# Ethnic Semiolinguistics' Role and Place in Discourse Formation and Discourse Development: Russian and English

## Andrew V. Olyanitch

Academician Pavlov St, Volgograd, 400121, *Russian Federation*

## ABSTRACT

The article examines the immersion processes of ethnic-specific signs-nominations in discourses of needs-based communication. Set is the ontological status of a scientific discipline "ethnic Semiolinguistics", the principles of which are developed within the framework of the scientific school "Semiolinguistics of needs" at the foreign languages department of Volgograd State Agricultural University; its principles of research are represented, and its prognostic and diagnostic potential are analyzed. We give the definition of the term "needs-based communication"; the concepts "discourse formation" and "discourse development" are defined; and algorithms of research of these processes are described. The means and methods of the semantic content of such units actualization in the corresponding discourse formation and discourse development are studied. Ethnic-specific contexts of Russian and English discursive space of gastronomy are used as examples. Considerable attention is paid to the principles of needs-based signs typology; actualized in the relevant discourse nominations' typology is carried out.

**Keywords:** Gastronomy; discourse; semiolinguistics; need-based design.

**Corresponding Author:** Andrew V. Olyanitch; Academician Pavlov St, Volgograd, 400121, Russian Federation

**e-mail:** olyanitch@gmail.com

## 1. Introduction

Discursive space, as is well known, can not exist without the semiotic structure that is its "flesh and blood", a discourse is full of linguistic and nonlinguistic signs of various qualities and properties. Their different configurations (clusters) dictate the kinds and types of discourse, marking the specifics of the latter – both thematic and ethnic. Thus, in all growth there is a problem of searching tools of studying the patterns of signs participation in the formation and existence of the discourses that unfold in ethnic-specific medium of communication. It can be solved, in my opinion, with the help of the operational opportunities offered by a particular scientific discipline; I propose to call it *ethnic semiolinguistics*.

Ethnic semiolinguistics is the science that studies the properties of signs and sign systems (in natural and artificial languages) that unfold in ethnic-specific medium of communication. As the research practice demonstrates, most vividly these properties are manifested when the need-motivated communication is being considered. It is the needs that exactly determine the course and direction of communication, affecting the processes of formation

and existence of discourse, i.e., processes of discourse formation and discourse development.

Any communication is noted by the needs-based character: we are entering into interaction with our own kind, "keeping in mind" a certain goal by solving specific problems, which are designed to meet the needs of our very diverse properties. Linguistic identity – is, among other its various incarnations, even (and perhaps especially), Person consuming (Lat. Homo Consummatus). World is cognitively mastered by him, but semiotic structures formed as a result of such development are subjected to further process of recycling: we consume the world, its products in the physiological sense, whereas the signs that denote them in language and speech – forgive us this metaphor – are "consumed" by us in daily communication. In other words, a person should live so as to "maintain a discriminatory tone," i.e., constantly maintain and update the parameters of the human species, which set it apart from everything else – plant and animal – of the world.

Accordingly, the objectives of the semiolinguistics of needs are: the identification of a variety of connections between the vital needs and the formation of ethnic socium communicative space and its members; description of dynamic processes, such as the semiotization of needs of the people of this type at the present stage of the history of civilization; studying, description and typologization of linguistic and non-linguistic signs involved by linguistic personality into the processes of cognitive development of the world and the formation of ethnic socium communicative space as a whole (process of discourse development).

Thus, in order to achieve the above goals I offer to apply the research algorithm which for quite some time has been successfully tested by us with Tatiana Astafurova: it is a "sign→ word→ text discourse" model. The explanatory power of this algorithm and its prognostic and diagnostic potential lies in the fact that it is possible to give a complete description of the process of actualization of the need for communication via the description of quality of signs belonging to reality encompassing the Man; signs that are actually involved into the communication process; through the analysis of the meaning of these signs, i.e., analysis of lexical semantics of nominations and other verbal complexes (collocations, phraseological units, proverbs) that reflect a particular need; through the study of the communicative qualities of the environment and conditions for the actualization of the signs of values corresponding to this need, i.e. the research of actual process of specific discourse development Astafurova and Olyanitch (2011).

## 2. Literature Review

This algorithm has been successfully used by several researchers, as is evidenced by the emergence of a number of theses, monographs and articles. Below their repertoire is presented.

1. Semiolinguistic, nominative and discursive actualization of needs for physiological survival was investigated in works devoted to: the analysis of English-language signs of territory and habitat (Yanushkevich 2009; Samokhina, 2010; Dorokhova, 2010; Astafurova & Olyanitch, 2011); the study of English (Katsunova, 2007; Zakharov, 2008; Zemskova, 2005; Yanushkevich, 2009; Ermakova, 2010; Simakova, 2011 and the German signs of gluttony / gastronomy (Golovnitskaya (2007); Golovnitskaya and Olyanitch (2008); the identification of similarities and differences in the actualization of gluttony signs in compared lingua-cultures, such as Russian and German (Reimer (2011), Russian and Turkic (Baratashvili (2011), Russian, German and Kalmyk (Bovaeva (2010); examination and scientific analysis of the English and Russian hunting signs (Olyanitch (2006); Vasilchenko (2011); Astafurova and Olyanitch (2011); the definition and description of the arsenal of protective communication signs that people used to overcome phobias and prejudices, to protect against threatening external action on the part of nature, "foreign" society, otherworldly "forces of evil", as well as overcoming the sacred fears and avoidance of "punishment from heaven" (Astafurova and Olyanitch (2006), Astafurova and (2006), Astafurova and Olyanitch (2008), Astafurova and Olyanitch (20083; Chernjavskaja (2008).

2. Problems of realization of self-actualization needs and the needs for successful communication with the assistance of semiolinguistic tools were studied from the perspective of identifying the semiolinguistic bases of mutual relations of members of society at different levels of its hierarchy. In other words, viewed was the semiolinguistics of power and institutional communication a) as

the text and discourse actualization of signs of obtaining, strengthening, retention and loss of power (Astafurova and Olyanitch (2006), Astafurova and Olyanitch (2008); b) as the involvement of trial signs into institutional communication, elimination and resolution of social conflict, the removal of legitimate imbalance (Medvedeva (2007); c) as a way of verbal and non-verbal impact on society by the political establishment by means of signs and self-dramatization (Raspaev (2007); d) as the political manipulation of the electorate intentions using clusters of signs of another's speech – quotations, aphorisms, proverbs (Ustinova (2011).

3. Finally, self-actualization (self-development) needs in semiolinguistic aspect were considered as the basis for verbalization by means of the university corporate culture English-language signs, as well as verbal and non-verbal signs that denote Anglo-American education institution from communication in a dyad "teacher - learner" to interaction within the fraternity (Kirillova (2010).

Here is an example of needs for physiological survival actualization, which is most clearly semiolinguistically explicated through gluttony (gastronomic) component. It seems that the semiosis of vital need for physiological survival considered constant has multilevel character.

1) *Purely semiotic level explication of this need type* is structured by such signs as:

- artifacts of consumer products belonging to the denotative sphere "Food / Nutrition" (meat, fish, seafood, edible plants, food recycled by insects [honey], bacteria [kefir, fermented baked milk, cottage cheese, yogurt], conservation products that do not allow interaction with oxygen [canned food, preserver, salting] or involving oxygen or participate in the preparation of [smoked foods, languor, drying, sublimation];

- artifacts of collection and detection of consumer of goods (tools / cultivation tools, detection, catching and producing of food sources in the cultivation environment, growing, hunting, fishing and gathering of consumer products);

- actors of such activities (miners, hunters, fishermen, cooks, etc.);

- food processing artifacts (processing tools);

- axiological signs, visually (aesthetically) representing the quality of the result of gluttony product processing (photos of meals, decorating dishes, etc.).

2) *Nominative (semantic) level of gastronomic vital needs for survival explication* is none other than the lexical nomination gluttony signs that denote:

- food and its components; for example, English-speaking gluttony sign system can be classified into a number of parameters, such as a substance, the product: meat, wheat, milk, bread, etc; state (liquid, solid): soup, dried crust, etc; composition (one, few, many components): pepper «Karri» is a mixture of many spices; class (seafood, animal food, dairy food, vegetarian food, fish, sausage, vegetable salad, etc.);

- locative signs; English gluttony system contains 1) signs nominating place of the product origin: Irish boxty bread (an Irish potato bread), Yorkshire pudding – a baked batter pudding typically eaten with roast beef, Devonshire cream, Welsh Rarebit (toast with cheese in Wales), Irish stew, Grasmere gingerbread (cake with ginger in dried fruits), etc.; 2) signs nominating method of cooking: Devonshire pie – rissoles of meat with onions and apples baked in pastry, etc.

- instrumental signs nominating tools for preparation and consumption of food (kitchen utensils – cookware, bolter – Sieve flour, meat chopper – grinder, etc.);

- signs-qualifiers of gluttony system, which form the vast semantic perception field, whereby the key parameters are the "flavor" oppositions "edible / inedible" (eatable – non-eatable) and "delicious / tasteless" (tasty, delicious / unsavory, unpalatable).

The main quality of these signs is a unique system of graded scales:

- the scale of the taste qualities of the product, which posts a negative assessment (несъедобно [non-eatable, unsavory, unpalatable – inedible, nasty]), the zero rating (съедобно [eatable – edible, tasteless – tasteless]) and a positive assessment (вкусно [tasty, delicious – tasty, refined]);

- the scale of the product ready for use (блюдо готово / не готово [ready / not ready], блюдо не дожарено / пережарено, не доварено / переварено [undercooked / overcooked dish]);

- products flavor grading scale (недосолено / пересолено [insufficiently salted / overdone], переперчено [over-peppered], etc.);

- the scale of the compatibility / incompatibility of products (подходит к … / не идет с… [goes well with / does not go well with … – comes / does not come with …]; используется с … [is used / not used with … – used / not used to …], испортит вкус… [will spoil the taste …]).

In the nominative (semantic) level of explication of gastronomic vital need for the survival there are also located:

- signs-personalities that represent the entities related to food production (рыбак – fisherman, охотник – hunter, фермер – farmer, садовод – gardener, grower, огородник – market gardener, доярка – milkmaid, etc.), its delivery (закупщик – purchaser, buyer, поставщик – supplier), processing (повар – cook, винодел – winemaker, мясник – butcher, пекарь – baker, кондитер – confectioner, pastry – cook, маслодел – butter manufacturer, etc.). - signs-descriptors that visualize gluttony processes and nominate 1) food preparation process to cooking (замораживать / размораживать [freeze / defreeze]; засолить [salt, pickle (meat, fish)]; мыть [wash], нарезать [cut, slice], разделать [cut], просеивать [sift]); 2) the cooking process (варка [cooking]; обжарка [roasting]; тушение [quenching, stewing]; кипячение [boiling]; засолка [salting]; шинковка [shredding]); 3) the process of food presentation and service to the consumer (сервировать [lay the table]; украшать [decorate, ornament]; наливать (чай, вино [pour (tea, wine) – pour out a cup of tea, a glass / goblet of wine]; накладывать [cast – put out in … ]; обносить [serve round] etc.).

On the same level are found:

- signs-commentatives, nominating the conditions of successful or failed progress and completion of the cooking process (кипятить в течение пяти минут [to boil for five minutes], лучше тушить в сметане [best stew in sour cream], если нет майонеза, можно заправить сметаной [if there is no mayonnaise, you can add sour cream], выключить, как только подрумянится [turn off as soon as browned]);

- signs-regulatives, warning of the consequences of cooking technology violations (если добавить в макароны сыра, то они будут вкуснее [if you add the pasta to the cheese, they will be more delicious], если насыпать много соли, то блюдо можно испортить [if you pour a lot of salt, the dish can be spoiled]);

- signs-permissives, providing variability of cooking process, which are marked by modal verb 'мочь'['can'] - and modal constructions like 'возможно' ['it's possible']; 'рекомендуется' ['it is recommended'], etc .;

- limitation signs that impose certain restrictions on the cooking process and directly prohibit deviations from cooking instructions (in the function of limitation markers are used mainly such patterns as 'не / not [predicate]', 'иначе [otherwise do not [predicate] or …').

3) *Discursive and textual level of vital signs gastronomic needs explication* is formed within topos-semiosis of gluttony space (kitchen, restaurant, pub, snack bar, cafe, deli, snack bars, strip bars and the like discourse) and, as a rule, is characterized by social / gender-based registers of visitation relevance of eating places by personalities involved in the gluttony interaction.

Thus, in the XVII-th century the representatives of different classes visited London pubs selectively: "…the gentry would go to the King's Head, the bankrupt – to the World's End, the Gardener – to the Rose, the Churchman – to the Mitre, etc.". Humorous poem of the same period claims: "The drunkards by noon would go to the Man in the Moon, / The Weavers will dine at the Shuttle, / The Glovers will unto the Glove, / The Maidens all to the Maidenhead. / And true Lovers unto the Dove"(Zakharov (2008).

## 3. The Study

Style and culture of food consumption is formed only under the influence of the advanced ranks of society, acting either in their own interests or in the interests of the dominant groups, responsible for the formation of social values. Accordingly, the vanguard of social interests require the involvement of certain linguistic signs into communication, contributing to the successful impact

of and influence on the tastes and habits of consumers of food with a view to change in favor of above mentioned subjects. Gluttony discourse makes an important tool of such impact together with usage of the whole repertoire of linguistic signs; it is related to the representation of the signs of food in mass communication. The process of representation is subjected to a certain algorithm, which we will attempt to describe. The starting impact point is the kitchen, inside of which there exists its own specific communication connected, firstly, with the sequence of operations for the food preparation, and, secondly, with the hierarchical distribution of roles between the entities of the cooking process. Socialized kitchen environment is always mysterious to society members, who are not indifferent to what they are fed with, and how is made that from which as a result arises an aesthetic experience in connection with the consumption of food. Rituality of what happens in the kitchen has long been a metaphor for the disclosure of the secrets of creativity and intrigue (cf. "kitchen of the writer", "political kitchen"). The process of cooking is not that other, as a rite, structure of which is known to the society, but only in general terms. Acute interest tend to cause the items and details of preparation.

Linguistic signs included in the discourse of internal communication are unequal in status. Here primarily, nominations of cooking technology for mass consumption are put forward – "flow sheets and layouts"; their first priority in the discourse is the nomination process of all gluttony signs' transactions into some scheme-script being constructed depending on the dishes recipe, temperature requirements, product properties, etc. The recipe is certainly important, but it is functionally secondary, because it can vary in a socialized environment of mass production of the food product. Therefore, in everyday discourse there appear such oppositions as "home food: restaurant food", within which are opposed the dominant features of "recipe: technology".

In a narrow local home environment, cooking process signs are in a relationship of complementarity with all other gluttony signs; in the socialized environment, catering technology signs are "king and god" of cuisine. The power of mass food production "puts pressure" on the quality of cooking: the cooking process at the slightest change or violation of the technology is difficult to reverse or correct as easy as it is possible in the conditions of the preparation of homemade food. In general, internal kitchen communication discourse is characterized by a common rigid policy-preparation process and a clear allocation of roles of entities in this process. Cook-technologist monitors the cooking modes and compliance with food recipes, the chef keeps an eye on food and feed presentability and design; part-time workers are responsible for compliance with the technology of preparation of products for the preparation of operations, etc. Accordingly structured is the discourse of communication participants involved: instructions and commands coming from a chef subordinate in the hierarchy of the kitchen workers, they can also be accompanied by emotive statements about the quality of the work of subordinates. From bottom to top, from the downstream to the upstream kitchen worker can only come interrogative statements, requests, the requests for an advice, advisory statements. Signs of interpersonal communication in the professional kitchen discourse, as a rule, are directive, since all communication is subjected to the time factor (the kitchen should have time to prepare a meal for a term appointed, the client does not like to wait, you can overdo the meal, and so on.). In the discourse of external communication, which has the status of the transition between the discourse of internal communication and media communication, are concentrated signs structured in clusters of concepts, frames or scripts of food preparation and consumption, and behavioral scenarios. Entities of external communication (customers, visitors, users) will learn about the process of cooking technology from intermediaries role of which can be acted by chef, one of whose functions is a representative function (he is one of the kitchen workers who has the right to communicate with customers in the restaurant), or waiters.

Cooking scenario is communicated to customers in its most general form ("Из чего это приготовлено?" ["What is it cooked?"], "Что входит в состав блюда?" ["What part of the food?"] – "Блюдо приготовлено из мидий, пропаренных в белом вине" ["The dish is made from mussels steamed in white wine"], "В состав гарнира входит морская капуста" ["The structure of a garnish includes seaweed"]). Consumption script can be deployed in sufficient detail and aestheticized ("Как это следует есть?", "Как это есть?" ["How it should be eaten?", "How to eat it?"];

"Блюдо разрезают на равные кусочки, обмакивают в соус, при этом положено пользоваться специальной вилкой для рыбы"; ["The dish is cut into equal pieces, dipped in sauce, while one should use a special fork for the fish"]). Discourse external communication is mainly consultative, it is not prescriptive. In addition, it is at full subjected to maxims of politeness and etiquette, at least on the part of serving. Failures in behavioral scenarios, external communication, tend to occur due to consumer dissatisfaction with the quality of food and quality of service: in this case, the communication involves linguistic emotive signs (an expression of dissatisfaction, exclamations, complaints, adverse statements, and even derogative signs).

All three scenarios are extremely closely linked, forming a generalized image of the gluttony socialized environment. Their balance determines the attention of mass communication, which acts on the one hand, as a means of shaping the public image of nutrition environment, and on the other – it serves as an indicator of the state of the cultural world view. Thus, gluttony discourse becomes a discourse of mass communication and accumulates the signs that represent cultural landmarks taken by society as the dominants, as well as signs that outline principles and ideas adopted in a particular community about nutrition that are profitable for power or dominant in society groups. All of these provide semiotic flow of information about gluttony in all its manifestations, directed to the society as a mass-information discourse.

Information on the quality of the food is presented to the consumer in the instructions and data on the elements contained in the product that accompany the product item. The impact on the consumer for the purpose of driving his consuming interest, as a rule, is regulated by advertising in the media, or by usage of evaluation performed by institutions responsible for testing of the product quality. Information about the presence, absence, adequacy and cost of the food resource is always in the media spotlight; the slightest deviation from the norm in the food status of the resource immediately becomes the object of attention (usually the object of criticism) of the press, respectively, in the mass-information discourse vector feedback with the consumer awareness of the quality of the product can be forwarded to the authorities and to those who are responsible for the quality and quantity of food resources. Thus, we can talk about the institutionalization of mass-information discourse towards gluttony system.

The process of cooking, food quality, its appearance, content and origin are also reflected in mass-information discourse in the form of the triad "process - image – culture". Cooking scenarios form the overall aesthetic image of the consumption and supply information about the cultural and national identity and self-identity of the consumer. By means of such reflection there appears the mass distribution of information about recipes and food styles (cookbooks, newspaper and magazine columns of experts in nutrition, TV shows, distribution of recipes over the internet, etc.). Gluttony discourse in the status of mass-information is also a regulator of the interaction between national cultures, spreading information on methods of preparing and manner of eating by the different nations and nationalities, meanwhile creating consumer preference and reminding him of his nationality, thereby promoting his or her national identity. It is also necessary to mention transnational trends in mass communication to deploy attention vector to a particular culture, including in the field of food consumption in relation to socially and politically important events: thus, according to the economic television agency "Bloomberg TV", China's accession to the WTO (World Trade Organization) and extensive coverage of this fact in the media immediately increased attendance of Chinese restaurants all over the world; casually pronounced President Vladimir Putin's recognition of his commitment to the Japanese fish-made dish of "sushi" made this dish the most fashionable in restaurants of Moscow.

Пища, еда (Food) is nothing else like 1) the cognitive system, which is a conglomerate of values and cultural landmarks, linked by a common idea gluttony, i.e. consumption and life-sustaining in Homo Consummatus; 2) a special sign system consisting of clearly enough hierarchized signs having their own special linguistic interpretation. Linguistic food signs, its characteristics and actions / conditions associated with its production, preparation and consumption, form the particular cognitive and informative-communicative environment in which the communication is subjected to the laws of discourse, or rather – its special variety, which is called by us as gluttony discourse forming food community preferences with a wide information society media. Like any

discourse, gluttony discourse is subjected to social stratification and, consequently, is represented by different genres, regularly verbalized in a variety of texts (recipes, culinary instruction, culinary memoirs, restaurant critical article, a culinary detective, menu, wine map, gastronomic Internet blog, website, chat, forum, etc.).

## 4. Conclusion

Thus, the food and the related discourse is a system of signs, which concentrates "cultural capital", national identity, personal identity and the subjective attitude (taste), gender characteristics and the characteristics of the social (class). In other words, the studied phenomena together represent a special cultural concept [13]. Gluttony (gastronomic) discourse linguistic signs form meanings that fold into a special semantic system structured into clustering significances that I call scripts or frames, which, in turn, in communicative goals of presentation are dismembered by human consciousness and are stored there in the form of directive messages (recipes, menus, aesthetic images of dishes, table manners, rituals, food intake, etc.). In mass communication one of the most important places takes interaction associated with the state of food resources and processes of processing and consumption. I call it gluttony communication and propose the statement of its representing the entire cognitive system involved a considerable amount of mutually interconnected signs, including language signs, which in turn form a broad semiolinguistic gluttony system. The means of implementation of these systems in the mass media are the mass-information resources that have an impact on consumers in terms of choice of their food preferences, form cultural preferences and dominants, related to the maintenance of life through food consumption.

Demonstrated analysis algorithm of gluttony element in ethnic semiolinguistics of needs for physiological survival can be quite successfully applied to the study of discursive and semiolinguistic realization of a wide variety of needs. Of course, there is always found a certain specificity in each case of such realization. Its search and a detailed description make future plans of our scientific school.

## References

Annenkova O.V. (2004). Lingua-cultural characteristics of Anglo-Saxon authoritative discourse. – Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Astafurova, T.N. & Olyanitch, A.V. (2006) Semiolinguistics of Anglo-Saxon prejudice. In: *Proceedings of the international scientific conference "Language, culture and communication."* - Part 1 - Volgograd: Volgograd Scientific Publishing House, 23-39.

Astafurova, T. N., & Olyanitch, A.V. (2006). Prejudice in the Anglo-Saxon lingua-culture. *Volgograd Scientific Publishing House Collection of articles*. Volgograd, 25-39.

Astafurova T.N, & Olyanitch A.V. (2004) Typology and classification of institutional nominations in the Anglo-Saxon lingua-culture. In: Homo Institutius - Man institutional / ed. O.V. Inshakov. - Volgograd, Chapter 30.

Astafurova T.N., & Olyanitch A.V. (2008a). Lingua-pragmatics of protective communications. *Professional communication: problems of the humanities*. Vol. 2. - Volgograd: Niva Pbs, 5-19.

Astafurova T.N., & Olyanitch A.V. (2008b). Semiolinguistics of power: sign, word, text. Monograph. Volgograd: Niva Pbs.

Astafurova T.N., & Olyanitch A.V. (2008c). Noosphere of foreign language bias. In: *Culture of the Black Sea. The scientific journal of Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, number 137*. Simferopol,. 134-148.

Astafurova T.N., & Olyanitch A.V. (2009). Semiolinguistics of the road. *Anthropological Linguistics. - Coll. of scientific articles*. - Volgograd College, 12-27.

Astafurova T.N., Olyanitch A.V. (2011). Semiolinguistics of vital needs: Monograph. Volgograd: Publishing House of Volgograd, 567s.

Baratashvili E.E. (2011). Ethnic specifics of semiolinguistics of needs: Turkish gluttony. *Bulletin of Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. 13 (2), 127-131.

Bovaeva G.M. (2010). Gluttony Signs in Kalmyk lingua-culture. Ethno-cultural ritual sacrifices. *Proceedings of the international scientific conference "Russian language in the dialogue of cultures."* Voronezh, 12-17.

Dorokhova N.I. (2010). Lingua-pragmatic parameters and semiolinguistic characteristics of concept-sphere "life" in the Anglo-Saxon world picture in V - XI centuries. *Journal of the Dagestan Scientific Center*, Russian Academy of Sciences. Makhachkala, 134-158.

Ermakova L.R. (2010) Gluttonic pragmatonyms and national character (on the material of Russian and English lingua-cultures). Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Belgorod.

Chernjavskaja T.A. (2008). Discursive space of English prejudices. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Golovnitskaya N.P. (2007). Lingua-cultural characteristics of German-language gastronomic discourse. Dissertation of Candidate of Science (Philology). Volgograd.

Golovnitskaya N.P. & Olyanitch A.V. (2008). Lingua-culture of German gluttony. Monograph. Volgograd: Niva Pbs.

Katsunova N.N. (2007). Experience in Lingua-cognitive analysis of metaphors and idioms with the concept of food (on material of English language). Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Irkutsk.

Kirillova I.K. (2010). Semiolinguistics of English-speaking university discourse. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Medvedeva L.V. (2007) The development of foreign language skills of interactive trial at students of college of law (in the English language material). Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Pedagogy), Volgograd.

Nekrasova T.N. (2011). Semiotic aspects of institutional communication in automobile travel. *Professional communication: problems of the humanities. - Philology, Linguistics, Didactics. Coll. scientific works of the Faculty of social sciences and humanities, and additional education*. Vol. 6 (1). Volgograd: Niva Pbs. 56-68.

Olyanitch A.V. (2004). Presentation theory of discourse. - Monograph. Volgograd: Paradigm.

Olyanitch A.V. (2006). Needs, discourse, communication. Monograph. Volgograd: Niva Pbs.

Raspaev A.A. (2007). Semiolinguistic category of theatricality in the English-speaking political narrative. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Reimer Y.V. (2011). Semiolinguistics of Bacchic culture in Russian and German. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Samokhina E.A. (2010). Representation of concept-sphere «LAND» in the English linguistic culture. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Simakova A.V. (2011). Features of functioning of linguistic realities with the semantics of 'food' (based on the works of Charles Dickens). Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Krasnodar.

Ustinova E.V. (2011). Quotation as a verbal tool of political manipulation in the English-speaking political discourse of the United States. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Vasilchenko Y.A. (2011). Semiolinguistics of Russian and British hunting: a comparative study. *Professional communication: problems of the humanities. - Philology, Linguistics, Didactics. - Coll. Of scientific works of the Faculty of social sciences and humanities, and additional education*. Vol. 6 (1). Volgograd: Niva Pbs, 26-38.

Vorkachev S.G. (2002). Concept of happiness in the Russian language consciousness: The experience of linguistic and cultural analysis. - Monograph. Krasnodar, Kuban University Pbs.

Yanushkevich I.F. (2009). Semiolinguistics of Anglo-Saxon culture. – Dissertation of Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Zakharov S.V. (2008). Of Anglo-Saxon institutional gluttony. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.

Zemskova A.J. (2009) Semiolinguistic characteristics of the English-language gastronomic discourse. Dissertation of Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Volgograd.