



CULTURAL LINGUISTICS:  
THEORETICAL AND APPLIED ASPECTS  
ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ:  
ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ И ПРИКЛАДНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ

DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-424-439

EDN: GBLHRZ

Research article

**Linguistic and cultural foundations  
of verbal aggression in the Russian language**

Mariya L. Lapteva<sup>ID</sup>✉, Mariya A. Firsova<sup>ID</sup>

*Tatishchev Astrakhan State University, Astrakhan, Russian Federation*

✉ [hohlina2004@yandex.ru](mailto:hohlina2004@yandex.ru)

**Abstract.** The relevance of the research is determined by the insufficient study of the forms of aggression in the context of culture, as well as insufficient description of the extralinguistic prerequisites of aggression correlated with the subject area of culture, and intra-linguistic means and methods of cultural reference of aggression. The aim of the study is to identify the linguistic and cultural foundations of expressing aggression in the Russian language and to describe the means of its verbalization through the prism of the binary category “Own/ Other”, which is the basis of ethnic conflicts. To achieve this aim, the method of definitional, semantic, linguistic-cultural analysis, descriptive method was used. A sociolinguistic experiment was conducted. Methods of continuous sampling from lexicographic sources and of quantitative calculations of the responses received by the participants of the experiment were applied. The research material included: 1) a corpus of more than 50 lexical and phraseological units of the Russian language taken from dictionaries, which verbalize aggressive attitude towards “foreign” culture and “foreign” ethnos; 2) a range of ethnopholisms obtained in the sociolinguistic experiment among high school students in Astrakhan. It was determined that aggression in the Russian language has a culturological explanation: it is conditioned by identifying the ethnos according to the principle of “own – other”. The linguistic and cultural basis of aggressive semantics is the semantics of “alienness”, which is expressed by demonstrating an obviously negative attitude to “alien”, which is the object of an aggressive action. A special group of lexical means – linguistic and cultural markers of aggression – includes units, negatively characterizing representatives/artifacts of a “foreign” culture. Linguistic and cultural markers of aggression are ethnopholisms. Aggressive nominations of ethnic groups historically residing both far abroad and in the Russian multicultural region are equally relevant in the linguistic consciousness of young people. From extralinguistic positions, the consolidation and activation of hostile lexico-phraseological means in the language are conditioned by the intercultural historical contacts of nations which are currently being reflected in the jour-

© Lapteva M.L., Firsova M.A., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

nalistic discourse, in Internet communication. The perspective of the research is seen in the use of its results for developing the concept of overcoming speech aggression in the educational space, where the factor of hostility has hindered the education of a tolerant personality.

**Keywords:** Russian language, verbalization, linguistic culture, own, other, ethnonym, ethnophilism

**Article history:** received 11.03.2023; accepted 28.06.2023.

**For citation:** Lapteva, M.L., & Firsova, M.A. (2023). Linguistic and cultural foundations of verbal aggression in the Russian language. *Russian Language Studies*, 21(4), 424–439. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-424-439>

## Introduction

Aggression, which initially interested psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers, has become the object of linguistic cognition relatively recently. This article is devoted to the problem of revealing the linguistic-cultural bases of expressing aggression in the Russian language.

The problem seems to be relevant due to the anthropocentric orientation of most modern linguistic studies, where language, man and culture are inseparable. As we know, “language acts as a source of knowledge about culture and at the same time as a tool for its comprehension, at the same time culture cannot be understood without its correlation with the people taken as a whole” (Lapteva, 2016: 54).

The study of forms of aggression manifestation through the prism of culture correlates with identifying extralinguistic preconditions of aggression, connected with the subject area of culture; with establishing a set of intralinguistic means and ways of cultural referencing of aggression; with defining methods and results of studying and describing the cultural semantics of “aggressive” language units. Full answers to these questions have not yet been given in the linguistic science.

Aggression as a linguistic phenomenon has been studied by researchers of the XX–XXI centuries, from different scientific directions and with different approaches to the linguistic conceptualization of aggression and aggressiveness.

First of all, there is a terminological polyphony. Special word combinations “linguistic aggression” (Apresyan, 2003), “speech aggression” (Vorontsova, 2006), “verbal aggression” (Sheigal, 1999), “word aggression” (Dashkovskiy, 1995) are used, often interchangeable, in modern linguistic studies (see, for example: Shcherbinina, 2006). In foreign works we meet “obscene language” (Baudhuin, 1973; Dreizin, Priestly, 1982), “hate speech” (Baker Edwin, 2008; Strossen, 1995), “verbal aggression” (Agar-Hutton, 2003; Infante, Wigley, 1986). In this article we focus on the term “verbal aggression”, which means the verbal forms of expressing aggression in the language.

Aggression verbalization is associated with the semantics of enmity (see, for example, a lexicographic event – the publication of the “Dictionary of the actual lexicon of unity and enmity in the Russian language of the beginning of the XXI century” (Leonteva, Shchetinina, 2021), destructive semantics and is actualized by invective

tive or more widely – pejorative means, containing negative semantic emotional-evaluative semes, in other terms – conflictogenic lexicon. The authors give interpretations to the words that characterize the process of communication from the point of view of implementing strategies of agreement (cooperation) and confrontation, especially relevant for the sphere of intercultural communication.

In the semantic field of aggression, the concept of conflict overlaps with the concepts of norm and its violation, taboo and euphemization, tolerance and intolerance, communicative freedom, political correctness, etc.

The vectors of the study of verbal aggression are aimed at such major scientific fields as media linguistics, jurilinguistics, contrastive linguistics. In a large volume of works covering manifestations of speech aggression, it is media texts that are used as research material (Vorontsova, 2006; Starova, 2000; Cherkasova, 2011, etc.). Specialists in the field of jurilinguistics give legal qualification to manifestations of aggression in speech (Baranov, 2007; Brinev, 2009; Galyashina, 2003, etc.). Besides, emotiogenic texts are studied in cross-cultural aspect (Seliverstova et al., 2023) and manifestation of aggression is described on the material of different languages (Lazebnaya, 2007; Makovskiy, 2006; Faizullina, 2008, etc.). Communicative linguistics considers, among other things, means of expressing the strategy of discrediting and its “aggressive” tactics (Issers, 2008; Pekarskaya, 2009; Fedorova, 1991, etc.). Discursology as a separate direction of communicative linguistics is also engaged in the study of linguistic aggression. In particular, Z.K. Temirgazina and M.S. Bachurka study aggressive negative-evaluative speech acts in Russian pedagogical discourse (Temirgazina, Bachurka, 2017).

However, there have been no systematic studies aimed at establishing the connection between aggression in the Russian language, intercultural communication, “aggressive” verbal means of expressing attitudes to “foreign” culture.

So, **the aim of the study** was set – to identify the linguistic-cultural bases of expressing aggression in the Russian language and to describe the means of its verbalization through the prism of the binary category of “Other/Alien”, which is the basis of ethnic conflicts.

### Methods and materials

To achieve the aim and solve the research tasks, the following methods were used:

- descriptive, including techniques of observation, as well as linguistic interpretation and comparison of the collected linguistic material;
- definitional analysis, which was used to establish definitions of scientific concepts basic for the research;
- semantic analysis, which was used to examine the semantic structure of aggressive lexical units of the Russian language and to identify the “aggressive” components of their meaning;
- linguistic-cultural analysis, which allowed us to establish the cultural basis of aggressive semantics of linguistic units;

– sociolinguistic experiment, which was conducted among students of 9–11 grades of secondary schools of Astrakhan, who study in naturally formed multinational groups, since Astrakhan Oblast is a multicultural region, where historically from 120 to 200 peoples and nationalities live (according to different data). A total of 53 schoolchildren took part in the experiment. The respondents were offered the following form to fill in.

1. Are there names of the representatives of these nationalities in the Russian language?

2. Which of the names express disdain and are offensive? Put a minus sign next to this word.

The words are distributed in two columns: the first one contains ethnonyms denoting representatives of the far abroad, the second one – ethnonyms nominating residents of the near abroad countries (Table).

<b>Ethnonyms</b>	
<b>Far abroad countries</b>	<b>Near abroad countries</b>
Americans	Azerbaijanis
African Americans	Armenians
The English	Belarusians
Jews	Georgians
Europeans	Dagestanis
Italians	Kazakhs
The Chinese	Tatars
Germans	Uzbeks
Poles	Ukrainians
Turks	Chechens
The French	
Swedes	
The Japanese	

In addition, the method of continuous sampling from lexicographic sources and the technique of quantitative counting of the received answers from the experiment participants were used in the work.

The research material was a corpus of Russian lexical and phraseological means verbalizing aggressive attitude to “alien” culture and “alien” ethnicity. In total, we analyzed over 50 units from academic explanatory and phraseological dictionaries<sup>1</sup>. Textual examples were taken from the Russian National Corpus<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Dahl, V. (1995). *Explanatory dictionary of the living great Russian language*. Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.); Elistratov, V.S. (2000). *Dictionary of Russian argot*. Moscow: Russkiye Slovarei Publ. (In Russ.); Lapteva, M.L. (2019). “Alien” in “own” phraseological space: A cognitive dictionary-guide. Astrakhan: Sorokin Roman Vasilievich Publ. (In Russ.); Mikhelson, M.I. (1994). *Russian thought and speech: Its own and alien: Experience of Russian phraseology: A collection of figurative words and allegories*. St. Petersburg: Russkiye Slovarei Publ. (In Russ.); Ogoltsev, V.M. (2001). *Dictionary of stable comparisons of the Russian language (synonymic-antonymic)*. Moscow:

We also used linguistic materials of the sociolinguistic experiment, which allowed us to determine the range of ethnopholisms – one of the significant linguistic-cultural markers of verbal aggression.

## Results

The results of our linguistic-cultural research are the following:

1. Aggression in the Russian language has not only psychological, philosophical, sociological, but also culturological explanation: it is conditioned by identification of ethnos on the principle “own – foreign”. The object at which aggression is directed is the “alien” ethnos as a whole, a person as a representative of an “alien” culture or individual elements of a foreign culture.

2. The linguistic-cultural basis of aggressive semantics is the semantics of “foreignness” based on the concepts of “xenophobia” and “intolerance”, which are closely related to the concept of hostility and are expressed through the demonstration of an obviously negative attitude to the “alien”, which is the purpose of aggressive action.

3. A special group of lexical means, which are linguistic-cultural markers of aggression, consists of units negatively characterizing the representatives/artifacts of “alien” culture. The actual semes in the pragmatic component of the lexical meaning of such units are the following: “disapproval”, “disdain”, “humiliation”, “contempt”, “insult”.

4. Linguistic-cultural markers of aggression are ethnopholisms – “ethnic nicknames”, which often objectify negative hetero-stereotypical perceptions of Russian speakers. As the study has shown, aggressive nominations of ethnic groups living both in far abroad and in the historically established Russian multicultural region are equally relevant for the linguistic consciousness of young people.

5. From the extra-linguistic point of view, the consolidation and activation of hostile lexical and phraseological means in the language are conditioned by intercultural historical contacts between peoples, which have been built up over a long period of time, and nowadays are subject to reflection in publicist discourse and Internet communication.

6. The correlation of the materials of the experiment with lexicographically fixed non-literary units proves that only a part of “aggressive” nominations enters the active vocabulary of the language, while many lexemes are the result of the linguistically creative thinking of native speakers and have become widespread, most likely, in the process of functioning on the Internet. However, it is unknown whether they can become part of Russian lexical system. Nevertheless, their actualization in the linguistic consciousness of respondents indicates potential communicative conflicts that may arise between different ethnic groups.

---

Russkiye Slovari Publ., Astrel Publ., AST Publ. (In Russ.); Ushakov, D.N. (Ed.) (1996). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language*. Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>2</sup> Russian National Corpus. Retrieved from <https://ruscorpora.ru>

## Discussion

The boundary between “one's own” and “another's” is distinct in socio-cultural space, and this archetypical two-member category is presented as an opposition (dichotomy) of “one's” culture and “another's” culture in the broadest sense of the word “culture”.

When defining themselves and the other in terms of “Own/Alien”, native speakers often assess the “alien” negatively, thereby express a hostile attitude to those who do not fit into their ideas of norm, do not meet the standard of appearance, demonstrate different cultural attitudes, etc., and in general – are representatives of another ethnicity, people, other nationality and therefore can potentially become an object of aggression.

Within the framework of this study, we limited ourselves to the consideration of lexical and phraseological verbalizers of aggression directed against “strangers”. Both lexical and phraseological systems of language always react sensitively to the changes in the public consciousness and reflect them, accumulating in the language consciousness the worldview, and most importantly – the attitude of native speakers to the foreign culture, the “alien”.

Returning to the meaning of the word “aggression” in the source language (from Latin *aggressio* – ‘aggression’), in the study we will correlate the understanding of the aggressive unit of language (or speech) with the act of conscious or unconscious verbal attack, i.e. the expression of accusation, censure, criticism, reproach. At the level of lexical and phraseological semantics it is manifested, first of all, in the following connotative semes in the pragmatic component of the meaning of language units: “disapproval”, “neglect”, “humiliation”, “contempt”, “insult”. In the case of speech realization of aggression, the listed semes are actualized in one or another communicative situation (within the contextual usage).

### **Lexicographic data analysis**

We should note that various negative hetero-stereotypes, determined by the history of interethnic relations or peculiarities of the immediate ethno-contact environment, are the grounds both for negative nomination of everything that is connected with “alien” culture, and for naming new social phenomena that are thus subjected to verbal aggression.

Since the word has close ties with social action, the very fact of ethnonyms and other culturally marked linguistic signs functioning determines certain aspects of linguistic existence in conditions of contrast between cultures. Thus, “most often, phraseological units include components - names of such peoples whose way of life sharply differs from the life of the speakers of a given language” (Lapteva, 2016: 132). In particular, units with the component “Gypsy” reflect stereotypes about the behavior of representatives of this people, and the behavior clearly does not correspond to the social norm from the position of a Russian speaker:

the stable comparisons *nomad* (*wander, move, move from place to place; do not have a permanent shelter*), *like a Gypsy*; *bargain* (*dress up, exchange*) *like a Gypsy*<sup>3</sup> have the lexicographical marking “disapproving”. The phraseologisms *Gypsy life* and *Gypsy soul* (*nature*) may acquire negative semantic connotations in the process of speech abuse. For example: “*Privalov the elder was forced to make sure that Privalov the younger was an irrevocably lost man – as a man who felt a physical aversion to all labor and with a morbid thirst sought everywhere only pleasures. It was quite a **gypsy nature**: unsteady, restless and at the same time deeply apathetic*” (D.N. Mamin-Sibiryak. *Privalov's Millions*).

Negative-evaluative phraseological units with a foreign cultural component also include *American doll* – ‘one who hinders, irritates, makes somebody angry’<sup>4</sup>; *greedy as a Jew* – ‘a very greedy, stingy person’<sup>5</sup>; *rotten West* – ‘an indication of the known difference in the development of Russia and the Western countries’<sup>6</sup>; *a real Italian* – ‘a rascal’<sup>7</sup>; *a Chinese doll* – ‘a self-righteous and limited person’<sup>8</sup>; *like in a Turkish bazaar* – ‘a noisy place where disorder reigns’<sup>9</sup>; *what a Turk!* – ‘a stupid, shallow, poorly perceptive person’<sup>10</sup>; stable expressions: *Beat the Jews, save Russia! Hands off Cuba! The Russian gave the German a kick in the ass! An uninvited guest is worse than a Tatar*, etc.

Let us recall aggressive lexical units, for example, *tsyganshina* (a noun form *tsygan* ‘Gypsy’) – in its direct meaning it is a disapproving name for ‘style of vulgar and sentimental songs and their performance, created in imitation of gypsy melodies and gypsy manner of performance’<sup>11</sup> and *tsygancha* – pejoratively derogatory from the ethnonym *Gypsy* – ‘people of Indian origin living in various countries of the world, as well as persons belonging to this people’<sup>12</sup>. For example, in discussions on one of the forums we meet: 1) *This **tsygancha** jumped on her [the conductor] and said brazenly, “We won't pay, we don't have any money”*. 2) *It seems that Ukhta has not had such a pilgrimage of **tsygancha** for a long time*<sup>13</sup>. In addition, the lexeme *infotsygane* ‘noun from information + Gypsy’, which has not yet been reflected in academic dictionaries, but is widely used to name people who earn money on the Internet from naive subscribers by offering

<sup>3</sup> Ogoltsev, V.M. (2001). Dictionary of stable comparisons of the Russian language (synonymic-antonymic) (p. 745). Moscow: Russkiye Slovarei Publ., Astrel Publ., AST Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>4</sup> Lapteva, M.L. (2019). “*Alien*” in “*own*” phraseological space: A cognitive dictionary-guide (p. 16). Astrakhan: Sorokin Roman Vasilievich Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. P. 68.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. P. 87.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. P. 92.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. P. 97.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. P. 154.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. P. 156.

<sup>11</sup> Ushakov, D.N. (Ed.) (1996). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language* (vol. 4, p. 1229). Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> News. Ukhta. Forum. (In Russ.) Retrieved March 29, 2023, from <https://uhta24.ru/forum/?id=1fb1k9op2y339870518>

them various training courses, services, and goods, as well as the derivative *infotsyganism*, which denotes the corresponding social phenomenon<sup>14</sup>. The ethnonym *Gypsy* plays a significant role in the choice of a naming unit for this category of people, since it is the semantics of deception, lying, and cheating, which underlie stereotypical perceptions of the Gypsy, that makes it possible to classify this lexical innovation as aggressive one, along with the already existing in the language *tsyganshina* and *tsygancha*.

The same group of aggressive lexical units – ethnonymic/toponymic derivatives – contains *amerikanshchina* (noun from *American*), *armiانشchina* (noun from *Armenian*), *italianshchina* (noun from *Italian*), *europaishchina* (noun from *European*), *evreishchina* (noun from *Jewish*). The word-forming means in each nominative unit is the suffix *-shchin-*, which is used to form either nouns that denote a domestic or social phenomenon with the attribute from the motivating adjective (*amerikanshchina* – ‘something American, produced in the USA, characteristic of Americans and their culture’; *armiانشchina* – ‘something Armenian, characteristic of Armenians and Armenian culture’; *europaishchina* – ‘something connected to Europeans, their languages, way of life, culture’; *evreishchina* – ‘something Jewish’; the word *italianshchina* has a narrower primary meaning, in contrast to the meaning of words with similar structure – ‘formulaic methods of Italian music (sweetness of melody, abundance of formal adornments with poverty of musical content) in a musical work, mainly in opera’<sup>15</sup>, or nouns with a secondary collective meaning (*inostranshchina* – ‘anything foreign, “alien” ’). Note that all words convey negative meanings in modern Russian and express disapproving attitudes towards objects of “alien” culture. For example: *Let's pay attention to an “external” detail: there are a lot of foreign words in the language of the first chapter of the novel. What is all this inostranshchina here for? Is it by chance?*<sup>16</sup>

The units *nemetchina* and *asiatchina* behave differently in the language.

The lexeme *nemetchina* (*nemetchina*) is recorded in M.I. Michelson's dictionary “Russian Thought and Speech” in an allegorical meaning without any stylistic marking – ‘foreign, non-Russian (about territory, manners)’<sup>17</sup>. At the same time, the word *asiatshchina* (*aziyatshchina*, *asiatchina*) is noted in the same dictionary as denoting ‘the opposite of European customs, i.e. rude; lack of civilization’ (note the lexical means of expressing aggression towards “strangers” –

<sup>14</sup> Sidnev, D. (2022, 18 February). The State Duma proposed to create a register of “infotsygans”. *Obozrenie*. (In Russ.) Retrieved March 29, 2023, from <https://oboz.info/v-gosdume-predlozhili-sozdat-reestr-infotsygan/>

<sup>15</sup> Ushakov, D.N. (Ed.) (1996). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language* (vol. 1, p. 1265). Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>16</sup> Gukovsky, G.A. (2000). *Study of literary work at school: Methodological essays on methodology*. Tula: Avtograf Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>17</sup> Mikhelson, M.I. (1994). *Russian thought and speech: Its own and alien: Experience of Russian phraseology: A collection of figurative words and allegories* (vol. 2, p. 45). St. Petersburg: Russkiye Slovarei Publ. (In Russ.)



*Asiat (aziyat)* (allegorically) – ‘rude, ill-mannered person’ and *Asia!* – ‘backward people, backward country’<sup>18</sup>. The word retains its negative connotations in modern usage (‘lack of culture’, ‘cultural backwardness’, ‘rudeness’ and ‘harshness’), and the same negative semantic components enter the meaning of the word *nemetchina*. Already in the dictionary edited by D.N. Ushakov we find a figurative meaning – ‘everything German (about manners, habits, way of life)’, provided with the mark “disapproving”<sup>19</sup>. Let us compare: 1) “*Idleness, passivity, drunkenness, low level of intellect, meanness, hypocrisy, herd feeling and many other things accompany Asiatschina*”<sup>20</sup>; 2) *The country was pressed by Nemetschina, eaten by the landlord, oppressed by the patriarch* (A. Vesely. Russia, washed in blood).

Words like *tsygancha* and *nemchura* are close to ethnopholisms – unofficial names (nicknames) of peoples and nationalities (see: Berezovich, Gulik, 2002; Korobkova, 2009; Fofin, 2008, etc.) and also have a pronounced aggressive, i.e. pejorative and insulting character. For example: 1) “*Parasite, sitting on our neck with your hordes, idler, you can make nothing but children, henpecked, cursed nemchura!*” (A. Rybakov. Heavy sand); 2) “*All the best cursed nemchura defiled – he sighed as we sigh remembering lost purity and innocence*” (S. Danilyuk. Business Class).

We should note that the jargon speech (argot) contains, according to our calculations, more than 50 such units recorded in the “Dictionary of Russian argot”<sup>21</sup>: american, bundes, evreets, zerbud, italiakha, nosan, petlyurovets, phinik, chuchmek, shashlik, etc.

All the above linguistic units, in our opinion, can be referred to linguistic-cultural markers of aggression. The fact of recognizing the “otherness” of a stranger, which is accentuated in speech both in a situation of intercultural contrast and in intracultural communication, becomes one of the factors provoking aggression.

### **Analyzing the results of the sociolinguistic experiment**

As part of the research, we conducted a sociolinguistic experiment to determine the degree of familiarity of native speakers with ethnopholisms. We emphasize that it was important not to find out the degree of usage of this or that aggressive unit, but to determine whether it enters the linguistic consciousness of the recipient. This could indirectly indicate the level of the recipient’s linguistic aggression towards the representatives of “foreign” people.

Let us analyze the obtained groups of ethnic nominations according to two parameters: 1) by the degree of linguistic reflection, determined by the number of

<sup>18</sup> Mikhelson, M.I. (1994). *Russian thought and speech: Its own and alien: Experience of Russian phraseology: A collection of figurative words and allegories* (vol. 1, p. 9). St. Petersburg: Russkiye Slovare Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>19</sup> Ushakov, D.N. (Ed.) (1996). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language* (vol. 2, p. 518). Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>20</sup> Society Memory. *LiveJournal*. (In Russ.) Retrieved March 30, 2023, from <https://pamyat-rfo.livejournal.com/50211.html?ysclid=503796648>

<sup>21</sup> Elistratov, V.S. (2000). *Dictionary of Russian argo*. Moscow: Russkiye Slovare Publ. (In Russ.)

received ethnopholisms; 2) by the degree of respondents' familiarity with ethnopholisms, determined by the occurrence of this or that ethnopholism in the subjects' answers.

According to our data, the Japanese are subjected to the greatest linguistic reflection. We recorded 14 unofficial lexemes denoting this nation: *Japs, narrow-eyed, Asians, animeshniks, animenshiks, anime freaks, anime women, kamikazes, fetishists, sushists, Chinese, tanks, korsaks, yellow-ass*. However, of the listed units only the first three are frequent: *Japs* – 11 uses, *narrow-eyed* – 5 uses, *Asians* – 4 uses. The other units occur no more than 2 times in the respondents' answers. It was the frequent units that were marked by the participants of the experiment as units that are offensive.

Jews receive 12 designations: *Yids* (6 uses), *greedy* (4 uses), *Judaeus* (3 uses), *goyim, geniuses, rich kods, hot people, thieves, eels, freaks, they are people too, curlies, shashlyks (shashlychki)*. In our opinion, the received lexical nominations cannot indicate a high level of aggression towards representatives of this nationality. Most of the presented units have an ironic or humorous connotation. This is confirmed by the fact that out of 53 participants of the experiment only 6 could remember the disparaging unit “Yid”, hence irrelevant for the linguistic consciousness of modern youth.

The English are also characterized by a total of 12 lexemes, which occur in the answers, however, sporadically: *pindos, footballers, Britons, tea drinkers, tea swallowers, chaikushi (from 'tea'), chaevniki (from 'tea'), Angles, Saxons, Saxe, drunkards*.

The Chinese are nominated by 10 ethnopholisms – *Chinks* (10 uses), *narrow-eyed* (8 uses), *Japanese, Asians, yellow-skin, yellow-ass, yellow-faced, yellow-bellied, Aliexpress, Kazakhs*.

Europeans are defined by 9 single ethnopholisms – *Muscovites, Europoids, scavengers, drunkards, enemies, Pindos, whites, gayropeans, half-pokers*.

Nine informal names are also noted for each of the following ethnic groups:

African Americans – *Negroes* (21 uses), *niggers* (5 uses), *blacks* (4 uses), *black-skin, dark-skin, chocolatiers, pindos, nigga, black-ass*.

Italians – *maccaroners* (6 uses), *italiashkas* (4 uses), *mafiosi, pasta-eaters, spaghetti (spaghettniki), parmesano, pepperoni pizza, pizzeria*.

Next, let us list the ethnic groups, which are represented by a small number of ethnopholisms, but some recorded units are characterized by high frequency.

Americans (6 ethnopholisms were recorded) – *pindos* (19 uses), *amerikos* (15 uses), *yankees* (5 uses), *westerners, americashki, creeps*.

French (7 ethnopholisms in total) – *frogmen* (10 uses), *freaks, baguettes, francs, fashionistas, croissants, batons*.

Germans (7 ethnopholisms in total) – *fascists* (14 uses), *Fritz* (5 uses), *Nazis, Naziks, Germanics, schnitzel, Aryans*.

The last subgroup includes ethnic groups whose unofficial nominations were not familiar to all respondents. The respondents gave few answers.

Poles – *kurva* (9 uses), *Przeki*, *khokhly*, *szlachta*.

Turks – *Mongols*, *Ottomans*, *Erdogans*, *Khachi*, *churks*, *kebabs*.

Swedes – *Vikings*, *rich people*, *hockey players*, *Livonians*, *Nords*.

Frequent aggressive ethnic nominations include such lexical units as *Negroes* – to denote African Americans, *Pindos* and *Américos* – to denote Americans, *fascists* – as a nomination of Germans, *frogmen* – as a nomination of the French and *kurva* – as a nomination of Poles.

Such results generally correspond to the fact that at present the relations between Russia, the USA and European countries are experiencing crisis, the current socio-political situation and the international situation are stressful.

While the lexeme *Negro* is nothing, but a long-standing quasi-stereotype known to young people, the lexeme *Pindosy* has established itself on the Internet and in other spheres of communication relatively recently and is used in relation to North Americans (cf.: *Pindostan* – “the United States of America”, variants: *Pindosia*, *Pindossia*, *Pendosia*). In the materials we received, this ethnopholism was used by respondents not only in relation to Americans, but also in relation to Ukrainians, Englishmen, African Americans and Europeans in general.

B.Ya. Sharifullin traces the origin and usage of this lexeme starting from the XIX century (Sharifullin, 2016: 349–350). In the XX century, the widespread meanings of this word “were first – any southern foreigner, and later, as a consequence, also – physically and morally weak, uninteresting person, weakling, wastrel. It is the latter meaning of this word (sometimes, due to the peculiarities of slang spreading, sounded as – *pendos*<sup>22</sup>) that became the most widespread in Russian speech” (Sharifullin, 2016: 350).

The second group is formed by direct interethnic contacts, which are verbalized by the following lexical units (ethnic groups are listed according to the degree of reduction of linguistic reflection):

Azerbaijanis (12 ethnopholisms) – *aziks* (10 uses), *churkas* (9 uses), *azers* (6 uses), *Baku settlers*, *khachi*, *allo asia*, *azerbots*, *chuchmeks*, *tajiks*, *korsaks*, *beauties*, *newcomers*.

Chechens (11 ethnopholisms) – *Czechs* (12 uses), *churkas* (8 uses), *noncha*, *cheshkas*, *khachi*, *Chechens*, *Kadyrovtsy*, *bearded*, *Turks*, *offended*, *chuchmeks*.

Uzbeks (11 ethnopholisms) – *churki* (5 uses), *gastarbeiters* (4 uses), *korsaks*, *shpaks*, *gasters*, *khachi*, *workers*, *plov*, *black-faced*, *newcomers*, *nasvaishiki*.

Armenians (9 ethnopholisms) – *churkas* (6 uses), *ara*, *armyashi*, *ararats*, *khachi*, *Armyashki*, *Aramchiki*, *mountains to the right*, *brothers*.

Kazakhs (8 ethnopholisms) – *korsaks* (10 uses), *mambets*, *khachi*, *narrow-eyed*, *kumysychi*, *kazakhtar*, *kalaysy*, *churki*.

Ukrainians (8 ethnopholisms) – *khokhly* (34 uses), *ukropy*, *bandera*, *ukropchiki*, *nationalists*, *pindos*, *banderovtsy*, *brothers* (2 uses).

<sup>22</sup> Emphasis added by us, because in this orthographic form it is more often found in our materials.

Georgians (7 ethnopholisms) – *khachi* (5 uses), *churki* (5 uses), *bijo* (3 uses), *gogi*, *workers*, *mountains to the left*, *araratun*.

Dagestanis (7 ethnopholisms) – *dagi* (18 uses), *churki* (8 uses), *Muscovites*, *beasts*, *khachi*, *korsaks*, *ara*.

Tatars (7 ethnopholisms) – *korsaks* (5 uses), *tatarlar*, *epochmak*, *Muslims*, *churki*, *nogai*, *cunning ass*.

Belarusians (6 ethnopholisms) – *potatoes* (5 uses), *whites*, *bulbashi*, *slavs*, *brothers*.

Frequent aggressive ethnic nominations include such lexical units as *Aziks* and *Azers* – to denote Azerbaijanis, *Czechs* – to denote Chechens, *Khokhols* – as a nomination of Ukrainians, *Khachi* – as a nomination of Georgians and *Dagi* – as a nomination of Dagestanis. All units are widely used, marked with “minus” in the respondents' answers and can be designated as lexical markers of the level of anxiety and tension of intercultural contacts.

It is necessary to note 2 aggressive lexemes, which with different degree of frequency were met in the respondents' answers to designate persons from Central Asia and the Caucasus, Kazakhs and Tatars historically living in Astrakhan oblast – *korsaks* and *churki*. In M. Fasmer's “Etymological Dictionary”, the unit *korsak*, borrowed from Kazakh and Kyrgyz, is also given in the meaning of ‘local name of Kazakhs’<sup>23</sup>, widely spread in the Astrakhan region. In V.I. Dal we find: “In Astrakhan it is the name of Kirghiz or Kaisaks”<sup>24</sup>. The word is actively used in modern speech to insult representatives of non-Slavic peoples and, in addition, in colloquial speech in the sense of ‘dumb, limited, incomprehensible person’. For example: *Well, you're a korsak, you can't make sense of anything* (from oral speech).

Negative connotations are assigned to the lexeme *churka* (*churak*). In V.I. Dahl, the word is fixed in the meaning of ‘dumb, clumsy man’, the same word is given with the Vologda marking. ‘Born out of wedlock’<sup>25</sup>, i.e. “alien”, which could later become a cognitive basis for fixing this nomination to representatives of an “alien” culture.

Even though the overwhelming majority of the recorded ethnopholisms denoting Ukrainians, according to the data of the experiment, have a negative, disparaging and insulting character, we found 2 uses of the positively colored nomination “brothers” in the materials. The same lexeme is used for Belarusians, in relation to whom we have not recorded a single aggressive lexeme.

From the linguistic-cultural point of view, we should note that the nomination of persons belonging to one or another nationality is based on certain cultural

<sup>23</sup> Fasmer, M. (1986). *Etymological dictionary of the Russian language* (vol. 2, p. 338). Moscow: Progress Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>24</sup> Dahl, V. (1995). *Explanatory dictionary of the living great Russian language* (vol. 1, p. 170). Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

<sup>25</sup> Dahl, V. (1995). *Explanatory dictionary of the living great Russian language* (vol. 2, p. 615). Moscow: TERRA Publ. (In Russ.)

codes, i.e. sources of the cultured worldview, which serve as a basis for the cultural interpretation of the linguistic image. Thus, the gastronomic code serves as a kind of “building material” for ethnic nominations: the lexemes *kebabs*, *sushis*, *croissants*, *spaghetti*, *baguettes*, *echpochmak*, etc., are humorous and are not marked by respondents with a “minus” sign, i.e. they are not perceived as offensive. At the same time, some nominations based on cultural code are aggressive, for example, *maccaronists*, *frog-eaters* (they are marked with “minus” in the respondents' answers), which is probably explained by the significant difference in gastronomic preferences of the peoples.

The anthropomorphic code is subjected to comprehension in the context of culture, since many nominations of “alien” ethnic groups are based on the indication of certain features of appearance characteristic of their representatives: *bearded*, *narrow-eyed*, *black-skinned*, *yellow-faced*, and others.

Some ethnic nominations are determined by such cultural codes as landscape (*mountains to the right*, *mountains to the left*, *Araratians*) and religion (*Muslims*). In addition, historical experience should be mentioned as a separate source indicating the connection between the image of ethnicity and the form of worldview of Russian language speakers (e.g.: *Vikings*, *Szlachta*, *Livonians*, etc.).

Demonstrating the insignificance of a particular people for the national consciousness, respondents named representatives of this or that nationality with other ethnic nominations. Let us compare: *Mongols* as a designation of Turks, *Chinese* as a designation of Japanese, *Kazakhs* as a designation of Chinese, etc.

Having compared the data obtained as a result of the sociolinguistic experiment with lexicographic data, we found that only a part of the recorded lexical units is fixed in dictionaries, i.e. it is part of the system of the national language (even if not in its literary variety), the other part is of occasional character.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that it laid the foundation for a linguistic-cultural approach to the study of the phenomenon of aggression, which finds different ways of expression in the Russian language and is actualized in speech.

## Conclusion

The linguistic-cultural aspect of the conducted research has shown that the basis of linguistic aggressive semantics is the conflictogenic nature of intercultural and interethnic communication, which determines linguistically expressed intolerance.

Verbal manifestation of aggression is a whole layer of lexicon and phraseology. The very existence of them in the language and in the linguistic consciousness of members of the linguistic-cultural community testify to aggressive tendencies characteristic of the field of conflictogenic nominations. Such semantic field is formed by numerous negative ethnic nominations (“ethnic nicknames”, ethno-pholisms), which are directed against the representatives of “alien” culture.

The prospect of the study, in our opinion, is connected with the use of its results in developing the concept of overcoming speech aggression in the educational space, where the hostility factor has a negative impact on establishing inter-ethnic contacts and prevents the formation of a tolerant personality.

### References

- Agar-Hutton, R. (2003). *How to deal with verbal aggression*. London: Troubador.
- Apresyan, V.Yu. (2003). Implicit aggression in language. *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies: Proceedings of the International Conference "Dialog 2003"* (pp. 32–35). Moscow: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.)
- Baker Edwin, C. (2008). Hate speech. *Extreme Speech and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baranov, A.N. (2007). *Linguistic examination of the text*. Moscow: Flinta Publ., Nauka Publ. (In Russ.)
- Baudhuin, E.S. (1973). Obscene language and evaluative response. An empirical study. *Psychological Reports*, (32), 399–402.
- Berezovich, E.L., & Gulik, D.P. (2002). Homo ethnicus in the mirror of language: On the methodology of description. *Etnolingwistyka: Problemy Jzyka i Kultury*, (14), 47–67. Lublin: Uniwerstytetu Marii CurieSkłodowskiej. (In Russ.)
- Brinev, K.I. (2009). *Theoretical linguistics and forensic linguistic expertise*. Barnaul: ASU Publ. (In Russ.)
- Cherkasova, M.N. (2011). *Speech forms of aggression in mass media*. Rostov-on-Don: RSTU Publ. (In Russ.)
- Dashkovskiy, Kh. (1995). Verbal aggression. *Nauka i Zhizn'*, (6), 99–101. (In Russ.)
- Dreizin, F., & Priestly, T. (1982). A systematic approach to Russian obscene language. *Russian Linguistics*, 6(22), 233–249.
- Faizullina, A.G. (2008). *Functional aspect of invective composites in multistructural languages*. Kazan: KFU Publ. (In Russ.)
- Fedorova, L.L. (1991). Typology of speech influence and its place in the structure of communication. *Voprosy Yazykoznaniya*, (6), 67–82. (In Russ.)
- Fofin, A. I. (2008). Russian and French ethnopholisms as verbal signs of national intolerance. *Vestnik Irkutskogo Gosudarstvennogo Lingvisticheskogo Universiteta*, (1), 45–51. (In Russ.)
- Galyashina, E.I. (2003). *Fundamentals of judicial speech*. Moscow: STENSI Publ. (In Russ.)
- Infante, D.A., & Wigley, C.J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. *Communication Monographs*, (53), 61–69.
- Issers, O.S. (2008). *Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech*. Moscow: LKI Publ. (In Russ.)
- Korobkova, O. S. (2009). Hate speech indicators in ethnic membership nominations: sociolinguistic aspect. *Izvestia: Herzen University Journal of Humanities & Sciences*, (111), 200–205. (In Russ.)
- Lapteva, M.L. (2016). "Own" and "Alien" in the cognitive-discursive space of Russian phrasemics. Moscow: KNORUS Publ.; Astrakhan: AGU, Astrakhanskii Universitet Publ. (In Russ.)
- Lazebnaya, I.B. (2007). Ways of expressing speech aggression in English. *Herald of Chelyabinsk State Pedagogical University*, (8), 242–254. (In Russ.)
- Leonteva, T.V., & Shchetinina, A.V. (2021). *Dictionary of the actual vocabulary of unity and enmity in the Russian language of the beginning of the XXI century*. Ekaterinburg: Azhur Publ. (In Russ.)
- Makovskiy, M.M. (2006). *The phenomenon of taboo in the traditions and in the language of Europeans. Essence – forms – development*. Moscow: KomKniga Publ. (In Russ.)

- Pekarskaya, E.A. (2009). Speech and behavioral aggression as the cause of communication failures. *Vestnik IGLU*, (3), 170–174. (In Russ.)
- Seliverstova, E.I., Volkova, L.V., & Ma, X. (2023). An emotion-evoking text in cross-cultural aspect attitude and evaluation. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14(1), 260–276. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-1-260-276>
- Sharifullin, B.Ya. (2016). Onomastic games in Russian information warfare. *Ecology of Language and Communicative Practice*, (1), 328–353. (In Russ.)
- Shcherbinina, Yu.V. (2006). *Verbal aggression*. Moscow: KomKniga Publ. (In Russ.)
- Sheigal, E.I. (1999). Verbal aggression in political discourse. *Voprosy Stilistiki*, (28), 204–222. (In Russ.)
- Starova, O.E. (2000). Mass media as a source of aggression. *Applied Psychology and Psychoanalysis*, (2), 15–21. (In Russ.)
- Strossen, N. (1996). Hate speech and pornography: Do we have to choose between freedom of speech and equality? *Conferences and Symposia* (pp. 465–470). Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, School of Law.
- Temirgazina, Z.K., & Bachurka, M.S. (2017). Speech acts of an aggressive nature in pedagogical discourse. *Speech Genres*, (1), 51–57. (In Russ.)
- Vorontsova, T.A. (2006). *Speech aggression: Invasion of the communicative space*. Izhevsk: Udmurtskii Universitet Publ. (In Russ.)

#### Bio notes:

*Maria L. Lapteva*, Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Chairperson of the Chair of Modern Russian Language, Tatishchev Astrakhan State University, 20a Tatishcheva St, Astrakhan, 414056, Russian Federation. *Research interests*: cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, intercultural communication, lexical and phraseological semantics. ORCID: 0000-0003-2412-1299. E-mail: hohlina2004@yandex.ru

*Maria A. Firsova*, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of the Chair of Modern Russian Language, Tatishchev Astrakhan State University, 20a Tatishcheva St, Astrakhan, 414056, Russian Federation. *Research interests*: mediallynguistics, cognitive linguistics, intercultural communication, discourseology. ORCID: 0009-0008-3819-6586. E-mail: firsovamariaa@yandex.ru

DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-424-439

EDN: GBLHRZ

Научная статья

## Лингвокультурные основы вербальной агрессии в русском языке

М.Л. Лаптева  , М.А. Фирсова 

*Астраханский государственный университет имени В.Н. Татищева,  
Астрахань, Российская Федерация*

 hohlina2004@yandex.ru

**Аннотация.** Актуальность исследования определяется недостаточной изученностью форм проявления агрессии в контексте культуры, а также недостаточным описанием экстралингвистических предпосылок агрессии, соотносимых с предметной областью культуры, и внутриязыковых средств и способов культурной референции агрессии. Цель исследо-

вания – выявить лингвокультурные основы выражения агрессии в русском языке и описать средства ее вербализации сквозь призму бинарной категории «Свой/Чужой», которая лежит в основе этнических конфликтов. Для достижения поставленной цели использовался метод дефиниционного, семантического, лингвокультурологического анализа, описательный метод, проводился социолингвистический эксперимент, а также нашли применение метод сплошной выборки из лексикографических источников и прием количественных подсчетов полученных ответов участников эксперимента. Материалом исследования послужил корпус из более чем 50 лексико-фразеологических средств русского языка, вербализующих агрессивное отношение к «чужой» культуре и «чужому» этносу», и круг этнофолизмов, полученных в результате проведенного среди учащихся старших классов школ г. Астрахани социолингвистического эксперимента. В результате определено, что агрессия в русском языке имеет культурологическое объяснение: она обусловлена идентификацией этноса по принципу «свой – чужой». Установлено, что лингвокультурную основу агрессивной семантики составляет семантика «чуждости», которая выражается посредством демонстрации явно негативного отношения к «чужому», что и является целью агрессивного действия. Выявлено, что особую группу лексических средств, которые являются лингвокультурными маркерами агрессии, образуют единицы, негативно характеризующие представителей/артефакты «чужой» культуры. Доказано, что лингвокультурными маркерами агрессии являются этнофолизмы. В частности, для языкового сознания молодежи в равной степени актуальны агрессивные номинации этносов, исторически проживающих и в дальнем зарубежье, и в российском поликультурном регионе. Определено, что с экстралингвистических позиций закрепление и активизация в языке враждебных лексико-фразеологических средств обусловлены межкультурными историческими контактами народов, которые в настоящее время подвергаются рефлексии в публицистическом дискурсе и интернет-коммуникации. Перспектива исследования видится в использовании его результатов в разработке концепции преодоления речевой агрессии в образовательном пространстве, где фактор враждебности препятствует воспитанию толерантной личности.

**Ключевые слова:** русский язык, вербализация, лингвокультура, свое, чужое, этноним, этнофолизм

**История статьи:** поступила в редакцию 11.03.2023; принята к печати 28.06.2023.

**Благодарности:** Исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке РФН в рамках научного проекта № 23-28-10019 «Концепция преодоления речевой агрессии в образовательном пространстве Прикаспия» (2023–2024 г.).

**Для цитирования:** Лантева М.Л., Фирсова М.А. Лингвокультурные основы вербальной агрессии в русском языке // Русистика. 2023. Т. 21. № 4. С. 424–439. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-424-439>