

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC UNITY OF THE PEOPLES OF DAGESTAN AS A FACTOR OF SUCCESSFUL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

© *Polina Y. Fedotova*

*Dagestan state pedagogical university,
Makhachkala, Dagestan Republic, Russian Federation
science-almanac@mail.ru*

The factors that have a direct impact on the positive intercultural dialogue of the peoples of Dagestan are analyzed. Being a multinational republic, Dagestan has a rather high degree of ethnocultural tolerance. In the historical context in Dagestan, developed the fundamental ideas of commonality and identity, including linguistic. In addition, over the long-term cohabitation and interaction of cultures among the peoples of Dagestan, numerous common elements have emerged in material culture, economic structure, in clothing, dishes and, of course, in traditions and customs. It is shown that in matters of constructive intercultural dialogue, it is of great importance to observe the equality of all represented ethnic groups. The peoples of Dagestan (Avars, Dargins, Laks, Kumyks, etc.) have a very similar psychological image, which largely contributes to the successful communication of ethnic groups and understanding of each other as a whole. This factor determines the similarity in attitude, which can also be attributed to the advantages of positive intercultural dialogue. One of the conditions for the prevention of interethnic tension, the increase of interethnic understanding between representatives of different cultures is minimization of negative and actualization of the existing positive ethnic stereotypes.

Key words: culture, ethnos, communication, peoples, Dagestan, stereotype.

[П.Я. Федотова Культурное и языковое единство народов Дагестана как фактор успешной межкультурной коммуникации]

Анализируются факторы, имеющие непосредственное влияние на позитивный межкультурный диалог народов Дагестана. Будучи многонациональной республикой, Дагестан имеет достаточно высокую степень этнокультурной толерантности. В историческом контексте в Дагестане выработались фундаментальные идеи общности и идентичности, в том числе языковой. Также на протяжении длительного совместного проживания и взаимодействия культур у народов Дагестана сформировались многочисленные общие элементы в материальной культуре, хозяйственном укладе, в формах одежды, блюдах и конечно в традициях и обычаях. Показано, что в вопросах конструктивного межкультурного диалога большое значение играет соблюдение равноправия всех представленных этносов. Народы Дагестана (аварцы, даргинцы, лакцы, кумыки и др.) имеют весьма схожий психологический образ, что во многом способствует успешной коммуникации этносов и пониманию их друг друга в целом. Этот фактор определяет и схожесть в мироощущении, что также можно отнести к плюсам позитивного межкультурного диалога. Одним из условий предотвращения межнациональной напряженности, повышения межэтнического понимания между представителями разных культур является минимизация негативных и актуализация сложившихся позитивных этнических стереотипов.

Ключевые слова: культура, этнос, коммуникация, народы, Дагестан, стереотип.

Polina Y. Fedotova – acting rector, candidate of sociological sciences. Dagestan state pedagogical university. Makhachkala, Dagestan Republic, Russian Federation.

Полина Яновна Федотова – и.о. ректора, кандидат социологических наук. Дагестанский государственный педагогический университет. г. Махачкала, Республика Дагестан, Российская Федерация.

«Mne vse narody ochen' nnavyatsya,
I trizhdy budet proklyat tot,
Kto vzdumayet, kto popytayetsya
Chernit' kakoy-nibud' narod.....»
(Rasul Gamzatov)

It is known that Dagestan is a multinational republic, where the ethnic groups inhabiting it speak 30 languages and 70 dialects. At the same time, a rather high degree of ethnocultural tolerance is noted here, the region practically does not know interethnic conflicts. This article analyzes the factors that have a direct impact on the positive intercultural dialogue of the peoples of Dagestan. Since the problem of respect and tolerance, positive intercultural dialogue and peaceful coexistence of different peoples on the same territory always remains actual.

In the historical dimension, the republic was a kind of strategic frontier of the Eurasian borderlands, a specific zone of intersection of Eastern and Western civilizations, world religions, a region of ancient cultures, where the original cultures of local peoples constantly interacted and mutually enriched. In this historical context, common ideas of community and Dagestan identity were developed. During the long-term cohabitation and interaction of cultures among the peoples of Dagestan, numerous common elements were developed in the material culture (settlements, housing, clothing, and food), economic structure, clothing, dishes, and of course, in traditions and customs.

It can also be said that the cultural interaction of the peoples of Dagestan was influenced by various groups of factors: the first group is natural-historical (where the main role is played by factors of the ethno-cultural environment, as well as demographic, natural-geographical), the second group is socio-historical factors (political, social -class, ideological), the third group - ethnic properties (language, material and spiritual culture, historical memory, lifestyle, customs, rituals, ethnic identity).

In geopolitical terms, Dagestan historically acts as a single multi-ethnic organism, as a kind of conductor who has played and will play the role of a link between the North and South Caucasus for a long time.

In the conditions of a multinational region, such as Dagestan, in the issues of consolidation and intercultural communication the factor of the common culture of the Dagestan peoples, including the language factor, is of great importance.

In early enough stages of ethnogenesis, it is possible to look at linguistics as a science about the origin and properties of language. So P.K. Uslar compared languages to the "true and inexhaustible conclusions of the records; all the Caucasian peoples, like all peoples on earth, have such chronicles. From these chronicles, you can create a true folk history" [13]. In 1864, P.K. Uslar formulated the idea of distant kinship of all groups of Caucasian languages, including languages of the peoples of Dagestan.

The theory of the kinship of the Iberian-Caucasian languages became widespread in the works of linguists of the twentieth century, although it was certainly not supported by all scientists. Genetic kinship of the Caucasian languages is proved by such scientists as K. Bouda, R. Lafon, I.A. Javakhishvili, A.S. Chikobaeva, V.T. Sharadzenidze et al. These and other linguists share the point of view that East Caucasian and Western Caucasian languages are related to South Caucasian (that is, Kartvelian - Georgian, Megrelian, Alazani) and form the so-called "Iberian-Caucasian" family of languages. Such scientists as G.V. did not share the theory of kinship of the "Iberian-Caucasian languages". Tsereteli, A.G. Shakidze, G.S.Avhlediani, T.V. Gamkrelidze, G.I. Machavariani, A.E. Kibrik and others.

G.A. Klimov noted that if the genetic affinity of the Caucasian languages cannot be proved, it will be necessary to confine ourselves to stating the fact that they represent a language union.

By analyzing and summarizing linguistic data, certain conclusions can be drawn. These generalizations, as we noted earlier, have both supporters and opponents. So, according to some linguistics, that in 7 thousand BC all the tribes that inhabited the Caucasus spoke the same language. In 5 thousand BC, these tribes were driven out by stronger ones into the North territory of the Caucasus and, therefore, the entire North Caucasus spoke in one language. In 3 thousand BC, this single language fell into two branches: the West-North-Caucasian branch (the Abkhaz-Adyghe languages) and the East-North-Caucasian branch (Dagestan and Nakh languages). In 2 thousand BC, Nakh-Dagestan linguistic unity breaks down into Nakh and Dagestan languages and approximately during this period all Dagestan spoke the same language. In 1 thousand BC, this common Pagan language has broken up into separate languages and dialects that exist today. Therefore, we see that linguists trace language processes in the territory of the Caucasus and Dagestan from 7 thousand BC.

The experience of a long interethnic dialogue of the peoples of Dagestan shows that in matters of intercultural consolidation of peoples, the rising generation, preservation of a single multiethnic space, prevention of interethnic tensions and social conflicts, the solution of interethnic problems are of great importance, as well as respect for the equal rights of all ethnic groups represented [14, p. 160; 18, p.12]. So, for example, in some cases, as soon as any interethnic or even intrageneric conflict in Dagestan is brewing, at the present stage traditionally, just as in former times, respected, authoritative for both conflicting parties are involved and they try to settle the situation that has arisen, or as they say to make a masliat (truce). Masliat is a distinctive arbitration (or mediator) method of settling and resolving conflicts, which has traditionally become widespread among some peoples of the North Caucasus and, in particular, Dagestan. It should be noted that if in the historical past, the masliat method of reconciliation was resorted to mainly in acute conflicts like murder, abduction of women, etc., then today they resort to Masliat in quite ordinary everyday conflicts and situations [1; 11; 5, p. 114].

In the context of the emerging trends of intercultural communication of the peoples of Dagestan, it has always been relevant not only to identify common features in culture, but also to know cultural characteristics and specifics of different ethnic groups in order to better understand each other and achieve mutual cultural recognition. Since "intercultural interaction is the contact of two or more cultural traditions, as a result of which counterparties exert mutual influence on each other" [8]. At the same time, a feature of Dagestan culture has always been that, in the framework of Dagestan ethics, the question of national identity was considered and is considered incorrect, because the one to whom such a question was addressed might have thought that the attitude to it depends on its national identity. Usually they asked and ask "k'ysy yurtlusan?" (Kumyk), "mun kissa?" (Avar), i.e. "Where do you come from?" This was done in order to determine the language of communication (Magomedkhanov, 2008). Thus, for the Dagestanis, in terms of their emotional and psychological intensity, the main thing remains their affiliation to one or another rural society (territory) rather than to the nationality itself. But at the same time, higher levels of self-identification are preserved that is Dagestanis, Caucasians, Russians.

The experience of intercultural contacts in Dagestan, interethnic relations and interactions can sometimes create problems caused by a significant difference and discrepancy between certain norms, values, worldview features of different cultures, therefore, in the polynational, multicultural environment of the university, and actively interact in different areas of life.

Modern experience shows that the mutual enrichment of national cultures in Dagestan largely takes place against the background of preserving its own ethnic identity, supporting national traditions and native language, creating national clubs, diasporas, organizing and holding national holidays, significant state dates and honoring national heroes, etc.

Within the framework of intercultural communication, it is also important that each ethnic group, as a rule, has its own psychological image, its own rules and norms of behavior [6; 9, p. 59]. Therefore, the lack of certain knowledge of characteristics, specifics of customs and traditions, rules and norms of behavior of ethnic groups with which to communicate, often leads to complications and some tension. Since traditions, demeanor, ways of communication between representatives of different ethnic groups not only differ from each other, but also, at times, can be opposed to each other. Speaking about the peoples of Dagestan (Avars, Darghins, Laks, Kumyks, etc.), one can say about a certain similarity of their psychological image, which in many respects promotes successful communication of ethnic groups and understanding of each other as a whole. This factor also determines their similarity in attitude, which can also be taken from the advantages of positive intercultural dialogue. Since it is known that the main causes of communication failures are rooted in differences in attitude, that is, a different attitude to the world and to other people.

With all this, Dagestan culture is not completely devoid of stereotypes and prejudices, because "negative stereotype is most often formed as a result of multiple repetition of unsuccessful social interaction between representatives of different cultures and nationalities" [2, p. 15-18; 12]. It is believed that stereotypes (positive and negative) form a fairly strong, long-term view of the country and its citizens, therefore, today, maximum accuracy, restraint, tolerance, mutual respect, and compassion are required in the process of intercultural interaction of peoples with each other.

In such multinational, polyethnic regions as Dagestan, different national stereotypes and national characters' overlap. So, for example, in the stereotypical representations of Dagestanis, Avars are considered to be excessively direct, somewhere even short-tempered, Laks are cunning, Kumyks are passion, Dargins are burdensome to trade and money. If we take, as a basis, the traditional image of a Dagestani (male) or Dagestanka (female), then in stereotypical representations the Dagestani is a determined, peaceful, responsive, ardent, honest, disinterested, courageous, daring, resourceful, unbalanced, and strong-willed; Dagestanka is kind, modest, somewhere shy, even wild. One of the conditions for preventing interethnic tension, increasing interethnic understanding among people of different cultures, is minimization of negative and actualization of existing positive ethnic stereotypes.

In fact, it is difficult to overestimate the understanding and consideration of national character, ethnic characteristics and stereotypes in harmonizing interethnic relations of young people, since they serve as a certain criterion not only for manifestations of national character, but also perform an important function of communication, influencing a person's likes or dislikes, determining his behavior in various communicative situations [19, p. 11]. Often, the national characters and features of the culture of the Dagestan peoples are presented and known through folklore, proverbs and sayings, anecdotes (folklore genre), written on national themes. For example, jokes – short funny stories – are one of the most common forms of existence of national stereotypes in the mass consciousness of young people from different countries.

So, the mutual enrichment of national cultures in Dagestan takes place both against the background and preservation of their own ethnic identity of peoples, support of national traditions and native language, and through co-building the holding of national holidays, significant state dates and honoring of national heroes and etc. [15; 18]. These events held in the republic promote the popularization of their own national world, acquaint students

with new languages, cultures and ethnic groups, which promote the development of international relations and expand the boundaries of international contacts.

Thus, “every individual on Earth enters the common human space through his own ethnic identity, as an ethnofor of his culture, he cannot “jump over” the diverse national world, culture and life created by his people, his family, which would make him poor, empty, restless, restless, restless, not having a permanent place. The term “ethnofor”, in the opinion of T.V. Stallion, means a single individual in a multi-ethnic society, a representative of any ethnic group [4; 7]. A permanent place, a home for a national person is not just a wall; it is a place where common generic features — features of national personality — are preserved.” [ten]. Moreover, since we are talking about intercultural interaction as a factor in the prevention and prevention of conflict situations in a multi-ethnic region like Dagestan, we should refer to examples of positive stereotypes, knowledge and interchange that will allow to communicate favorably to representatives of different national groups. At the same time, it is clear that a number of traditional national stereotypes cannot fully illuminate the real ethnic picture of this or that people, since it is also important to understand and comprehend foreign culture through other cultural forms - communication, family institution, language, folk art, education, religion etc.

Литература

1. *Вигель Н.Л.* Утилитарно-прагматический феномен современности и его отражение в метамодернизме // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. 2015. № 7-2(57).
2. *Власова В.Н.* Стратегические инициативы ЮНЕСКО по сближению культур в глобальном пространстве // Культура. Наука. Интеграция. 2011. № 1 (13). С. 13-18.
3. *Гасанов М. Р.* Некоторые вопросы изучения взаимоотношений народов Кавказа // Научная мысль Кавказа. 2002. № 4.
4. *Жеребило Т.В.* Словарь лингвистических терминов. 5-е изд. Назрань: Пилигрим, 2010. - Назрань: Кэп, 2015. 154 с.
5. *Жолобова И.К., Камалова О.Н., Мустафаева З.С.* Проблема формирования коммуникативной толерантности студентов высших учебных заведений // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2017. № 3. С. 113-122.
6. *Ивушкина Е.Б., Дашкова Е.В.* Проблема коммуникационного познания // Экономические и гуманитарные исследования регионов. 2010. № 4. С. 85-94.
7. *Камалова О.Н., Шаповал Г.Н.* К вопросу о нравственном воспитании российских и иностранных студентов, обучающихся вместе // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2014. № 2. С. 378-381.
8. *Маремшаова И. И.* Северный Кавказ: проблемы этнокультурного взаимодействия // Научная мысль Кавказа. 2002. № 4.
9. *Матяш Т.П., Несмеянов Е.Е.* Проект модернизации – европейский соблазн // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 7: Философия. Социология и социальные технологии. 2011. № 2 (14). С. 57-61.
10. *Мурзаев М.С.* Влияние межличностных контактов на динамику этнических стереотипов: дисс...канд...психол.наук. М., 2003. 127 с.
11. *Мустафаева М.Г., Мустафаев М.В.* Вопросы социально-психологического поведения личности: национальные и этноконфессиональные аспекты // Известия Северо-Кавказского научного центра высшей школы. Естественные науки. 1987. № 2. С. 95.

12. *Старовойтова Г.В.* Этнические особенности поведения и выживания в восприятии горожан. (Этнические стереотипы поведения). М., 1983.
13. *Услар П.К.* Древнейшие сказания о Кавказе. Сборник сведений о кавказских горцах. Вып. X. Тифлис, 1880.
14. *Федотова П.Я.* Механизмы внедрения принципов должной морали в практику государственной службы // Социология власти. 2011. № 2. С. 156-163.
15. *Федотова П.Я.* Общественное воздействие на процесс формирования морали государственных гражданских служащих // диссертация на соискание уч. степени канд. социологических наук. Москва, 2011.
16. Этнокультурные проблемы Северного Кавказа: социально-исторический аспект / Под ред. проф. А.И. Шаповалова. Армавир: Издательство АГПИ, 2002. 366 с.
17. *Foster R.* Making National Cultures in Global Ecumene // Annual Review of Anthropology, 1991. 244 p.
18. *Gurieva L.K., Dzhioev A.V.* International Economic Migration: Past and Present// Science Almanac of Black sea region countries. 2016. № 1 (5). С. 8-12.
19. *Mustafaeva M., Mustafaev F.* Role of ethno-confessional factor in international communication in regions of traditional islam spread // Science Almanac of Black sea region countries. 2017. № 2 (10). С. 8-14.
20. *Tajfel H.* Social stereotypes and social groups II Intergroup behaviour. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981. p.

References

1. *Vigel' N.L.* Utilitarno-pragmaticheskiy fenomen sovremennosti i yego otrazhe-niye v metamodernizme. [Utilitarian-pragmatic phenomenon of modernity and its reflection in metamodernism]. Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Questions of theory and practice. 2015. No. 7-2(57) (in Russian).
2. *Vlasova V.N.* Strategicheskiye initsiativy YUNESKO po sblizheniyu kul'tur v globalokal'nom prostranstve. [UNESCO Strategic Initiatives for the Rapprochement of Cultures in the Global-Local Space]. Culture. Science. Integration. 2011. No. 1 (13). pp. 13-18 (in Russian).
3. *Gasanov M.R.* Nekotoryye voprosy izucheniya vzaimootnosheniy narodov Kavkaza. [Some issues of studying the relationship of the peoples of the Caucasus]. Scientific thought of the Caucasus. 2002. No. 4 (in Russian).
4. *Zherebilo T.V.* Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov. [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. 5-ye izd. Nazran': Pilgrim, 2010. Nazran': Kep, 2015. 154 p. (in Russian).
5. *Zholobova I.K., Kamalova O.N., Mustafayeva Z.S.* Problema formirovaniya kommunikativnoy tolerantnosti studentov vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeniy. [The problem of the formation of communicative tolerance of students of higher educational institutions]. Humanitarian and social sciences. 2017. No. 3. pp. 113-122 (in Russian).
6. *Ivushkina Ye.B., Dashkova Ye.V.* Problema kommunikatsionnogo poznaniya. [The problem of communication knowledge]. Economic and humanitarian studies of the regions. 2010. No. 4. pp. 85-94 (in Russian).
7. *Kamalova O.N., Shapoval G.N.* K voprosu o npravstvennom vospitanii rossiyskikh i inostrannykh studentov, obuchayushchikhsya vmeste. [On the issue of moral education of Russian and foreign students studying together]. Humanitarian and social sciences. 2014. No. 2. pp. 378-381 (in Russian).

8. *Maremshaova I.I.* Severnyy Kavkaz: problemy etnokul'turnogo vzaimodeystviya. [Northern Caucasus: problems of ethnocultural interaction]. Scientific thought of the Caucasus. 2002. No. 4 (in Russian).
9. *Matyash T.P., Nesmeyanov Ye.Ye.* Proyekt modernizatsii – yevropeyskiy soblazn. [Modernization project - European temptation]. Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Series 7: Philosophy. Sociology and social technology. 2011. No. 2 (14). pp. 57-61 (in Russian).
10. *Murzayev M.S.* Vliyaniye mezhlichnostnykh kontaktov na dinamiku etnicheskikh stereotipov [The influence of interpersonal contacts on the dynamics of ethnic stereotypes]. Thesis of Candidate of Psychological Science. Moscow, 2003. 127 p. (in Russian).
11. *Mustafayeva M.G., Mustafayev M.V.* Voprosy sotsial'no-psikhologicheskogo povedeniya lichnosti: natsional'nyye i etnokonfessional'nyye aspekty. [Issues of socio-psychological behavior of a person: national and ethno-confessional aspects]. News of the North-Caucasian Higher School Research Center. Natural Sciences. 1987. No. 2. 95 p. (in Russian).
12. *Starovoytova G.V.* Etnicheskiye osobennosti povedeniya i vyzhivaniya v vospriyatii gorozhan. [Ethnic characteristics of behavior and survival in the perception of citizens]. (Etnicheskiye stereotipy povedeniya). Moscow, 1983 (in Russian).
13. *Uslar P.K.* Drevneyshiy skazaniya o Kavkaze. Sbornik svedeniy o kavkazskikh gor-tsakh. [The most ancient legends about the Caucasus. Collection of information about the Caucasian mountains]. Issue X. Tiflis, 1880 (in Russian).
14. *Fedotova P.Ya.* Mekhanizmy vnedreniya printsipov dolzhnoy morali v praktiku gosudarstvennoy sluzhby. [Mechanisms of introducing the principles of proper morality in the practice of public service]. Sociology of power. 2011. No. 2. pp. 156-163 (in Russian).
15. *Fedotova P.Ya.* Obshchestvennoye vozdeystviye na protsess formirovaniya morali gosudarstvennykh grazhdanskikh sluzhashchikh. [Public influence on the formation of the morality of civil servants]. Thesis of Candidate of Sociological Science. Moscow, 2011 (in Russian).
16. Etnokul'turnyye problemy Severnogo Kavkaza: sotsial'no-istoricheskiy aspekt. [Ethnocultural problems of the North Caucasus: the socio-historical aspect]. Ed. prof. A. I. Shapovalova. Armavir: Publ. AGPI, 2002. 366 p. (in Russian).
17. *Foster R.* Making National Cultures in Global Ecumene. Annual Review of Anthropology, 1991. 244 p.
18. *Gurieva L.K., Dzhioev A.V.* International Economic Migration: Past and Present. Science Almanac of Black sea region countries. 2016. No. 1 (5). pp. 8-12.
19. *Mustafaeva M., Mustafaev F.* Role of ethno-confessional factor in international communication in regions of traditional Islam spread. Science Almanac of Black sea region countries. 2017. No. 2 (10). pp. 8-14.
20. *Tajfel H.* Social stereotypes and social groups II Intergroup behaviour. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

20 June, 2019