METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF COGNITIVE-SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF CONCEPT

Soroka T. V.

INTRODUCTION

At the present stage of the development of linguistics, the interest to the problem of speech and the personality of the speaker has led to the development of anthropological linguistics, which studies language in close connection with a person, his consciousness, thinking and spiritual and practical activities. One of the urgent tasks of anthropolinguistics is to define the notion of the picture of the world and the basics of its modeling, as well as to study the language personality. The picture of the world is a holistic, global image of the world, which is the result of all the spiritual activity of a person. Having captured a certain image of the world, which is never a mirror image of the whole world, the picture of the world is a certain vision and construction of the world in accordance with the logic of the worldview.[1]Exploring the picture of the world, it is proposed to distinguish between the linguistic and conceptual picture of the world.

The linguistic (verbal) picture of the world is a set of ideas about the world, a certain way of conceptualizing reality historically-developed in the everyday consciousness of a given language collective and reflected in the language, primarily in semantics and grammatical forms.

The conceptual picture of the world is richer and more varied than the linguistic picture of the world. Its basic units of the former are concepts and conceptual complexes, including images, notions, ideas, setups and evaluations embodied in the language with words and phrases. At the same time, it is postulated that the conceptual (or cognitive) aspect of word meanings reveals knowledge about the world. Lexical meanings, although they relate to the conceptual sphere, are most closely related to words, create a kind of "bridge" from the sphere of thinking to the sphere of language, establish the relationships "concepts – words".

1. Anthropocentric nature of the phenomenon "language consciousness"

The term "language consciousness" refers to concepts that relate to different but contiguous fields of knowledge: linguistics and psychology.

---

[1] Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Минск : Тетра Системс, 2004. 256 с.

The convergence of the corresponding concepts, from N. Ushakova's[2] point of view, should be considered as a very progressive trend. Linguistic and psychological approaches to the study of consciousness are different views on the nature of the transitory relationship between suprasemiotic reality and sign essence in reflective processes.

In order to understand the nature of the interaction of consciousness and language as a practical realization of consciousness, it is necessary to go beyond the limits of individual human thinking, beyond the limits of the human body organization and enter the world of its culture. Indeed, any speech act, although carried out by the neuro-brain system of an individual, is still located within a certain socio-cultural space. Moreover, it becomes, according to N.F. Alefirenko[3], a fact of practical consciousness, which, as a result of its objectification by language, turns into language consciousness. The result of this transformation is a set of images of consciousness formed and interpreted with the help of language means.

Saying about "language consciousness", we mean the aspect that is directly related to the processes of speech generation and its perception and through which linguists approach the study of the mentally-linguistic complex of the national conceptual sphere. At the same time, according to V.V. Krasnykh[4], it is necessary to agree with the thesis that language consciousness cannot be an object of analysis at the time of the processes that implement it. It can be studied only as a product of past, former activity, that is, in its transformed, alienated from the subject of consciousness forms of cultural objects.

For L.S. Vygotsky and, after him, for A.N. Leontiev, consciousness has a linguistic, speech nature. To have consciousness is to possess a language. Proficient in language – proficient in meanings. Meaning is a unit of consciousness (primarily referring to linguistic, verbal meaning). Consciousness in this sense is a sign. Developing the theory of L.S. Vygotsky and A.N. Leontiev, A.A. Leontiev[5] argues that if language is understood as the unity of communication and generalization as the system of meanings, acting as subject and verbal forms of existence, the "linguistic consciousness", i.e. consciousness considered as indirect meanings is close to understanding of "image of the world" in modern psychology. And this is not accidental, since it is through the image of the world that a person is aware of within oneself he or she perceives the world from the outside; the

---

[2] Ушакова Т.Н. Языковое сознание и принципы его исследования. Москва, 2000. С. 13–23.

[3] Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные проблемы семантики. Москва : Гнозис, 2005. 326 с.

[4] Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. 375 с.

[5] Леонтьев А.А. Языковое сознание и образ мира. Язык и сознание: пара-доксальная рациональность. Москва, 1993. С. 16–21.

world through the eyes of a person is a view of the world based on the processing that we are able to subject the world enclosed in us. Accordingly, human language is a surface structure in which texts fix the model of the world that we carry in our consciousness, since language itself, as a kind of meaningful system, requires correlation with existence. In principle, it is impossible to construct a sentence from natural language words in such a way that there is no reflection in the presence of the reflected, that is, so that the sign correlates with reality, bypassing its reflection in the human head. Therefore, we can assume that between the actual, real situation and the statement reflecting this reality (the result of speech actions) there is an intermediate stage – the stage of dividing the situation for specific purposes, while the division of reality itself is connected with the thesaurus.

It is also important that language consciousness has many different levels and contains both facts that lie on the surface and those ones hidden very deeply, in other words, consciousness has the depth. At the same time, what is hidden in the depths can be extracted to the surface. Thus, language consciousness is a form of existence of an individual cognitive consciousness of a reasonable person, a person who speaks, a person who communicates, a person as a social being, who has a complex inner world and belongs to a particular culture. Here there is a relationship between consciousness and culture, since consciousness is formed in society, and culture, in turn, is created by society and exists in it. In other words, a human being as phenomenon creates culture, and as individual entering it becomes a person, and in the process of understanding the person develops and improves its specific ability of conscious reflection of reality.

Developing a typology of language personalities in value, behavioral, and cognitive aspects and analyzing the types of discourse in a communication situation, V.N. Karasik[6] identifies (along with language ability, communicative need, and speech behavior) language consciousness as one of the five aspects in the speech organization of a person, and communicative competence is qualified by him as a manifestation of language consciousness in the choice of means of communication. The scientist's conception is based on the postulate that what happens in certain ethnic and social frameworks, the awareness of identity is fixed in the language consciousness, which is divided into relevant verbalized fragments of understanding reality, allowing for ethno-cultural, socio-cultural and personal-cultural dimensions.

Language consciousness is considered an integral part of the communicative consciousness, which, in turn, is considered as an integral component of the cognitive consciousness of the nation. Communicative

---

[6] Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 390 с.

consciousness is defined as a set of communicative knowledge and communication mechanisms that provide the entire complex of human communicative activity.

The position of researchers undoubtedly confirms the anthropocentric nature of the phenomenon of language consciousness, since mental structures do not exist independently, and the actions of the subject itself are included in the resulting image of the world. However, language consciousness is not only anthropocentric, but also ethnocentric, since the image of the world changes from one culture to another, and as a result, there are no two identical ethnolinguocultures and images of the world. Since the worldview of each nation is based on its own system of individual's values, social stereotypes, cognitive schemes, etc., human consciousness is always ethnically conditioned. The ethno-socio-cultural factor is revealed, in particular, in the nationally-ethnic features of the way of forming and formulating thought. Obviously, this process is largely "unconscious" in nature, since the system of consciousness itself is most likely determined by ethnic stereotypes of behavior and is not recognized by each individual carrier of culture, that is, it belongs to the collective unconscious of this nationally-linguistic-cultural community (in terms of V.V. Krasnykh). However, it is this particular system of consciousness, or image of the world, that influences the behavior of representatives of a particular community and determines it.

Naturally, with the common structure of the human mental-linguistic complex, each of its hypostases (consciousness, thinking, and language) can manifest itself differently in different language personalities and different ethnic communities. The consciousness responsible for storing, ordering and evaluating the information results obtained by thinking is related both to the logic embodied in the structure and content of units and categories of a particular ethnic language.

2. Concept as a basic notion of cognitive linguistics

Cognitive linguistics in Ukrainian and foreign linguistics has established itself as a science that emerged at the intersection of Cognitology (the science of knowledge), Cognitive psychology (the psychology of cognition), Psycholinguistics and linguistics, and studies the mechanisms of language knowledge and the mechanisms of knowledge representation in language[7].

The tasks of Cognitive linguistics should be defined as an attempt to understand the following:

1. The role of language in the processes of cognition and comprehension of the world.

---

[7] Иванова Л.П. Курс лекций по общему языкознанию : научное пособие. Киев, 2006. 312 с.

2. Language knowledge in the procedures of obtaining, processing and transmitting information about the world.

3. Processes of conceptualization and categorization of knowledge, description of means and methods of language categorization and conceptualization of cultural constants.

4. Description of the system of universal concepts that organize the concept sphere and are the main rubricators of its division.

5. The problem of the linguistic picture of the world[8].

In this regard, the current stage of the study of language data is characterized by a new level of understanding the problems of verbal realization of national worldviews, combining cognitive and linguoculturological paradigms on a single methodological basis, developed in line with the anthropological direction of scientific knowledge. The unit of description of the picture of the world is the concept.

In modern science, according to N.V. Sluhay[9], there are three main approaches to the analysis of the concept. These include: 1) system-language, based on the understanding of the concept in the totality of their language settings in the axis system of syntagmatics, paradigmatic and associative relationships that allows to identify typical propositions, in the center of which there is a concept (G.P. Djindjolia[10]); 2) denotative, which focuses on the description of the extra-linguistic correlate of the proposition (A.D. Koshelev[11]), and 3) significative, in which this phenomenon is comprehended in a comparative aspect by analyzing its significative field, or through a simplified grid of universals of binary, ternary, quaternary, and similar systems (A. Wierzbicka[12]), either in a complex of encyclopedic and linguistic components (S.G. Vorkachev[13]), or in the unity of the profane, secular and mythological meanings (L.G. Panova[14]).

[8] Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Минск : Тетра Системс, 2004. 256 с.

[9] Слухай Н.В. Основные направления осмысления культурно-языкового феномена «концепт» в современной русистике. Русское слово в мировой культуре. Санкт-Петербург, 30 июня – 5 июля 2003 г. *Концептосфера русского языка: константы и динамика изменений*. Санкт-Петербург : Политехника, 2003. С. 290–298.

[10] Джинджолия Г.П. Концептосфера глагола «любить» в русском языке. *Когнитивные стратегии языковой коммуникации*. Симферополь, 1998. С. 83–85.

[11] Кошелев А.Д. О языковом концепте долг. *Логический анализ языка. Языки этики*. Москва, 2000. С. 119–124.

[12] Вежбицкая А. Сравнение – градация – метафора. Теория метафоры. Пер. С англ. Москва : Прогресс, 1990. С. 133–152.

[13] Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Филологические науки*. 2001. № 1. С. 65–72.

[14] Панова Л.Г. Грех как религиозный концепт (на примере русского слова «грех» и итальянского "peccato"). *Логический анализ языка. Языки этики*. Москва, 2000. 131 с.

The existing approaches to understanding the concept in linguistics are reduced to linguo-cognitive and linguo-cultural understanding these phenomena.

Linguo-cognitological studies have a typological orientation and focus on identifying common patterns in the formation of mental representations. In general, they are oriented semasiologically: from meaning (concept) to language (means of its verbalization).

An extended interpretation of the definition of "concept" is recorded in the Short Dictionary of Cognitive Terms: "Concept (in cognitive linguistics) is a term that serves to explain the units of mental or psychic resources of our consciousness and the information structure that reflects the knowledge and experience of a person; an operational content unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system and language of the brain (lingua mentalis), the entire picture of the world reflected in the human psyche"[15].

In the context of speech activity, verbal forms are considered as a specific means of fixing the content of mental images in language that is why language is defined as an indirect form of reflection of reality[16].

The study of the human factor in language requires an emphasis on the fact that, in comparison with language, thinking is richer in its content. The process of thinking consists in the formation of new connections between different ideas and concepts; it is characterized by a constant "fluidity". Words are more stable, more conservative than concepts, and in this sense less adequately reflect the process of development of reality. So, the Russian word *house* existed in the Indo-European proto-language. Over thousands of years, the shape of the house has changed enormously – from a primitive hut to a modern high-rise building, but the house sound complex itself says nothing about these changes[17]. In this regard, it seems appropriate to state the fact that the notion *concept* corresponds to the idea of those meanings that a person operates in the processes of thinking and that reflect the content of the results of all human activity and the processes of cognition of the world in the form of certain "quanta of knowledge"[18].

The study of the nature of the concept in cognitive linguistics is of paramount importance. Any attempt to understand its essence leads to the realization of the fact of the existence of a number of related concepts and terms, which can be represented in the form of a quadriadum – *the key word*

---

[15] Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е.С. Кубрякова и др. Москва : МГУ, 1996. 246 с.

[16] Houdé O., Kayser D., Kœnig O. éd. Vocabulaire de sciences cognitives. Paris : P.U.F., 1998. 435 p.

[17] Роль человеческого фактора в языке : Язык и картина мира / Б.А. Серебренников и др. Москва, 1988. 216 с.

[18] Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е.С. Кубрякова и др. Москва : МГУ, 1996. 246 с.

of culture – concept – notion – meaning. The problem of their differentiation is very controversial in modern theoretical linguistics.

In the works of A. Wierzbicka[19; 20], the concept is often used as a synonym for the term *key word of culture*, but we believe that these are different phenomena. The main thing that separates them is that the concept arises as a nuclear structure, comparable to the inner form of the word, and then "grows" with all new meanings. A limited number of concepts with small variations function in all cultures, and their frequency does not play a role[21], since they do not disappear, changing their relevance at different stages of the cultural development of any society.

These or other concepts are not represented in the minds of all native speakers, the associations caused by the concept do not always carry a bright cultural colour, concepts are not used figuratively in speech.

Keywords are specific to each national culture. They have the following characteristics: 1) fame and representation in the minds of native speakers; 2) high sense and semantic load; 3) the ability to evoke cultural associations in native speakers of a given language; 4) the ability to be used figuratively in speech; 5) high frequency (the criterion introduced by A. Wierzbicka). The key word of culture does not close the meanings as a concept, does not entail a chain of associations behind the notional meaning. A keyword has a stable plan of expression, in contrast to a concept, the verbalization of which implies a high degree of variability.

The activity of words characterized by the degree of use in their unchanged form is very relevant for the qualification of them as key words (cf., for example: "The Caucasus as a key word of culture in the Russian language consciousness" in the studies of L.P. Ivanova[22]).

The concept, according to V.V. Krasnykh[23], requires a higher level of abstraction, it is a kind of "idea", "notion". However, the correlation of a *concept* with a *notion* needs the following clarification: in fact, these terms are very close, but the basis of a notion is logical, rational, and the basis of a concept is sub-logical.

At the same time, the content of concept includes the content of a naive concept, but is not limited to it, since it covers all the many pragmatic elements of the name, which are manifested in its compatibility. And the

---

[19] Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 1999. 780 с.

[20] Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов. Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. 288 с.

[21] Иванова Л.П. Курс лекций по общему языкознанию : научное пособие. Киев, 2006. 312 с.

[22] Иванова Л.П. Кавказ в русском языковом сознании XIX–XX столетий. Киев : Изд. дом Дм. Бураго, 2004. 110 с.

[23] Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. 375 с.

compatibility of the name reflects both logical and rational connections of its designation (denotation) with others, and illogical, irrational, reflecting the emotional and evaluative perception of the world by a person.

If notions are sets of known and necessary features of certain objects, then concepts, according to V.A. Maslova[24], are not any notions, but only the most complex and important of them, without which it is difficult to imagine this culture. These are mental national-specific formations, the content plan of which is all the totality of knowledge about these objects (essential and non-essential features), and the plan of expression is the totality of linguistic means (lexical, phraseological, paremiological, etc.). In other words, a concept is a unit of culture, and a notion is a unit of science, for example, the notion of a tree in Biology and the concept of a "tree" in culture. The main thing that distinguishes a concept from a notion is the amount of formative knowledge and the emphasis of research placed on them.

Considering the terms "concept" and "meaning", it should be emphasized that they also do not correspond to each other. These linguistic phenomena are considered in different systems of relations: a meaning – in the system of language, a notion – in the system of logical relations and forms, a concept is realized in its notional meanings. A concept does not directly arise from the meaning of the word, but is "the result of the collision of the dictionary meaning of the word with the individual and national experience of a person". Suggested connects linguistic, cognitive and mental plans: from a minimum of "the closest meaning of a word" to the broad cultural and historical background associated with the "further word-meaning" (after A.A. Potebnya). In other words, "immediate meaning" serves as an inner form of representation of "further meaning", a way of linguistic objectification of intellectual and emotional content.

The concept is a relatively stable and steady cognitive "cast" from the object of reality, since a concept is connected to the world more directly than a meaning. The word always expresses only a part of the concept by its meaning. In our study, the point of view is adopted, according to which meanings construct a concept, "closing" and accumulating in its "layers" in the process of development.

The psycholinguistic interpretation of a concept presents it as a basic perceptual-cognitive-affective formation of a dynamic nature that spontaneously functions in the cognitive and communicative activity of an individual, obeying the laws of human psychic life and, as a result, differing in a number of parameters from notions and meanings as products of scientific description from the standpoint of linguistic theory.

What is important in the psycholinguistic approach is that a concept is considered not as a "hopelessly frozen entity", but as a structure prone to dynamic modifications: concepts expand, merge, that is, undergo

---

[24] Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Минск : Тетра Системс, 2004. 256 с.

transformations[25]. American anthropologist K. Hardy[26], offering an extremely productive concept phenomenon for psycholinguistics, noted its possibility to be a component of the processes of generating meaning, which are integrated into the dynamic processes of thinking, actively stimulating new connections, associations, a new mental (self)organization.

According to N.N. Boldyrev[27], a concept can be based on knowledge of different degrees of abstraction and formats: 1) *concrete and sensual image* (concrete phone); 2) *representation* (mental picture as a generalized sensual image, such as a phone at all); 3) *scheme* – a mental sample of an object or phenomenon having a spatially-contour character (geometric aspect of the submission, the general outlines of something, for example, a house, a human figure, mechanical trajectory); 4) *notion* – a concept containing the most common, essential attributes of an object or phenomenon, its objective, logical design features (notion is a concept devoid of secondary characteristics, from the standpoint of logical analysis); 5) *prototype* – a categorical concept, which gives an idea about a typical member of the definite category (a typical representation of a car or of a politician, etc., it is the rationale for the conceptualization, segregating something typical on the basis of experience); 6) *propositional structure*, or *proposition* – a model of a certain area of experience, in which elements (arguments and connections between them) are isolated, their characteristics are given; this is a generalized logical model of relations, reflected in deep grammar; 7) *frame* – a three-dimensional multicomponent concept that represents a "package" of information, knowledge about a stereotypical situation, a *frame* is a two-level structure consisting of vertex nodes that contain constant data for a certain situation, and terminal nodes, or slots, filled with data from a specific situation, for example, the "theater" frame includes the vertex nodes "ticket office", "stage", "auditorium", "performance", etc., and terminal nodes, for example: "queue at the ticket office of a particular theater, impressions associated with this event in which I took part"; analyzing the second-level frames (nested frames, or subframes), we restore the situation as a whole; 8) *scenarios*, or *scripts* – dynamically presented frames, a sequence of stages, episodes unfolding in time (for example, a visit to the theater); 9) *gestalt* – a conceptual structure, a holistic image that combines sensory and rational components in their unity, as a result of an undifferentiated perception of the situation, the highest level of abstraction: non-discrete, unstructured knowledge.

---

[25] Привалова И.В. Итеркультура и вербальный знак (лингвокогнитивные основы межкультурной коммуникации). Москва : Гнозис, 2005. 472 с.

[26] Hardy C. Networks of Meaning: A Bridge between Mind and Matter. Wesport, Conn. : Praeger, 1998. 217 p.

[27] Болдырев Н.Н. Когнитивная семантика. Тамбов, 2000. 130 с.

The lack of a single definition of a concept is due to the fact that its structure includes, in addition to the conceptual basis, a socio-psycho-cultural part, which is not so much thought by a native speaker as experienced by oneself.

The object of linguo-culturological research is the correlation of language and culture, which is manifested in the ways of linguistic expression of ethnic mentality. The interest of scientists here is focused on the study of the specific in the composition of mental units and is aimed at accumulating and systematizing the description of the distinctive semantic features of specific cultural concepts. Linguoculturological studies are oriented more onomasiologically and go from the name of the concept to the totality of the meanings it nominates[28].

When considering a concept, Yu.S. Stepanov[29] pays great attention to the cultural aspect, according to which the whole culture appears as a set of concepts and relations between them. Under a concept in the original interpretation, set out in the work "Constants. Dictionary of Russian culture: Research experience", the scientist understands the phenomenon of the same order as a notion, and considers it as "a bunch of culture in the human mind <…> that's how culture enters the mental world of a human being", and that "by means of what a human being <…> oneself enters the culture, and in some cases influences it". However, in his subsequent linguistic studies, Yu.S. Stepanov argues that a concept of culture is understood as a phenomenon related to a notion, but different from it in content, form and sphere of existence. The sphere of a concept is the mental world, not logic, but culture in any of its areas. Its form is not a scientific term, but a word or phrase of a common language. The internal content of a concept is understood as the property of the whole society.

If we take into account the fact that cultural reality embodies mainly the phenomenological (objectified) sphere of semantic space, then mentality acts as a sphere of consistently reproducible and translatable cognitive mechanisms, in which the semantic and axiological structures of this very cultural reality are formed. Therefore, based on the above, a concept is represented as the main cell of culture in the mental world of a person.

Revealing the specific features of the phenomenon of *mentality*, V.V. Kolesov[30] notes that it is "a worldview in the categories and forms of the native language, combining in the process of cognition the intellectual, spiritual and volitional qualities of the national character in its typical manifestations". The main unit of mentality, according to the scientist, is the concept of this

---

[28] Воркачев С.Г. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт. Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004. 236 с.

[29] Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры : Опыт исследования. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1997. 824 с.

[30] Колесов В.В. Жизнь происходит от слова <…>. Санкт-Петербург : Златоуст, 1999. 368 с.

culture, which within the boundaries of the verbal sign and the language as a whole appears in its content forms as an image, notion and symbol. For our scientific research, it is especially important to recognize the role of the trinity – an image, notion and symbol. The analysis of the mentioned forms will be optimal for the completeness of establishing the semantic scope of linguo-cultural concepts by means of highlighting the following components:

– notional, reflecting the characteristic and definitional structure of concepts;

– figurative, fixing cognitive metaphors that support the analyzed concepts in the linguistic consciousness of speakers;

– significant, determined by the place which the names of concepts occupy in the lexical and grammatical systems of specific languages.

In the totality of its components, which have a certain cipher, a concept cannot be simple; any element of it must be explained by another element.

Linguo-cognitive and linguo-cultural approaches to understanding a concept, according to V.I. Karasik's viewpoint[31], are not considered mutually exclusive: a concept as a mental formation in the consciousness of an individual is an exit to the concept sphere of society, i.e. to culture, and a concept as a unit of culture is a fixation of collective experience, which becomes the property of the individual. These approaches differ in their vectors in relation to the subject: the linguocognitive concept represents the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the linguocultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness.

V.G. Zusman[32] rightly notes that "a concept is a micromodel of culture, and culture is a macromodel of a concept. The concept generates culture and is generated by it". Consequently, the concept existing in the culture and reflected in the linguistic consciousness of a person develops and, as a result of its existence, acquires a cultural content.

The process of understanding and choosing the definition of a concept is important for us, because depending on what is considered to be the object of research. The methodology of its modeling should be built, as well as the boundaries, composition, and means of formal display should be determined.

Synthesizing the above interpretations, we take as a basis the understanding of a concept as a mental formation in the collective linguistic consciousness of representatives of ethnic culture. It is defined by a number of its verbal realizations and revealed in terms of content by a variety of nationally-specific semantic meanings.

---

[31] Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 390 с.

[32] Зусман В.Г. Концепт в культурологическом аспекте. *Межкультурная коммуникация*. Нижний Новгород : Деком, 2001. С. 38–53.

Sharing the point of view of most researchers (N.D. Arutyunova[33], A. Wierzbicka[34], Yu.S. Stepanov[35], F. Rastier[36], etc.), we consider the word to be a proper form of the concept.

The concept is related to the word, but it is more specific both in the plan of exprexxion (which is practically static) and in the plan of content. The word has grammatical categories that do not extend to the concept. Being fixed in the dictionary, the word is enclosed in the framework of its meanings, which are clearly defined. When it comes to a synonym, it is already a different word, although close in meaning.

E.S. Kubryakova[37] believes that the organization of the internal lexicon as an ordered, structured linguistic picture of the world is based on the centrality of the word, because it is the word that gives access to different structures of knowledge – both verbal and nonverbal. The word serves as a connecting vector from sensory perception to activity, since the meaning reflects the results of the previous cognitive (thinking) activity of a person. In their totality, words unfold before us a certain picture of the world as a result of categorization, which is present in the consciousness of a person.

The movement from thought to a word is subordinated to the development of a whole system of components that provide a sensory reflection of real reality in consciousness, which is manifested in the conceptual system, in the formation of the idea of a speech message.

In each language unit, the individual properties of the object seen by a person are combined in a peculiar way, which can be represented as the result of the conceptualization carried out by the subject in the process of cognition of reality. Therefore, the word by its roots is bonded with the knowledge of reality and reflects them in a variety of ways. The meaning of the word in full, in fact, is inexhaustible, since the actual sense of each word is determined, in the end, by all the richness of the moments existing in consciousness related to what is expressed by this word. It follows that the meaning of the word expressing the concept is not equal to the semantic content of the concept, which is much broader due to the layered structure of the concept, which is able to absorb the cultural experience of the people as a whole and the individual in particular. That is why cognitive scientists

---

[33] Арутюнова Н.Д. Аномалии и язык : к проблеме языковой «картины мира». *Вопросы языкознания.* 1987. № 6. С. 3–19.

[34] Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 1999. 780 с.

[35] Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры : Опыт исследования. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1997. 824 с.

[36] Rastier F. La sémantique des textes – concepts et applications. *Hermes : Journal of Linguistics.* 1996. № 16. P. 15–37.

[37] Кубрякова Е.С. Проблемы представления знаний в современной науке и роль лингвистики в решении этих проблем. *Язык и структуры представления знаний.* Москва : ИНИОН РАН, 1992. С. 4–38.

emphasize the importance of knowing the deep meaning, which is potentially present in the meaning as an element of its content, unfolding in the semantic network of the cultural content of the concept.

Concepts are heterogeneous in terms of the designation of objects. On the one hand, we can distinguish the abstract concepts of "soul", "fate", "truth", on the other hand, the concepts of artifacts: "house", "bell", concepts – ideas about a person – "fool" and "God's fool". Concepts can only be abstract entities, objects are not signs of concepts. One can agree with this argument, but "matryoshka", as V.I. Karasik[38] notes it is not just a painted toy carved out of wood, but also a lot of experienced associations that arise in people familiar with traditional Russian folk culture. No matter how contradictory, at first glance, the notion "object concept" may be, we believe that it has a right to exist if in the linguistic consciousness a certain object is associated with culturally-significant semantic series. In our understanding, the conceptual picture of the world should initially be formed by "subject" concepts, and then by abstract entities. Objects form the substance of the world. They are the most visual, specific, and can be easily fixed and formalized. It is the process of fixing and forming the "subject" concept that provides for its detailing and structuring, taking into account specific features.

Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin[39] point out that specific system-language factors regulate the possibility of expressing certain concept features, taking into account its partial form. Taking into account this feature in the analysis of the concepts that appear in our study as nouns, we draw to consideration, for example, such parts of speech as adjectives, verbs, adverbs, are bound with nouns by semantic relations.

Following N.D. Arutyunova[40], the verbalizers of the concepts include etymology of words, synonymy, antonymy, the circle of compatibility, typical syntactic positions, semantic fields, assessments, figurative associations, metaphorics, phraseology, language patterns. In other words, the paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections of the concept verbalizers create a sphere of their implementation that is individual one for an each concept. The means of linguistic representation of concepts can also include definitions, semes, utterances, texts, and sets of texts. Based on this data, one can reconstruct a concept.

The meanings of concept are traced at the level of etymology, then at the level of its fixation in the language (the meanings in which the word denoting it is recorded in dictionaries) and, finally, since the concept is usually recreated on the trail left in classical exemplary texts, the most

---

[38] Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 390 с.

[39] Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Понятие «концепт» в лингвистических исследованиях. Воронеж : Воронежский ГУ, 2000. 30 с.

[40] Арутюнова Н.Д. Понятие судьбы в контексте разных культур. Москва : Наука, 1994. С. 3–4.

valuable observations can be made by studying its manifestations in the artistic speech of great writers, because their works are the living environment for the development of the concept.

Thus, concepts, acting as basic, supporting linguistic elements, unite representatives of a certain linguocultural community, providing a basis for mutual understanding between them through a set of potential conceptual meanings, in which the spirit of the people is embodied. The designation of a concept with a word allows one to define it as a phenomenon, a means of representing a cultural theme in a text.

CONCLUSIONS

The theoretical approach to the object of research has allowed to formulate conclusions. The term "language consciousness" refers to a set of images materialized by language signs. The term emphasizes the union, the fusion of the main components of speech activity: mental and linguistic elements. The carrier of language consciousness is a language personality, that is, a person who exists in the language space – in communication, in the meanings of language units and the meanings of texts, in the stereotypes of behavior recorded in the language, which, in turn, binds people into an ethnic community through concepts. The monitoring nature of language consciousness in cognitive processes allows to say about it as an ethno-linguistic and cultural phenomenon, in which the national image of the world is reflected.

In modern science, there are three main approaches to the analysis of concept. These include: system-language, denotative, and significative. The existing approaches in linguistics are reduced to linguo‑cognitive and linguo‑cultural understanding of these phenomena. In the linguo‑cognitive direction, the concept is defined as a global thinking unit, an ideal entity that is formed in the human mind. The concept is recognized as the main unit of linguo‑culturology and is considered as a multidimensional culturally‑significant socio‑psychic formation in the collective consciousness, defined in one or another language form. In the concept – the basic unit of culture – there are significant, figurative and conceptual sides. A review of modern linguistic researches has shown that knowledge formats of varying degrees of abstraction can stand behind the concept.

The prospect of research is to use the results for pragmatics study for fundamental investigation of conceptual paradigms of the Ukrainian, English and French language societies.

SUMMARY

The article is focused on the methodological aspects of cognitive-semantic description of concept. Besides, the paper focuses on the problems of modern linguistics in correlation with the culture and language, the picture of the world and language. The question of determing the term "language consciousness" is considered. Linguocognitive and linguocultural approaches to understanding

concept are justified. The structure of concept and its definitions existing in modern science are analysed. The phenomenon "concept" is separated from contiguous notions and terminological synonyms. Based on the forming meanings the content of concepts is designated.

REFERENCES

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные проблемы семантики. Москва : Гнозис, 2005. 326 с.

2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Аномалии и язык : к проблеме языковой «картины мира». *Вопросы языкознания*. 1987. № 6. С. 3–19.

3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Понятие судьбы в контексте разных культур. Москва : Наука, 1994. С. 3–4.

4. Болдырев Н.Н. Когнитивная семантика. Тамбов, 2000. 130 с.

5. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов. Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. 288 с.

6. Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. А.Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 1999. 780 с.

7. Вежбицкая А. Сравнение – градация – метафора. Теория метафоры. Пер. с англ. Москва : Прогресс, 1990. С. 133–152.

8. Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Филологические науки*. 2001. № 1. С. 65–72.

9. Воркачев С.Г. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт. Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004. 236 с.

10. Джинджолия Г.П. Концептосфера глагола «любить» в русском языке. *Когнитивные стратегии языковой коммуникации*. Симферополь, 1998. С. 83–85.

11. Зусман В.Г. Концепт в культурологическом аспекте. *Межкультурная коммуникация*. Нижний Новгород : Деком, 2001. С. 38–53.

12. Иванова Л.П. Кавказ в русском языковом сознании XIX–XX столетий. Киев : Изд. дом Дм. Бураго, 2004. 110 с.

13. Иванова Л.П. Курс лекций по общему языкознанию : научное пособие. Киев, 2006. 312 с.

14. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 390 с.

15. Колесов В.В. Жизнь происходит от слова <…>. Санкт-Петербург : Златоуст, 1999. 368 с.

16. Кошелев А.Д. О языковом концепте долг. *Логический анализ языка. Языки этики.* Москва, 2000. С. 119–124.

17. Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. 375 с.

18. Леонтьев А.А. Языковое сознание и образ мира. Язык и сознание : парадоксальная рациональность. Москва, 1993. С. 16–21.

19. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е.С. Кубрякова и др. Москва : МГУ, 1996. 246 с.

20. Кубрякова Е.С. Проблемы представления знаний в современной науке и роль лингвистики в решении этих проблем. *Язык и структуры представления знаний*. Москва : ИНИОН РАН, 1992. С. 4–38.

21. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Минск : Тетра Системс, 2004. 256 с.

22. Панова Л.Г. Грех как религиозный концепт (на примере русского слова «грех» и итальянского "peccato"). *Логический анализ языка. Языки этики.* Москва, 2000. 131 с.

23. Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Понятие «концепт» в лингвистических исследованиях. Воронеж : Воронежский ГУ, 2000. 30 с.

24. Привалова И.В. Итеркультура и вербальный знак (лингво-когнитивные основы межкультурной коммуникации). Москва : Гнозис, 2005. 472 с.

25. Роль человеческого фактора в языке : Язык и картина мира / Б.А. Серебренников и др. Москва, 1988. 216 с.

26. Слухай Н.В. Основные направления осмысления культурно-языкового феномена «концепт» в современной русистике. Русское слово в мировой культуре. Санкт-Петербург, 30 июня – 5 июля 2003 г. *Концептосфера русского языка: константы и динамика изменений*. Санкт-Петербург : Политехника, 2003. С. 290–298.

27. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры : Опыт исследования. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1997. 824 с.

28. Ушакова Т.Н. Языковое сознание и принципы его исследования. Москва, 2000. С. 13–23.

29. Hardy C. Networks of Meaning: A Bridge between Mind and Matter. Wesport, Conn. : Praeger, 1998. 217 p.

30. Houdé O., Kayser D., Kœnig O. éd., Vocabulaire de sciences cognitives. Paris : P.U.F., 1998. 435 p.

31. Rastier F. La sémantique des textes – concepts et applications. *Hermes : Journal of Linguistics.* 1996. № 16. P. 15–37.

Information about the author:
Soroka T. V.,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology
Ismail State University of Humanities
12, Repin str., Izmail, Odesa region, 68600, Ukraine