Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences
2022 15(10): 1533–1547

DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0471
УДК 81-25

Two «Characters» in the Russian Linguistic Worldview: «We» and «They»

Inna. V. Revenko and Elena V. Osetrova*
Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V.P. Astafyev
Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation

Received 03.07.2019, received in revised form 30.09.2019, accepted 14.10.2019

Abstract. The article reconstructs semantic context (evaluation, movement, actions, etc.) of WE and THEY – two usual subjects of the Russian linguistic worldview. Monologues and dialogues recently collected in Krasnoyarsk reveal the main characteristics of this opposition. A relatively big number of contexts have indefinite-personal verb forms such as [they] «buy», «make», «climb», «cover up for», «turn», «serve», «locate», «repair», «accommodate», etc. Due to their grammar and semantic realization in the oral speech they are included in the syntactic connection with the personal pronoun «they» – the representative form of some indefinite collective subject. This group of predicates, as well as their closest linguistic entourage, «tells» about the circumstances and details of «Their» actions, «Their» characteristics and «Their» partners, forming the distinctive specificity of the text content. In the same contexts there happens to be no less active collective subject – the author's «We». «We» and «They» are realized in different event-based and qualitative interactions, given by spatial and temporal coordinates, where these two «characters» distinguished by linguistic consciousness live and act. This semantic field in the Russian language common worldview is divided into several parts, for example: power environment, professional environment. Inter-ethnic communication, sacred communication, etc. As a result, the indistinctive subject «They» developed by the indefinite personal form of the verbal predicate and the pronoun «There» turn out to be only a mask – superficial uncertainty. It is easily removed by the subsequent context and specified through the parameters «place» (for example, «in power», «at work»), «social status of the subject» («officials», «bosses», «the rich», «owners»), «the character of the situation» (irrational, useless action – or rightful, useful for «Us», ordinary members of the community, «folks», «people»). The grammatical uncertainty itself is transformed into semantic markers of two definite evaluations – evaluations of distrust and unbelonging (often in relation to «Them») and self-evaluations of rightness and sympathy (often in relation to the subject «We»).

Keywords: concept of «our (own) – alien (other)», ordinary (linguistic) worldview, semantics, semantic field, «We», «They», predicate.

Research area: russian language; language theory.

* Corresponding author E-mail address: osetrova@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0003-2894-2254 (Osetrova)

Citation: Revenko, I.V., Osetrova, E.V. (2019 online). Two «characters» in the Russian linguistic worldview: «we» and «they». J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. soc. sci., 2022 15(10), 1533–1547. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0471

Два «героя» русской языковой картины мира: мы и они

И.В. Ревенко, Е.В. Осетрова
Красноярский государственный педагогический университет им. В.П. Астафьева
Российская Федерация, Красноярск

Аннотация. В статье реконструировано событийное и оценочное поле двух субъектов обыденной картины мира – МЫ и ОНИ. На материале разговорных монологов и диалогов современных жителей Красноярска и с помощью лингвистического анализа выявлены смысловые характеристики этой ключевой оппозиции. Довольно большое число контекстов имеет в своем составе неопределенно-личные глагольные формы: «покупают», «делают», «лезут», «выгораживают», «переворачивают»; «обслуживают», «размещают», «ремонтируют», «приспосабливают» и т. п. Грамматические и семантические условия реализации этих форм в разговорной речи доказывают их включенность в синтаксическую связь с личным местоимением *они* – репрезентантом некоего неопределенного группового, коллективного субъекта. Данная группа предикатов, а также их ближайшее языковое окружение «рассказывают» об обстоятельствах и деталях «Их» действий, «Их» характеристиках и «Их» соучастниках, формируя явную специфику содержания. В тех же контекстах обнаруживается не менее активный коллективный субъект авторского «Мы». «Мы» и «Они» входят в определенное событийное и качественное взаимодействие, заданное пространственными и временными координатами, в границах которых обитают и действуют два «героя», выделенные языковым сознанием. Это семантическое поле в обыденной картине мира разделено на несколько частей, например: среда власти, профессиональная среда, среда межнационального взаимодействия, сакральная коммуникация и т. д. В результате неопределенность субъекта «Они», на первый взгляд, развиваемая неопределенно-личной формой глагольного предиката и местоимением «Там», оказывается лишь маской – поверхностной неопределенностью. Она с легкостью снимается последующим контекстом и конкретизируется через параметры «место» (например, «во власти», «на работе»), «социальный статус субъекта» («чиновники», «начальство», «богатые», «хозяева»), «характер деятельности» (действие нерациональное, бесполезное либо правильное, полезное для «Нас» – рядовых членов сообщества, «народа», «людей»). Сама же грамматическая неопределенность трансформируется в семантические маркеры двух определенных оценок – оценки недоверия и непричастности (часто в отношении к «Ним») и самооценки правоты и сочувствия (часто в отношении к «Нам самим»).

Ключевые слова: концепт «свое – чужое», обыденная (языковая) картина мира, семантика, семантическое поле, «Мы», «Они», предикат.

Научная специальность: 10.02.01 – русский язык; 10.02.19 – теория языка.

Introduction

The juxtaposition of «our» and «alien», according to Yu. S. Stepanov, «in different kinds permeates the whole culture and is one of the main concepts of any collective, mass, folk, national perception. Including, of course, Russian. Depending on the size of the team considered we can find in it a somewhat special, but always distinct difference between «Our» and «Alien» (Stepanov, 2004: 126–143).

This opposition is based on the differences in the system of moral and ethic regulations, customs and traditions, being realized as an antithesis: «we» – «they» / «our – alien», «I – other». There is a concise quotation: «A person as a subject and a personality does not exist without the Other – such unit or starting point, which gives an impression about of a man's commensurability in comparison with peers» (Mullagalieva, 2008: 138).

Contemplating about the origins of the conceptual opposition «our – alien», Yu. S. Stepanov attributes them to cultural specifics and connects them with the emergence and development of an ethnos. The scientist discerns a behavioural component in this opposition, which. In his opinion, goes back to the animal nature of man and is associated with differing interactions with respect to objects classified as «our» or «alien»; these interactions accordingly range from benevolent and to varying degrees hostile. Based on E. Benvenist's analysis of Indo-European languages, the author proves the existence of this conceptual opposition in all groups of these languages and notes that the concept «our» was originally an awareness of the blood kinship of some a group of people (tribe, clan) within which a person at the same time perceives him- / herself «… free by birth» and contrasts him- / herself with «others» – «alien, enemies, slaves» (a friend or a foe concept) (Stepanov, 1997: 480). Due to the presence of a semantic community, represented in the components of «our tribe, people» and «the place where law and order prevails», the language embodiment of the abovementioned opposition has some specifics in different languages.

As regards the concept «alien», Yu. S. Stepanov points to the peculiarity of its representation in Russian culture because of the relationship and in some cases the contamination with the concept «miracle». This specificity seems fully justified, since «the concept, consisting in the opposition of «our – alien» is in the closest connection with the self-consciousness of an ethnic group and its stereotypical behaviour» (Stepanov, 1997: 486).

In this context the comparative works are of particular interest. For instance, I. Z. Borisova in the article «The concept of 'alien' in the linguistic worldview» gives the presentation of the binary concept in the Russian, Yakut and French linguistic worldviews. Analyzing phraseological units, the researcher concludes that there are common features in the concept representation in the linguistic cultures under study, which «is evidence of some common perception of the world by representatives of these cultures» (Borisova, 2014: 223), and also highlights a number of significant differences. Determining the dominant component of the concept, the author notes that in the French linguistic worldview the component «our own» is dominant, which can be explained the self-identification of the French as a nation of enlighteners in relation to other peoples. The Russian linguistic worldview is subject to the «alien» component, which is due to Russia's location between the West and the East and the corresponding need for «self-identification in relation to the 'alien', often through denial». In Yakut culture, the core concept «alien» is the meaning of «other stratum, kin, people» (Borisova, 2014: 223).

On the basis of dictionaries V. A. Ermakova in her work «Paremic verbalization of opposite 'our – alien' concepts in differently

structured languages» defines a meaningful minimum of concepts that make up the binary opposition of «our – alien» in the Russian and English Languages. The author marks similarity of the semantics of the components in the opposition «our own» and «one's own» and tells about the wider semantics of the second component of the opposition in the English language («other»), which is in addition to the lack of possession or indication of similarities between subject and object «accentuates the existing differences between the subject and the object, their disparateness; … The word 'Others' in English may also represent a non-personalized group of people» (Ermakova, 2011).

S. Y. Sazonova in the work «The concept of 'our (own» in the Russian and German language linguistic worldview» uses etymological, phraseological dictionaries and thesauruses for the analysis; she reveals the specifics of the concept of «our (own)» in the Russian and German linguistic worldviews. The author draws a conclusion that there is a similarity in two languages in core («our», «own») and additional meanings representing the concept (Sazonova, 2010: 150).

The research material in comparative works includes not only lexicographical sources, but also mass media texts.

The opposition «our – alien» is considered. In particular. In modern studies as a way to describe the Russian linguistic worldview in the structure of metaphorical models found in the German press.

N. A. Santsevich in the article «Metaphorical models and the opposition 'own – alien' as a way to describe the linguistic worldview of Russia in the German periodical press» examines how this opposition is used in the monarchical metaphorical model, being realized in the particular varieties: «nation – power (government)» and «the East (Russia) – the West (Germany)», «dangerous – not dangerous»; and in the militaristic model, where the opposition «own – alien» (a friend or a foe) is already embedded in the concept. To actualize the concept «alien» the German mass media use special lexical markers («spy», «outsider», etc.) (Santsevich, 2002). The same author in the thesis «Modelling the variability of the linguistic worldview on the basis of the bilingual corpus of journalistic texts (metaphors and semantic oppositions)» carries out a comparative analysis of metaphorical models and the opposition «own – alien» presented in them on the basis of the materials of Russian and German mass media, eventually drawing a conclusion about the variability of the Russian and German linguistic worldviews (Santsevich, 2004).

In the article «Intentional potential of a pragmatically marked word: the interaction of ideological and evaluative components» by E. Y. Bulygin and T. A. Tripolskaya, the opposition «our own – alien» is considered in the aspect of its axiological content. The «our – alien» component is usually connected with the axiological content in the pragmatic macrocomponent structure, with negative connotation in the overwhelming majority of cases. The researchers define the following vocabulary groups (words) containing the semantic opposition «our – alien» in their meanings:

1. Political lexicon: *tovarishchi, tovarishchi iz bratskikh kommunisticheskikh partii, soratniki po partii, vernye lenintsy, zapadnye partnery, politicheskie opponenty, liberaly, demokraty, pochvenniki, patrioty* [*comrades, comrades from fraternal communist parties, party associates, loyal Leninists, Western partners, political opponents, liberals, democrats, pochvenniks, patriots*], etc.

2. Religious lexicon: *pravoslavie, musul'manstvo, iudaizm, religiia, Bog, Vsevyshnii* [*Orthodoxy, Islam, Judaism, religion, God, the Almighty*], etc.

3. Nominations on national, racial and ethnic grounds, which at all times have potentially contained an ideological component. Being neutral, as according to the dictionaries. In real communication they acquire negative connotations: *kavkazets, litso kavkazskoi natsional'nosti, gruzin, chechenets, nemets, evrei, tsygan, chukcha* [*Caucasian person, a person from the Caucasus, Georgian, Chechen, German, Jewish, Gypsy, Chukcha*], etc.

4. Nominations for persons of traditional/non-traditional sexual orientation: *geteroseksualy, gomoseksualisty, golubye, lesbiianki, seksmen'shinstva, geiropa* [*heterosexuals, ho-*

mosexuals, fags, lesbians, sex minorities, Gayrope], etc.

5. Nominations on territorial belonging (centre – periphery): *regiony, periferiia, stolitsy, megapolis, gorod, derevnia, selo, glukhoman', zamkadyshi* – «te, kto prozhivaet za moskovskoi kol'tsevoi avtodorogoi'» [*regions, periphery, capitals, metropolis, city, village, settlement, hinterland, zamkadyshi* – «those who live outside the circle formed by the Moscow ring highway (MKAD)»] (from NTV show), etc.

6. Social and professional lexicon: *militsiia – politsiia, menedzher – upravlenets, razvedchik – shpion* [*militia – police, manager – administrator. Intelligence officer – spy*], etc. (Bulygina, Trypilska, 2015: 12–13).

The conceptual opposition «our (own) – alien» acts as an object not only in linguistic but also in literary studies.

V. V. Kolesov in the work «The world of man in the word of ancient Russia» scrutinises features of representation of the concept in the Old Russian literature. The author spots the expansion of the concept «our (own)»: in the world history different people were called by this term at different times, and the development of this terminology consisted in the fact that the circle of «our (own)» constantly enlarged, but at the expense of friends and relatives (Kolesov, 1986: 11).

Analyzing the representation of this concept in the literature data, V. Zusman acknowledges that the study of this opposition is based on comparison. «Comparison of these concepts includes: 1) comprehending 'one's own' against the background of 'alien'; 2) 'estranging' one's own and imparting 'personal' to the alien. When comparing, one can discover direct connections and feedback coming to the fore. It is also important when the 'own' is retreating, while the 'alien' is approaching» (Zusman, 2003). Opposition «our (own)» and «alien» is seen by the researcher in relation to other concepts. Thus. In L. N. Tolstoy's novel «War and Peace» one can observe the intersection of the concepts «Austria and Austrians» and «our (own) – alien», which leads to the concretization of the semantic content of the concepts: «The 'own – alien' opposition takes the form of 'deep – superficial'. Our own is deep; the alien is strange, superficial» (Zusman, 2003). Implementation of the concept in the literary text, as a rule, is associated with the advancement of meaningful for the author semantic components. In Tolstoy's novel, the basis for the characterization of «aliens» is careerism and dry rationalism, while «our own», on the contrary, are always associated with the general course of history, brotherly, folk and communal origins. As a result, as the researcher assumes, «the concepts of 'our own' and 'alien' gradually lose their purely ethnic character in «War and Peace», and, coupled with it, their sharp contrast» (Zusman, 2003).

In M. M. Prishvin's novel «The Kasheyev's Chain», the concepts of «our (own)» and «alien» are viewed as the basis for the Russia-German opposition. According to L. N. Yurchenko, «the path of the hero of the Kascheev's Chain from Germany to Russia (from alien to one's own) turns out to be the way of the prodigal son of the revolutionary intelligentsia, who has destroyed her home, lost her homeland and now is returning to it. This is the starting point for liberation from the inner blinders and manacles, a return to nature, to the foundations of existence» (Yurchenko, available at: http://prishvin.lit-info.ru, date of access: 18.12.2018). Analyzing Prishvin's novel «The Kashcheev's Chain», M. Kh. Morozova consociates the opposition «our (own)/alien» with the originality of the image of the land and points out that «the native land … its extemporaneous power, grandeur, maternal power are presented by the writer as the basis of the great unity of the world» (Morozova, 2014: 56).

L. N. Tretiakova studies the opposition «our (own)/alien» from the standpoint of argumentation theory. She chose A. T. Tvardovsky's poem «Vasily Terkin» as the research material. In which the war divides the opponents into one's own and others, while «our (own)» in this context is filled with such characteristics as *honest, responsible*, and *kind to people*; the concept of «alien (other)» forms a nominal field with a number of synonyms: *nemets – protivnik – svoloch' – podlets – zver' – vrag – pes – chert – podlyi narod*» [*the German – enemy – bastard – rascal – scoun-*

drel – beast – foe – dog – devil – sneaky people] (Tretiakova, 2013: 54). In the poem, the concept «own» – «alien (other)» is emotionally experienced and reflected through the prism of likings and dislikings, represented by the means of cognitive metaphors (zoomethaphors and religious metaphors). The author of the article finds the sensory characteristic in the zoomethaphor, which is associated with the component «ethnic smell»: «The ancient peoples of Europe believed that every nation had a 'different distinctive smell'. In fairy tales of different peoples there are expressions like «There is a smells of this or that people. In A. T. Tvardovsky's poem «Vasily Terkin» German enemies have a bad smell, and everything which is «our (own)» emits wonderful Russian «smell» (Tretiakova, 2013: 55).

In works devoted to literary studies, the opposition «own-alien» is explored in a slightly different aspect as well. Thus, looking into the specifics of Ershov's literary fairy tale «The Humpbacked Horse», T. V. Rezanova assumes that Russian and German folklore texts could act as possible sources of the plot, noting that «alien (other)» European tradition, being disembogued in the literary Russian fairy tale, becomes «our (own)» due to the eternal and generally valid model of happiness as Good and Life. «Alien (other)» in this sense is completely assimilated with «our (own)» (Rezanova, 2003: 131). In the article, the folklore opposition «our (own) – alien (other)» is discussed in a traditional way in relation to P. P. Ershov's fairytale poem «The Humpbacked Horse»: as a contradiction of «our (own)» and «alien (other)» fairytale worlds, at a higher level – as a contradiction of good and evil, life and death. Ivan the Fool with his humpback horse is the embodiment of a good start, «our (own)» world, which is in conflict with the tsar and chamberlain of the bedchamber, representatives of the other, evil, alien world (Rezanova, 2003: 132).

One of the components of the concept is its dynamism, i. e. the ability to reflect the transformation of the linguistic consciousness of an ethnos: «Characteristics of the concept are subject to constant changes due to the variability of the nature of being. Their instability can be explained by individual interpretation, which causes many different opinions on the same subject or phenomenon, disagreements among communicators. The communication participants understand the main essence, but deny the opponent's point of view, treating the concept as a phenomenological entity (Krapivkina, 2017: 216), as, for example, when comprehending «our (own)» and «alien (other)» in a peculiar situation of rumour spreading (Osetrova, 2016).

The works by I. S. Vykhodtseva (Vykhodtseva, 2006; 2016) are devoted to the identification of the concept's content scope. Comparing the representation of the category «our (own)» in folk and elitist cultures, the author distinguishes four thematic groups for the elitist one: «family and clan»; «land, house, property»; «close relations or joint activity»; «external and internal world of man». The category of «alien (other)» in folk culture is represented by two thematic groups: «not of our land, foreign» and «not ours, belonging to others». In elitist culture, this category is expanding, and we can distinguish another thematic group in it, namely «alien, devoid of property» (Vykhodtseva, 2016: 61–62). On the basis of diachronic analysis, the researcher comes to the conclusion that in Soviet verbal culture the semantics of the concept «our (own) – alien (other)» is transformed: the division into «our (own)» and «alien (other)» is imbued and filled with ideological content. Among «our (own)» there can be found disguised «alien (other)» both in one's own families, between close friends and fellow party members. As for «alien (other)» the most dangerous and strongest are internal enemies, former «one's own». This new ideological content makes the analyzed concept central, basic in the Soviet conceptual sphere (Vykhodtseva, 2016: 63).

Cultural omnitude of the concept leads to the fact that through it a person habitually explains to him-/ herself and others all kinds of processes and phenomena of modern life. In this connection, we should remember about two well-known illustrative philological works – «The Russian word, our own and someone else's: Studies in the modern Russian language and sociolinguistics» by L. P. Krysin (Krysin,

2004) and «Our» among «alien»: myth or reality?» by V. V. Krasnykh (Krasnykh, 2003), where this opposition is used as the main idea organizing the scientific text.

In general, the binary opposition «our (own) – alien (other)» (Rudnev, 1997: 38–39) is based on differences in the system of moral and ethical norms, customs and traditions, manifested in the form of antithesis: «we – they», «our – alien», «I – other». Man as a subject and as a person does not exist without the *Other* – such element, the point of reference, which gives an idea of the commensurability of man in comparison with their peers (Mullagaliyeva, 2008: 138).

Statement of the problem

According to the authors of this study, the binary concept «our (own) – alien (other)» (Rudnev, 1997: 38–39) as a general reference point for textual analysis helps, among other things, to comprehend the ideas of the Russian everyday consciousness about the social structure of the surrounding world, the hierarchy that underlies it, and, no less importantly, to descry the attitude to this hierarchy.

The opposition *My – Oni* [*We – They*], which was mentioned in the title of the present article, is one of the specific linguistic embodiments of the concept, which actualises its subjective constituent. Hence it is a subject of further research.

Methods

Modern linguistics uses a number of methods for analyzing concepts – linguocognitive, conceptual, component, definitional, cluster analysis, whose effectiveness is proved. Inter alia, by this study.

Linguocognitive analysis of concepts is used. In particular. In the dissertation study by T. G. Ardasheva (Ardasheva, 2012); conceptual analysis as a leading method used to be applied by D. S. Likhachev (Likhachev, 1993), V. I. Karasik, G. G. Slyshkin (Karasik, 2007; Karasik, Slyshkin, 2008), E. S. Kubriakova (Kubriakova, 2008; 2009), I. G. Serova (Serova, 2007), D. R. Valeeva (Valeeva, 2018) used component analysis as a way of revealing the content of the concept in the works by N. A. Stadul'skaia (Stadul'skaia, 2012) and A. A. Lepenysheva (Lepenysheva, 2011: 170).

To solve linguistic problems, one of the most appropriate method. In addition to the aforementioned, can be a hierarchical cluster analysis, the essence of which is consistent combination of smaller clusters into larger or division of larger clusters into smaller ones (Nurgalieva, 2013: 455). The cluster analysis of emotional concepts has been extensively used by V. Y. Apresyan in his works (Apresyan, 2011a; 2011b).

As for the study of the conceptual structure – «our (own) – alien (other)» opposition in general and the opposition concept *«We – They»* in particular, the cluster analysis is applied here insofar as the identification of semantic and discursive embodiments of the concept implies their subsequent typological unification or specification.

The basis of research observations are materials from the authors' textual archive. Decoded conversational dialogues and interviews with modern residents of Krasnoyarsk, a large industrial city of Siberia, are useful for speech studies and various linguistic researches.

In the process of processing the material, we paid attention to quite a large number of contexts, which contain indefinite personal verbal forms:

pokupaiut, delaiut, lezut, vygorazhivaiut, soobshchaiut (v militsiiu), (palatku) perevorachivaiut; obsluzhivaiut, razmeshchaiut, remontiruiut, prisposablivaiut

[such as [they] buy, make, crawl into someone else's business, protect, report (to the police), turn over (the tent); serve, locate, repair, accommodate], etc.

The grammatical and semantic realizations of these forms in colloquial speech are such that they are actually or potentially included in the syntactic connection with the personal pronoun *Oni* [*They*] – a representative of a certain group, collective subject («some people» in the wording by E. N. Shiriaev).

This group of predicates, as well as their immediate linguistic context, explains the circumstances and details of *Their* actions, *Their* characteristics and *Their* accomplices, which forms a clear specific content. In the same con-

texts, the collective subject of the author *We* also functions more or less actively in the world shaped by the language efforts.

The analysis shows that *We* and *They* are a part of a certain event-based and qualitative interaction, conditioned by spatial and temporal coordinates. This fact, eventually, 1) allows us to speak of a single semantic space in which these two heroes, singled out by the language consciousness in the ordinary worldview, live and work, and 2) encourages us to reveal their event-based and evaluation semantics, making these subjects (heroes) the object of linguistic analysis, the main results of which are presented below.

Results

Indefiniteness as an apparent characteristic of the subject *Oni* [*They*] in a number of cases is backed up the indefiniteness of the locative – typical *Tam [There]:*

Oni mne skazali / tak chto-o-o mozhet byt' budet v Paskhu / znach(it) // Tam u nikh raspisanie visit / nado budet ego posmotret'; My von videli / tam zagoraiut / my kak raz cherez most proezzhali; Tam paek takoi khoroshii dali / izvini / esli by tam paek etot vydavali / normal'no.

[*[They] told me / so oh maybe it will be on Easter / it me[ans] // There they have a schedule hanging / we need to see it over; We saw / there [they] sunbathe / we were just passing across the bridge; There [they] gave such a good ration / sorry / if there were ration this given / normally*].

At the same time, the apparent uncertainty of details in almost every context is overcome so consistently that it allows us to identify the typology of their semantic habitats and activities of *Ikh [Them]*, to which *My [We]* have direct relation:

- «Environment of power», cf.:

K Universiade khot' poriadok oni v gorode naveli / v tsentre // Doma takie nichego / seroi krasochkoi pokrasili / skuchnovato konechno / no chisto // Ploshchad' Revoliutsii tozhe / gamaki besedki // O detiakh … liudiakh dumaiut / o sebe naverno tozhe / da

[*For the Universiade, [they] at least have put order in the city /in the centre // The houses are good enough / coloured [them] grey / boring, of course / but clean // the Revolution Square, too / hammocks pavilions // About the children … people [they] think / about themselves probably, too / yes*];

and

Slushai menia / oni vse sdelali tak / chtoby on ushel ot otvetstvennosti / oni normal'no ne mogli / nasudit' spustia god / tam polgoda // Normal'no eto delaetsia vse i srazu.

[*Listen to me / they did everything so that / he got away with it / they couldn't normally / adjudge to in a year / some half a year // Normally it is all done at once*].

Meanwhile, propositions of social action and movement with a pronounced meaning of activity, which describe actions for which anaphorically represented authorities are responsible, can be neutral: *prislali, skazali, otpravili, otdali, uzakonili, pozvonili* [*sent, said, dispatched, gave, legalized, called*]. However. In many cases verbal predicates are loaded with evaluative semes, cf.: *obdiraiut, che popalo delaiut, tolpu sozdaiut, unichtozhaiut, ne puskaiut, «volokut', orut na nas – pensiiu podnimaiut, l'goty vyplachivaiut, o liudiakh dumaiut, novuiu plitku kladut; gorod ukrashaiut*

[*ripping off, doing mishmash, generating crowds, destroying, don't let, «dragging», yelling at us – raising the pensions, paying benefits, thinking about people, putting new pavestone decorating the city*].

- «Criminal environment»:

A: *[Otets] grit / vot tol'ko kupil / uperli // Nu vygrebli vse / grit / televizor / dva vidika / … Odezhdu kakuiu-to // Prichem vsiu odezhdu unesti ne smogli / v koridore brosili // I kholodil'nik / vobshche / pustoi // <…> A / zoloto eshche vse zabrali //*

B: *U nas / u znakomykh kvartiru vskryli / vobshche / ponial / vynesli vse.*

[A: *[Father] sais / just bought / just been snatched // Well, raked everything off / sa[y]s / TV / two VCR / … Some clothes // And all clothes [they] could not be carry away // threw in the corridor // And the refrigerator / actually / empty // <…> Oh / all gold [they] took away, too //*

B: *At our / acquaintances [they] broke into the apartment / actually / understood / took out everything*].

Here the attitude of the linguistic consciousness towards criminal *Them* is undoubted and absolutely unambiguous in its critical pathos despite the initial neutral semantics of some predicates: *unesli, zabrali, vynesli* [*take away, carry away, take out*];

• «Environment of professional relationships:

Nu znaesh' / kak by / esli oni schitaiut za durochek / to oni sami duraki / polneishie / <...> prosto / my tak poniali po vsem zvonkam / chto oni na dannyi moment delaiut / nu tri zakaza / i to u nikh kakie-to problemy / oni rugaiutsia tam vse... i nam eshche govoriat / «devochki / zvonite / che vy sidite // Zvonite tam / vsem predlagaite vse' ...

[*You know / as if / if [they] took as stupid / they're fools themselves / they're totally / <...> just / we've got it by all calls / what they're doing at the moment / well, three orders / and yet they've got somewhat problems / they're quarelling there everybody ... and we're still told / «girls / call / why are you sitting // Call there / offer everyone everything» ...*]

• «Environment of rich and successful»

is located far away from the ordinary life space of an ordinary person: he or she does not have direct access to it and probably does not want to be like *Them*, having his or her «own pride and dignity»:

[talking about former classmates from wealthy families]:

A: *Nu u nikh poluchilos' blagodaria…*

B: *Oni / izvini menia…*

A: *Oni prosto postupili tuda blagodaria roditeliam / no-o…*

B: *Roditeliam / roditeliam…*

A: *I to / chto oni imeiut mashiny / i vse takoe / eto blagodaria roditeliam //*

B: *A u menia chuvstvo gordosti za sebia / chto ia smogla / sdelala tak / kak ia khotela // Ia vse-taki s soboiu… to / chego khotela… to/ chto ia khotela / ia dostigla.*

[A: *Well, they made it thanks to…*

B: *They/excuse me…*

A: *They just entered these thanks to their parents / but-oh…*

B: *Parents/parents…*

A: *And what /that they have cars / and all that / it's because of the parents //*

B: *And I have a feeling of pride of myself /that I could /do it // as I wanted to // I did it with myself... what I wanted… what I wanted / I achieved*].

• «Environment of interethnic relations»

Contrary to research expectations it did not show vividly expressed conflict semantics; at any rate, this could have been asserted with regard to the reviewed material. Rather, this opposition is accompanied by an emotion of condescendence:

A: *Znakomaia priezzhala / u nikh /grit / pol-Ameriki / zhenshchiny / grit / uzhasnye // A muzhiki bolee luchshe vygliadiat chem zhenshchiny / to est' muzhiki v kostiumakh khodiat / kak prilichnye // A baby vo-pervykh / tolstye / odety /... nu u nikh zhe / grit /odezhda udobnaia / prosto udobnaia // A u nas-to na kablukakh / vidish' / khodiat kak / da / nu / malen'ko sebia podderzhivaiut // Tam / grit / vo-pervykh / tolstye / vo-vtorykh odezhda / kak meshki visit na nikh / to est' prosto dlia udobstva <...>*

B: *Ol'ga rasskazyvala <...> oni [amerikantsy] poshli / ketchupov ponabrali / eto v nashikh poniatiiakh / ponabrali / vse vot govoriat / netu u nikh dobrotnogo // U nikh pochemu vot shchas / ikh sportom zastavliaiut zanimat'sia / chtoby oni bolee-menee sebia podderzhivali // Oni vse zhe s narusheniem obmena veshchestv <...> Vot naverno / ostalos' edinstvennoe / gde natural'nye produkty / eto Kitai / i my shchas.*

[A: *An acquaintance came / [they] have / sa[y]s /half-America /women / sa[y]s / horrible // And men look better than women / that is, men wear suits / as decent // While women-folks are, first / fat / dressed /... well, they have / sa[y]s / comfy clothes / just comfortable // And we – on heels / you see / [they] walk as / yes / well / hardly keep fit // There / sa[y]s / first / fat / second clothes / as bags is hanging on them / that is just for convenience <...>*

B: *Olga told <...> they [Americans] went / picked up ketchups / this is in our notions / picked up them / everybody says / they have no good quality // Why do they have now / they are forced to do sports / so that they could more or less keep fit // They all are with metabolic disorders <...> That's probably / that's the only place left / where natural products / this is China / and we are now*].

At best, otherness evokes respect, developed alongside the same opposition, but with a changed attribution of evaluation, oriented to the widespread stereotypes «they have, but we do not have» or «they can, while we are not able»:

[conversation in a travel agency; manager's monologue]

A chashche vsego / oni dazhe na russkom ponimaiut // Kak-to problem ni u kogo ne bylo // Mezhdunarodnyi iazyk zhestov on vsegda dokhodchiv // [smeetsia] Nu / a esli s angliiskim vot/ esli vy znaete / to ochen' mnogie // Tem bolee u nikh seichas usilennaia programma / izucheniia angliiskogo iazyka k olimpiade // Poetomu u nikh seichas / vsia sfera obsluzhivaniia / usilenno uchit angliiskii <...> nikto eshche na zhalovalsia // V Pekine vot / po krainei mere tam gde nakhodiatsia russkie turisty / ochen' mnogie govoriat na russkom iazyke / gidy te zhe / kitaitsy / no russkogovoriashchie // V oteliakh liudi tozhe staraiutsia govorit' na russkom.

[*And most often / they even understand in Russian // Somehow nobody had any problems // International Sign Language it is always comprehensible // [laughs] Well / and as for English here // if you know / that a lot of people // Especially now they have an enhanced program / English language learning for the Olympics // That's why they have now / the whole sphere of service / are intensively learning English / nobody has ever complained // In Beijing here / at least where there are Russian tourists / very many people speak Russian / guides do, for example / Chinese / but Russian speaking // In hotels people also try to speak Russian*].

- «Environment of sacred»

A: *A tut kstati budet bogosluzhenie e-e vsiu etu nedeliu kak by utrom // Vot // Ia dumaiu mozhet ia v piatnitsu skhozhu / tak kak u nas k chetyrnadtsati tridtsati //*

B: *Strastnaia piatnitsa //*

A: *Da // Bol'she v drugoi den' kak-to ne poluchaetsia // <...>*

B: *V raznykh tserkviakh po-raznomu poiut //*

A: *Nu konechno //*

B: *Voobshche vot luchshe vsego poiut v Pokrovskom sobore <...> kotoryi na Surikova //*

A: *A! Nu tak eto Surikovskaia tserkov' / Ia ee nazyvaiu Surikovskaia //*

B: *Ne / vot tam vot poiut // Na moi vzgliad // A vot v Blagoveshchenskom ne ochen' khorosho.*

[A: *By the way, there will be a divine service eh-eh-eh all this week as if in the morning // So // I think maybe I'll go on Friday // because we have to fourteen oh three //*

B: *Good Friday //*

A: *Yes // More on a different day somehow [we] can't make it // <...>*

B: *Different churches sing differently //*

A: *Well, of course.*

B: *Generally speaking, the best singing is in the Cathedral of the Intercession<...> which is on Surikova Street //*

A: *Ah! Well, it's Surikov's church / I call it Surikov's //*

B: *No / there they sing // In my opinion // But in the Annunciation church [they sing] not very well*].

As it seems, even such a sacral sphere as the religious one is not free from the assessment of a layman, however, one should admit the caution and correctness of such characteristics, which apply to the external and secondary attributes of the religious rite, without affecting its essence.

Finally, a very special place in our typology is occupied by what we have called the environment of the «alienated our own». In contrast to the above mentioned categories, which have quite perceptible spatial dimension and sometimes even specialized loci – «administration», «place of work», «church», «foreign state», etc., this category has rather blurred borders. To be more precise, these borders are absolutely conventional and are drawn by *We* in the process of speech. This happens when for some reason the speakers want to designate the distance between themselves and ad hoc *Them*, who are in their habitual zone and who are ready to part with the fleeting status of alienation, to return again to the boundaries of the usual *«We are together with you»*. Such role mobility is noticeable in the stories about relatives, friends, acquaintances or colleagues at work, the narrative characteristics of which determines some detachment:

[talking about the family of acquaintances]

On govorit / eto samoe / oni plokho zhili / on eto samoe / gulial zhe / gulial // V piatnitsu uezzhaet / i vecherom v voskresen'e priezzhal

[*He says / this is a sort of / they lived badly / he is a sort of / «betray // On Friday [he] leaves / and arrived on Sunday evening*];

[talking about a female relative]

A: *Kak u Diny-to s golovoi-to? // S davleniem s ee?*

B: *Proshlo // Pomerili ei // Bylo koroche // sheisiat na sto devianosto*

[A: *How's Dina doing with her head? // With her pressure?*

B: *It passed // They measured it // It was in short // It was sixty over hundred and ninety*];

[mother's conversation with her son before he left home]

Ty ukhodish' tak pozdno / dazhe ne khochu tebia otpuskat' ... Oni [rodstvenniki] khot' pust' taksi tebe vyzovut obratno

[*You're leaving so late / I don't even want to let you go... They [the relatives] let them call you a taxi back*].

Sometimes *Our (own)* become *They*, being separated from the general public by some social attribute or characteristic: men in relation to women, women in relation to men, workers from other industries, people who have received a sudden reward or, conversely, damage, older members of the community, see, for example:

[the story about going to one's grandmother's grave]

A my kogda vot v Kansk priekhali v eto leto / k nei / na kladbishche <...> Menia ne pomniat / Ol'gu pomniat / menia plokho pomniat // Tam / kto vot / s ch'imi det'mi / ia obshchalas' / vot te / pomniat menia / a Ol'gu khuzhe / a te kto bol'she pomniat starshee pokolenie tam konechno

[*And when we arrived in Kansk this summer / to her / at the cemetery <...> I am not remembered of / Olga is remembered of // I am not remembered of enough // There / this is someone who / with whose children / we were friends/ they are those / who remember me / and they remember Olga poorly / and those who remember more is the older generation there, of course*].

In general, there is a very definite picture of *Their* life activity. If we take for granted that the linguistic worldview in everyday consciousness is divided into three global spaces – «our own», «alien» and «other», *They* find the conditions for action and relationships with *Us* within the boundaries of each of them. «Power», «bosses», «wealthy people» and «criminals» live in the space of alien / other, which in turn is heterogeneous and divided into «bottom» (for criminals) and «top» (for others). As for the sacral or foreign space, *They* can be naturally attributed to the space of «other», being placed at either the high levels or those «similar to *Our*» / «low».

They also operate in the space reserved for *Our (own)*. Unlike the above cases, where *Their* alienation has signs of an inert, frozen characteristic, here it turns out to be very mobile, being easily overcome within a single context. In fact, this is not even alienation, but a certain degree of detachment of the narrator from one of the characters of the story, which is necessary for the author to take the character beyond the boundaries of his/her personal sphere.

The main actor in all the described environments is *They*. *We* and/or *I*, which is the author's active and event-based position coming to the fore from time to time, should be characterized as the second actor. These actors are subject to two semantic modes of interaction. If the speaker chooses a unidirectional interpretation of events, then the «autonomous» mode of description comes into force, and the text itself exerts *They* (acting without any restrictions) or harmoniously existing *We*. If the author's view is less unambiguous, it leads to the activation of the semantic mode, which can be characterised as «joint action» of the two withdrawn participants. And then one can observe an unequivocal opposition developing into a conflict.

The expression of both subjects through pronouns is only the primary way of their representation: in the right context it is specified regularly and demonstrably, proving the substantivization of personal pronouns. Both the author of the statement and the listener clearly understand who the pronounced text is about. This content may imply concretization through the introduction of spatial coordinates:

v sude, v nalogovoi, v administratsii, naverkhu, v Kitae, v sobore [*in court. In the tax office. In the administration, at the top. In China. In the cathedral*], etc; or may give a direct nomination such as: *vlast', nalogovaia, sud'i, menty, beznesmeny, amerikantsy, bogatye, vor'e, mafiia, kommunal'shchiki, organy zdravookhraneniiia* [*the power, the tax authorities, judges, cops, businessmen, the Americans, the rich, the thieves, the mafia, the public utilities, the health authorities*], that is, *They*; or *(prostye) liudi, narod, bol'shinstvo, studenty, rabotiagi, pensionery* [*(ordinary) people, the folks, the majority, the students, the workers, the pensioners*], that is, *We*.

Often the subject is specified to the maximum extent, up to the introduction of nominations of the process participants, representing a particular group or agency; cf. a typical example:

[conversation between a driver and a passenger during a city trip]

A: *Nu kak oni ubiraiut? Koldobina na koldobine! Kak budto po poliu edesh'! Shchas pristegnus' //*

B: *Znaete takoi «Bionorm' / oni zakupili // V tridtsat' gradusov kak po luzham edesh' / vse topit // Eto mer dal rasporiazhenie / Egorov ... Net Eremin //*

[A: *Well, how do they clean up? A pothole in a pothole! It's as if you're going across the field! I will buckle up now //*

B: *You know what «Bionorm» / they bought // At thirty degrees when you're going across the puddles / everything's drowning // It's the mayor who gave the order / Egorov ... No, Eremin //*].

As can be seen, there are evaluations in the immediate vicinity of the predicate that undoubtedly qualify the described action as negative.

In general, evaluativeness, which is considered to be an optional modus operandi when describing the sphere of interaction between *They* and *We*, changes its status, becoming one of the main elements of the description, almost as necessary as, for example, the main proposition or the subject argument (actor). *Their* being in power and professional activity causes feelings of detachment. Indignation, irritation; hopelessness and apathy; or, quite the opposite, satisfaction and approval; cf:

Tam vsia eta mut' // A vse grazhdanskoe stroitel'stvo / i tam / khoziaistvo / narodnoe / oni ego vsiu zhizn' / obdiraiut / che popalo delaiut // Odin pridurok pridet / kukuruzu v kolymskoi tundre seet / drugoi sobiraet kukuruzu / a tolku net //

[*There's all this gibberish // And all this civil engineering // and there / economy / public / they spend their lives / ripping it off / doing crap // One jerk comes / sows corn in the Kolyma tundra / another collects this corn / and it is no sense //*];

and

[conversation between a driver and a passenger]

A: *A oni otremontirovali s»ezd na Sverdlovskuiu / voobshche udobno stalo // A novyi most / chetvertyi / oni otkryli razviazku / khorosho stalo // Ia vchera s pravogo do doma za piat' minut doekhal // Dazhe ne ozhidal / tak bystro!*

[A: *And they have repaired the interchange ramp to Sverdlovskaya St. / all in all it became comfortable // And as for a new bridge fourth / they opened the junction / it became good // Yesterday I came home from the right bank in five minutes // I did not even expect // so quickly!*]

They are like foreigners and «alienated 'one's own» are able to awaken in the speaker irony, condescension or sympathy:

[conversation between a driver and a passenger during a car ride; characteristics of the Japanese cars are being discussed]

A: *U nas «iapontsy' pri tridtsati gradusakh uzhe normal'no ne ezdiat // Prosto dazhe ne rasschitany //*

B: *Dazhe zhalko ikh... Net / nu podozhdi // oni zhe delaiut levorukie dlia Evropy // Znachit dolzhny zhe / kak-to i temperaturnyi rezhim uchityvat' //*

A: *Da // No eto tol'ko u levorukikh //*

[A: *In our places «Japanese» at thirty degrees drive no longer normal // Just they have not been even designated for this //*

B: *I even can feel sorry for them... No / well, wait // they do make left-hand for Europe // So they should /somehow take into account temperature mode, too //*

A: *Yes // But it's only right for left-hand cars //*].

Our own actions in describing various kinds of social failures cause sympathy, directed by the speaker to him- /herself, more precisely, to the people alike. *We* evaluate successful actions (from the point of view of society) positively, *We* are proud of them. In public sphere, this common view as if extrapolates a positive halo to what has not yet been done, but what is planned for the near or the distant future; cf.:

[from the electoral leaflet of the United Russia party]

Nasha obshchaia sud'ba – Krasnoiarskii krai [*Our common destiny is the Krasnoyarsk Krai*];

[from A Just Russia Party's election leaflet]

Eti vybory opredeliat nashe budushchee na 5 let vpered. Eto shans vosstanovit' spravedlivost' [*These elections will determine our future for five years to come. This is a chance to restore justice*];

[from the Communist Party's election leaflet]

Nam predstoit nachat' uskorennoe voskhozhdenie [*We have to start the accelerated rise*].

Conclusion

As a result, the uncertainty of the subject *They*, at first glance, developed by the indefinite personal form of the verb predicate and the pronoun *There,* turns out to be only a mask disguising a superficial uncertainty. It is easily removed by the subsequent context and concretized through the parameters «place» (for example, *vo vlasti, na rabote* [*in power, at work*]), «social status of the subject» (*chinovniki, nachal'stvo, bogatye, khoziaeva* [*officials, bosses, the rich, owners*]), «nature of activity» (irrational, useless or correct actions; actions useful for *Us* – ordinary members of the community, *naroda, liudei* [*people*, *folks*]). The very grammatical uncertainty transforms into semantic markers displaying two certain polar evaluations: 1) distrust and non-confidence (often in relation to *Them*) and self-evaluation of rightness and compassion (often in relation to *Us*).

References

Apresyan, V. Iu. (2011a). Opyt klasternogo analiza: russkie i angliiskie emotsional'nye kontsepty [Experience of cluster analysis: Russian and English emotional concepts]. In *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* [Issues of linguistics], 1, 19–51.

Apresyan, V. Iu. (2011b). Opyt klasternogo analiza: russkie i angliiskie emotsional'nye kontsepty [Experience of cluster analysis: Russian and English emotional concepts]. In *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* [Issues of linguistics], 2, 63–88.

Ardasheva, T.G. (2012). *Lingvokognitivnyi analiz kontsepta SVOBODA (na materiale russkogo, angliiskogo i frantsuzskogo iazykov): dissertatsiia na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk [Linguistic-cognitive analysis of the concept FREEDOM (on the material of Russian, English and French): Thesis for the Degree of Candidate. of Philological Sciences].* Izhevsk, 213 p.

Borisova, I.Z. (2014). Kontsept «chuzhoi» v iazykovoi kartine mira [The concept of «alien» in the linguistic worldview]. In *Vestnik IrGTU [Bulletin of ISTU].* 8 (91), 219–223.

Bulygina, E. Iu., Tripol'skaia, T.A. (2015). Intentsional'nyi potentsial pragmaticheski markirovannogo slova: vzaimodeistvie ideologicheskogo i otsenochnogo komponentov [Intentional potential of a pragmatically marked word: the interaction of ideological and evaluative components]. In *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta [Bulletin of the Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University]*, 5 (27), 8–22.

Ermakova, V.A. (2011). Paremicheskaia verbalizatsiia oppozitivnykh kontseptov «svoi-chuzhoi» v raznostrukturnykh iazykakh [Paremic verbalization of opposite «friend-foe» (our-alien) concepts in differently structured languages]. In *Vestnik KarGU [Bulletin of KarSU]*, 2 (62).

Iurchenko, L. N. Kontsept svoe / chuzhoe v romane M. Prishvina «Kashcheeva tsep'» [The concept «own»– «alien» in M. Prishvin's novel «The Kashcheev's Chain»], available at: http://prishvin.lit-info.ru (accessed 18 December 2018).

Karasik, V.I. (2007). *Iazykovoi krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs [Linguistic circle: personality, concepts, discourse].* Volgograd, Peremena, 480 p.

Karasik, V.I., Slyshkin G.G. (2008). Lingvokul'turnyi kontsept kak edinitsa issledovaniia [Linguocultural concept as a unit of research]. In *Metodologicheskie problemy kognitivnoi lingvistiki [Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics],* 75–80.Voronezh, Voronezh State University.

Kolesov, V.V. (1986). *Mir cheloveka v slove Drevnei Rusi [The world of man in the word of ancient Russia].* Leningrad, Leningrad State University, 311 p.

Krapivkina, O.A. (2017). Lingvosemioticheskii analiz kontsepta i poniatiia (na materiale tekstov nauchnogo i nauchno-populiarnogo diskursa) [Linguistic and semiotic analysis of the concept and notion (on the material of the texts of scientific and popular science discourse)]. In *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta [Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University],* 4 (7), 209–222.

Krasnykh, V.V. (2003). *«Svoi» sredi «chuzhikh»: mif ili real'nost'? [«Our» among «alien»: myth or reality?].* Moscow, Gnozis. 375 p.

Krysin, L.P. (2004). *Russkoe slovo, svoe i chuzhoe: Issledovaniia po sovremennomu russkomu iazyku i sotsiolingvistike [The Russian word, our own and someone else's: Studies in the modern Russian language and sociolinguistics].* Moscow, Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 888 p.

Kubriakova, E.S. (2008). Ob odnom fragmente kontseptual'nogo analiza slova pamiat' [On one fragment of the conceptual analysis of the word «memory»]. In *Logicheskii analiz iazyka. Kul'turnye kontsepty [Logic analysis of the language. Cultural concepts]*, 85–91. Moscow.

Kubriakova, E.S. (2009). Problemy predstavleniia znanii v sovremennoi nauke i rol' lingvistiki v reshenii etikh problem [Problems of knowledge representation in modern science and the role of linguistics in solving these problems]. *In Iazyk i struktura predstavleniia znanii* [Language and structure of knowledge representation]. Moscow. 4–38.

Lepenysheva, A.A. (2011). K voprosu o metodakh izucheniia kontseptov [On the question of methods of studying concepts]. In *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A. S. Pushkina [Bulletin of the Leningrad State University named after A. S. Pushkin]*, 3 (1), 168–173.

Likhachev, D.S. (1993). Kontseptosfera russkogo iazyka [Russian conceptual sphere]. In *Izvestiia RAN. Seriia literatury i iazyka [Proceedings of the RAS. Literature and Language Series]*, 1 (52).

Morozova, M. Kh. (2014). Rodnaia/chuzhaia zemlia v romane M. Prishvina «Kashcheeva tsep'» [Native/alien land in M. Prishvin's novel «The Kashchey's Chain»]. In *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A. S. Pushkina [Bulletin of the Leningrad State University named after A. S. Pushkin]*, 1 (1), 50–56.

Mullagaliyeva, L. (2008). «Svoi – chuzhoi» v aspekte mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii [«Own – alien» in the aspect of intercultural communication]. In *Gosudarstvennaia sluzhba [Public Service]*, 3 (53), 138–142.

Nurgalieva, N. Kh. (2013). Klasternyi podkhod v lingvisticheskom analize (na materiale korpusnolingvisticheskogo analiza zaimstvovanii iz angliiskogo iazyka (anglitsizmov) v nemetskom iazyke) [Cluster approach in linguistic analysis (based on corpus-linguistic analysis of borrowings from English (Anglicisms) in German)]. In *Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta [Bashkir University Bulletin]*, 2 (18), 454–460.

Osetrova, E.V. (2016). Rumors: a traditional motif and image in the fictional worldview. In *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* 9 (3), 695–704.

Rezanova, T.V. (2003). «Svoe» i «chuzhoe» v skazochnoi poeme P. P. Ershova «Koniok-gorbunok» [«Own» and «alien» in the fairy-tale poem by P. P. Ershov «The Little Humpbacked Horse»]. In *«Svoe» i «chuzhoe» v kul'ture narodov evropeiskogo Severa: materialy 4 Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii [«Own» and «alien» in the culture of the peoples of the European North: Proceedings of the 4th International Scientific Conference]*, 130–132. Petrozavodsk, Petrozavodsk University.

Rudnev, V.P. (1997). *Slovar' kul'tury XX veka: Kliuchevye poniatiia i teksty [Dictionary of culture of the 20th century: Key concepts and texts].* Moscow, Agraf. 384 p.

Santsevich, N.A. (2002). Metaforicheskie modeli i oppozitsiia «svoi – chuzhoi» kak sposob opisaniia iazykovoi kartiny mira Rossii v nemetskoi periodicheskoi pechati [Metaphorical models and the opposition «own – alien» as a way to describe the linguistic worldview of Russia in the German periodical press]. In

Komp'iuternaia lingvistika i intellektual'nye tekhnologii. Trudy Mezhdunarodnogo seminara Dialog'2002 (Protvino, 6–11 iiunia 2002 g.) [Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies. Proceedings of the International Workshop Dialogue'2002 (Protvino, June 6–11, 2002)]. Moscow, Nauka.

Santsevich, N.A. (2004). *Modelirovanie variativnosti iazykovoi kartiny mira na osnove dvuiazychnogo korpusa publitsisticheskikh tekstov (metafory i semanticheskie oppozitsii): avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk [Modelling the variability of the linguistic worldview on the basis of the bilingual corpus of journalistic texts (metaphors and semantic oppositions): Abstract of Thesis for the Degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences].* Moscow, 24 p.

Sazonova, S. Yu. (2010). Kontsept «svoi» v russkoi i nemetskoi iazykovoi kartine mira [The concept of «own» in the Russian and German linguistic worldview]. In *Vestnik Amurskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Bulletin of the Amur State University]*, 48, 147–151.

Serova, I.G. (2007). Kontseptual'nyi analiz v lingvokul'turologii: metody i vozmozhnosti [Conceptual analysis in linguoculturology: methods and opportunities]. In *Voprosy kognitivnoi lingvistiki [Issues of cognitive linguistics]*, 1 (010), 15–22.

Stadul'skaia, N.A. (2012). Komponentnyi analiz znacheniia slova kak sposob vyiavleniia soderzhaniia kontsepta [Component analysis of the word meaning as a way to identify the concept content]. In *Vestnik Cheliabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University]*, 32 (286), 117–120.

Stepanov, Yu.S. (2004). *Konstanty: Slovar' russkoi kul'tury [Constants: Dictionary of Russian culture].* Moscow, Akademicheskii Proekt. 992 p.

Tretiakova, L.N. (2013). Kognitivnaia struktura kontsepta «Svoi» – «Chuzhie» v poeme A. Tvardovskogo «Vasilii Terkin» [The cognitive structure of the concept «Own» – «alien» in the poem by A. Tvardovsky «Vasily Terkin»]. In *Mezhdunarodnyi aspirantskii vestnik. Russkii iazyk za rubezhom [International Post-Graduate Bulletin. Russian Language Abroad],* 1, 53–56.

Valeeva, D.R. (2018). O metodakh issledovaniia kontsepta [On the concept research methods]. In *Filologicheskii aspekt [Philological aspect],* 11 (43). Available at: http://scipress.ru (accessed 18 December 2018).

Vykhodtseva, I.S. (2006). *Kontsept «svoi-chuzhoi» v sovetstkoi slovesnoi kul'ture (20–30-e gg.): dissertatsiia na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk [The concept of «friend-foe» (our-alien) in the Soviet verbal culture of the 1920s and 1930s: Thesis for the Degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences].* Saratov, 187 p.

Vykhodtseva, I.S. (2016). Funktsionirovanie kontsepta «svoi – chuzhoi» v sovetskoi slovesnoi kul'ture [Functioning of the concept «friend-foe» (our-alien) in the Soviet verbal culture]. In *Vestnik VGU. Seriia: Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaia kommunikatsiia [Bulletin of VSU. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. Series]*, 2, 60–64.

Zusman, V. (2003). Kontsept v sisteme gumanitarnogo znaniia [Concept in the system of humanitarian knowledge]. In *Voprosy literatury [Issues of literature],* 2.