproving
131 reaction to what is designated.” 12 The former include respect, reverence, commendable attitude, etc., the latter
132 -contempt, neglect, censure, derogatory attitude and their varieties. As a rule, the focus of linguistic research is
133 on certain types of emotions, which are meant ”feelings-relationships” 13 . Thus, ”cognition and emotion go hand
134 in hand, next to each other: emotion motivates cognition, cognition is in emotions.” 14 The unity of emotion
135 and thinking is undeniable in view of the recognition of the existence of emotional intelligence as proposed by
136 Daniel Goleman 15 . This term means the specific ability of a person to control emotional impulses, to regulate
137 more delicately his or her emotional relationships, the ability to motivate their emotions, co-feel, co-suffer.

138 Man and emotions are inseparable. Emotions existed in humans even in the pre-language period, at the level
139 of gestures. ”Emotion is the core of a linguistic personality, just as reflection is the core of its consciousness.” 16
140 All this leads to the conclusion: the concept of ”linguistic personality” -first of all -implies its emotional essence,
141 that is, emotional intelligence. In turn, the type of emotional intelligence is determined by the person’s mental
142 style.

143 In accordance with the foregoing, it seems that the term linguistic personality claims to be an obligatory
144 attribute emotional -emotional linguistic personality (Shakhovsky V.I.). However, modern linguistics presents
145 a whole paradigm of linguistic personality models: ethnosemantic personality (S.G. Vorkachev), elite linguistic
146 personality (O.B.Sirotnina, T.V. Kochetkova), Russian linguistic personality (Yu.N. Karaulov) and others. Thus,
147 ”the diversity of the linguistic personality is manifested in various images that are just beginning to be developed.”
148 17 In Russian linguistics, for example, on the basis of linguistic data, the image of a person is reconstructed, the
149 representation parameters of which correspond to the hypostases of a linguistic personality, including I-physical,
150 I-social, I-intellectual, I-speechthinking, I-emotional 18 . In this regard, in the article ”Human image according
151 to language data: an attempt at a systemic description” Acad. Yu.D. Apresyan names eight systems that make
152 up the image of a person. In the opinion of a well-known linguist, in the ”reconstruction” of a person, the
153 following list of his systems must be taken into account: 1) physical perception; 2) physiological conditions; 3)
154 physiological reactions to various kinds of external and internal influences; 4) physical actions and activities; 5)
155 desires; 6) thinking, intellectual activity; 7) emotions; 8) speech. At the same time, the emotional system seems
156 to be one of the most complex and least autonomous systems of a person. On the one hand, it activates all other
157 systems of Homo Sapiens, and on the other hand, ”almost all other human systems take part in the emergence,
158 development and manifestation of emotions ... and even speech.” 19 Therefore, within the framework of the study
159 of the emotional sphere of a person, a linguistic personality appears in such a significant image as Homo Sentiens,
160 or an emotional person. Reflecting in language, emotions acquire the status of emotiveness.

161 It is impossible to know the functional side of the language to the end without contacting its creator and user
162 in all the diversity of its historical, social, national and other features. Popular ideas about emotions reveal deep
163 insight into the structure of emotions and the nature of emotional life 20 . These representations ”crystallize”
164 in the language of emotions, especially in the emotional vocabulary of this language. For example, ”the rules
165 for English speakers to use the words grief, remorse, disappointment or shame take into account specific inner
166 feelings that are qualitatively different from each other” 21 .

167 In addition, T.V. Larina draws attention to the open manifestation of emotions, especially negative ones,
168 in the English communicative culture. This is confirmed by the fact that such emotive units as emotional,
169 effusive, demonstrative, excitable, in English have a negative connotation. So, ”to characterize a drunk
170 person in English there is a funny idiom -tired and emotional, which literally means tired and emotional.”
171 22 In general, sociological, psychological and linguistic research shows that all people are both ”linguistic

1 INTRODUCTION

172 and emotional animals.”¹ Nevertheless, cross-cultural studies of the emotional behavior of representatives of
173 various linguocultural communities are very interesting. For example, comparing the individual and national
174 characteristics of expressing the emotionality of Americans and Russians reveals curious linguistic parallels and
175 contrasts. The emotional styles of Americans and Russians are in tune with their chronotopic national trends.
176 Americans are dominated by “happiness,” “complacency,” “friendliness,” while today’s Russians are dominated
177 by “despair,” “fear,” “anger,” “disrespect.”

178 However, despite the presence of cultural conditioning in the emotions of a person speaking, it is important
179 to note the existence of universal crosscultural emotive codes that express an emotional state and at the same
180 time indicate it. Thus, a universal field was established by referring to the variant types of the emotive deictic
181 (indicative) field, represented by the emotive-deictic (indicative) fields of homo sentiens and femina sentiens²⁴.
182 In this case, the data of the English and French languages are used as the analysis material. The results of the
183 linguosemiotic analysis are accumulated in the content of the invariant emotiveindicative field. The center of the
184 emotive demonstrative field as a possible tertium comparationis is occupied by interjections, emotional-evaluative
185 adjectives, intensifiers, morphological means of verbalizing emotions, associative-emotive vocabulary and emotive
186 syntactic means that play the role of emotive-symbols and emotive-indices. One of the pronounced features of the
187 emotive indicating field is the ability of units of affective vocabulary, interjections, emotional-evaluative adjectives
188 to become significant components of the central part of the deictic field as emotive symbols. This is due, first of
189 all, to the semantics of affectives, coupled with maximum expressiveness, aimed at the realization of the speech
190 effect, which, in turn, determines the self-sufficiency of the affective-indicative vocabulary, both in language and in
191 speech implementation, from the position of the category of indicating emotivity. The periphery of the invariant
192 deictic field is occupied by figurative emotive signs that correlate with a specific meaning in the semantics of the
193 indicative lexicon²⁵. The determined invariant emotive-indicative field allows to prevent communication gaps
194 within the framework of a cross-cultural space.

195 Obviously, emotive semiotics, occupies a central place in the “family of sciences”, since without receiving,
196 storing and transmitting information, human life is impossible -neither knowledge of the world, nor the
197 organization of human society and its cultural and linguistic spaces, including the dialogue of cultures.^{1 2}
198 3 4 5 6 7 8

¹ Ivanova S.V. Linguoculturological aspect of the study of linguistic units: Abstract dissertation. ... doc. philol. sciences. -Ufa, 2003 .-P.9.

² Lotman Yu.M. Several thoughts on the typology of cultures // Languages of culture and problems of translatability. -M.: Nauka, 1987 .-S. 3-11.

³ Teliya V.N. The connotative aspect of the semantics of nominative units. -M.: Nauka, 1986 .-P. 129.

⁴ Shakhovskiy V.I. Linguistic theory of emotions: Monograph. -M., 2008 .-p. 384.

⁵ Goleman D. The Emotional Intelligence. Why it Can Matter More than IQ? -Bentam Books, 1997.

⁶ Shakhovskiy V.I. Linguistic theory of emotions: Monograph. -M., 2008 .-p. 48.

⁷ Saifi L.A. Conceptualization of the somatic image of a person in language and discursive practices: Abstract dissertation. ...Cand. philol. sciences. -Ufa, 2008. -P.7

⁸ Apresyan Yu.D. The image of a person according to language data: an attempt at a systematic description // Questions of linguistics. -1995.-No. 1.-P.37-67.