

VERBAL INDICATORS OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL IDENTITY (PERSONAL PRONOUNS AS THE EXAMPLE)

N.Y. Yasakova,*

n.yasakova@ukma.edu.ua

S.V. Kharchenko,**

s.kharchenko@nubip.edu.ua

V.D. Shynkaruk***

vashyn2010@ukr.net

Abstract: *The purpose of this article is to shed light on the peculiarities of using personal pronouns as expressions of cultural information in the communicative act and as special markers of individualization and self-identification.*

The methodological basis of the study is the activity approach, in which culture is interpreted as a holistic system of different forms of human activity, i.e. culture connects society with the individual; it is a way of its entry into social life, a way of existence of a social group in interaction with nature, other social groups, which covers in particular, ethno-cultural stereotypes. The study of language, reflecting universal and ethno-specific ways of categorizing and conceptualizing the world, the history and modern existence of its speakers, is one of the most effective ways of studying cultural phenomena. The basis of the research strategy was the cultural-semiotic method, the method of semantic-differential scales and the systematic approach. Therefore, studying the phenomena of culture and the phenomena of language in the linguistic-cultural paradigm will help to deepen the understanding of the mental code of Ukrainians. The semantics and pragmatics of personal pronouns in a

* Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of the Ukrainian language of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

** Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Journalism and Language Communication of the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine.

*** Doctor of Philology, Professor, Dean of the Faculty for Humanities and Pedagogy of the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine.

communicative act at the linguistic-mental level is a fragment of the Ukrainian linguistic picture of the world.

The use of personal pronouns as special markers of individualization and self-identification is conditioned by the mental identity of Ukrainians and is one of the many elements of the identity code of ethnos information that depends on the specifics of the national world perception.

Keywords: *linguistic-cultural identity, verbal indicator, communicative act, personal pronoun, communicative act.*

Introduction

In the dichotomy "language – culture" both language and culture are interdependent constructs. Language, which reflect, stores and accumulates cultural information, shapes a person's mentality, *his/her* cultural consciousness. Culture through archetypes, mythologized stereotypes operates in the language of its modern carriers¹. It is well known, that any cultural stereotype and any single act of social behavior explicitly or implicitly contain the communication as its component that is needed to preserve and transmit it from generation to generation. Naturally, linguistic units, focused on establishing the basic parameters of communication, are the expression of meanings – elements of the system of cultural codes. The main, defining national-marked component of national culture and its identifier is language, which accumulates the memory of the nation, its cognitive-historical experience, spiritual and aesthetic ideals, traditions and customs. In addition, it is through language that they convey social experience, culture, mentality, behavior patterns. At the same time, language is an element of complex cultural phenomena, in particular traditions and rituals. It is recognized as an important component of social culture, which is an attribute of any society and has ethnic characteristics due to various factors: natural and climatic conditions, historical path of ethnicity, contacts with other peoples, features of religion, etc².

Communication flow is also influenced by the linguistic and cultural environment both of the national and the local level, which determines the models of linguistic behavior of representatives of a particular people. Personal pronouns are the markers of communicative roles in most

¹ Shynkaruk, V. D., Kharchenko, S. V., Zavalnyuk, I. Ya., *"Language-culture" dichotomy in formation of the mental sphere of ethnic consciousness and specificity of national world perception*. Bulletin of the National Academy of Management Personnel of Culture and Arts: Sciences. Kyiv: Idea-print, Vol. 1. 2019, 97p.

² Radevych-Vynnyts'kyy, Ya., *Etyket i kul'tura spilkuwannya*. Kyiv: T-vo «Znannya», 11 p.

languages. At the same time, pronouns serve as carriers of many additional meanings that manifest the traditions of communication inherent in a particular community. The system of meanings of personal pronouns of a particular language is a kind of cultural code that reflects not only the core aspects of the speech interaction of representatives of a particular culture, but also captures the most important social roles and characteristics^{3,4}. This system is generated and modified throughout the existence of the language and is a means of relaying relevant meanings within a particular national culture.

The analysis of the scientific literature

In the XX – at the beginning of the XXI century cultural and national stereotypes of linguistic consciousness, the interrelationship of language and culture, linguistic-cultural traditions, verbal linguistic-cultural markers, etc., are increasingly becoming part of the scientific interest of Ukrainian linguists, in particular B. Azhnyuk, P. Hrytsenko, I. Holubovska, V. Zhaivoronok, I. Zavalnyuk, M. Kalko, V. Kononenko, T. Kosmeda, V. Moiseienko, V. Ponomarenko, T. Semashko, M. Stepanenko, M. Teleka, S. Kharchenko, V. Shynkaruk, N. Yasakova, and others.

The purpose of the study

The purpose of this article is to shed light on the peculiarities of using personal pronouns as expressions of cultural information in the communicative act and as special markers of individualization and self-identification.

Methodology of the study

The methodological basis of the study is the activity approach, in which culture is interpreted as a holistic system of different forms of human activity, i.e. culture connects society with the individual; it is a way of its entry into social life, a way of existence of a social group in interaction with nature, other social groups, which covers in particular, ethno-cultural stereotypes. The study of language, reflecting universal and ethno-specific ways of categorizing and conceptualizing the world, the history and modern existence of its speakers, is one of the most effective ways of studying cultural phenomena. The basis of the research strategy

³ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistolarnoho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, pp. 32-41.

⁴ Yasakova, N., *Katehoriia personalnosti: pryroda, struktura ta reprezentatsiia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi*. Kyiv: NaUKMA, 2016, pp. 212-275.

was the cultural-semiotic method, the method of semantic-differential scales and the systematic approach.

Theoretical basis and results

Every linguistic personality is unique, has *his/her* thesaurus, formed under the influence of the linguistic-cultural and socio-cultural environment, *his/her* models of linguistic behavior, *his/her* system of communicative values. Although the terms of communication may be diverse, the use of different ways of pointing to its participants has general laws. The pragmatic variants of personal pronouns values reflect both the human traits of the course of communicative acts and the national and cultural traditions of the Ukrainian people.

Communication takes place in accordance with the relevant rules of politeness, principles of cooperation and co-working, using certain strategies and tactics in speech interaction⁵. The choice of a particular model of expression, filling it with vocabulary in specific grammatical forms depends on many communicatively relevant circumstances, as well as on the actualized cultural information, which manifests itself in the language through cultural semes, cultural background, cultural concepts and cultural connotation⁶.

Certain ways of pointing the speaker to himself, the interlocutor and a third person in various communication situations constitute a single system for representatives of one linguistic and cultural community. They are evaluated positively or negatively as being in conformity with or contrary to accepted traditions of communication. Thus, the speaker chooses one of the possible ways to refer to himself and the interlocutor according to the communicative roles, assessing the communicative statuses of the participants in the speech interaction (the extent of their communicative rights and responsibilities), which are conditioned by social statuses and roles. These methods reflect behavior patterns and stereotypes associated with these roles, peculiar to native speakers. Pronouns as markers of social culture explicate the properties of that culture of pragmatic variability of the categorical meanings of the first and second persons attests to the diversity of social statuses and roles of the speaker and the addressee (equal/unequal partners), the formality/informality of the communication situation, the degree of

⁵ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistoliarneho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, p. 23.

⁶ Shynkaruk, V.D., Kharchenko, S.V., Zavalnyuk, I. Ya., *"Language-culture" dichotomy in formation of the mental sphere of ethnic consciousness and specificity of national world perception*. Bulletin of the National Academy of Management Personnel of Culture and Arts: Sciences. Kyiv: Idea-print, Vol.1. 2019, p. 99.

acquaintance of the interlocutors, the nature of personal relationships between them (friendly/neutral/conflict), the upbringing of the speaker. Appropriateness / non-conformity of the use of these markers to the standards of a particular culture his physical condition (normal/unhealthy/alcoholic or narcotic intoxication), emotional state and purpose of communication. Thus, the indications of the participants of the communicative act reflect pragmatic presuppositions of a social nature, the content of which depends directly on the socio-cultural traditions of the ethnic group.

The speaker is the creator of the communicative-pragmatic field, organizing it from the standpoint of self-centeredness. It is the speaker who determines the place of the interlocutor in the social hierarchy in view of his own status⁷. Speaker's assessments, such as appealing to *you (sing.)* or *you (pl.)*, may not coincide with the interlocutor's vision, which creates a conflict between communicators, since successful interaction is possible only when interpretations of social structure are conventionalized⁸. The likelihood of conflict increases significantly, when the speaker and the addressee belong to different linguistic cultures, because they are characterized by different stereotypes of communicative behavior, and various aspects are relevant to their selection, such as the age or gender of the interlocutors, the formality/informality of the situation, etc. In the process of communication, there are peculiar pragmatic conventions – implicit norms, rules and models of communicative interaction, which regulate and harmonize the relations between the communicants in the dialogue. Formed within the limits of ethnic consciousness as the dominant way of seeing the world, ethnic stereotypes, functioning in a certain cultural society, through cultural forms, consolidate cultural traditions and habits in the consciousness of the ethnic group; act as regulators of linguistic ethno-consciousness and behavior; promote awareness of ethnicity by members of a single community; form part of the linguistic and cultural picture of the world of ethnicity, etc⁹. Representatives of different linguistic cultures have different social stereotypes and ideas about their influence on the course of communication and use of pronouns.

Speech activity in the linguistic and cultural environment is dynamic; it is modified by the influence of external and internal factors, in

⁷ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistolarnoho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, pp. 33-34.

⁸ Deyk, T.A., *Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya*. Moscow: Progress, 1989, p. 22.

⁹ Semashko, T.F., *Movna stereotyzatsiia sensohoho spryiniattia v ukrainskii linhvokulturi*. Kyiv, 2017, p. 21.

particular, such as ordering and hierarchization of social life. Accordingly, the use of personal pronouns is changing, that is, social status-related speech variants of personal meanings are characterized not only by ethno-linguistic specificity but also historically. For example, the widespread earlier appeal to parents as *you (pl.)* is gradually replaced by the appeal to *you (sing.)* as a result of reducing the social distance between children and parents, changing perceptions of their rights and responsibilities, reducing the ritual in intergenerational relationships. Replacing *you (pl.)* with *you (sing.)* attests to the equally respectful attitude towards older family members (sometimes you even addressed older siblings), and changes in the child's social status. She is no longer considered by peasant tradition to be another working hand in the family, as a person entirely dependent on the will of the parents. Numerous Ukrainian proverbs and ceremonies demonstrate their special importance in the fate of man. An important event in the life of even an adult son or daughter did not occur without parental blessing. If the parents did not consent to the marriage, they did not enter into it. The child who violated the will of the parents was considered doomed to an unhappy destiny, and the most severe punishment was the parental curse. Thus, the Ukrainian traditions in different forms reflected the value of the family in the life of the peasant and the decisive role of parents, who pass on land to adult children. The emergence of a new tradition of addressing you is conditioned by the socio-economic and cultural changes that took place during the XX century. These include, in particular, an increase in urban population and the destruction of commonplace relationships between peasant family members, resulting from the loss of private land ownership and forced collectivization. Nowadays, the use of *you (sing.)* on parents, grandparents or other elderly relatives is perceived as an attribute of democracy and emotional closeness of family members.

The functions of personal pronouns of the Ukrainian language in the dialogue represent the traditional notions of a place in society, importance, character of certain social roles, traditional for our culture. Among the methods to point to the speaker, there are those, related to a particular type of human activity. In the canonical communicative situation, the speaker points to himself with the pronoun *I*. In situations where the speaker performs special social roles, this pronoun is inferior to other units.

In accordance with the linguistic and cultural tradition, we often use the pronoun as a means of labeling communication, solidarity of courtesy, and oriented towards subjectivity in the interests of the addressee and the interests of the addressee. The addressee's use of other self-presentation options depends on the social, psychological or linguistic and cultural

situation. Some of these ways of self-presentation have deep historical roots, testifying to the influences of cultures of other nations.

In ancient Indo-European languages one of the first redistributions of functions of personal pronouns was held which, according to V. Ponomarenko, tended to be used instead of the so-called honorary / majestic (pluralismaiestatis (maiestaticus)) and authorial *we* (pluralis modestiae) "Modesty set")¹⁰. The use of plural forms to indicate the author of the text is characteristic not only of the Ukrainian language, but also of others, in particular German, Russian and Serbian. This demonstrates a certain commonality of scientific traditions in the countries where the speakers of these languages live. At the same time, in English-language scientific texts, which have become especially popular nowadays, we observe the regular use of the first-person singular pronoun. Since English has acquired the status of an international language of science and Ukrainian scholars use it both as readers and authors of professional texts, as well as speakers and participants in scientific discussions, there is a likelihood of spreading the English-speaking tradition in Ukrainian scientific discourse.

I. Matviyas notes that in the Russ chronicles the examples of using the author's *we* is already the XII century¹¹. Nowadays, in the Ukrainian language, author's *we* is first and foremost characteristic of a scientific discourse, for example: *... (we) will focus only on a brief overview of the concepts of verbal aspect in general and of aspectuality in particular* (M. Kalko); *(We) distinguish three basic levels of prose language polymorphism...* (S. Bybyk). However, it is also present in fiction and publicist texts, for example: *But this event cannot be considered an adventure, and we would not have mentioned it if Yavtukh had not thrown a new focus* (I. Senchenko); *We have already talked about the poet's willingness to humble* (V. Bazylevskiy).

In scientific discourse, in particular in written texts, oral reports, discussions, the use of the plural instead of singular is moderated by tradition and supported by the general tendency to objectify the content. The author of artistic or journalistic texts has less regard for tradition and has greater opportunities for self-presentation through various explicators of grammatical semantics of personality through various linguistic means.

¹⁰ Ponomarenko, V.P., *Vtorynna nominatsiia u zaimennykovii sferi // Indoieuropeiska spadshchyna v leksytsi slovianskykh, baltiiskykh, hermanskykh i romanskykh mov: semantychni ta slovotvirni zviazky i protsesy*. Kyiv: Publishing house of Dmitry Burago, 2013, pp. 483-484.

¹¹ Matviyas, I.H., *Syntaksys zaimennykiv v ukrainskii movi*. Kyiv: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962, p.19.

A special kind of the author's *we are* inclusive. In this case, the performer of the action is the speaker who tries to involve the addressee(s) of the speech in the active perception of their actions. The author's inclusive *we* is actively used in pedagogical discourse, for example: *(We) will solve a similar equation; (We) will determine the area of the rectangle; (We) will consider another case.* Formation of the author's *we* inclusive, which is characterized by dialogue, involvement of the imaginary addressee in the explanation, H. Naenko notes in the scientific texts of the middle Ukrainian period (XVI-XVIII centuries). Such a model is given by translated samples, which were distributed in educational institutions, for example, in the "Dialectics" of J. Damaskin. As defining for academic discourse, it is also inherent in the Latin-language training courses of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, in particular in Stefan Yavorsky's and Heorhiy Konyssky's¹².

In scientific discourse, inclusive *we* is an instrument of objectification, since the author involves the reader or listener in his own observations and conclusions, for example: *As an example, (we) will consider generalizations in the theory of groups of concepts of "unit" ("single element") and "product" (M. Popovych); As (we) see, in this sense, the absolute imperfection of the first two options is combined with the correlation of the other two (M. Kalko).* We can perform the same function in a nonfiction text, for example: *(We) will suppose that the Prolitfront was not pressured and forced to disband (M. Khvylovyi); The result (we) can observe live (From the journal).*

Due to its function to ensure the interaction of the speaker and the addressee of the inclusive language, *we* are not perceived as a tribute to an outdated tradition. As a result of the democratization of the educational process and the reduction of the social distance between teacher and student, teacher and student, *we* are of particular relevance to the Ukrainian pedagogical culture.

The pluralis maiestatis *we* (honorative *we*) is much less common in the Ukrainian language. It is used occasionally in fiction texts, for example: *"Willing or not willing to give, // We will order to tear up! - // Lion was saying.* – heading the state. It survived during the period of sole rule and has become a tradition that has been learned in other countries. On the other hand, the tradition of using the Latin *nos* (we) in the meaning of maiestatis is derived from the triumvirates of the 1st century. B. C. Its confirmed appearance dates from the middle of the III-IV centuries. (beginning with the reign of Emperor Mark Anthony Gordian and his son),

¹² Naienko, H., *Adresantnist naukovykh tekstiv serednoukrainskoho period.* Ukrainska mova. Vol. 2. 2012, p. 121–122.

and distribution – V c.¹³. Up to the XVIII century appraising *we* was used by the Ukrainian authorities to denote their high social status in society¹⁴.

M. Sulyma noted the significant difference between *we* honorative and author's, emphasizing the foreign origin of both and the ancient tradition of using the latter in Ukrainian book memorabilia¹⁵. In the modern Ukrainian language, honorative *we* can be considered the grammatical historicism used in the modern Ukrainian language only in the fiction style. This method of monarchical self-presentation did not become widespread in the Ukrainian language, nor was popular the idea of monarchical rule. In addition, the Ukrainian folk-linguistic tradition is not aware of honorative *we*. Instead, author's *we* has become traditional in scientific discourse, and its inclusive version is actively used as a tool for objectification. Consequently, *we* are on the far periphery of system of pronoun meanings that reveal aspects of Ukrainian social culture.

Characteristic of the Ukrainian culture of communication is also the use of *we* instead of *I* in order to actualize family belonging, in particular in situations of invitation to a house, yard or table, for example: *(We) welcome to our home!- the old lady graciously pronounced, opening the hinged door* (H. Kosynka); *(We) ask dear guests to the yard, – Fedor bowed and pointed to the wicket with both hands* (H. Tyutyunnyk); to involve a socially independent recipient of a speech (a child, a seriously ill or elderly person) in their own actions, for example: *Now (we) will boil porridge; During the walk (we) will buy bread*. As with the author's *we*, in such cases, the speaker diminishes the attention to his own personality.

In modern language, we also use *we* instead of *I*, when a speaker acts as an official of a particular organization, he wants to emphasize his involvement (*we* corporate), e.g.: *The value of an organization such as the Council of Europe is that we draw the conclusions of our analysis on real facts... (From the journal). Recently we have been in America, now, as last year, (we) will be touring in Russia (From newspaper)*.

An important component of traditional Ukrainian culture has been, and is, the cult of the family, a family that embraces adults and children, each of them feeling its representative. The usual questions for the Ukrainian village were *whose are you (masc.)? Whose are you (fem.)?* to identify a person; nicknames that applied to all members of a particular

¹³ Ponomarenko, V.P., *Vtorynna nominatsiia u zaimennykovii sferi // Indoieuropeiska spadshchyna v leksytsi slovianskykh, baltiiskyykh, hermanskykh i romanskykh mov: semantychni ta slovotvirni zviazky i protsesy*. Kyiv: Publishing house of Dmitry Burago, 2013, p. 484

¹⁴ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistoliarnoho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, p. 50.

¹⁵ Sulyma, M., *Ukrainska fraza. Korotenki nacherky*. Kharkiv: Rukh, 1928, p.21.

family; perceptions of wrongful personal conduct as a shame for the whole family, which could result in expulsion from it. All of these traditions have identified a tendency to weaken the individualization of the subject, which is demonstrated by the spread of *we* instead of *I*.

Strengthening the position of the collective *we* was caused by the dominant Orthodox religion for a long time in most of Ukraine, which is characterized by the leveling of the individual. At the time of the Soviet Union, the collective ascendancy over the individual was fueled by propaganda, a tool which became the so-called ideological *we*, actively used in nonfiction texts. The ideological collective *we*, on the one hand, personified responsibility, and on the other, created the illusion of everyone's involvement in wealth, well-being, etc.

In the Ukrainian linguistic-cultural tradition of the second person, the researchers first of all point out the opposition of *you* (sing.) and the polite (honored) *you* (pl.)¹⁶. V. Ponomarenko analyzed secondary meanings of pronouns in the historical aspect, which were formed in many Indo-European languages to politely point to the addressee of the speech. According to the scientist, "the two-stage structure of appeal, the formation of which took place in different languages at different stages of their development, became, without doubt, the most common type ..."¹⁷. The appearance of the polite *you* (pl.) in the Ukrainian language V. Ponomarenko dates back to the XIV century and indicates that it should not be considered as a borrowing: "one should rather speak about the influence from other languages caused by active and heterogeneous in content and character in international or interstate, and also interlanguage contacts". The polite plural formation may have been influenced by Polish, in which similar shifts occurred almost at the earliest among the Slavic languages"¹⁸.

Contradiction between *you* (sing.) and *you* (pl.) in modern Ukrainian is multifaceted: each of the components of the opposition is embodied in a number of variants that reflect a certain type of social parameters of speech interaction. Among the parameters relevant to the communication

¹⁶ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistoliarneho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, p. 62.

¹⁷ Ponomarenko, V.P., *Vtorynna nominatsiia u zaimennykovii sferi // Indoieuropeiska spadshchyna v leksytsi slovianskykh, baltiiskyykh, hermanskykh i romanskykh mov: semantychni ta slovotvirni zviazky i protsesy*. Kyiv: Publishing house of Dmitry Burago, 2013, p. 552.

¹⁸ Ponomarenko, V.P., *Vtorynna nominatsiia u zaimennykovii sferi // Indoieuropeiska spadshchyna v leksytsi slovianskykh, baltiiskyykh, hermanskykh i romanskykh mov: semantychni ta slovotvirni zviazky i protsesy*. Kyiv: Publishing house of Dmitry Burago, 2013, pp. 552-553.

flow, they distinguish between age ratios, which are realized in the meanings adult/non-adult, intimacy, embodied in meanings ours/other's, social status, which may be symmetrical and asymmetrical, and also take into account the formality/informality of the situation relations between communicators¹⁹. Although communicative interaction can be characterized at the same time by several parameters, the speaker chooses a method of pointing to the addressee according to the features he considers most important. For example, in an informal situation of communication with an addressee of the same social status, the speaker uses a form of honor because the addressee of speaking is older. This characteristic of the individual is crucial in terms of social culture. Recall the tradition in public transport of giving way to an older person, which is seen as a display of courtesy and respect.

Normally, close acquaintance, informality of circumstances, equality with a partner or his or her lower status and role, friendship, warmth, intimacy, familiarity of relations are typical for *you (sing.)* – communication²⁰. Now it is *you (sing.)* that has become widespread in addressing children to mother and father, grandfathers and grandmothers, although it is traditional for many regions of Ukraine to use plural forms for a senior interlocutor, for example: – *Why is it you, grandma, are eating so bad today?* (H. Tyutyunnyk); *The wife asks: "Mom, don't you (pl.) listen to the radio, I'll throw it away!"* (L. Kostenko). Using *you (sing.)* outside the family circle to an adult, especially an older person is a violation of communication. It can be seen as a manifestation of a superficial, familiar attitude, a demonstrative humiliation of the addressee of speech, an element of cursing. At the same time, verbal forms of the second person singular are typical for military and sports teams. In the case of symmetrical use *you (sing.)* indicates the minimum social distance between the interlocutors, but if *you (sing.)* is used only by one of them, it will be perceived as a manifestation of social dominance.

Somewhere in Ukraine, there is a respectable plurality not only for the second but also for the third person²¹: – *At least the dogs did not bite ... Give her some stick – grandmother Natalka **are worried**, obviously forgetting that you **is** not afraid of dogs and they do not bite you. **You your selves** told us how you was little, could not walk yet, climbed into Sirko's doghouse and fell asleep there ...* (H. Tarasyuk). According to P.

¹⁹ Yasakova, N., *Katehoriia personalnosti: pryroda, struktura ta reprezentatsiia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi*. Kyiv: NaUKMA, 2016, p. 243.

²⁰ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistoliarneho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, p. 63.

²¹ Kharchenko, S., *Zasoby vyrazhennia sponukannia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi: semantyko-syntaksychnyi i komunikatyvnyi aspekty*. Kyiv: Milenium, 2015, p. 206.

Houtzagers, the revered plural regarding third parties is extended in the range from Slovenian to the middle of the Ukrainian language territory and is typologically connected with a small social distance between persons and warm relations between them²². This archaic form, for the Ukrainian language, preserves the features of social culture inherent in our ancestors, for whom expression of respect for persons of higher social status was more important than for modern Ukrainians.

Using *you (pl.)* is typical for the official situation, as well as for informal communication in the direction of junior/senior, underage/adult, between adult strangers regardless of age and gender²³. Often, *you (pl.)* witness a much older interlocutor, higher social status. At the same time, the official *you (pl.)* marks not so respectful attitude of the speaker to the interlocutor as the formality of the situation. Even close acquaintances, friends or relatives in the official situation use the accepted form of pointing to the addressee, although in informal communication they use close *you (sing.)*. The speaker chooses the honored plural even when such attributes of the addressee of speech as adulthood and lack of close acquaintance are valid.

In some cases, *you (pl.)* do not express respect for the recipient of the broadcast. Using the plural form used instead of the usual close *you (sing.)*, the speaker can attest to the removal of the interlocutor from the circle of friends or ironically²⁴.

It is characteristic of Ukrainians to appeal to God as *you (sing.)* that can be interpreted as preserving ancient traditions, since there are no polite forms of plural in the Bible. For the modern speaker the use of *you (sing.)* in appealing to God seems logical because of the distinctive specificity of the addressee of speech. Opposition *you (sing.)* – *you (pl.)* reflects the differences regarding individuals as members of society. The divine person (absolute) not covered by social relations, is above them, and therefore the parameters by which the choice is made to appeal to *you (sing.)* or *you (pl.)* are not applicable to such addressee²⁵. In written form, the specificity of the sacred *you (sing.)*, pointing to God, is often conveyed with a capital letter, e.g.: *You (sing.), God, the key and the gate at the same time, // And I, as a constant in You(sing.)– knock* (E. Andievska); *I*

²² Houtzagers, P., *The honorific third person plural in Slavic*. Russian Linguistics. Vol.42 (1). 2018, pp. 3-26.

²³ Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., *Sotsialni katehoriï modusu v tekstakh epistoliarneho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, 2007, p. 61-62.

²⁴ Yasakova, N., *Katehoriia personalnosti: pryroda, struktura ta reprezentatsiia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi*. Kyiv: NaUKMA, 2016, pp. 252-253.

²⁵ Yasakova, N., *Katehoriia personalnosti: pryroda, struktura ta reprezentatsiia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi*. Kyiv: NaUKMA, 2016, p. 258.

asked *You* (*sing.*) for a source, and it jumped out of the ground in two steps ... (V. Herasimyuk). The special design of the pronoun codifies its special status among other means of pointing to persons. Thus, the system of pronoun values reflects not only the most important parameters of communicative interaction between members of the society, but also the religious beliefs of native speakers.

The emergence and development of polite forms of treatment is certainly connected with the social differentiation of native speakers, with the formation of ideas about the difference in social statuses and the importance of certain social characteristics and roles. Different languages may be dominant in the choice of destination method. In the Ukrainian linguistic-cultural community, age-related attitudes are the dominant characteristics: the older recipient is approached by *you* (*pl.*), despite the equality of social status, the same profession, etc.

Conclusions

Therefore, studying the phenomena of culture and the phenomena of language in the linguistic-cultural paradigm will help to deepen the understanding of the mental code of Ukrainians. The semantics and pragmatics of personal pronouns in a communicative act at the linguistic-mental level is a fragment of the Ukrainian linguistic picture of the world.

The choice of the addressee's self-representation and representation of the addressee/addressees explicated by the pronouns *I* and *we* depends on extra-linguistic factors (circumstances of communication, status-role relationships, social and psychological distance between the addressees) and linguistic traditions of the linguistic and cultural community. Since honorative *we* is not known to the Ukrainian folk-linguistic tradition, we qualify it as a foreign element in linguistic and cultural identification. Author's *we* has become traditional in the scientific discourse, and we use it inclusive option as an objectification tool.

Usual prescriptions are used by participants in a communicative act in using the pronouns *you* (*sing.*) and *you* (*pl.*). Nowadays, pronouns, as indicators of social culture, express both traditional values for the Ukrainian linguistic community (respectful treatment of elders, in particular, parents of higher social status), and new perceptions of norms of social interaction, which attests to the spread *you* (*sing.*)

The use of personal pronouns as special markers of individualization and self-identification is conditioned by the mental identity of Ukrainians and is one of the many elements of the identity code of ethnos information that depends on the specifics of the national world perception, the history of our people.

References

- Deyk, T.A., (1989), *Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya*. Moscow: Progress, p. 312.
- Houtzagers, P., (2018), *The honorific third person plural in Slavic*. Russian Linguistics. Vol. 42 (1). pp. 3-26.
- Kharchenko, S., (2015), *Zasoby vyrazhennia sponukannia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi: semantyko-syntaktychnyi i komunikatyvnyi aspekty*. Kyiv: Milenium, p. 206.
- Matviias, I.H., (1962), *Syntaksys zaimennykiv v ukrainskii movi*. Kyiv: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, p. 131.
- Naienko, H., (2012), *Adresantnist naukovykh tekstiv serednoukrainskoho period*. Ukrainska mova. Vol. 2. pp. 112–128.
- Ponomarenko, V.P., (2013), *Vtorynna nominatsiia u zaimennykovii sferi // Indoieuropeiska spadshchyna v leksytsi slovianskykh, baltiiskyykh, hermanskykh i romanskykh mov: semantychni ta slovotvirni zviiazky i protsesy*. Kyiv: Publishing house of Dmitry Burago, pp. 482-554.
- Radevych-Vynnyts'kyy, Ya. *Etyket i kul'tura spilkuvannya*. Kyiv: T-vo «Znannya», p. 291.
- Semashko, T.F., (2017), *Movna stereotypizatsiia sensorneho spryiniattia v ukrainskii linhvokulturi*. Kyiv, p. 37.
- Shynkaruk, V.D., Kharchenko, S.V., Zavalnyuk, I. Ya., (2019), *"Language-culture" dychotomy in formation of the mental sphere of ethnic consciousness and specificity of national world perception*. Bulletin of the National Academy of Management Personnel of Culture and Arts: Sciences. Kyiv: Idea-print, Vol.1. pp. 96–102.
- Sulyma, M., (1928), *Ukrainska fraza. Korotenki nacherky*. Kharkiv: Rukh, p. 97.
- Teleky, M.M., Shynkaruk, V.D., (2007), *Sotsialni katehorii modusu v tekstakh epistoliarnoho zhanru*. Kyiv, Mykolaiv: Pedagogical University named after Petra Mohyly, p. 176.
- Yasakova, N., (2016), *Katehoriia personalnosti: pryroda, struktura ta reprezentatsiia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi*. Kyiv: NaUKMA, p. 328.