III PMMIS 2019
Post mass media in the modern informational society "Journalistic text in a new technological environment: achievements and problems"

KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE WORLD VIEW

Olesya F. Tsibernaya (a)*
*Corresponding author

(a) Faculty of Linguistics and Translation, Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk, Russia,
igoshevaolesya@gmail.com

Abstract

This article describes a part of the research, dedicated to the problem of knowledge transfer in language world views of native Russian and Chinese speakers. It particularly describes the part that characterizes the process of knowledge transfer in the Russian language world view. During the work on the draft the theoretical premises of linguocultural transfers theory were established. The working definition of "knowledge" is given. The terms "intracultural" and "intercultural transfer" are delineated. The usage of one of the basic concepts as the unit of knowledge is explained. In addition, the necessity to use publicistic texts as the material of research is justified. The methodology, methods and procedures of the research are described. The author aims to trace the process of formation of the concept "human" and thus to explain the idea of knowledge transfer process existence in the Russian language world view. A brief description of the results of the concept "human" study was given for each of the three synchronous states. The semantic shifts occurred in the field structure of the concept in question are described. According to the author, the described shifts indicate the existence of intercultural transfer in the Russian language world view. In conclusion the necessity of further research using the materials of the Chinese language and the comparison of the obtained results is proved.

Keywords: Knowledge transfer, concept, semantic group, field of representation, intercultural transfer, language world.

1. Introduction

With the development of scientific thought, the previously dominant comparative-historical paradigm and the system-structural paradigms have been replaced by cognitive paradigm, the main object of which is a language as a general cognitive mechanism.

Most researches in the sphere of cognitive linguistics focus on the connection of knowledge put in the language with the subject of perception, mindset, behavior and activity. They also concentrate on the forms of reflection of the reality in the language- in the form of terms, ideas, images, concepts due to subjective and ethnic factors.

One of the modern tendencies in the research is the theory of cultural transfers. The theory touches upon the problem of interaction of knowledge got in different spheres of life and it also focuses on the knowledge reflection in different cultures and world views (Furs, 2018).

At the beginning of the 20th century among the situations of knowledge transfer the German philosopher and scientist Ernst Cassirer singled out the situation of cultural transfer in the processes of different perception ofgeneral scientific notions and situationof intercultural transferin the diachronic processes of adaptation and rethinkingthe basic cultural concepts and conception of the world from different spheres of culture (Feshchenko, 2016).

The study focuses on the knowledge transfer process. Knowledge is an essential element of an integrated cultural historical system, which represents human comprehension of his experience in context. A concept may be considered as a knowledge unit. This is due to the fact that cognitively-loaded notions including concepts may be studied in the context of intercultural knowledge transfer (Belyaeva & Teng, 2016). The study of the concept "human" is representative according to the following reasons: first of all, this concept is basic, and basic concepts form the fundament of the language world view, then, during the European culture development process, the so-called "anthropological shift" happened, which is the shift ofphilosophical ideas from cognition of the world to comprehensionof the phenomenon called "human" (Krasina & Perfil'eva, 2018; Sabitova, 2015; Stekol'nikova, 2011).

To date, the scientists have examined the concept from different points of view and have devoted many studies to it, however, the theory of cultural transfer, which leads to the possibility of studying the phenomenon of concept from different point of view (Tishechenko, 2008).

2. Problem Statement

This study bases on the hypothesis considering that historical events in particular country including changes of social and political order have an impact on the content of the concepts in general and on the basic concepts in particular.

The process of intercultural transfer can be observed while studying the content of the concept in several synchronic states. Several periods in the history of Russia can be singled out, the change of which made the content of the concept "human" different.

Due to the historical factors it is possible to determine the following periods:
• Before 1917
• 1918 – 1980

• 1981-present times

During the research it is supposed to describe the content of the concept "human" for each of the periods in question and to make its field model and macro model for the Russian language world view.

The comparison of the models will give the possibility to determine the presence of the knowledge transfer process in the Russian language world view and to assess the significance of the historical events for mental processes of people speaking this language (Dzyuba, 2015).

3. Research Questions

Please replace this text with context of your paper.

The most important questions to be answered in the study are as follows:

▪ If there is a knowledge transfer process in the Russian language world view;

▪ If it is possible to observe the knowledge transfer process, taking a concept as a knowledge unit;

▪ If the historical events influence the mental processes of native speakers.

4. Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study is to detect and describe the knowledge transfer process in the Russian language world view.

The following objectives need to be met in order to reach the goal:

• First, it is necessary to make a nominative field of the concept "human" for each of the synchronous states.

• Then, it is necessary to make a field and a macro model of the concept "human" for all the periods.

• After that, it is necessary to compare the models and to make a conclusion about the presence of any changes in structure of the concept.

• In case if the knowledge transfer process is observed, is necessary to describe it.

5. Research Methods

During the work on the research the content of the concept "human" for each periods mentioned above was analyzed in details. During each stage of the research a nominative field of the concept was made. The materials used for the research were publicistic texts, dating the period of time in question. The usage of publicistic texts makes the research representative as this is the most contemporary and mass material for each historical period (Dronova, 2013). In particular the representatives of the concept "human" were examined in the issues №20, №40, №60 of the daily newspaper "Siberian life", 1910, in the issue № 308 (415) of the newspaper "Izvestia", 1930, and the issue № 47 of the newspaper "ArgumentyiFakty" 2016.At the pre-revolutionary period 1161 representative was singled out, at the post-revolutionary period 1175 representatives were singled out, at the present time period 1337 representatives were singled out, accordingly 491, 519 and 753 of which are unique.

These representatives were distributed to the zones of the representation field according to the field model of the concept: the nucleus zone and the close and far periphery zones in accordance with the image components, the components of informational content of the concept and the components of its interpretative field(Pimenova, 2013; Saigin, 2015). Thus, the macro structure of the concept was made. According to Li (2016), the nucleus zone includes the representatives, constituting 40% and more from the maximum frequency index in the period of time in question. The distribution of the concept "human" to the representation fields is presented in the table 1.

Table 01. Distribution of the concept "human" representatives to the representation fields

Period of time	Nucleus	Close periphery zone	Far periphery zone
Before 1917	10 (2%)	171 (35%)	310 (63%)
1918 – 1980	9 (1,7%)	160 (30,8%)	350 (67,5%)
1981 – present times	11 (1,4%)	196 (26%)	546 (72,6%)

As can be seen, the number of representatives, distributed to the nucleus zone is almost the same for all periods. As regards the zones of close and far periphery the representatives are also distributed proportionately.

At the next stage the representatives of the concept "human" are distributed to semantic groups according to cognitive characteristics. The semantic groups, belonging to different time periods may differ. During the analyses of the representatives and the distribution of semantic groups, the research of Erofeeva (2011), who described the content of the concept "human" in the Russian world view, was taken as a base.

6.   Findings

Having analyzed the macrostructure of the concept "human" it is possible to make the following conclusions. The nucleus zone of all three synchronic states includes the representatives of several semantic groups, the content of which changed in the course of time. The cognitive characteristics of the representatives, belonging to the nucleus zone also changed.

The same changes are detected in the close and far periphery zones- in different synchronic states there are representatives, belonging to different semantic groups, having different nomenclature.

The change in the field model of the concept may indicate the cognitive changes in the native speakers' mindset. These changes can be seen in the table 2.

Table 02. Distribution of the representatives of the concept "human" to the semantic groups according to the representation field

Period of time	Nucleus	Close periphery	Far periphery
Before 1917	• Denominationof human (2): *«General notions» (2)*; • «Socialcharacter isticsofaman»	• «Socialcharacteristicsofama n» (67): *«Profession and other activities» (69)*, *«Status» (51)*; • «Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of	• «Socialcharacteristicsofama n» (137): *«Profession and other activities» (78)*, *« Status » (59)*; • « Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of

	(6): *«Profession and other activities » (3)*, *«Groups and group relations » (2), «Status» (1)*; • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (2): *«Gender» (1), «Age» (1)*.	a man » (13); • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (17*): « Gender » (6), «Age» (6), «Physical condition» (4).*	a man » (47); • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (51*): « Gender » (14), « Age » (23), « Physical condition » (14).*
1917 – 1980	Denominationofhuman: *« General notions » (321).*	• «Socialcharacteristicsofaman» (108): *«Family» (6), «Profession and other activities» (34), «Interpersonal relationships» (3), «Status» (5), «Beliefs» (26), « Groups and group relations» (34);* • «Denominationofhuman» (20): *«Personalities» (15), « General notions» (5);* • « Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of a man » (2); • Fields and kinds of activity (14); • Living space (4).	• «Socialcharacteristicsofaman» (178): *«Family» (6), «Profession and other activities» (59), « Interpersonal relationships » (11), «Status» (13), « Beliefs » (31), « Groups and group relations» (58);* • «Denominationofhuman» (30): *«Personalities» (23), « General notions » (7);* • « Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of a man » (22); • Fields and kinds of activity (33); • Living space (5).
1981 – present time	• Denominationof human (3): *«General notions» (2), «Personalities » (1)*; • Socialcharacteristicsofaman (3): *«Family» (1), «Groups and group relations» (1), «Social role» (1)*; • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (1): *«Age» (1)*; • «Activity and field of activity»	• «Socialcharacteristicsofaman » (107): *«Family» (9), «Profession and other activities» (19), « Interpersonal relationships » (5), «Social role» (25), «Beliefs» (4), « Groups and group relations» (24), «Status» (21);* • «Denominationofhuman» (27): *«Personalities» (20), « General notions » (7);* • « Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of a man » (1); • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (31*): «Gender» (9), «Age» (15), «Physical condition »*	• «Socialcharacteristicsofaman » (225): *«Family» (8),« Profession and other activities» (47), « Interpersonal relationships » (15), « Social role » (44), « Beliefs » (16), «Groups and group relations» (65), «Status» (30)*; • «Denominationofhuman» (125): *«Personalities» (121), « General notions » (4);* • « Subjective evaluativecharacteristics of a man» (40); • «Objective physical characteristics of a man» (40): *« Gender » (10), « Age » (6), « Physical condition »*

	(1): *«Field of activity» (1);* ● «Living spaceand attributes» (1): *«Attributes» (1).*	*(7); «Parts of the body (0)».* ● «Activity and field of activity» (43): *«Field of activity» (32), «Activity» (11);* ● «Living spaceand attributes» *(18): «Living space » (3), «Attributes» (15);* ● «Abstract notions» (9).	*(23); « Parts of the body (1)».* ● «Activity and field of activity» (101): *«Field of activity» (76), « Activity » (25);* ● «Living spaceand attributes» (28): *«Living space» (2), « Attributes » (26);* ● « Abstract notions » (17).

Speaking about the periphery zone, it is necessary to mention, that, in comparison with the pre-revolutionary period, the number of the representatives, belonging to the semantic group "Social characteristics of a man", doubled in the post-revolutionary and present time periods. This may indicate the increase in the importance of a man as a part of society. In the post-revolutionary period the number of the representatives belonging to the semantic group "Denomination of a man" increased significantly. Besides, it is necessary to mention the increasing activity of the representatives of the subgroup "Personalities" in the present time. The representatives of the semantic group "Subjective characteristics of a man" lost their importance due to the shift towards post-revolutionary period, their number decreased in the close periphery zone though they are still observed in the far periphery zone. The representatives of the semantic group "Objective physical characteristics of a man" are practically non-existent in the post-revolutionary period, though return their positions in the present time. It is also worth mentioning the increase in power of the representatives of the semantic group "Fields and kinds of activity". Though, it is important to note that the present time period adds the subgroups "Physical condition" and "Parts of the body" to previously present "Gender" and "Age" subgroups. The subgroups "Living space and attributes" and "Abstract notions" appear at the present time period (Igosheva, 2017).

Apart from the macrostructure of the concept, Popova and Sternin (2015) suggest ranging cognitive characteristics, singled out and distributed to the zones in the structure of the concept, according to the degree of their brightness in the concept structure (by percentage of language representations, defined during the experiment, whichmake the certain cognitive characteristic objective) thus, they suggest making field description of concept's content. The scientists point out that the macrostructure of the concept and its field description are most likely to differ from each other, as both image components and components of information content with components of its interpretation field may belong to the nucleus zone in equal proportion. At the same time, some characteristics of these macro components may be found in the close, far and remote periphery zones of the concept's content. The distribution according to the field zones in the concept structure will be carried out using the same methods as during the distribution in the process of making macrostructure.

Concept "human" in pre-revolutionary period:

Nucleus: Profession and other activities (37,12%);

Closeperiphery: status (27,47%), subjective characteristic of a man (14,85%);

Far periphery: age (7,42%), physical condition (6,96%); gender (5,19%);

Remoteperiphery: Groups and group relations (0,5%),general notions (0,49%).

Concept «human» in post-revolutionary period:

Nucleus: general notions (34,35%);

Closeperiphery: profession and other activities (12,61%), family (12,61%), groups and group relations (12,48%);

Far periphery: beliefs (7,73%), Fieldofactivity (6,36%);personalities (5,15%), subjective characteristic of a man (3,25%), status (2,44%), interpersonal relations (1,8%), living space (1,22%);

Concept "human" in present time period:

Nucleus: personalities (17,7%);

Closeperiphery: fieldofactivity (13,6%), groups and group relations (11,23%);

Far periphery: socialrole (7,37%), professionandotheractivities (7,23%), status (6,36%), attributes (5,24%), subjective characteristic of a man (5,11%), activity (4,49%), physical condition (3,74%), abstractnotions (3,24%), age(2,74%), beliefs (2,49%), interpersonal relations (2,49%), gender (2,37%), family (2,24%), general notions (1,62%).

Remoteperiphery: living space (0,62%), parts of the body (0,12%).

It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the representatives on the semantic group "Social characteristics of a man" (particularly of the subgroup "Profession and other activities") shifted from the nucleus zone in the pre-revolutionary period to the zone of close periphery in the post-revolutionary period and then to the far periphery zone in the present time period. At the post-revolutionary period the nucleus zone of the concept was filled with the representatives of the semantic group "Denomination of human" (in particular, those, belonging to the subgroup "general notions"). It is interesting to mention that these representatives are located in the far periphery zone in both pre-revolutionary and present time periods. At the present time period as well as at the previous stage, the nucleus zone consists of the representatives of the semantic group "Denomination of human", though now of those, belonging to the subgroup "Personalities".

As regards the periphery zone, its content changed every time each period changed into another. The representatives of the subgroup "Status" of the semantic group "Social characteristics of a man" and the representatives of the group "Subjective characteristics of a man" shifted from the close periphery zone in the pre-revolutionary period to the far periphery zone in the post-revolutionary period and remained there at the present time period. At the same time, the zone of close periphery in the post-revolutionary period is made up of the representatives, belonging to the semantic group "Social characteristics of a man" (those of subgroups "Profession and other activities", "Family", "Groups and group relations"). The representatives of the subgroup "Groups and group relations" maintained the positions at the present time period. The representatives of other semantic groups changed their position towards the far periphery zone. Besides, the zone of close periphery now includes the representatives of the semantic group "Fields and kinds of activity" (subgroup "Field of activity").

7. Conclusion

The changes in the field description of the concept "human" first of all mean the certain changes in the Russian native speakers' way of thinking. Besides, these changes indicate the presence of the

intercultural knowledge transfer in the Russian language world view. At the next stage it is supposed to compare the results of the research using the material of the Russian and the Chinese languages and to compare the processes of the knowledge transfer in both language world views.

Acknowledgments

References

Belyaeva, E. V., & Teng, L. (2016). Reprezentatsiiakontsepta "chelovek" v russkomikitaiskomiazykakh [Representation of the concept "human" in Russian and Chinese languages]. In *Philology and linguistics in modern society: proceedings of the IV international scientific conf* (pp. 63–65). Moscow.

Dronova, L.P. (2013). Metodikadiakhronicheskogoissledovaniiaikognitivnyipodkhod k iazyku [Diachronic research methodology and cognitive approach to language]. *Bulletin of Tomsk state University. Philology, 2*(28)*,* 16–22.

Dzyuba, E.V. (2015). *Lingvokognitivnaiakategorizatsiia v russkomiazykovomsoznanii.*[Linguo-cognitive categorization in Russian language Consciousness]. Yekaterinburg:Ural.

Erofeeva, E.V. (2011). Strukturasemanticheskogopolia "chelovek" v soznaniinositeleirusskogoiazyka [Structure of the semantic field "Human" in the mental lexicon of Russian native speakers]. *Vestnik of Perm University. Russian and foreign philology*, *1*(13), 7–19.

Feshchenko, V.V. (2016). *Lingvistikaisemiotikakul'turnykhtransferov:metody, printsipy, tekhnologii* [Linguistics and semiotics of cultural transfers: methods, principles, technologies] (monograph). Moscow: Kul'turnaiarevoliutsiia.

Furs, L.A. (2018). Vzaimodeistviekognitivnogoimeta kognitivnogourovnei v formirovaniikompleksnogoznaniia [Interaction of cognitive and metacognitive levels in the formation of complex knowledge]. *Issues of cognitive linguistics, 2*, 74–78.

Igosheva, O.F. (2017). Kontsept "chelovek" v russkoiiazykovoikartinemira (namaterialepublitsisticheskikhtekstov 1990 goda) [The concept "Human" in the Russian language world view (on the material of publisistic texts of 1910)]. In *Science and Education in the modern conditions* (pp. 427–435). Moscow.

Krasina, E.A., & Perfil'eva, N.V. (2018). Semanticheskieparametrykvantitativnykhedinits v raznostrukturnykhiazykakh [Semantic parameters of quantitative units in languages of different structures]. *Issues of cognitive linguistics, 1*, 126–136.

Li, H. (2016). *Dinamikaleksicheskoireprezentatsiikontsepta "den'gi' v russkomikitaiskomiazykakh* [Dynamics of lexical representation of the concept "money" in the Russian and Chinese languages] (Doctoral Dissertation). Irkutsk: Irkutsk State University.

Pimenova, M.V. (2013). Tipykontseptovietapykontseptual'nogoissledovaniia [The types of concepts and the stages of conceptual structure analyses]. *Vestnik of Kemerovo University*, *2*(2), 127–131.

Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2015). *Iazykinatsional'naiakartinamira* [Language and national picture of the world]. Moscow: Direct Media.

Sabitova, Z.K. (2015). *Lingvokul'turologiia: uchebnik* [Linguoculturology: a textbook]. Moscow: Flinta.

Saigin, V.V. (2015). Kognitivnyepriznakikontsepta "pokaianie" i ego iazykovaob'ektivizatsiia v sovremenomrusskomiazyke[Cognitive features of the concept of "repentance" and its linguistic objectification in modern Russian]. B*ulletin of Nizhny Novgorod University. N. And. Lobachevsky, 4,* 248–253.

Stekol'nikova, N.V. (2011). Dinamicheskaia model' invariantafol'klornogotekstarekursivnoistruktury[A dynamic model of an invariant of a folk text of a recursive structure]. In *Problems of the lexical-semantic typology: collection of scientific works* (pp. 286-290)*.*Voronezh: Voronezh State University.

Tishechenko, I.E. (2008). *Kontseptkakdiakhronicheskiifenomen (namaterialeissledovaniiakontsepta "smelost" vofrantsuzskomirusskomiazyke)* [Concept as a diachronic phenomenon (based on the study of the concept "courage" in French and Russian)]. (Doctoral Dissertation). Kemerovo.