

## Real and Possible in the Boundaries of the Common Language and Cultural Universe

<sup>1</sup>Natalia A. Bozhenkova and <sup>2</sup>Raisa K. Bozhenkova

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Linguistics and Intercultural Communication Southwest State University  
<sup>2</sup>Bauman University

---

**Abstract:** The article is devoted to the problem of the correlation of language and culture. The correlation has a multi-leveled character which aspires from the content of a possible textual culture to its possible language expression. They say that a possible textual culture is a notional construct of the most important chain of the communication act and of its main unit, i.e. of the text. The text is the main communicative-pragmatic unit of the language and its complexity depends on the complexity of the process of communication itself in all of its aspects. The text has some inner strength which limits it to certain frames of a linguistic sign and, at the same time, connects it with ideal and material things of possible cultural universe.

**Key words:** Common language • Cultural universe • Linguo-philosophic theory • Gnoseology • Peculiarity of the speech model • Linguoculture • Deixis • Language expression

---

### INTRODUCTION

Primary studying of traditional linguistic problems and rapid development of the information-oriented society have led fantasy cultures to become the reason for many scientific research areas to arise. At the same time ethnical and authorial cultures began to multiply. A new linguo-philosophic theory made researchers to study fundamentals of cognitive science and gnoseology in terms of contemporary achievements of humanitarian, technical and natural sciences, i.e. to study modality as one of the most important categories of existence. Modality is meant in terms with the theory which summarizes knowledge of the contemporary culture; it is one of the main substantial nature of the language and therefore of language units. Sign systems and types of possibility can be studied in terms of modality. Therefore modality can show what the language and its units present as possibility.

The main possibilities of verbal units are realized in the language modeling. So the theory of possible cultures is studied in terms of reflective character of the language. Any language has a multi-leveled structure, a mechanism of sampling and receding ethnical cultural experience as well as transfers the multilateral world of possible cultural

experience into speech chains; consequently it builds over the speech and makes some additional hierarchical space. The peculiarity of the speech model is that it represents the whole situation of communication, therefore it carries the information of an object, a subject, a combination of conditions and factors and a role the speech model plays in communication as well. Reflective character of the speech model is evaluated both with the degree of its conformity to the presented cultural reality and with the ability to understand the presented information. However, a semantic-syntactic structure of models doesn't conform to the presented cultural content word for word but specifies it differently while texts are being produced. Thus it sheds light on a problem of correlation between language and culture. The correlation has a multi-leveled character which aspires from the content of a possible textual culture to its possible language expression.

It should be noted, that the name "a possible textual culture" is as a new term for Russian linguistics as a problem of possible linguo-cultural worlds in whole. In traditional textology this word-group is used in the meaning of "an informational text" (the term has also been introduced recently). At the same time culture is differentiated as a real one and a textual (or possible) one.

---

**Corresponding Author:** Natalia A. Bozhenkova, Dean of the Faculty of Linguistics and Intercultural Communication Southwest State University.

That's why two types of language are defined. They are a language of the real culture and a language of the possible culture. Actually, such a differentiation is not certain because a Russian real culture, for example, cannot be imagined without the Russian literature. Moreover, conformity of the textual unit's meaning is characterized with relevance of its correspondence with a certain cultural situation (both real and imaginary). It is generally admitted that the language hypothesizes speech acts which correspond to the present as well as to the future; it can describe non-real cultural situations (in fiction, particularly). The language can also describe fabulous, mythological and religious situations which can never exist, though they are the subject of thinking and speech.

From our point of view all possible cultures are real because reality and possibility are two extra features of the same culture. Every culture is real for itself and is possible in respect of other cultures. In other words, relevance characterizes the culture which contains a viewer whereas possibility characterizes all other cultures. Based on the above stated we can conclude that a possible textual culture is a notional construct of the most important chain of the communication act and of its main unit, i.e. of the text.

Studying the processes of producing and understanding a text shows that two groups of factors are important to organize a text. They are shape-making and meaning-making. A text is a sign system which is given by a certain code and defined by influence of different factors (both extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic); it is characterized with discontinuity, linearity, meaningfulness and involvement in a cultural universe. The content is designed with a sign system itself and with such mechanisms of notional link which present a certain type of linguoculture, correspond to the consciousness of people and have prescriptive, regulative and valuable meaning. So, the text is the main communicative-pragmatic unit of the language and its complexity depends on the complexity of the process of communication itself in all of its aspects. The text has some inner strength which limits it to certain frames of a linguistic sign and, at the same time, connects it with ideal and material things of possible cultural universe.

The most interesting feature of the text is a category of bi-actuality, which is connected with its thematic, semantic and informational unity. In our opinion this category represents inner logical-semantic links of the text where the nature of these chains influences contents of the given text. Therefore we consider a bi-actual text (BA)

as a unit of mixed communication, i.e. a speech unit which elements are real and textual cultures. This unit includes a language, a cognitive, social and informational thing and is characterized with completeness of its structural and notional hierarchy.

Traditional linguistic descriptions don't often correspond to processes which take place in text units while they are being produced as well as while they are understood. It happens because of bi-actuality of any communication act and also because the described parts of linguistics don't agree enough and they are too biosystematics, covert and presentative. First, researchers usually don't pay attention to the fact that mental representation of extra-linguistic factors (not factors themselves) influences the process of communication. This representation depends on realizing (which is always subjective, so is possible) linguocultural worldview and oneself in this world. Second, researchers usually study lexical items or sentences. The results are transferred to the whole mechanism of verbal and cogitative process which fulfills communicative-cognitive function. All this is not enough to analyze the relevance of BA or its referential truth. Though a real language is a many-sidedness and multiple-level system where deixis has a heterogeneous character, is closely connected with logical-linguistic notions "quantification" and "qualification", so requires heterogeneity of the studied ethnical language (which arises from its intentional and extensional nature).

A leveled method used in the problem of deixis allows marking three stages of the text existence due to a possibility to record it, i.e. a real text and its relevant idealization called a virtual text and its text as a model.

An actual text is realized in a pragmatic paradigm, i.e. "author-text-recipient", characterized with an actual reference and "truth/false" parameters. A virtual text is a materially fixed actual one, which is considered out of the context of communication (its author, recipient and so on). Only general rules of text generating, understanding and of deixis are applied to this kind of text. A model text is abstraction which is presented as idealization of real texts. This abstraction can have two modes of existence: a frame or a set of typical pragmatic-semantic rules to generate and understand texts. A frame is a result of analysis of a certain number of texts which have similar features. A set of typical pragmatic-semantic rules are formed during an individual's life and present fragments of social practice. A referential status of a sample text is made of indicatory relevant rules.

This differentiation of textual category allows defining two groups: constructional and functional. The first one includes a lexical item, a type of the sentence (structurally-semantic) and a model text. The second one is described as a paradigm of "word-phrase-predication (a notional unit presented by language)-text". In real communication pre-text things (cited above) are functional and constructional units of the text as a communicative unit. So, this paradigm has two statuses. They are actual (includes a word, an actual utterance, an actual semantic unit, an actual text) and virtual (includes a word, a virtual utterance (sentence), a virtual semantic unit and a virtual text).

So, actual and virtual types of deixis are units of the functional level. A certain information status is for constructional units. However, BA in the whole isn't a set of functional and constructional units, but a unit of communication with new informative features. Functional units should have some additional classification into quantitative and modal taking into account double specifications of referential relevant units. A quantitative deixis is semantic and extensionally-intensional whereas a modal one is pragmatically-semantic and intensional.

The described above types or reference intercross making a certain set of notations which are defined in advance by a referential status of the corresponded constructional units and appear while different units from different levels begin functioning.

As the result every BA presents its own textual culture, possible on the base of constellation of texts. The status of possible culture of BA is characterized by order and structure making inner logical reference of the text. It is also characterized by the degree of proximity from an actual culture where participants have certain epistemic prescriptions making some external reference of the text. Consequently, BA means not only one real or possible text culture, but a set of such cultures available from the structure of the given text. One of the cultures is supposed to be basic.

An important feature of bi-actual texts is that they fulfill a special social function. An official, sacral, scientific or publicistic text, an official document, private diaries and fiction texts are connected with certain emotional tune and have certain cultural value and valeur which depend on every person individually and on the society as a whole. That is why one should consider producing general structure of a possible cultural situation in terms of BA. A level of complexity and a cultural situation in whole influence the depth of understanding a text. There exist three mechanisms of

understanding a text. The first one is when an addressee searches for an objective sense of the text, reconstructs it and makes new sense constructs of the text, which are based on the feature of a "possible" sense of BA. The second one is when an addressee reveals a new sense of the text while BA comprehension. The third mechanism is sense enriching under the influence of possible cultural factors of BA which doesn't change its set of signs.

The most valuable aspect of comprehension of BA (as well as its making) is synthesis of its possible cultural sense. The addressee generates a new cultural sense which the author meant while constructing BA integrating it with the sense from a linguocultural universe. So, the addressee generates new sense constructs which have links between structural units of the comprehending BA and other texts and also with a possible changed cultural situation. These links are included into the process of making possible sense constructs of BA by the act of understanding so they enrich a possible cultural world. Thus the addressee continues author's creativity to make a possible cultural sense of BA.

A new possible sense unity of BA is made by repeating constituents of BA (lexical meaning in the form of images, signs and so on), so that different in meaning fragments of the text become the integrative whole. Second, this sense unity is made by forming diversified content according to stereotyped speech models which are historically proved. Consequently the result of comprehension and (re)translation of BA of all generations) which take the position between the author and the last reader) makes a possible cultural sense of BA.

Describing mechanisms of making possible cultural senses of BA (we named them as syntactic mechanisms) conclude revealing and understanding the underlying factors. Such factors are interpretation, identification, division and integration, deleting old material and adding new one, repeating, organizing, marking, deformation, classification, composition and decomposition, exemplification, applying labels (names, predicates, gestures, pictures, the music row and so on) which don't exist in a possible culture but are its natural part. At that syntactic mechanisms fulfill multi-leveled referential functions and in this way organize BA as a symbolic system. Moreover such uniting of different but relevant symbols transforms BA into a communicative-cognitive-pragmatic unit with unlimited number of mechanisms to describe and transmit a possible culture.

Possible linguocultural universes, involved into BA are not characterized by containing or lacking some symbolic classes (as matter, energy, waves, phenomena, word units), but by organizing the same units into relevant and non-relevant types. Even if the described things coincide, the markers, types and features which they express can be entirely different and some relevant marks of one culture will be presented as irrelevant in another culture, i.e. with changed interests and new understanding. Semantic load of aspects of morphology or syntax is corrected and a textual culture is rich in new symbolic classes.

Linguocultural modeling is the main mechanism of integrating and organizing symbols. It is the base of making new cultural senses in BA. So a speech model becomes actual due to a possible culture, thinking, communication and reflected reality, i.e. due to lexical meaning and a possible cultural sense. This model has two levels: textual and non-textual. These levels are formed by aims, motivation and sense conditions of a communicative situation. The first level represents new information of the sphere of a possible culture. The second level restores a non-textual reality as a system of subjective relations which relate communicants. The beginning of the process in forming a verbalized model has a communicative intention. This kind of a model plays a regulative role of a person non-speech cultural activity. In turn a person projects his past experience into the future one, i.e. extrapolates communicative-cognitive knowledge and skills.

Actually lexical meanings and a possible cultural sense form semantic constructs as the result of interacting of verbal and non-verbal semantics. They make an ideal form of a possible culture, so this culture is able to transfer and express constantly new content.

Thereby even if you contemplate over simple things you shouldn't colour outside the lines of the real world. If there is only one culture, then it integrates a lot of opposite aspects. If there are lots of cultures then they present one super-culture. In general one culture can be described as many cultures or many cultures can be described as one. The mechanism of describing determines if there is one culture or many.

A possible culture as such isn't hidden, but to understand it one should use several mechanisms. Accordingly, any statement is true and any description is correct for a possible culture. It's all about references, categories, a context etc. It is impossible to interpret the units of BA without understanding the system it belongs to.

The language was chosen to be the main symbolic system in our research because numerical symbolic forms, which fulfill the only aim to understand the culture, are generated in it. The language can't be studied as a prototype of things but presents a condition of our knowledge about these things. The language is a supposition of our concept of empirical things, of our understanding so-called "a possible culture". Moreover the language is the mechanism to organize person's experience. Consequently it develops a linguocultural universe in whole.

The integrated world of the language is created and revealed at the same time. We can take one of the precise descriptions of a linguoculture for a real linguoculture by mistake. And sometimes we mistakenly consider possible cultures when they are just descriptions of a real culture but in other terms. All possible cultures are contained in one real culture. Therefore we can consider a new type of thinking nowadays which is formed in the conditions of modern interpretation the problem of possible cultures multiplicity.

## REFERENCES

1. Bozhenkova, N.A., 2005. Logical syntax encoding of possible mechanisms of cultural meanings in the text. Moscow.
2. Bozhenkova, N.A. and A.M. Bozhenkova, 2011. The linguistic aspects of the study of semantics of possible worlds // News SWSU. Series Linguistics and Pedagogy. Kursk: SWSU, 2: 13-15.
3. Bozhenkova, R.K. and N.A. Bozhenkova, 2008. Activity of the language and cultural aspect of the process of understanding the text // Studia Rossica Poznaniensia, vol. XXXIV: Adam Mickiewicz University Press, Poznań, pp: 95-105.
4. Bozhenkova, R.K., 2000. Understanding of the text as language and cultural category: Monograph. Kursk.
5. Leontiev, A.N., 1975. Activity. Consciousness. Personality. Moscow.
6. Lotman, Y.M., 1977. Culture as a collective intelligence and the problem of artificial intelligence. Moscow.
7. Semiotik: Ein Handbuch Zu Den Zeichentheoretischen Grundlagen von Natur und Kultur/ Hrsg. von R. Posner, K. Robering, T.A. Sebeok. Bd. 1-4. Berlin; New York, 1997-2004.