

Interpretative Model of Linguacultural Knowledge

Elena A. Ogneva, Ilia A. Danilenko, Yana I. Kireeva and Alina A. Kutsenko
Belgorod State University, Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Postcode, Belgorod, Russia

Abstract: The subject matter of the study is the actual issues of modern cultural linguistics and the mainstreams at this new integral sphere of linguistics. Cultural linguistics is identified as the multifarious model of complex scientific knowledge of synthesizing type. The aim of the research work under consideration is to study some principles of cognitive cultural and linguistic correlations to verify the steps of linguacultural interaction process as the integral model of linguacultural knowledge. First, the cognitive aspects of the cultural and linguistic correlation are identified. Second, the different formats of linguacultural knowledge are studied as the unity of cultural components and the linguistic structures as the objects of detailed cognition. Third, the specificity of linguacultural knowledge is identified as the synergizing model of knowledge. This model is studied by the complex methodology as the unity of methods such as Synchronistical, Diachronic, Historical-Genetic, Typological and Comparative-Historical Method. The cognitive-hermeneutic analysis of any specificity of linguacultural knowledge model is used to represent any quantitative and qualitative parameters of static and dynamic linguacultural cognitive structures to model different cognitive-hermeneutic patterns of nominative fields at the fiction concepts. Consequently it is well founded that the modeling of static and dynamic cognitive structures representing linguacultural knowledge is the way to form the large informative base. This informative base is used to interpret the semantic interactions at the kernel-peripheral architectonics of different formats of linguacultural knowledge as the unity of linguacultural structures. This unity of linguacultural structures are studied as the phenomena of world view. The resulting data can be applied to the theory of linguacultural knowledge modeling. To sum up, the cognitive-cultural status researches of such structures as the ethno-semantic substances is studied as the base to identify the different cognitive configurations at the architectonics of interpretive model of linguacultural knowledge. The interpretive results are used to verify the role of cognitive-pragmatic features of modeling formats of linguacultural knowledge.

Key words: Cultural linguistics, linguacultural knowledge, modeling, cognitive-hermeneutic analysis, architectonics

INTRODUCTION

According to the paradigm of modern humanitarian outlook the linguacultural knowledge is the specific sphere represented by a wide spectrum of research aims, objectives and methodological approaches. Still as usual there are a lot of unsolved and questionable aspects which are “mysterious islands” on the map of scientific research branches.

One of such branches to require further detailed work is the cognitive structure modeling to represent linguacultural knowledge.

Cultural linguistics as a new integral linguistic discipline which became the new scientific field in the second half of the XX century, based on researches of Alifrenko (2005, 2010), Vorob’ev (1997), Vorkachev (2001), Lotman (2010), Maslova (2001), Holland and Quinn (1987), Johnson-Laird (1983) and Wierzbicka (1994) and other famous Russian and Foreign linguists. According to

Vorob’ev’s scientific researchers is the fact that “cultural linguistics is a complex scientific sphere of synthesizing type which studies the correlation and interaction of culture and language in its functioning and reflects the process as an integral structure of units in the unity of their linguistic and extra-linguistic (cultural) content with the help of the system methods and with an paying attention to the modern priorities and cultural establishment, i.e., the system of norms and human values” (Vorob’ev, 1997) whereas Maslova (2001), considers cultural linguistics as a “branch of linguistic which arose at the edge of linguistics and cultural studies” as “a humanitarian discipline studying embodied into a living national language and revealing in the linguistic processes material and spiritual culture” as “an integrative part of knowledge which incorporates the results of studies in linguistics and cultural studies and cultural anthropology ethnolinguistics”.

According to Vorkachev (2001) “the tasks of cultural linguistics include the study and description of the interaction of language and culture, language and ethnicity, language and national mentality”, therefore an object of cultural linguistics is linguistic, i.e., discursive activity considering from a value-semantic point of view therefore, cultural linguistics studies communicative processes made conditional upon ethnic mentality created by various cultural epochs represented by such categories as “national language picture” (Zalevskaja, 2000; Gak, 2000; Kravchenko, 2008), “model of the world”, “linguistic, ethnic and cultural consciousness and mentality of a nation” (Alefirenko, 2010; Ogneva, 2011).

At the beginning of the XXI century cultural linguistics was a model of synergizing knowledge. In the research of Gurochkina (2003), named as “Actual problems of modern cultural linguistics” an analytical review of the research achievements in the field of scientific knowledge was presented. Later Zinov’eva and Jurkov (2009), underlined the fact that cultural linguistics “explores different ways of presenting the knowledge about the world of this or that language speakers through the study of language units of different levels, speaking activity, speech behavior, discourse which should allow to give such a description of these objects which in their entirety would disclose the value of the analyzed units, shades, connotations and associations, reflecting the consciousness of native speakers. It is important to take into account the encyclopedic information which correlates with the language meaning proper the development of principles of its selection is one of the problems of cultural linguistics”.

Thus, it is obvious that “to the end of the 20th century this area has acquired the status of a full-fledged scientific branch: its object and subject being defined, the basic theoretical principles being postulated and the theoretical foundations had been laid that get embodiment in practical results” (Alefirenko, 2010) as a result cultural linguistics has a complex methodology and extensive research base.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Currently in cultural linguistics the following research methods are being applied:

- Synchronistical Method by which linguacultural units are being compared at the same historical period of language evolution
- Diachronic Method is based on a comparative analysis of linguacultural units at the different historical periods

- Historical-Genetic Method is focused on the study of linguistic and cultural facts in the evolving algorithm, i.e., since its inception till its disappearance transition to unactual fund of language or until the actual linguacultural researches
- The Typological Method reveals the typological proximity of linguacultural units in the historical and cultural aspects

Comparative-Historical Method is targeted at the comparing of original linguacultural units in the dynamic development conditioned by historical extralinguistic factors.

Structural and Functional Method involves the division of culture object into the components and identifying the connections between them.

In the period of rising of cultural linguistics as a the new branch of linguistic researches many well-known linguists worked in the field of new scientific methodological vector. For example in the theoretical views of Telija (1996) the methodological basis to cultural linguistics is “semiotic presentation of the data of this interaction being taken with the cognitive content of mental procedures to have the result of cultural verbalized mental structures” because of according to the opinion of outstanding Russian philologist and culturologist of the XX century who was the founder and head of the Moscow-Tartu Semiotic School Lotman (2010) studied Russian literature and culture who made a lot of efforts to spread cultural knowledge in society “from a semiotic point of view the culture can be studied as a hierarchy of particular semiotic systems as the amount of text and the related set of functions or as some device that generates these texts”.

Cognitive-hermeneutic theory formed as a result of the successful development and correlation of cognitive science, lingvopragmatics, hermeneutics and cultural linguistics. Cognitive hermeneutic theory is “possesses the significant explanatory power. This theory is the basis for cognitive-comparative modeling of socio-cultural space of conceptsphere” (Ogneva, 2011), so now a days, we use the cognitive-hermeneutic analysis of deferent textual types to discover linguacultural parameters of literary space architectonics. This type of linguistic analysis is “the unity of some methods such as:

- Contextual analysis to discover the specificity of nominative fields’ linguacultural parameters of fiction concepts
- Cognitive-discursive analysis of textual dynamic to interpret the specificity of nominative fields’ parameters and to model different cognitive structure of fiction concept sphere

- Conceptual analysis of cognitive-communicative fiction space to identify the basic components of hermeneutic dynamics
- Semantic-cognitive analysis of nominative fields to interpret the architectonics of fiction concept sphere” (Ogneva, 2014)

The cognitive-hermeneutic analysis are used to represent any quantitative and qualitative parameters of static and dynamic linguacultural cognitive structures to model different cognitive-hermeneutic patterns of nominative fields at the fiction concepts. The space cognitive-hermeneutic patterns are very important to interpret the cognitive linguacultural parameters of fiction concept sphere architectonics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Modeling of static and dynamic cognitive structures representing linguacultural knowledge provides extensive range of information is the basis for interpretation of the deep relationship of kernel-periphery components at the architectonics because “model as a research construct of reality represents a research way for the study of the nature of the phenomenon on its system and functional connections both with phenomena of a general order and equal phenomena” (Karasik, 2013).

It is known that Piotrovskij (1998) wrote that “the model can be the way of studying and describing the internal structure of the original (structural model), its behavior (functional model) and development (dynamic model)”. Modeling reveals the specifics of concept architectonics which is the subject of many research works of Russian and Foreign researchers Alefirenko (2010), Kravchenko (2008) and Langacker (1991).

In our case, the construction of the interpretative models is based on linguistic and cultural knowledge of cognitive hermeneutic analysis of material. Modeling is aimed to identify the correlation of cognitive words in a linguacultural way caused speech and language structures as “systemic interdependence of linguaculture and synergy is predetermined by systemic discursive consciousness which is perhaps the most difficult creation of cognitive power of the culture” (Alefirenko, 2005). In such way culture is represented in the words of a language code.

Linguaphilosophical interpretation of creative special aspects of words was presented in Humboldt’s conception of language as activity. Gumboldt (1985) emphasized the importance of words for the spiritual life of man “because it is filled with spiritual and creative energy of ethnic culture, accumulating the potential of the

national spirit” whereby the language is as a sign model representing the world, its spatial, temporal, and other parameters. For example, examining the time-patterns of the sign world view represented in the literary discourse Danilenko (2015), concludes that “we suppose that cyclic chronemas are pointed, prolonged, limited and generalized chronemas which denote a period or a moment of time being a part of a time cycle and repeating with constant frequency within a particular context” where the context is as a model generated of creative energy by the ethnic culture.

Semiological theory of cognitive-linguistic culture integrates to Humboldt’s conception of language as activity because as we know, cultural and historical genesis of the human psyche due to the environment, so that cognitive processes are known to correlate with linguacultural environment predetermining parameters of semantic space. Semantic space is dynamic in its nature, so one linguacultural realities of “linguistic community” are replaced by another realities, representation of which entails the emergence of new linguistic forms.

Reconstruction of cultural marked linguistic forms that are relevant to society in certain historical periods, causing a number of difficulties. Thus, Kutsenko (2014) exploring the principles of reconstruction of language of Edwardian era in modern television serials, writes: “The fact is that the kitchens include a number of different functions in their premises, under the general title. There was stored and cooked food. There were large and small rooms where the oven shelves with kitchen utensils and freezer with ice to store perishables. Another interesting fact gone down in history is that tea and dinner sets, glasses and silverware were kept in a personal butler room, a special buffet” Lur’e (2004) at that time pointed out to the fact that “the coordinate system is formed by the cultural marked words in which the individual lives. The world pattern is formed by this coordinate system as a fundamental element of ethnic culture” that is why, the dynamics of this coordinate system provokes the dynamics of cultural language fund of people.

It is known that the concept “linguistic community” is one of the fundamental concepts in an active supporter of neo-humboldtism in Germany. J.L. Weisgerber as one of the greatest linguists of the XX century considered the linguistic community as a basic form of human community, revealing all the factors of the existence of the spirit and culture of the area. Language in this research line is not seen as an isolated area of human life and as a spiritual center, the core of the vast horizon of relations, the action of language is the evolution forces of the spiritual component of cultural development and applies to all spiritual achievements and the whole

spiritual activity of a particular language community in its linguacultural and cognitive realization spectra (Croft and Cruse, 2004; Culicover, 2005).

As the foundation of human life, according to Weisgerber (2009) the language “is connected with all the manifestations of life of the individual and linguistic community as a whole. Accordingly, there are three main areas of the relationship between language and common culture: the action of language linguistic community and the results of this action; the impact of community and culture in the language; parallels between the development of language and other cultural phenomena” as “language is a universal form of primary conceptualization of the world, the exponent and guardian of the unconscious knowledge of the natural world mirror of the culture, showing the faces of previous cultures, intuition and category of visions of the world” (Postovalova, 1999) because, according to Wierzbicka (1994) “in some ways it may seem obvious that the words with special, cultural-specific values reflect and transmit not only a way of life, distinctive to a given society but also a mode of thinking”

The researches of linguistic cultural knowledge full range as a result of the national mode of thinking in order to create the interpretive model of knowledge associated with different methods but cognitive hermeneutic analysis of the material is a prevalent, because “linguistic culture and synergy systemacity interdependence is a predetermined by discursive consciousness systemacity that is perhaps the most complex creation of the cognitive power of culture” (Alefirenko, 2005), power detectable by the cognitive hermeneutic analysis. So, studies conducted by Kireeva describing the picture of everyday life of the American South in Faulkner's novel “The Hamlet” revealed that “the synergy of two or more concepts contributes to the reader's perception of the original work detailed image of characters as important components of the American South image”. Those literary characters, according to the study, are significant components of the designed fiction image of the American South in the work of W. Faulkner, Nobel Laureate in Literature.

Thus, the ongoing research based on the application of cognitive hermeneutic analysis of the material reveals the specifics of the cornerstones and other components of the linguistic cultural knowledge nuclear periphery model, creating the preconditions for the application of the following interpretive algorithms taking into account the fact that the “present-day science anthropocentric aspiration offers logocentric principle has been recognized language as a life-giving source of all

axiological space of culture. In the center of this space is a sign discursive semantic roots of which go back centuries, preserved the tradition of the creative (transforming and creative) power of the word” (Alefirenko, 2010) as the activity cognition object that on the one hand, is a cognitive process, process of information obtaining (Hutchins, 1995; Bernadez, 2003), knowledge, their categorization, conceptualization, verbal and cogitative activity using and on the other hand, represents the results of this process. This result is the knowledge, since according to Harnad (2005), “cognition is thinking” the results of which appear in many cognitive models, including linguistic cultural knowledge interpretive models.

CONCLUSION

Linguacultural researches of recent decades are directed towards the deep study of language and speech structures both within one language conceptsphere and within multiple language conceptspheres.

Linguacultural researches are contributed to the formation of extensive methodological framework which covers the range of approaches both synchronic and diachronic plane of linguistic scientific research. Manifestations of actual linguistic-cultural speech circuits are studied at the synchronic plane, while the diachronic research plane considers the formation of linguistic-cultural language factors in the axiological space of cognitive-discursive human modeling that is one of the priority areas in modern linguistics. Under modeling we meant a schematic representation of the nominative field of language and speech entities verbalizing linguistic-cultural cognitive structures in concept sphere of one language or several closely and unclosely related languages.

The interpretative model of linguistic-cultural knowledge is one of the possible formats of structured representation of a people ethno-linguistic world view in a cross-cultural cognitive-communicative space. It is obvious that cognitive-cultural settings of one language or several closely and unclosely related languages conceptsphere reflecting the unity of language, thought and culture and determine principles of linguistic-cultural knowledge interpretive models, its cognitive-discursive aura and the model appears as an integrated nuclear-peripheral field substance that is formed by ethnic discourse and includes pragmatically significant culturally marked realities of life.

Cognitive-hermeneutic analysis of the culturally marked language and speech cognitive structures that

form cognitive-discursive field of concept sphere closely and unclosely related languages reveals the results of heuristic understanding of linguistic and cultural knowledge ethnic-discursive dynamics and supports cognitive hermeneutic interpretation of this knowledge spectrum model.

Integrated kernel-periphery field structure of culturally marked language and speech cognitive structures as the worldview phenomena, their cognitive-cultural status as existentially meaningful ethnic substance, semantic content parameters contribute to the identification of the various configurations in interpretive model of linguistic-cultural knowledge architectonics and define the role of cognitive pragmatic properties of designed culturally marked language and speech cognitive structures allowing the implementation of the system speech ethnic-marked concepts.

REFERENCES

- Alefirenko, N.F., 2005. Philosophy lingvokul'turologii kak metodologicheskaja problem. Russkoe word in the center of Europe: Segodnya and zavtra. Bratislava, Russia, pp: 75-79.
- Alefirenko, N.F., 2010. Lingvo Kulturologija. Cennostno-smyslovoe expanse jazyka. Moscow: Flinta (In Russian).
- Bernadez, E., 2003. Social cognition: variation, language and culture. Paper presented at the 8th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference Logrono, July 20-25. University of La Rioja, Spain.
- Croft, W. and Cruse, D.A., 2004. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culicover, P.W., 2005. Linguistics, cognitive science and all that jazz. The Linguistics Rev., 22: 227-248.
- Danilenko, I.A., 2015. Chronemas as a Part of the Net Time in F.S. Fitzgarrald's "The Great Gatsby". Experientia is optima magistra. Belgorod: ID "Belgorod", pp: 192-196.
- Gak, V.G., 2000. Russkaja dinamicheskaja picture mira. Russkij jazyk segodnja, Russia, 1: 36-44.
- Gumboldt, V., 1985. Jazyk i filosofija kul'tury. Moscow: Progress (In Russian).
- Gurochkina, A.G., 2003. Aktua'nye problemy sovremennoj lingvokul'turologii. Vestnik Chuvash. ped. un-ta. Cheboksary, Russia, 4: 38-45.
- Harnad, S., 2005. Distributed Processes, Distributed Cognizers and Collaborative Cognition. In: I.E. Dror (Eds.), Cognitive Technologies and the Pragmatics of Cognition: Special issue of Pragmatics and Cognition, 13 (3): 501-514.
- Holland, D. and Quinn, N., 1987. Cultural Models in Language and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchins, E., 1995. Cognition in the World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson-Laird, P.N., 1983. Mental Models. Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference and Consciousness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karasik, V.I., 2013. Jazykovaja matrica kul'tury. Moscow: Gnozis (In Russian).
- Kravchenko, A.V., 2008. Kognitivnyj gorizont jazykoznanija. Irkutsk: BGUJeP (In Russian).
- Kutsenko, A.A., 2014. Lingvisticheskaja in jekstralingvisticheskaja specific realij change Jevardianskoj jepohi v teleformate istoricheskogo seriala. Sovremennye problems of science and obrazovaniya, Russia. <http://www.science-education.ru/117-13775>.
- Langacker, R.W., 1991. Concept, Image and Symbol: the Cognitive Basis of Grammar. Berlin; New York, pp: 28-33.
- Lotman, Ju.M., 2010. Inside mysljashhih peaceful. Semiosfera, Russia, pp: 150-390.
- Lur'e, S.V., 2004. Istoricheskaja jetnologija. Moscow: Akademicheskij project: Gaudeamus (In Russian).
- Maslova, V.A., 2001. Lingvo Kulturologija: uchebnoe posobie dlja studentov vysshih uchebnyh zavedenij. Moscow: Akademija (In Russian).
- Ogneva, E.A., 2011. Modelirovanie jetnokognitivnoj arhitektoniki literaturnykh proizvedenij. Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, Russia.
- Ogneva, E.A., 2014. Specificity of space landscape language units at the fiction conceptsphere. J. of Lang. and Lit., <http://www.ijar.lit.az/philology.php?go=jll-august2014>.
- Piotrovskij, R.G., 1998. Modelirovanie v linguistics. Voprosy romanskogo i obshhego jazykoznanija, Russia, pp: 86-96.
- Postovalova, V.I., 1999. Kartina mira v zhiznedejatel'nosti cheloveka. Rol' chelovecheskogo faktora v jazyke: Jazyk i kartina mira, Russia, pp: 8-70.
- Telija, V.N., 1996. Russkaja frazeologija: Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij i lingvokul'turologicheskij aspekty. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury (In Russian).
- Vorkachev, S.G., 2001. Lingvokul'turologija, jazykovaja lichnost', koncept: stanovlenie antropocentricheskogo paradigmy v jazykoznanii. Filologicheskie Nauki, Russia, 1: 64-72.
- Vorob'ev, V.V., 1997. Lingvokul'turologija: teorija i metody. Moscow: RUDN (In Russian).

- Wierzbicka, A., 1994. "Cultural Scripts": a New Approach to the Study of Cross-cultural Communication. *Language Contact and Language Conflict*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp: 67-87.
- Weisgerber, J.L., 2009. *Rodnoj jazyk i formirovanie duha*. Moscow: Librokom (In Russian).
- Zalevskaja, A.A., 2000. National-cultural specificity kartiny mirai different transition to ee issledovania. *Jazykovoe soznanie i obraz mira*, Russia, pp: 39-54.
- Zinov'eva, E.I. and E.E. Jurkov, 2009. *Lingvokul'turologija: teorija i praktika*. SPb.: ООО "Izdatel'skij dom", "MIRS" (In Russian).