Linguistic World Picture: Logoepisteme - domain - linguocultureme

Nikolai F. Alefirenko
Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russia

Kira K. Stebunova
Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russia

Abstract—The paper considers the components of language worldview (including literary worldview) in its relationship with the world model and the world image. The constructive role of a word, a domain and a logoepisteme in modeling the world image is revealed. The authors are intended to prove that an integral image of ethnic culture is the basis of the semantic space of language. Another basic idea is that literary worldview consists of two interrelated aspects: 1) the *existential* including sensual about times everyday and (subconscious) substantive work, and 2) *reflexive* (conscious), which includes language and speech meanings.

Index Terms—language worldview / model / world image, logoepisteme, domain, linguocultureme

I. INTRODUCTION.

In linguo-cultural studies, language worldview (WV) is considered to be a base category which helps to reveal the way the universal and individual knowledge is displayed in verbal and cogitative activities. However, WV is rather difficult to study because of its diversity, ambiguity, and vague structure. To solve this problem, it is necessary, first of all, to identify the nature of this phenomenon and the way it is related to allied concepts, to find "working" unit of study. In linguo-philosophy, they distinguish scientific and naïve worldview (WV) (Bartminski, Zinken, 2012). Linguo-cultural studies focus on the latter one. Linguists also define naïve worldview as *world model* and *world image*. However, these terms represent concepts which, although similar, still have differences that cannot be ignored.

II. FROM WORLD MODEL TO THE LANGUAGE WORLDVIEW

In this paper, we state that that world model is a "coordinate grid" by means of which people perceive reality and build up the world image in their minds. Consequently, the image of the world is a secondary category, a derivative formation, projected by the world outlook model. This is not a "grid" and not a scheme, but a full-scale mapping of the objective world in the human mind (Leontiev, 2001). Besides, the word *image* in this context is supposed to have a corporate meaning: an integral unity of interconnected individual (particular) images which displays certain angles of value-semantic perception of the world in ethnic conscious. Thus, the world image is a category of ethnoculture (Hutchins, 1980, p. 143; Wertsch, 1985, p. 273). This means that the world image is determined by the value-semantic matrix of worldview through which ethnicity interprets environment of its existence in the semantic space of a language (Casson, 1981, p. 437; D'Andrade, 1981, p. 179). As a result, previously collectively generated world model becomes filled with personal meanings, shaping not only real, but also "possible worlds". As V. I. Postovalova points out, "People percieve the world, behold it, learn it, conceptualize it, interpret it, reflect and display it, dwell in it and imagine "possible worlds" (Postovalova, 1988, p. 14). Consequently, the world image origins from our experience in the following aspects: axiological processes of gestalt attitude (visual and spatial perception of the reality), outlook, orientation, worldview, and conception. World image is formed by the integration of the various traces of human interaction with objective reality. As A.A. Leontiev concludes, "the world image comprises both the direct, or situational, reflection of reality and the conscious (reflexive) one" (2001, pp. 260-271). It is very important to consider this feature when we are displaying a world image in the literary texts, where a literary WV is created through individual images of the characters' reality. Literary WV should not be identified with the world image of the individual. The latter is, according to A.A. Zalevskaya, "simultaneous, holographic and multifaceted", is operating at different levels of conscious and always comprises both "knowledge" and "experience". For this reason, it is "not completely amenable to verbal description". (Zalevskaya, 2001, p. 43). Thus, in cognitive linguo-poetics it is important to use discourse analysis to understand those aspects of WV which are impossible to explicit verbally. (Rosch, 1975; Paivio, 1986). Having this in mind, we can conclude that "literary worldview" is a broader concept than "world image". On the other hand, the *world image* is a broader than the common notions of the world related to the cognitive experience, reflection and emotions of an individual. World image develops throughout our life, in the course of their age-long relations with the nature and society. The result of those relations is a system of images through which not only the world is recognized, but also the nature of ethical values, including the estimation of events described in a literary text. Thus, we can assume that different subjects

of communication possess the equal world model as a "coordinate grid", but literary WV created by them may differ significantly from its model. This might result from the fact that one and the same world model is influenced by different discursive factors of a communicative, cognitive, pragmatic and sociocultural nature.

So, the world model is a scheme which is filled by images of reality displayed in the minds. The result is a variety of personal and ethnosocial images of reality (Child, 1968, p. 82). Their structured aggregate forms an invariant world image. When interpreted in a particular communicative situation, it becomes a literary WV.

From the perspective of cognitive linguo-poetics, the core (the invariant) of a "world image" is formed by linguistic meanings, common to the whole ethno-cultural community. The semantic space of our native language is based on a complete image of ethnic culture. It consists of two interconnected layers: 1) an *existential* one, involving sensual images and ordinary substantive activity, which is undertaken, as a rule, unconsciously and 2) a *reflexive* one (see Zinchenko, 1991), which is conscious, because it includes the meaning and sense of linguistic characters which serve as names for cognizable objects and phenomena.

The idea of the world model, the description of WV and the reflection of world image are formed by the information which is fixed in the collective consciousness and objectified in language. This structured knowledge of the world, fixed by nominative, grammatical and other functional means of language, forms the so-called linguistic WV, which is regarded as special derivation participating in learning the world. It sets interpretation samples of perceiving text in dynamic retrospect. Regarding the linguistic WV as diachronic category opens up new perspectives in understanding ethno-cultural specificity of words by relating it to the concept in general and the literary concept in particular.

III. WORD, DOMAIN AND LOGOEPISTEME

The scope of the notion "domain" is determined by its correlation with the terms "linguocultureme", "mythologeme" and "logoepisteme". However, to define its semantics does not mean to reveal its nature. On the contrary, the confusion the domain with its related phenomena can create jumble of terms. Identifying domain with the word, or rather with its meaning, which is recently observed, does not seem correct too. It should be noted that, that it's the ontological properties of the domain that give the reason for this confusion. The semantic content of a domain is close to the semantics of words in two aspects: a) as protosemantic idea and b) as a derivative of the lexical-semantic implicational. In the second aspect, the domain comprises both the lexicographical and encyclopedic information carried by a word. Semantic content of the domain integrates the denotation and connotation, the "nearest" and "further" meanings of a word, knowledge about the world and a person who is the learning the world. A.A. Zalevskaya defines the domain as a perceptual, cognitive and affective forming of dynamic nature which objectively exists in the human mind, unlike the notions and meanings which are products of scientific description (the constructs) (Zalevskaya, 2001, p. 39).

Terminological definition of the word *domain* could eliminate the current confusion in its use and, thus, solve some problems linguo-cognitive science is presently facing. One of the first steps in this direction could be a distinction between the domain and logoepisteme. While the domain is alongside with such phenomena as the meaning, sense, notion, noeme and idea, the logoepisteme primarily continues the semantic projection of an episteme.

The syncretic nature of logoepisteme (Foucault, 1985) is encoded in its etymology: Greek. *logos* 'word', speech + *episteme* 'knowledge'. However, this is not a simple conjunction of the two concepts. Comprising a spiritual content and a language form of its objectification, logoepisteme reflects the folk mentality. Mentality, according to V.V. Kolesov, is the outlook represented by means of the categories and forms of one's native language, which combine typical intellectual, spiritual and volitional aspects of the national character during the process of cognition (Kolesov, 2004). Seen this way, the logoepisteme is such an ideal construction, which acts simultaneously as the fragment and the mode of the soul of both the individual and the community in general, or, as Wilhelm von Humboldt put it, a way of expressing "national spirit". Being an element of cognitive basis of Homo Loquens, logoepistemes have a wide associative potential that promotes the formation of expressive and emotive speech. So, it is easy to notice the similar features between the concept and the logoepisteme. However, the latter one differs from the former because it harmoniously combines the universal, which originates from ideas, and the ethnocultural, that roots from the national language. This is the essence of informational and energy understanding of "national spirit", in contrast to its rationalistic interpretation.

Ethnocultural specificity of a logoepisteme develops from three main components: (a) cognitive component, which encodes and represents the knowledge from different areas of our axiological and semantic space; (b) the pragmatic component, which determines the ethno-cultural specificity of communication; (c) the motivation component, resulting from the understanding of personal involvement in associative-shaped primary source of verbalized ideas. Thus, we can say that a logoepisteme determines a subconscious feeling of man's spiritual kinship with his native ethnic culture. To understand logoepistemic model of culture means to understand the way the values and language of a community are formed. It should be noted that initially, E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov posed the term *logoepisteme* as a unit of culture-through-language studies (Vereshchagin, Kostomarov, 2005) to describe the methods of representation of specific knowledge about the reality in the national language. Such a linguo-cognitive content is primarily enclosed in the term that represents this concept: "logoepisteme is a linguistic expression of the trace of reality reflection which is enshrined by socio-cultural memory in the minds of the language speakers as a result of understanding (or creating) their cultural values of national and world cultures" (Kostomarov Burvikova, 2002). We must say, this role was prescribed to other phenomena, too: a linguocultureme (V.V. Vorobyov), a linguo-cultural universal (V.M. Shaklein) a

national socio-cultural stereotype (Y.E. Prokhorov), a domain (Y.S. Stepanov), a linguo-cultural domain (V.I. Karasik and G.G. Slyshkin). In our opinion, we should exclude linguo-cultural universal and national socio-cultural stereotype out of this logoepistemic series. The point is that the logoepisteme (not as a universal stereotype, but as a socio-cultural one) is not always verbally expressed (Bragina, 2009). So it can be the episteme, but not the logoepisteme. There are also some differences between the other terms. However, these differences are often based on different grounds: logoepisteme is an element of the word meaning; linguocultureme (as interlevel unit) is not localized in a word; the domain is an operational meaningful memory unit; socio-cultural stereotypes determine the nature of linguistic connotations and serve, metaphorically saying, as the oldest semiotic skeleton of human existence.

Trying to find the properties signs that bring together domains and socio-cultural stereotypes, V.I. Karasik, G.G. Slyshkin suggest the term *linguo-cultural domain* and emphasize the verbalized and culture-bearing nature of its semantic content. Linguists see specific features of the linguo-cultural domain in its mental nature, because it is located in the collective or individual mind (Karasik, Slyshkin 2003, p. 76; cp.: Langacker, 1991). In general, we share this view, but it is true for logoepisteme as well, because it is also an element of mentality. We suppose that the point is not in the mental nature of linguo-cultural domain, but in the appropriateness of the detachment of its generic term "domain" at all.

Emphasizing the term "linguo-cultural" domain is also supported, oddly enough, by S.G. Vorkachev. The strangeness of this position is that the author himself states that any "domain is a culturally marked verbalized meaning, which is presented in terms of a number of its linguistic implementations, forming the corresponding lexical-semantic paradigm" (Vorkachev, 2002; emphasis – N. A.). So, it is not only the linguo-cultural domain that is "culturally marked" and "verbalized".

Of course, the very desire to narrow the search of the essential properties of this term can only be welcomed, since, unfortunately, it has already turned into a "terminological phantom". Y.E. Prokhorov in his book "In Search of the domain" (Flinta, 2001) tries to get to the bottom of the existing terminological and conceptual confusion. Numerous definitions of the domain given in this book prove that the term "domain" refers to quite different phenomena. Unfortunately, too "free" use of the term leads to a kind of "devaluation" of the underlying notion.

Still, despite the variety of definitions referring to the term "domain", researchers agree that the domain is a conditional mental structure. It has purely cognitive status and doesn't exist beyond human mind. The complexity of the domain is "determined by the two-way communication between language and consciousness, because the categories of consciousness are implemented in the language categories and are determined by them at the same time" (Vardzelashvili, 2004, p. 39). Rightly stressing that culture determines the domain, the author believes that the relationship between language and culture is more complicated than it seems at first glance. After all, the language is both a part of the culture and its external factor. Doubtless, the domain is actualized by language units. However, the assertion that a "concept-thought, being designated with a word becomes a domain", seems somehow simplistic without further clarification. This feeling is further enhanced by the following statement: "from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics, according to the author, it is proved that the use of the term *notion* in its traditional sense does not meet the requirements of the current stage in the linguistics" (Vardzelashvili, 2004, p. 40). The author argues that it is time to replace the term *notion* with the term *domain,* which "corresponds to the representation of those values, images, ethnospecificities which a person is founded on and which he operates in the process of thinking" (Vardzelashvili, 2004, p. 41). Further, it is concluded that it is the concept that "captures the essence of the epistemological process and human functioning" (ibid.). But what is wrong with the term *notion*? As we believe, it has its own niche in the structure of human thinking, and this niche was determined in the Middle Ages. The domain is more than just a notion which is only "approximate to the domain, the presentation of a domain in one of its substantial forms" (Kolesov, 2004). The same idea is emphasized by Y.S. Stepanov, who perceived the notion as one of the incarnations of the domain. Apart from the notion, there are such forms of the domain existence as feelings, images and experiences of a subject who is thinking and perceiving the world. These non-notional incarnations of domains clearly explain the nature of "fuzzy" definitions of the domain. Although they lack the terminological certainty, they are still quite capable of grasping their cognitive essence. Indeed, the domain is a mental formation, a cognitive mental structure, the clot of meaning, etc. Cp.: **1.** Domain is a mental entity which replaces "undefined set of items of the same kind" (Askoldov, 1997, p. 269). We can agree with it: domain is indeed a multiplicity, but not any multiplicity is a domain. **2.** Domain is a cognitive psychic structure, arranged to provide the capability of reflecting the reality in the unity of aspects (Kholodnaya, 2002, p. 23). We do not think that reflection of the objects of reality in the unity of affine aspects is the prerogative of the concept. **3.** Domains are "the meanings that constitute basic cognitive subsystems of opinions and knowledge" (Pavilenis, 1983, p. 241). But this definition is true for logoepistemes as well. **4.** Domains are the units of thinking which are characterized by separate integrity of the content and do not really dissolve into smaller thought (Chesnokov, 1967, p. 173). To what extend is that assertion true nowadays? We have no doubt that since the domains have semantic content, their components are elementary meanings included in the content of the domain. With this terminological ambiguity the multi-featured essence of the domain reminds elusive firebird from a famous Russian fairy tale.

IV. DOMAIN: BETWEEN IMAGE AND NOTION

When it is difficult to determine the nature of the phenomenon, human brain usually tries to use its hidden metaphorical resources. Modern researchers express associative-shaped "genetics" of a domain with very vivid metaphors like

gene or *clot of culture* (Y.S. Stepanov), "multilateral clot of sense" (S.H. Lyapin), "a kind of meaning potency" (D.S. Likhachev). Deep metaphors, no doubt! But they are forgotten when some researchers try to refer to domains those phenomena which were traditionally considered as concepts, categories or images. Besides, this kind of metaphorical characteristics could be as well applied to logoepisteme. Obviously, in this case it is advisable to involve the arguments which fall into the category of anthropological linguistics and shed some light on the interrelation between the **domain** and *linguistic identity*, **domain** and *language*. After all, according to T.B. Radbil, "domain is what I see in my mind (*being a linguistic identity – N.A.*) when the words are spoken, sometimes even unconsciously to myself, and what has value to me, and what has sense for me, although sometimes I do not know exactly what kind of sense" (Radbil, 2010, pp. 206-207; see also: Wierzbicka, 1985). Indeed, an object or a phenomenon which cannot cause the *e x p e r i e n c e*, cannot give rise to the domain. No one would ever call the back of a seat or a chair leg a domain. It's the objects of knowledge which serve as a source of axiological and semantic perception (like *a spring*, *a heart*, *a hearth)* that are conceptualized. Each of these domains can become a source of implicit connotation of the word due to their association-shaped energy. For example, the domain "Spring" involves a fairly wide range of axiological and associative-shaped experiences. It is only natural that the springs, which were worshiped by pagans for many centuries, gave birth to the literary domains of Mikhail Lermontov (*in my soul... there is an unknown and virgin spring, // Full of simple and sweet sounds*), Ivan Bunin (*In the forest there is a mountain spring, lively and ringing*), Igor Severyanin (*A spring, full-flowing, full-sonorous, // My mother, my natural spring, // Again to you (you cannot bore me!) // I clung insatiably*).

The direct meaning of the word **spring** – 'water source, bubbling, flowing out of the depth of the earth' - usually raises the domains of moral purity and filial devotion. Modern perception of this domain is presented in the songs of Oleg Gazmanov: *Springs, oh my springs, // I'll go back to you, wherever I would be // And will drink your holy water // Right in the heart of Russia.*

In speech, figurative and sensitive components of this domain actualize the allegoric meaning represented by the word "spring": *spring* is 'what is the source of anything, where anything originates from': *love spring*, *spring of soul*, *spring of grace*, *spring of goodness and light*, *springs of poetry*, *springs of wisdom*, *springs of inspiration*, etc. Such a rich semantics of the domain is determined by its multilayer structure. The most important are the three layers empathized by Y.S. Stepanov (1997, p. 47): 1) a basic, actual property; 2) an "extinct" property, which became irrelevant, historical for our consciousness, and 3) an etymological property which is not usually realized and which serves as blurred internal form of the domain. A special linguo-poetic role is played by the actual and etymological layers, which generate a certain context associative-shaped halo of words. For example, discursive associations in the song of V.S. Vysotsky: *My springs of silver, my gold placer!* Within the ethnocultural subconscious of the poet the springs as treasures of the soul correspond to Slavic symbols of Family and ancient archetype: silver as a symbol of the moon and gold as a symbol of the sun. Archetypes and symbols are the main sources of culture-bearing meanings of literary texts in cognitive linguo-poetics.

In contrast to the domain that expresses a certain idea (see Alefirenko, 2011, p. 116), an embryo of thought, the "grain of primary meaning" (V.V. Kolesov), logoepisteme carries already "matured" semantic content, information and knowledge. Often this knowledge takes the shape of a statement: "Everything had got all mixed up at the Oblonskys", "Battle of Kulikovo", "Ilya Muromets". Moreover, the whole contexts of Russian culture stand behind such statements; therefore the logoepistemes can be understood as systems of cultural meanings expressed in semiotic and symbolic form. Thus, we can say that logoepistemics is a "fundamental culture code" that identifies specific forms of associative and imaginative perception of reality, the originality of their textual representation. Finally, the system of logoepistemes serves as the indicator of literary thinking style in the author's linguistic WV.

V. Conclusion

Unlike the word linguocultureme has a more complex significatum: its content splits up into the linguistic meaning and cultural sense. Mythologeme refers to stable and repetitive constructs of national perception of the world, generally reflecting the reality in the form of material and concrete personifications which were conceived as quite real by archaic consciousness. (E.g.: mythologeme World Tree, mythologeme Flood etc.) Logoepisteme is a set of cultural meanings which are expressed in the semiotic and symbolic form; domain is a common, naive notion, an "embryo" of the divine Logos and the archetype of thought. Finally, considering this correlation between basic categories of linguistics, we define the literary WV as the axiological and semantic space, which displays the sphere of domains of culture-bearing text as a product of discursive human activity. Therefore, the WV should concern the cultural linguistics only in its verbally presented aspect, i.e. as linguistic WV. For this reason, it is important to keep an interdisciplinary balance of harmonious understanding of cognitive and cultural ingredients of linguistic WV within the linguo-cultural study: on the one hand, to refer to the fundamental possibility of verbalization of any result of comprehension of reality, and on the other hand, to take into account author's variations of ethnic and cultural stereotypes of consciousness represented in the literary text.

Acknowledgment

REFERENCES

[1]   Alefirenko, N. F. (2011). Linguistic culturology. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.
[2]   Askoldov, S. A. (1997). Domain and word. In Nerosnak V. P. (ed.) *Russian literature. From the theory of literature to the structure of the text. Anthology*. Moscow: Academia, 21-35.
[3]   Bartminski, J. & Zinken, J. (2012). Aspects of cognitive ethnolinguistics. Sheffield: Equinox.
[4]   Bragina, N. G. (2009). Mythology stereotype and common knowledge. Stereotypes in language, communication and culture. Moscow: URSS.
[5]   Casson, R. W. (ed.) (1981). Language, culture, and cognition: Anthropological Perspectives. New York: Macmillan.
[6]   Chesnokov, P. V. (1967). A word and the corresponding unit of thinking. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
[7]   Child, I. L. (1968). Personality in culture. In E. F. Borgatta and W.W. Lambert (eds.) *Handbook of Personality Theory and Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 82-83.
[8]   D'Andrade, R. G. (1981). The culture part of cognition. *Cognitive Science*. 5, 179-195.
[9]   Hutchins, E. (1980). Culture and inference. A Trobriand case study. *Cognitive Science Series*. 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press: 143.
[10]   Karasik, V. I. & Slyshkin, G. G. (2003). Linguo-cultural domain as an element of language consciousness. *The methodology of modern psycholinguistics.* Moscow; Barnaul: Altai University Press, 75-80.
[11]   Kholodnaya, M. A. (2002). Psychology of Intelligence: Paradoxes of research (2nd edn.). St. Petersburg: Piter.
[12]   Kolesov, V. V. (2004). Language and mentality. St. Petersburg: Petersburg Orientalism.
[13]   Kostomarov, V. G. & Burvikova, N. D. (2000). Modern Russian and cultural memory. *Ethnocultural specificity of speech activity*. Moscow: INION RANS, 8-22.
[14]   Kremer-Marietti, A. & Foucault, M. (1985). Archeologie et genealogie [Archeology and genealogy]. Paris: Livre de Poche.
[15]   Langacker, R. W. (1991). Concept, image, and symbol: The cognitive basis of grammar. Berlin; N.Y.: Monton de Gruyter.
[16]   Leontiev, A. A. (2001). A deedful mind: (Activity, Sign, Personality). Moscow: Smysl.
[17]   Paivio, A. (1986). Mental representation. A Dual Coding Approach. New York: Oxford University Press.
[18]   Pavilenis, R. I. (1983). Problem of meaning: modern logical and philosophical analysis of language. Moscow, Mysl.
[19]   Postovalova, V. I. (1988). Worldview in human life. In B. A. Serebrennikov (ed.) *Role of the human factor in language: Language and worldview.* Moscow: Nauka, 8-69.
[20]   Radbil, T. B. (2010). The basics of linguistic mentality study. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.
[21]   Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive representation of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 104, 192-233.
[22]   Stepanov, Y. S. (1997). Constants. Dictionary of Russian culture. Research experience. Moscow: Academic Project.
[23]   Vardzelashvili, J. (2004). Domain as a linguistic category – "constructive nature". Tbilisi State University. Faculty of Philology. *Collections of studies.* Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University, 39-45.
[24]   Vereshchagin, E. M. & Kostomarov, V. G. (2005). Language and culture. Moscow: Indrik.
[25]   Vorkachev, S. G. (2002). Methodological bases of linguo-conceptology. *Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* (vol. 3). In Voronezh (ed.), 79-95.
[26]   Wertsch, J. V. (ed.) (1985). Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[27]   Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Lexicography and conceptual analysis. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
[28]   Zalevskaya, A. A. (2001). Introduction to psycholinguistics. Moscow: Gnozis.
[29]   Zinchenko, V. P. (1991). Worlds and the structure of consciousness. *Questions of psychology*. 2: 15-36.

Nikolai F. Alefirenko, a Professor of Philology holds a doctorate degree in Philology from the Institute of Linguistics named after A. A. Potebnya of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (1989). Since 2004 he has been working as a Professor of the Russian Linguistics Department in Belgorod State National Research University, Russia.

He has been lecturing the courses of Introduction to linguistics, History of linguistics, General linguistics, Cognitive linguistics at Volgograd State Pedagogical University and Belgorod State National Research University. He is a constant participant of major symposia in Russia and abroad (Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Serbia, Slovakia, Croatia, etc.). Dr Alefirenko has published more than 250 scientific works, including monographs and textbooks such as "Theory of Language: An Introduction to General Linguistics" (Moscow, 1998), "Poetic energy of words: synergy of language, consciousness and culture" (Moscow, 2002), "Controversial problems of semantics" (Moscow, 2005) etc.

Dr Alefirenko is also the Honoured Science Worker of the Russian Federation, Honorary Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation, Corresponding member of Russian Academy of Natural Sciences. His scientific interest lies in the field of cognitive, semiological and cultural linguistics. He is a head of scientific school on cognitive semantics, cultural linguistic and phraseology which is working on different research projects.

Kira K. Stebunova holds an MA degree in Philology (2011) from the Belgorod State National Research University, Russia. She also received her bachelor degree in Philology (2009) from the Belgorod State National Research University, Russia.

She has been working as teaching assistant at the Belgorod State National Research University for 3 years. She has published 10 papers on phraseology.

Ms. Stebunova is interested in cognitive semantics, Russian and contrastive phraseology, pragmalinguistics. She is working within the framework of Dr Alefirenko's scientific school.