

FAMILY COMMUNICATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE RUSSIAN VERBAL IDEAL: AXIOLOGICAL VIEW (BASING ON MATERIAL OF FAMILY CONVERSATIONS OF URAL TOWN COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE NATIVE SPEAKERS)

Alla A. Evtyugina^{1*}, Irina V. Shalina², Konstantin O. Shokhov³, Hairullo N. Tabarov⁴

¹Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Department of the Russian and Foreign Languages, Ekaterinburg, Russia, ²Ural Federal University named after the First President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Department of the Russian Language, General Linguistics and Verbal Communication, Ekaterinburg, Russia, ³University of Tyumen, Department of the Arts, Institute of Psychology and Pedagogy, Tyumen, Russia, ⁴Russian-Tajik (Slavonic) University, Department of Tajik Languages, Dushanbe, Tajikistan.

Email: ^{1*}alena.seven@mail.ru, ²irina_shalina@mail.ru, ³ko9mart@mail.ru, ⁴tabarov-64@mail.ru

Article History: Received on 25th July 2019, Revised on 01st September 2019, Published on 08th October 2019

Abstract

Purpose of the study: The topicality of the issue under study is caused by the interest to peculiarities of the Russian national routine verbal communication, and to constants and variables thereof. The goal of the article is finding certain peculiarities of family communication which are revealed against the background of the Russian verbal ideal.

Methodology: A leading approach to the investigation of this issue is linguo-culturological one which allows revealing value systems, apprehensions and stereotypes realized in family conversations of Ural town colloquial language native speakers and contributing to harmonization of communication between the family circle members, both close and distant.

Results: As a result of the undertaken analysis, it was found that communicators' socio-centric view of life is supported by the value sets on cooperation, the entourage's respect, jocosity, communicative confidence, and sociability; value of complicity to the family circle and family memory were revealed; the trend to direct valuation use was denominated; it was shown that it is the popular-tongue environment wherein apprehensions of Russian people about children's obedience, fate and justice are tied up ([Alapuro, R., Mustajoki, A., & Pesonen, P. \(Eds.\). \(2011\)](#)).

Applications of this study: Materials of the article can be of interest for researchers of the Russian communicative culture, colloquialisms, teachers of Russian language as a foreign language, specialists in scope of communication optimization, higher and secondary school teachers, people forming and perfecting skills of conflict-free communication within the Russian verbal ideal.

Novelty/Originality of this study: The authors established that participants of a family communication take definite verbal efforts for providing communicative concord and harmony supporting speech traditions flowing out from parents' families. The socio-centric mental outlook of speech partners is achieved through realization of conversational sets on cooperation, respect to close people, communicative confidence and frankness. Senior family members translate communicative stereotypes that are adopted in their parents' families.

Keywords: *Russian verbal ideal, colloquial linguistic culture, value attitudes and apprehensions, national-cultural constants.*

INTRODUCTION

The man and culture are treated as phenomena internally correlated and perceived through each other. Being "a complex of organized forms, spiritual processes and states of a man and his activities" ([Lobão, J., & Pereira, C. 2016](#)), the culture becomes also a medium of people's speech existence ([Machado, A. D. B., Souza, M. J., & Catapan, A. H. 2019](#)). This medium forms and renovates a man as a communicative personality the result of self-perception and self-conscience whereof will be various cultured apprehensions ([Zare, Z. 2015; Bakhshandeh, M., Sedrposhan, N., & Zarei, H. 2015](#)), value attitudes and ideals as components of the culture's spiritual code conditioning the verbal behavior of the national-cultural community carriers.

"The man's capability to create global social ideals" is his universal ontological feature. Being the culture's function, a man becomes a carrier and exponent of its apprehensions, attitudes, values, work methods, communication forms fixed in cognitive structures, categories of thinking and, even wider, spiritual practices. Culture not only creates the man but is also created by him: he cultures his living space, tills the cultural reality converting the social generational experience into individual one, and vice versa. "Culture is orientation, and the culture is always oriented to a certain ideal, more clearly, on an ideal which goes beyond the borders of the individual to the community ideal".

The category of the ideal can be treated as a cultural value. Under cultural values, "meanings of internal categories and directives of the culture" are implied. An ideal as 'the perfect implementation, the best sample of something', filled with moral, aesthetic, communicative-pragmatical or other meanings, along with codes of conduct, national customs and traditions, is included into the conceptual filed of cultural values united by "the ability to project human strivings and renew the people's cultural heritage in generations". Cultural values are samples of general significance, spiritual

benchmarks having social significance ([Novikova, I. N., Popova, L. G., Shatilova, L. M., Biryukova, E. V., Guseva, A. E., & Khukhuni, G. T. 2018](#)).

“The Russian culture, in general, is communicative to a high extent” (Demytyev, 2016), thus the speech culture is the most essential component of the social environment’s culture; it “forms the standard and style of the public life”, singles out of good speech criteria, and demonstrates samples of verbal communication which are fixed in various communicative practices.

The object of our study is family communicative practices of Ural town colloquial language native speakers. Colloquial language as a subsystem of the Russian national language and variety of the “towny” speech is the unique material for developing of various scientific problems: properly linguistic, linguo-culturological, ethnolinguistic, socio-linguistic, the, etc. Under colloquial language we understand a form of existence of the Russian national language featured with non-conformance to the codified literary language standards. We treat the Ural colloquial language as a regional version of the general Russian colloquial speech. Native speakers of this colloquial language are town inhabitants, persons with a low educational level, people of different ages and occupations: high-skilled workers, small clerks, salesmen, housewives, pensioners. The social and linguistic non-uniformity allows distinguishing “old” and “young” colloquial language, to reveal its peculiarity both inside a vernacular group of persons (for instance, inter-generation family communication) and at the confluence of other social collectives. In Russia’s multicultural space of today, the colloquial, or popular, language occupies its strong social niche, in a peculiar way re-processing speech and cultural phenomena of our time ([Nisawa, Y. 2018](#)).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material of the Study

Our language material under study is verbal texts from conversations of Ural town colloquial language native speakers, inhabitants of Ekaterinburg, Asbest, Pervouralsk, Verkhnyaya Salda and other cities of Sverdlovsk Region. The texts were recorded by overt observation with the use of hidden and flush voice tape records. The vocal speech was transcribed and put down on scriptory media with support on the technique of furnishing of colloquial texts, which in general is successive to the technique designed by a team of scientists of the Russian Language Institute named after V.V. Vinogradov of the Russian Academy of Sciences and realized in the book “The Russian Colloquial Speech”. The transcription of conversations of Ural town inhabitants allowed to maintain specificity of the sounding dialect and colloquial language units (their literary analogs are given in parenthesis) ([Nisawa, Y. \(2018\)](#)).

Methods of the Study

Vital speech of city inhabitants heard in conditions of the routine informal natural person-oriented communication attracts scientists’ attention with its naturalness and vividness, spontaneous character of verbal actions of participants of communication, when they exercise various communicative rights and duties in process of verbal interaction, including rights for freedom of verbal self-expression and for the personalized attitude to the world. The lingua-culturological approach to the mentioned phenomenon allows to distract from linguistic errors and in corrections made by communicators and to focus on mentally and communicatively significant utterances which makes it possible to bring to light the ideas of what is proper, right and preferable from the social and personal point of view, to reconstruct value attitudes, stereotypes, taboos, prescriptions, cultural scenarios which a man or a social group are governed by. Town colloquial speech, in this case, is seen not as a linguistic pattern but as a linguistic culture, as “a special <...> mental-psychological and social world possessing a kind of a peculiar verbal conduct code”. The method of lingua-culturological reconstruction allows judging both the specificity of world outlook of members of the national cultural-linguistic community and about peculiarities of the national/personal axiological reality ([Haldane, J. \(Ed.\). \(2004\)](#)).

RESULTS

In our understanding, the verbal ideal is a mentally value-based construct focusing “the initial superior principles” (Petrov, 2008) a man is governed by in his verbal activity; generalized stable ideas about what is significant, correct and good in the verbal communication. These ideas can be both eternal and ephemeral.

It’s the family where a man receives his first communicative experience and verbal behavior habits. A family is the foundation of the society where a child’s self-consciousness is formed, his primary socialization occurs, and it is by right regarded as a “natural source for the creation of a cultural domestic environment”. It is a special world with its own value system wherein individual and collective bases combine. It is the family as an uneven-aged collective, as a community of people connected with each other by a bind of wedlock – parenthood – kinship, which is a treasurer of many values and traditions. The culture of intra-family conduct, including verbal, to a significant extent is realized under influence of those world-outlook and ethical attitudes which are transferred from senior family members to junior ones and is formed “on an example of senior and authoritative persons, through the acculturation process, and quite frequently through enforcement as well” ([Bassett, C., Steinmueller, E., & Voss, G. \(2013\)](#)).

Analysis of inter-generation relations of members of a “vulgar tongue” family collective shows that senior members who had passed their primary socialization in a peasant environment did not lose connection with the rural environment up to

now though they are city inhabitants for a long time already. The peasant approach to life is demonstrated by their translating of mental and communicative stereotypes and attitudes assimilated on parents' families. The sociocentric world perception outflowing from the folk culture is fixed, for example, in verbal stereotypes of the kind *to live hand in hand*, *to live cousinly* which are often objectified in narrative reminiscences of senior members of the family: *Mummy and Daddy lived hand in hand // We lived hand in hand with my good mother / cousinly / she loved us / and when we 'ould (would) come to her / she 'ould ask at once / "Verushka (here: a hypocorism of name Vera) / how you're gettin' (getting) on? Hope Tolya doesn't hurt you?" // Well, I always asked her so // "No, Mom / we've nothin' (nothing) to quarrel about. Nothin' (nothing) to brawl // Working' (working) / waitin' (waiting) for vacation/goin' (going) to you" (Stingl, A. I., & Weiss, S. M. (2015)).*

The mentioned stereotypes lean on the apprehensions that relatives strive to understand and respect each other; senior relatives try to forecast family complications and contribute to prevention thereof. Being cast into the attitudes accepted by all members of the family circle they form, for example, various practices which harmonize communication: choice of family appellatives and verbal etiquette formulas, family pow-wows, family talks. Cf.: (about the parents) *Mummy and Daddy called each other / "Man" / "Van"* (here: curtailed hypocorisms of names Mariya and Ivan, respectively) // *Just the same way // And so it is in our family "Verunchik" / "Tolyunchik"* (here: hypocorisms of names Vera and Anatoly, respectively) // *Daddy was well-bred around the bend // We in our family didn't even have such a word / "Go to hell" // (about the mother-in-law) Steps over the threshold / I'm rushin' (rushing) to her at once // First / first // "Well / mummy / how're you / let's be acquainted"! She hugged be and tears are rollin' (rolling) // And my Tolen'ka (here: a hypocorism of name Anatoly) was so loved in the family / they lived hand in hand, altogethah (altogether) //*

From the viewpoint of folk's ethics, the right to be called a family circle member is obtained, first, by birth; second, it is granted to a person whom one can ask for advice, confide, have a heart-to-heart talk with; third, this right is given to an interlocutor with whom one can recall the past, whom one may ask around about relatives, intimates, family legends, and stories, to have a talk "about everything on earth". Here is an example of talk between two elderly lady friends **F.** (73 years old) and **Z.** (75) who are recalling their usual friends and talks practiced with relatives ([Mokeyeva, E. V., & Andreeva, I. N. \(2016\)](#)):

F. *How's your auntie's health?*

Z. *Well... Naw (no) bad at all //*

F. *I wanna here ask around from her / ask for advice // Maybe / she'll tell somethin' 'bout (something about) my Dad // I think she knew him well // What's (what is) about me that I ne'er (never) asked her around somethin'? <...>*

Z. *Here I am, see / would 'ya (would you) know / I've got a kinda (kind of) need the other day // And I think / that well, Nastasya (about her sister), while she's alive / so that I could ask around even her // We... her and me / I'd come / and we'd begin 'bout (about) ev'rything / ev'rything, yes / and 'bout all townies 'bout // Or, well, somethin' (something) 'bout countrymen // And ev'rybody would here begin askin' her // Asked her / how's their names / well, complete ones / of Grandpa and Grandma, that's it / well, here she told me / who'n'where (who and where) was born, that's it / and 'bout Daddy she told, yea // By the by, they've got one birthday with Dad / their birthdays are on the same date / on twenty-second of December //*

F. *So, d'you recall back to him?*

Z. *For sure, yes! Here we come / at first have a drink for her health / gathering / then she'd say / "Let us drink for Zina's father! <...> //*

The above text is saturated with locutionary verbs: *ask around, ask, ask for advice, tell, recall back*. It allows reconstruction of a genre model of communication between relatives who are holding conversations both about the past and today's life. The communicative partners (*I – she*) are united by a need to know about *ours*: *I* initiate *questioning, query about* with interest (i.e. 'ask questions with a purpose to find out, clear out') details of the entourage's life, listen to with interest – *she* frankly and with details tells *about everything and everybody: names of persons, whoever and whenever was born, about Dad, about countrymen*, etc. The idea of value of the conversations which form the sensation of belonging to the family circle is supported in the communicators' conscience. Ethic norms of person-to-person interaction are manifested in these talks. The confident communication and the communicative mood are recognized as the most essential cultural value ([Csicsery-Ronay Jr, I. \(2011\)](#)).

Let's examine a fragment of a family inter-generation communication. The grandson **V.** (26 years old, an engineer) and his wife **N.** (24 y.o., a University student, work in a communal service) are visiting Grandmother **K.** (75 y.o.) and Grandfather **G.** (77 y.o.).

G. (addressing to **N.**) *What's about working in your office? Naw (no) bad?*

N. *Office work? Goes on and on / what would occur to it //*

G. (Jokingly) *Well, you're a kinda (kind of) boss there, naw?*

N. A beeg (big) boss, indeed (Laughing) //

V. The boss number two... from the end / yes?

G. Big one?! Have you got a black case? Or brown?

V. An ostrich hide briefcase //

N. Ye-a //

V. Foreign-made //

N. Lacquered //

G. When d'you have your vacation on plan?

N. In September //

G. And Vladik? In September too?

N. And Vladik too //

G. (Smiling) Oh-ho / 'ere (here) you'll go huntin'?

V. Hunting, yes //

N. Nana Klava / what's your blood pressure?

K. I say, here, you all / laugh on, it's up to you // Here I kept a fust (fast) / and felt better // A[h]a / well, better I felt // And as I began eatin' sausage a bit / butter a bit / here / worse I became // Mins (means) / I cannut (cannot) ead it (eat it) //

N. (with sympathy) What / at all you cannut (cannot)?!

V. Yes, you can / just in a moderate way //

K. Give it up / give up this staff at all // See (see you) / vessels 're crackin' // Well, what's that?

N. You have to strengthen your vessels / you need ascorutine // You know / buy it at the drugstore / like vitamin drops or sour pills / they make vessels better //

The relatives' cooperative interaction is manifested in the choice of various topics for discussion which are supported and developed by all communicators (work, vacation, health, etc.) and by the uniform alternation of the speech partners' conversational moves. New themes are initiated by both senior and junior members. The set on the speech partner's significance, the-other-centricity is realized by a genuine interest to the personal sphere of each family member which gives a feeling of belonging to the family group: *What's about working in your office? When d'you have your vacation on plan? ... you'll go huntin'? Nana Klava, what's your blood pressure?* The interest to the topic and interlocutors is supported by the selected tonality (the communication emotional-style form) – jocose, respectful, interested, or sympathetic, which correlates with the topic of the talk. For instance, the jocose-respectful tonality felt in G.'s question, is recognized by N. and supported by V., which confirms the unisonous nature of positive emotional reactions of the communicators: *Well, you're a kinda boss there, naw? – A beeg boss – The boss number two... from the end, yes?* The obsolete Soviet-era cliché of *a boss with a briefcase* creates the denotation of a person's high social status: it was men of senior management position who usually went on work with a briefcase. The same communicative-pragmatical sense is conveyed by the noun *office* in the meaning of 'clerk's occupation and his working place': *What's about working in your office?* These verbal devices are aimed at enlargement and hyper-correction of the grandson's wife image. The old man feels pleased about the fact that she is about to obtain higher education and has a good prestigious work ([Krechetova, S. Y., Karanin, A. V., Kudryavcev, N. G., & Kocheeva, N. A. \(2018\).](#)).

The confident communicative mood also speaks for the significance and importance of each member of the family as a personality. The need of K. to share the information about her physiological state with others (*Listen to me, here, you all / laugh on, it's up to you // Here I kept a fust and felt better //*) is conditioned not just by the necessity in an answer to the question but also by an inner motive to speak out, find her entourage's sympathy and receive any advice or direction from a man who is more competent in health issues.

The value-based attitude to care about a close person and his/her health is explicated by means of modal words with the meaning of oughtness *you have to, you need: You have to strengthen your vessels / you need ascorutine //*. Modal words allow constructing an utterance designating the normative coordinate system and value-based orientation of the speaker: N. believes that medicines and care about one's own health will prolong one's life.

The conversational move is also supported by a partial transition of the young men who have higher education to the popular language code. The conversation commonality is supported by use of colloquial verbal stereotypes *to work in the factory; go / to have a go in the factory*; colloquial and dialect units of the type *tausend* (thousand), *cannut* (cannot), 'ere (here), *vork* (work), *huh* (what):

K. *I need to go to hospital / I reckon //*

N. *Why, cannut (cannot) you go in the factory?*

V. *'ere (here), she didn't work in the factory //*

G. *She worked / in shop thirty-five! Well, just now ev'rybody (everybody) can go in the factory*

// The more so 'cause (Pause) our neighbour's here in the access control//

K. *And I really vorked (worked) / in this fodge (forge) shop there // This hammer, yes*

/ the heaviest one it was // Huh / 'ere (here) / forty-five tons 'twas (it was) / or hundred an' tweny

(and twenty) //

The value-based orientation on maintaining of strong family bonds, supporting of the family memory is manifested in actualization of the issue of marriage and wedlock ([Westfahl, G. & Yuen, W. K. \(Eds.\)](#)):

N. *And so you married / how old you were?*

K. *See, we registered on April tweny (twenty) four with him /after Ister (Easter) / just on Ister (Easter), well... // Ister was on April eighteen / and on May thirty-first I was tweny / and him tweny-two //*

N. *'ere (here), alright// Twenty years is alright, indeed //So, you have your anniversary in April // I say to Vladik / how 'twas (it was) / you're kinda (kind of) God-believers / and married in fasting-days / so it was // The Easter occurred to be those days / yes //*

K. *No, no... / not on Ister (Easter) we did //*

The senior family members who married not a long time ago (**N.** and **V.** are newly-married) regard the old folk who reached their “golden wedlock” years as an example to follow. The interest to details and circumstances of the event that had occurred a long time ago (the old folk’s wedding) (*And so you married / how old you were?... how 'twas / you're kinda God-believers / and married in fasting-days / so it was*) speaks for the value of the generational commonality.

The set on knowledge of the family chronology is supported by many family micro-teams. Let’s have examples:

I remember /mummy told / how she married // The dowry they carried on seven horses // She's got seven wood cases / very-very large / next a bit smaller / smaller / and the largest casket / Various values // Father would sit down one day 'n (and) say / “Well, Mummy / you rescued all the children // Due to your tresuries (treasures) our children survived” // There was the famine in nineteen thirty-three / and there Father sold her gold things in town / and bought bread / exchanged for salt / for bread //; Granny / tell us/ how you went to the town / to enter the training school / just in high boots //

Family communication between various generations allows revealing the conversational set for the balance of the informative and actual information. The ludic code, witty talk, teasing, on one hand, provoke a verbal partner for a predictable behavioral reaction (to embarrass, perform a counter-communicative move); on the other hand, they do not insult and humiliate the partner’s dignity, do not breach ethic interaction norms and do cause the common pleasure:

K. P. *I some 'ow (somehow) wanna (want to) regale you with bobbon (bonbon) pellets / with bobbons to regale you?*

N. *Granny / don't do it //*

V. *Na-na / we're fed up //*

K.P. *You too begin to eat less shugger (sugar)? Aha / refrain / or you'll have diabetes / at vunce (at once)//*

V. (Laughing) *No, we don't //*

N. *And this fellow (points out at V.) stows away ice candies every day //*

V. *Why / every day! Amazing me indeed!*

N. *Yesterday / the day before / and to-o-day (today) will eat ice candies too, for sure //*

V. *Yes, I will / and you – will you not?*

N. *I will //*

Everybody is laughing in unison.

One of the typical genres realized in colloquial communication is heart-to-heart conversations. To a higher extent, it specifies the Russian verbal ideal: “<...> to have *heart-to-heart* conversations is as understandable, natural and imbued with profound meaning for a Russian man as, to tell the *truth* and live up to the *truth*”. Reconstruction of cultural scenarios and constants of the popular-tongue linguistic culture which is regarded as a town version of the folk culture preserving conventional patriarchal values confirms that the set on frankness and directness is universalized in the Russian national

culture. Below we offer a fragment of a talk between the aunt **A.** (76 y.o.) and her niece **S.** (58 y.o.) who came to see her aunt from the city of Berezovsky to Ekaterinburg. The behavior of her son **S.** is one of subjects of their conversation.

A. (about her son **S.**) *Take pies with you for Slavka //*

S. *Auntie Nyura* (a colloquial form for the name Anna) / *I don't mind takin' (taking) jam for him / but he wouldn't hear anythin' and wouldn't do anythin' (anything) //*

A. *Awfully!*

S. *And wouldn't help nothin' (nothing) at all! So / as they say / I've got no wish to feed him //*

A. *And does he obey his ol' (old) man even a bit?*

S. *To Father, eyes / he does hear and is a bit afraid of / but not me //*

A. *Well... yes //*

S. *So you see / turns Father against me //*

A. *Why turning? Say to him / "Unhealthy man he is / why turnin' (turning) him against)?" //*

S. (waving her hand) *A-a-ah //* *And here he diddled out five hundred roubles of him, to buy trousers //*

A. *A svine (swine) of a man, indeed! Holy shit / oh hell!*

S. *Yes //* *A sly one, that's it / a sly one / and shrewd, that's it //*

A. *Oh / well, does he learn a bit / or no?*

S. *I know nothin' (nothing) / auntie Nyura //* *Here I go to work in the mornin' (morning) / and he / leaves too in mornin' //* *Then I come back / and he goes to Father //* *Goes to Father / so you say / at Father's //* *Hurries thru meals and then rushes to lads, don't know who they're //* *Comes back at nine o'clock only ev'ry (every) evening / and sits at his computer //*

A. *Lo and 'hold (behold)!*

S. *And drunk he comes //*

A. *Plus, tipsy he comes?!*

S. *Yes //*

A. *O-oh / what a mess!*

The set on communicative confidence forces **S.** to frankly narrate to her relative **A.** about the deviant behavior of her adolescent son. The colloquial expression *wouldn't hear anythin'* (anything) soaks up the general communicative-pragmatical sense which is implemented by minor verbal paradigm reconstructing a bad son's behavioral stereotype: *wouldn't help, wouldn't do anythin', turns Father against Mother, diddles out money, neglects schoolwork, comes home tipsy, always sits at his computer*. **S.** tells about her son hoping to speak out about her sore point and to receive moral support and advice from **A.** The unisonous character of emotional-evaluative reactions is one of vivid communicative sets that features a heart-to-heart conversation and contributes to harmonizing communication. It is this unisonous character that forms the modality of consent in the dialogue. The right for axiological liberty is realized by the speech partners in their choice of ethical evaluations of the subject amplified by the intensifier *that's it* and the reiteration (*a sly one, that's it, and shrewd one, that's it*, i.e. 'pushing, cunning, crafty'), speech supports, including emotional wordings, expressive syntactical structures, zoomorphism (*Awfully! Lo and behold! A svine of a man, indeed / holy shit! O-oh / what a mess!*) ([Johnson, S. \(2018\)](#)).

The text fragment allows reconstructing the things which were "held back" by the speaker. The value of children's obeying to parents which is significant to those who speak the obsolete popular tongue and translate the life's cultural scenario of parents' patriarchal family to their own families is implicitly designated here. Later on in the conversation, we see this value shifted to the bright field of consciousness when **S.** tells about her elder foster daughter Yulka who has already left the mother's house and lives separately from her:

A. *And how about Yulka? Does she live with this lad?*

S. *With him / or not / auntie Nyura / I don't know //* *Maybe they rent a flat / with her bestie //* *She's got a kinda (kind of) bestie there / and she's very well-heeled //* *And very wayward //* *You know well / for right now children are not too much out for obeying parents //* *And I feels (feel) so / she's persuaded Yulka / and they rent a flat with Yulka somewhere //* *Well, I don't think / she lives with this boy //* *Would they were together / she'd have told me //* *So, I don't know at all / where 'n' what (where and what) / and how it is // <...> That's the way the cookie crumbles!*

The utterance with a negation (*for*) *right now children are not too much out for obeying parents* forms the evaluative modality. It characterizes the object from the viewpoint of axiological reality which is relevant to a certain culture and structures the following thought chain thread: it is bad when children do not obey their parents.

Moreover, the conversation between the relatives allows deducing the following communicative sets: “A man’s soul is opened in confident and heart-to-heart communication”; “Speak out and relieve your soul”.

Let us look at one more text. A talk between relatives **A.** (65 years old, a woman on pension) and **F.** (71, a pensioner). **A.** and **F.** are in-laws to each other.

F. *Hi / Anna Mikhailna!*

A. *How’re you / Faddey Grigoryich //*

F. *You see / Anna Mikhailna / I went fishin’ yesterday at mornin’ //*

A. *So, much did you catch / Faddey Grigoryich?*

F. *Well... if just a single were hooked on / basted (bastard) //*

A. *So why should they swallow hook / Faddey Grigoryich / it’s not warm yet //*

F. *(Sighing) It’s not / Ann’ Mikhailna / and water in the rivar (river) too high //*

A. *And what you went for? Just not to work at home?!*

F. *And Nastya / I say?*

A. *Well... what? //*

F. *(about their granddaughter) Nastya’s handwrittin’ (handwriting) / becomes so fine, I’d say / writin’ as a clerk //*

A. *A[h]a // A while back she writes and asks me / “What mark would you give me / nana*

// I say to her “Five with a plus” // Well / no / there are no fives with a plus /

Just five” //

F. *Impressible she is, indeed / Nastya, I means (mean) //*

A. *A[h]a //*

F. *I dig out verms (worms) / so she runs up and come on / to help me / and asks me /*

what is for and so on // I had gone already / and she would diggin’ and diggin’ /

tryin’ to feed chickens and the water bug with them //

A. *Yea / brought this bug yesterday / I would say to her / “What’s it for to you / throw it away*

/ the demon” // And she / “No / nana / I’ll feed him”

F. *A good girlie (girl) she is! (Pause) Did you hear / Ann’ Mikhailna / in Kamyshlov, yea*

[a city in Sverdlovsk region. – I.Sh.] they killed a girl?

A. *Yes, I did / Faddey Grigoryich // Me (I) would have choked him with my hands /*

this bloody dooper //

F. *Had he just killed her / but no, mauled the whole of her / tore the girl limb from limb //*

A. *So you’d raise them / and then pieces of dopers would have them abused / and you’d bury them*

// What ‘bout (about) her / what has she seen in her life / and such a death // She’d better have

drowned / if such a fate // And what’s her parents’ life from then on / awful!

F. *A herod he is / to kill him is too little // He deserves / that he would be tortured to the end*

of his days //

A. *Well, well... such blokes don’t live long in prison //*

F. *(Nodding his head) // (Pause)*

A. *(Jokingly) You / Faddey Grigoryich / where to did you define your verms (worms)?*

Fish didn’t eat them, no?

F. Gave them to chickens // You know / how they fought for 'em (them) //

*A. Right / chickens (chickens) want meat too // They need meat and fish / to fodder them /
or they'd get / what's it / vitaminosis (avitaminosis) //*

They laugh and see a bus arriving.

F. Anna Mikhailna / let's go / the bus is rolling on //

They board the bus and drive away.

The common cultural etiquette norms based on the attitude to the manifestation of politeness or rudeness are those communicative benchmarks that provide the comfort of verbal communication of people included in “the fold”. The mental samples are cast into verbal-behavioral conventional methods of the communicative status attribution – his own and his partner’s. The cultural modus is an integral aspect of verbal interaction which is fixed in an actual utterance.

The communicators master etiquette verbal forms of greeting which initiate communication, and address each other by names and patronymics (*Hi / Anna Mikhailna! – How're you / Faddey Grigoryich!*). Fishing as a topic of the talk is being unwrapped in a harmonic and agreed way due to the cooperative strategy: a question is followed by an answer, each of the participants makes a certain contribution to the development of the conversation. The verbal etiquette “services the zone of partners’ benevolent relations”, as opposed to that of “malevolence and strife: breach of contacts, quarrels, invectives, bawdry, defamation, etc.”. A benevolent attitude to a party of communication enlarges the set on unconditional recognition in the other party of his/her moral dignity and his/her right to be respected.

The provocative question of **A.** which was asked point-blank: *And what you went for? Just not to work at home?!* becomes a signal of communicative tension. **F.** delicately neutralizes this communication tension using the tactics of reticence and pivot of the theme. Their granddaughter Nastya becomes a subject of the next thematic fragment. The dialogue demonstrates the unisonous nature of the old folk’s emotional-evaluative reactions: *fine handwritin’; A good girlie she is //* A positive characteristics of the granddaughter expressed by a common evaluative adjective *good* can be treated as a signal of the value-based attitude to labor (the girl is a good pupil and neatly writes in her copy-books) and to assistance to the senior family members (*she runs up to help me*). Solidarization of the communicators is also manifested in the attitude to the drug addict’s crime who killed a girl: *A herod he is; this bloody dooper //*

In the talk of the popular-tongue culture carriers, topics of routine trivial matters and untrivial universal ones are interlaced. In particular, when discussing the topic of violent death, the communicators are reasoning about fate and justice. Fate is perceived as the objective certainty, as the forces not benevolent to the child’s life (*She'd better have drowned / if such a fate //*). The fate buffets are perceived as providential. The set on reconciliation with the reality is formed: a man “realizes” what is prepared for him by fate. In A. D. Shmelev, A. A. Zaliznyak and I.B. Levontina’s (2005) opinion, such and similar “reconciliation with the reality” formulae” are characteristic for the Russian speech, though the conclusion about the Russians’ aptness to mystics and passivity of the Russian character can be superfluous, as contexts with the noun *fate* often express the idea of the future’s unpredictability, at least until *the fate has determined* (Shmelev, Zaliznyak and Levontina, 2005).

What also comes under notice is the interlocutors’ mutual faith in the recompense to the drug addict: *A herod he is / to kill him is too little // He deserves / that he would be tortured to the end of his days // such blokes don't live long in prison //* “Justice in the Russian language picture of the world is included into the line of principal moral values <...>” (Levontina and Shmelev, 2005). The biblical expression *herod* (coll. desp.) – ‘fiend, torturer’ [reference to a cruel ancient Hebrew tzar] explicit the negative emotional evaluation of a man which is given for committed amoral deeds. Expressions *Me would have choked him with my hands //*; *A herod he is / to kill him is too little //* demonstrate the extreme manifestation of the verbal partners’ indignation and speaks not for their aggressive and revengeful mood but about manifestation of the set on verbalization of the internal state, the “direct evaluation” approach and the principle of communicative hyperbolizing which is characteristic for colloquial speech.

Thus, the family inter-generational communication of popular-tongue culture carriers speaks for the importance of communicative sets of mental and verbal stereotypes for communicators, the mentioned sets defining “consonants”, conversations acting as a key to understanding of the Russian verbal ideal.

DISCUSSIONS

The concept of the verbal ideal as a perfect word incarnation of the speaker’s intention was always a subject of researchers’ attraction. A. K. Mikhalskaya, one of the first researchers who turned to the interpretation of the verbal ideal concept, determined it as “an essential element of the culture itself, the general principle of its logosphere” implemented in “a kind of the hierarchy of values: requirements to the speech and verbal behavior of people who are carriers of this culture”. Usually, it was studied on the example of a talker’s public speaking to his audience. The Russian verbal cultural tradition and substantiation of the Russian verbal art specificity originate from the ancient Greek rhetorics. It was Gorgias of Leontinoi, Aristotle, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Isocrates, Theophrastus, Cicero, Quintilian and other theorists and practitioners of rhetorics who developed categories basic for any speech: “the author’s image, type of speech, the certain

speech image, emotions impulsion, argumentation, composition, and style”; ideas about multiplicity of speech properties making it marvelous are laid down. Reflections about a certain speech image led them to comprehension of moral-spiritual appetencies of the speaker: a hearer paid his attention to substantial-organizational, ethical, aesthetic, psychological, communicative-pragmatical and other aspects of the speech, and evaluated its coherence, originality, brevity, purity, clearness, adequacy, harmony and other merits. For example, Socrates strove to spiritual harmonization of his speech, its psychological adequacy, and insisted that one should consider the nature of the soul and so it is necessary to address with speeches which are complicated and all-embracing to a sophisticated soul, and with simple speeches to a simple soul. Marcus Thullius Cicero, a Roman speaker, was rather concerned about substantiality of one’s speech: “The speech should flourish and unwind only basing on the full knowledge of a subject; should it be not supported by the content assimilated and cognized by the speaker then its verbal expression is regarded by me as an empty and even childish babbling”. In a way, criteria of the perfect speech and requirements for the perfect verbal behavior were worked out. This continuity is manifested in works by Yu. V. Rozhdestvensky, A. K. Mikhalskaya, A. P. Skovorodnikov, V. I. Annushkin, and other researchers.

Ancient authors built their considerations about merits and drawbacks of a speech supporting on their own vision and understanding of the world, on their feeling of the ideal which was based by them on the attitude to hierarchically linked value-based elements manifesting the eternal life principles: “thought – truth, benefit – good, beauty – harmony”.

Other ideas about the truth and benefit were put into life by sophistic which was regarded as a technology based on lies and hypocrisy; however, sophists Gorgias, Protagoras, Polus, Isocrates, Prodicus, Hippius, Antiphons and others with a great access taught their compatriots to master this “imaginary wisdom” with the purpose to achieve a practical success, exciting a spirit of competition, vanity, hypocrisy, and verbiage in them.

Addressing folklore texts, e.g. proverbs and folk-says, also allows revealing certain intellectual and ethic-aesthetic values laid down by the folk rhetorics. For instance, a language/speech, effective verbal communication as such are estimated from the positive viewpoint (*The tongue speaks with the God; Let’s sit side by side and have a good talk; To win by a living word*); these or those verbal characteristics (informative content, adequacy, clearness, expressiveness and so on) and verbal behaviour features (benevolent attitude, meekness, frankness, carefulness of the communication partners): *A meek word will win anger; A good word is an unhoused’s wealth; A tongue will not dry out from sweet words; Speak up but do not blurt out; Through a mouth an illness goes in, and trouble goes out*; the value of the Other, the value of an interlocutor: *People are speakers but they’re also listeners; From your word as from a gold dish*.

The folk’s verbal ideal can be presented as a domestic verbal behavior code for a speaker and hearer (in form of prescriptions and taboos) which fixes one’s attention both on the pragmatical and on the properly rhetoric aspects of the verbal behavior focused, first of all, on an affecting impression. For instance, attention is paid in the speech manner as a performance characteristic: *(She) talks like a bad lace-maker makes her needlepoint: what she would lace no once can make out; Your lips are fine for honey drinking; Shortly it was said but awkwardly*. It is prescribed to take into account socio-cultural features of communicators and the communication circumstances: *A poor talk is without bread and salt; Sly jokes at just first meeting; Her one wrangles with his own and reconcile himself, and if an alien adheres – will be hateful for ages; A female word adheres as glue*. A communicative result is fixed, either harmonizing or disharmonizing: *Chit-chat – and you’ve got neither this nor that; A fast-talker would speak up – all hearers be worn out; A wise man is drugged, stupid is poor, and a chatterbox is worst of all*.

At the same time, the Russian folklore picture of the world is characterized with alternativeness of many considerations about русская speech, contradictive character of rules and tactic lines of the verbal behavior, non-coincidence of real communicative practices and the verbal ideal, just the way the spiritual and the rowdy, or the ground and the heavenly do not coincide. For instance, the value-based set on truthfulness and frankness of the speech is not brought to the absolute level. On one hand, a speaker is expected to be truthful and frank: *Tell you lies but not too much, turn back to look; Eat bread and salt and cut the truth; He lies enough to turn my stomach; No matter that you sit askew – speak up directly; He speaks to the right but looks to the left; His eyes are crying and his heart is laughing*. On the other hand, a speaker should understand that a stern and ruthless truth can hurt a verbal partner and thus tell the truth accounting for real circumstances of the communication (*The truth is rough but pleasing to God; Not everything which is said shall be acceptable; Don’t believe every rumour, and don’t tell every truth; I could have uttered a word but am afraid of a wolf behind; Each man is lies – and so are we*).

Thus, the penchant for the absolute in the spiritual activity sphere (truth, benefit, goodness, beauty) is a bright feature of the national language personality, orientation on values of the Antique culture purified and ennobled by the Orthodox faith. At the same time, individual values are not brought to the absolute level.

As scientists state, the social structure of modern Russian society reflects disorder of the value-based picture of the world flowing from contradictory nature of the actual modern life which allows that the national verbal ideal is subjected to interventions of alien cultures and requires that all components thereof be comprehended.

It is known that the description of the Russian verbal ideal on the material of colloquial speech collected by the method of involved observation was not conducted, as a matter of fact. The electronic database of conversational texts of Ural town

colloquial language native speakers at our disposal allows manifesting certain mentally value-based attitudes, comprehensions, and stereotypes that allow revealing substantial, ethic, aesthetic and communicative-pragmatical aspects of the Russian verbal ideal.

CONCLUSION

On the material of family conversational texts of Ural town colloquial language native speakers, we conducted the linguo-culturological analysis of the mentioned texts passed through the lens of the Russian verbal ideal. Having drafted off the view on the colloquial linguistic culture as the city variant of the folk culture, we attempted to comprehend sources of the Russian verbal ideal which combines the worldview ideas of Antique, Byzantine and Russian communal cultures that leaned on such life-sense values as the truth, benefit, and beauty. We found some fundamental mentally significant apprehensions, value-based attitudes, and presumptions that have their verbal expression in family communication. We established that participants of a family communication take definite verbal efforts for providing communicative concord and harmony supporting speech traditions flowing out from parents' families. The socio-centric mental outlook of speech partners is achieved through realization of conversational sets on cooperation, respect to close people, communicative confidence and frankness. Senior family members translate communicative stereotypes that are adopted in their parents' families. The direct estimation approach in communication becomes a consequence of exercising of the right for axiological liberty. In heart-to-heart talks, the attraction to actual communication is manifested distinctly. The set on laugh a joke allows to relive communicational tension. In the modern Russian popular-tongue environment supported are the values of belonging to the family circle – close and distant, to the family history, and apprehensions about children's obedience, fate, and justice are preserved.

Materials of the article can be of interest to researchers of the Russian communicative culture, colloquialisms, teachers of Russian language as a foreign language, specialists in scope of communication optimization, higher and secondary school teachers, people forming and perfecting skills of conflict-free communication within the Russian verbal ideal.

It is necessary to go on with researches on finding foreign-culture interventions that are incarnated in the Russian verbal ideal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study is performed under the financial assistance of RFBR with scientific project No. 18-012-00382/18 “A family's conversational routine life: the axiological reality and methods of the study (based on materials of Ural town colloquial speech”.

REFERENCES

1. Lobão, J., & Pereira, C. (2016). Looking for Psychological Barriers in nine European Stock Market Indices. *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management*, 1(1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.20897/lectito.201639>
2. Machado, A. D. B., Souza, M. J., & Catapan, A. H. (2019). Systematic Review: Intersection between Communication and Knowledge. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.29333/jisem/5741>
3. Zare, Z. (2015). The benefits of e-business adoption: an empirical study of Iranian SMEs. *UCT Journal of Management and Accounting Studies*, 3(1), 6-11.
4. Bakhshandeh, M., Sedrposhan, N., & Zarei, H. (2015). The Effectiveness of Cognitive-Behavioral Group Counseling to Reduce Anxiety, Marriage; Single People have to be Married in Esfahan City (2013-2014). *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 10-13.
5. Novikova, I. N., Popova, L. G., Shatilova, L. M., Biryukova, E. V., Guseva, A. E., & Khukhuni, G. T. (2018). Lexical and semantic representation of the linguistic and cultural concept “Rest” in the English, German, and Russian languages. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 237-256.
6. Nisawa, Y. (2018). Applying van Hiele's Levels to Basic Research on the Difficulty Factors behind Understanding Functions. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(2), 61-65. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2696>
7. Krechetova, S. Y., Karanin, A. V., Kudryavcev, N. G., & Kocheeva, N. A. (2018). Peculiarities of Thunderstorms Distribution (Altai Mountains, Republic of Altai, Russian Federation). www.mjltm.com/info@mjltm.org, 63.
8. Alapuro, R., Mustajoki, A., & Pesonen, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Understanding Russianness*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203834145>
9. Malyuga, E. N., & Orlova, S. N. (2017). *Linguistic pragmatics of intercultural professional and business communication*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68744-5>
10. AHRENS, W. P. E., & SHEILA, M. The Impact of Language Teachers' Role on Language Learners' Name Choice.
11. Abashev, V., Akhmetova, M., Bittner, S. V., Dehaan, H., Dixon, M., Lurye, M., ... & Pyrah, R. *Forum 12: City Culture, Urban Culture*.
12. srael, N. (2000). *Outlandish: Writing between exile and diaspora*. Stanford University Press.
13. Csicsery-Ronay Jr, I. (2011). *The seven beauties of science fiction*. Wesleyan University Press.



14. Mokeyeva, E. V., & Andreeva, I. N. (2016) Volume 11 Issue 15.
15. Haldane, J. (Ed.). (2004). Values, education and the human world: Essays on education, culture, politics, religion and science (Vol. 1). Imprint Academic.
16. Westfahl, G., & Yuen, W. K. (Eds.). (2014). Science fiction and the prediction of the future: Essays on foresight and fallacy (Vol. 27). McFarland.
17. Bassett, C., Steinmueller, E., & Voss, G. (2013). Better made up: The mutual influence of science fiction and innovation. *Nesta Work. Pap.*, 13(07).
18. Johnson, S. (2018). *Farsighted: How we make the decisions that matter the most.* Penguin.
19. Stingl, A. I., & Weiss, S. M. (2015). "Whose Science? Whose Fiction?" *Uncanny Echoes of Belonging in Samosata. Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 35(3-4), 59-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467616635916>
20. Bajaber, M. A. (2015). *Utopian Literature and Imperialism.*
21. Butchard, D. K. (2015). *Electric amateurs: literary encounters with computing technologies 1987-2001.*