

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHII (Russia) = 0.156  
ESJI (KZ) = 4.102  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

### International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2018 Issue: 10 Volume: 66

Published: 18.10.2018 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



A.B. Bunyatova

lecturer of Department of  
Foreign Languages of Sumgait State University,  
Sumgait, Azerbaijan Republic

SECTION 29. Literature. Folklore. Translation  
Studies.

## CONCEPT AS AN OBJECT OF STUDY OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND LINGUOCULTUROLOGY

**Abstract:** In the article there was done a brief analysis of differentiating the notions of “concept” and “world picture” in cognitive linguistics and linguaculturology. As the result of the analysis, it can be shown as general similarity of usage of the same terms in both cognitive linguistics and linguaculturology, integrative approach to the language, the main attention which is paid to the dyad of “language and human” in investigating concept and world picture. In the other hand, usage and expressing of these concepts in their own limits and in certain conceptual and cultural frames can be observed.

**Key words:** cognitive linguistics, discourse, linguoculturology, cognition, concept, language and culture.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Bunyatova, A.B. (2018). Concept as an object of study of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (66), 219-226.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-66-25> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2018.10.66.25>

### Introduction

The word “concept” and its analogs “lingvoculturema”, “mythology”, “logo episteme” have been actively used in linguistic literature since the early 90s. The revision of the traditional logical content of the concept and its psychologization are primarily related to the change in the scientific paradigm of humanitarian knowledge that began at the end of the last century, when the anthropocentric, functional paradigm, which returned the status of a “measure of all things” and returned it to the center, replaced the dominant system-structural paradigm of the universe, and when the research interest of linguists shifted from the immanent structure of the language to the conditions of its use. The need to create a new term synthesizing lexicographic and encyclopedic information, in the semantics of which denotation and connotation, the “nearest” and “further” meanings of a word, knowledge about the world and about its cognitive subject would merge, including the needs of cognitive science linguistics, which focuses attention on the correlation of linguistic data with psychological data, for which the use of a category of a concept in a classical, “ugly” representation turned out to be clearly lacking full-time.

So far, the appearance of the word “concept” in linguistic discourse only indicates that the latter

belongs to a certain scientific school (“hermeneutical”, “linguo-culturological”, etc.) or to a certain scientific direction - mainly cognitive, but to make the concept from a term, it is necessary to include it in a specific “universe of reasoning”: the definition in the context of the relevant scientific theory or the relevant field of knowledge. Without claiming to create an original semantic theory or enriching linguistic science with a new term, you can, however, try to define the meaning of the word “concept” as it came from its use in linguistic texts, especially since the definition of words, would save the world from half misconceptions. Like most new scientific concepts, the concept is introduced with a certain amount of pathos through a cognitive metaphor: this is a “multidimensional clot of meaning”, a “semantic quantum of being”, the “gene of culture”, “a certain potency of meaning”, “a clot of culture in human consciousness”, it is the “embryo of the mental operation”. Very convincingly and in detail are described the properties of specific types of concepts, especially cultural ones, however, it remains unclear whether the concept is a form of a concept, representation or meaning, or it is something qualitatively different from them, especially since in real textual use it is very often a concept and meaning function as synonyms, replacing each other to avoid monotonous repetition.



## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHII (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

### Materials and Methods

In modern linguistics, there is a tendency to study language as a productive way of interpreting human culture. This is explained by the fact that language is the key to the system of human thought, to the nature of the human psyche, it serves to characterize a nation. According to L. Elmslev, the language "can open the way, both to an understanding of the personality style, and to the events of the life of past generations[8, p. 131]." His 'calls for cultural research were heard by national culturalists and anthropologists.

Analysis of the work of scientists over the past 10-15 years allows us to notice in modern domestic linguistics an increasingly pronounced tendency to intensively form a new direction - cultural linguistics (linguistic culturology). The tasks of linguoculturology include the study and description of the relationship of language and culture, language and ethnic group, language and folk mentality [18, p. 216]. It is created, according to Emil Benvenista, "on the basis of the triad - language, culture, human personality" and presents linguistic culture as "a lens through which a researcher can see the material and spiritual identity of an ethnos [3, p. 45]". The basis of the categorical apparatus of cultural linguistics is the concepts of linguistic personality and concept, the epistemological development of which has not yet been completed.

As noted by S.G. Vorkachev, "... a gnoseological need could call into place a concept any lexical unit of the semiotic series: idea, meaning, noema, representation, etc. S.G. Vorkachev also writes that in the case of a concept, the closest semantic "neighbors" are the concept, (general) idea and meaning, the generic feature of which is not just relatedness to the ideal area where all abstractions are sent, but that part of it where reflects - refers to itself, where the subject of knowledge coincides with its object, and the ontology of this subject coincides with its epistemology [5].

The fundamental, multidimensional study involves the mandatory appeal of scientists to the analysis of various levels or tiers of the language through the use of various research techniques. The lexical and phraseological level of the language is recognized as a priority, on which the material facts and, consequently, the spiritual culture of a person are most clearly fixed in a symbolic form, in general, the value orientations of a particular society, the system of its moral, ethical and aesthetic preferences, are illustrated community. This article sets the following tasks: 1. substantiation of the use of the term "concept", its difference from the term "notion" 2. description of the structure and components of the "notion", criteria necessary for isolating the concept from the text 3. various classifications of the concept. At the beginning of the article, we think it is

necessary to briefly dwell on the history of the development of the term "concept" in science.

Oddly enough, but the "concept" was borrowed by linguists from mathematical logic. Its use as a term in our linguistics begins in 1928 with the publication of the article by S.A. Askoldov "Word and Concept", published in the journal "Russian Speech". However, due to various objective and subjective reasons, one of which was the state ideology of the Soviet Union, the "concept" for a long time disappears from the national linguistic lexicon. It can also be assumed that this foreign language term could not compete with the well-established traditional, more than 2 terms for the scientific community of the Russian language "concept", on the difference between which we dwell in more detail. Only a few decades later, cognitive scientists begin to operate with this term, some of whom work in the paradigm of the philosophy of language. In their work, the priority is to study the basic subsystems of human knowledge. Verbal signs fixing elements of conceptual systems, as a rule, are not emphasized by cognitive scholars. Unfortunately, this does not contribute to the in-depth analysis and understanding of the essence of linguistic concepts that are going through the stages of their formation in specific historical conditions, in a certain cultural context.

The key to modern conceptual and cultural linguistic approach to the concept is, first of all, the concept of spiritual value: public ideas about good and evil, the beautiful and ugly, justice, the sense of history and purpose of a person, etc., which in itself is sufficiently symptomatic because the problem of values, as a rule, always arose in the epoch of the devaluation of the cultural tradition and the discrediting of the ideological foundations of society, and it was the crisis of Athenian democracy that made Socrates put for the first time the question: "what is good?" Thus, the appeal to cultural concepts and the search for "value dominants", "terms of spiritual culture" and "existential meanings" are in some measure following the apostolic appeal "to be jealous of spiritual gifts". A direct consequence of the value character of these mental units is "survivability" - they are not only thought, but also emotionally experienced, being the subject of sympathies and antipathies - and the ability to intensify a person's spiritual life - to change its rhythm when placed in the focus of thought [16, p. 5]. Another consequence of the axiological coloring of cultural concepts is "semiotic density" - representation in terms of expression of a variety of linguistic synonyms (words and phrases), thematic series and fields, proverbs, sayings, folklore and literary plots and synonymous symbols (works of art, rituals, behavioral stereotypes, objects of material culture), due to their importance in human life.



## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA</b> (India) = <b>1.344</b>	<b>SIS</b> (USA) = <b>0.912</b>	<b>ICV</b> (Poland) = <b>6.630</b>
<b>ISI</b> (Dubai, UAE) = <b>0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI</b> (Russia) = <b>0.156</b>	<b>PIF</b> (India) = <b>1.940</b>
<b>GIF</b> (Australia) = <b>0.564</b>	<b>ESJI</b> (KZ) = <b>4.102</b>	<b>IBI</b> (India) = <b>4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b> = <b>1.500</b>	<b>SJIF</b> (Morocco) = <b>5.667</b>	

Another way of separating the concept from the notion is "stratification" of the concept into classical "volume" and "content", "extension" and "intensional", "denotate" and, "meaning" and "content" and assignment of the name "concept". To the second member of the pair:" we mean the meaning that it defines the denotation or that it is a concept ". A concept is a way of semantic representation of the conceptual content of a name, and a value is a class (set) of objects to which it is sent. If we transfer this division to abstract objects - concepts-universals and spiritual values, which are hypostated properties and relations of an infinitely wide and in no way defined class of objects of reality, it turns out that in the end such concepts are volume-free concepts, especially thoughtful constructs, since denotatno they are related to the "empty set" of objects. Like the content of "phantom concepts" (mermaid, centaur, chimera, etc.), concepts (beauty, good, justice, etc.) objectively (as entities) are present only in the mind of the subject of thought.

Another sign by which the selection of concepts can be carried out is the complexity, the internal dismemberment of their semantic composition - their "non-completeness", "molecular structure", which determines the need for some way of their semantic organization. Thus, from the number of concepts, not only mental images of specific realities are excluded, but also such "primitive meanings" as, for example, "modal-evaluative operators ("indifferent", "good", "bad", etc.). And, finally, a somewhat different, ultimately consistently linguistic feature is used as the basis for distinguishing the concept of N.D. Arutyunova: in her interpretation, concepts are "concepts of life philosophy", "ordinary analogs of worldview terms", fixed in the vocabulary of natural languages and ensuring the stability and continuity of the spiritual culture of an ethnos. Concepts in this understanding are units of ordinary philosophical (primarily ethical) consciousness, they are culturally significant, axiologically colored, and world-oriented. Such an interpretation of the concept is consistently linguistic to the extent that it is identified with the lexical meaning. The linguistic status of "cultural concepts" determines the possibility of their description in terms of the "linguistic picture of the world" and at the same time implicitly indicates the non-recognition of any cultural specificity as a purely scientific ideological and ethical concepts, which in itself is not so obvious, taking into account the existence of culturally-historically conditioned "styles of thinking" and "scientific paradigms" - "cultures of thinking" as an integral part of culture in general. Any concept is an element of a certain conceptual system of the carrier of consciousness as information about the actual or possible state of affairs in the world and as such is associated with all the many

other, real or possible, "systems of opinion" reflecting world views. It can be assumed that the concept semantics as an optional component includes a kind of "conceptual memory" - a functional analogue of the "cultural memory of the word". And finally, the concept is defined as the basic unit of the national mentality as a specific individual and group way of world perception and world outlook, defined by a set of cognitive and behavioral stereotypes and attitudes, the main characteristic of which is the peculiarity of thinking and behavioral reactions of an individual or social group. With this approach, ideal formations that do not have any group or ethnicity are excluded from the number of concepts.

The term "concept" has been experiencing an era of "linguistic renaissance" from the beginning of the 90s of the 20th century, primarily due to the scientific works of D.S. Likhachev and U.S. Stepanov, who reanimated it and gave his thorough interpretation. The active use of this term in cognitive linguistics, in the paradigm of linguistic conceptualism and in linguistic culturology is explained by the necessity of introducing the missing cognitive "link" into their categorical apparatus, the content of which includes associative figurative evaluations and ideas about it by its producers and users. Before we proceed to the description of the concept as a complex cognitive lingual social construct, it is necessary to briefly justify the need to use this foreign language term in linguistics.

The noun "conceptus" comes from the Latin verb "concupere" - "to conceive", i.e. literally means "the potion, the conception". It is easy to see that both verbs are etymologically related, expressing the general idea of acquisition, but are not absolute synonyms. Following U.S. Stepanov we consider the concept to be a more volumetric mental construct of human consciousness compared with the concept. According to Stepanov, the concept is "a certain summary phenomenon, in its structure consisting of the concept itself and the value (often figurative) idea of a person about him [17, p. 40-43]". The concept as a mental formation of a high degree of abstractness is associated primarily with the word. From this it follows that it includes, in addition to the subject relatedness, all communicatively significant information. First of all, these are indications of the place occupied by this sign in the lexical system of the language: its paradigmatic, syntagmatic and word-formation connections are what F. Saussure calls "significance" and what ultimately reflects the "linguistic value of an extra-linguistic object [12, p. 40-59]". The semantic composition of the concept also includes all the pragmatic information of the linguistic mark, associated with its expressive and illocutional functions, which is quite consistent with the "survivability" and "intensity" of spiritual values, to which he sends. Another highly probable component of the semantics of the linguistic concept



## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 1.344</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.156</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 4.102</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>		

is the cognitive memory of the word: the semantic characteristics of a linguistic sign associated with its original purpose and the system of spiritual values of native speakers. However, conceptually, the most significant here is the so-called cultural-ethnic component, which determines the specifics of the semantics of units of the natural language and reflects the 'linguistic picture of the world' of its speakers.

Concept, according to the scientific definitions of S.A. Askoldova, E.S. Kubryakova, S.Kh. Lyapina, O.P. Skidan is "a multidimensional mental construct reflecting the process of 3 knowledge of the world, the results of human activity, his experience and knowledge about the world, which stores information about it." M.A. Cold treats the concept as a "cognitive mental structure, the features of the organization of which provide the possibility of reflecting reality in the unity of different aspects". According to R.Pavlsen, concepts are "meanings that constitute cognitively basic subsystems of opinion and knowledge". A concept is a unit of cognitive order. The architectonics of the concept as a structural-semantic education is more complex than the concept architectonics. Of course, the concept is "multidimensional idealized shaping" [14, p. 11-35], but there is no consensus on the number of semantic parameters by which it can be studied. For example, S.Kh. Lyapin, U.S. Stepanov and V.I. Karasik suggests that these parameters include both conceptual and imaginative value, behavioral, etymological and cultural 'dimensions', of which almost everyone can have a priority status in the study [11, p. 78-89].

A distinctive feature of the concept as a unit of lexical semantics is linguocultural distinction, but this distinction itself can be understood in different ways, as different material, spiritual, social and behavioral cultures are represented in language semantics. So, if material and social cultures (specific realities of life and social institutions) are presented, as a rule, in the form of nominations, then spiritual and behavioral culture are present in lexical semantics mainly in the form of connotations.

Language conceptualization as a set of methods for semantic representation of the content plan of lexical units obviously differs in different cultures, however, the specifics of the semantic presentation method for distinguishing a concept as a linguistic and culturological category are probably not enough: language and cultural peculiarities are largely random here and do not reflect national -cultural (proper ethnic identity of semantics, and not all differences in the internal form of individual lexical units must be understood as conceptually meaningful.

If a set of concepts as semantic units, reflecting the cultural specificity of the worldview of native speakers, forms a conceptual area correlated with the

notion of mentality as a way of seeing the world, then concepts marked with ethnic specificity fall into the area correlated with mentality as a multitude of cognitive, emotive and behavioral stereotypes of the nation. The border separating mentality - concepts in a broad sense and narrowly understood concepts are not quite clear, and there are currently no formal means for describing the modern mentality of a particular linguocultural community. Selection of the concept as a mental education, marked by linguocultural specificity, is a natural step in the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm of humanitarian, in particular, linguistic knowledge. Essentially, in the concept, the impersonal and objectivist concept is authorized relative to the ethno-semantic personality as fixed in the semantic system of the natural language of the basic national-cultural prototype of the carrier of this language. Recreation - "image of a person according to language", carried out through the ethno-cultural authorization of the concept, is to a certain extent comparable to authorization of the utterance and proposition regarding the subject of speech and thought in the theory of the modal framework of the utterance and in non-classical (evaluative) modal logics. "We can get to thought only through words (no one has yet invented any other way)" - this is a linguistic and, thus, somewhat narrowed statement of the general fact that the meaning is created and appears to man only through a symbol (sign, image). And if a concept is a verbally expressed meaning, then linguistic problematics in its study are associated with determining the area of existence of this meaning and the level of its communicative realization: it is a fact of idiolectic or national linguistic consciousness, a fact of speech or language, a fact of random one-time implementation or a unit of a dictionary, if a dictionary, then we correlate it with a word or with its lexico-semantic variants.

The concept as a semantic entity sends to the content plan of a certain sign unit and, thus, we correlate with the categories of meaning and meaning, which in logical semantics and linguistics are terminologized, theoretically divorced and ordered definitionally. Meaning is "general correlation and connection of all phenomena relating to a situation". It is always situational, context-driven, belongs to speech and is primary in relation to meaning, which, in turn, is non-contextual, non-situational, belongs to language, derived from meaning, socially institutionalized and formulated, unlike meanings created by each and every one, exclusively by compilers, dictionaries. The meaning is abstracted from meanings and connects the idiolect with the national codified language. It can be noted that the linguistically terminologized opposition of meaning and content is quite clearly consistent with





## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 1.344</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHII (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.156</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 4.102</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>		

the concept of these categories in the “naive semiotics” of ordinary consciousness.

The following structure S.Vorkachev proposes. He identifies three components in the linguocultural concept: conceptual, reflecting its attribute and definitional structure; figurative, fixing cognitive metaphors that support the concept in linguistic consciousness, and significant. This is the place that takes the name of the concept in the lexical-grammatical system of a particular language, which will also include its etymological and associative characteristics [5, p. 115-124]. According to V.I. Karasik, the concept consists of three components - conceptual, figurative and value [9, p. 3-16]. According to the figurative remark of S.Kh. Lyapin, "in the depths of the concept, the concept is flickering [14, p. 11-35]." A concept is not only thought, but also experience. Methodologically, we consider the reasoning about the structure of the concept of U.S. Stepanova. The concept, in his opinion, includes such components as “1) the main, relevant feature; 2) an additional or several additional, passive signs that are no longer relevant, but historical; 3) the internal form, usually not at all realized, imprinted in the external verbal form [17, p. 40-43]”. The first component - the main, relevant feature of the concept - is significant, “known” to all speakers of a particular language, this or that culture. Expressed verbally, it is a means of communication of representatives of a certain ethnic community, nation, people, nationality. In contrast, the second component - an additional, passive feature of the concept - reveals its relevance is not for the entire ethnic group; it is available for members of a particular social group, for a specific microsociety. And, finally, the third component - the etymological feature or the internal form - is the least relevant for the language and concept carriers of any culture, since the life history of the word is primarily engaged in specialists in specific sciences.

In the texts of linguistic and cultural studies, the concept receives a variety of names: these are “existential meanings” and “ultimate concepts”, and “cultural concepts”, however, taking into account the fact that the concept belongs to the national linguistic consciousness, we can assume that the value-meaning dichotomy correlates with the value, and all that remains is to find its name — to determine the language units whose content plan it represents. In linguistic-cultural texts, concepts are “objectified”, “distributed”, “they absorb the generalized content of many forms of expression”, “are filled with meanings”, etc. The predicate compatibility of the lexeme “concept” ultimately suggests the existence of two basic cognitive metaphors, two complementary models, describing the relation “concept-form of its language representation”: “archetypal” and “invariant”. In the archetypal model, the concept is considered as something

extremely generalized, but nonetheless sensually-shaped, hidden in the depths of consciousness, embodied in a reduced form in a concept, in a representation, in the meaning of a word. In the invariant model, the concept is represented as the limit of generalization (invariant) of the content plan of linguistic units covering a certain semantic area. The archetypal model of concept formation implies their innateness, pre-language readiness for semantization, invariant - their formation in the process of mastering a language and mastering extra-linguistic reality by the subject of thought and speech. The connection of the concept with verbal means of expression is generally noted in almost all linguistic and cultural definitions.

Linguocultural concept - semantic education of a high degree of abstractness. However, if the first is obtained by diverting to the subsequent hypostatization of the properties and relations of directly objects of reality, then the second is the product of abstracting semantic features belonging to a certain set of significant linguistic units [15, p. 28]. The correlation of the concept with the units of the universal subject code hardly agrees with the belonging of linguocultural concepts to the sphere of national consciousness, since the universal subject code is idiolectic and is formed in the consciousness of an individual speech personality. In principle, the concept could be correlated with the root morpheme, which forms the basis of the word-formation nest, but then it will remain without a name. Most often, the representation of the concept in the language is attributed to the word, and the word itself receives the status of the name of the concept - a linguistic sign that conveys the content of the concept most fully and adequately. On the correlation of the concept with the word, in principle, based on the compilation of concepts dictionaries. However, the word as an element of the lexico-semantic system of a language is always implemented as part of a particular lexical paradigm, which allows it to be interpreted as 1) an invariant of the lexical paradigm formed by the LSV of the word; 2) the name of the semantic (synonymous) series formed by synonyms, correlated with one of the LSV of the word. In any case, the concept, as a rule, is related to more than one lexical unit, and the logical conclusion of such an approach is its correlation with the plan for expressing the entire set of heterogeneous synonymous (lexical, phraseological in aphoristic) unions that describe it in language, ie . in the end, the concept is correlated with the plan of expression of the lexical-semantic paradigm. The frame model that reproduces in the lexical system the relations of the concept and its implementations are hyponymic, species-specific structures, but in the field of such highly abstract semantic entities as cultural (“spiritual”) concepts, similar relations are practically not observed. Also, theoretically, relations



## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 1.344</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.156</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 4.102</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>		

“concept - its language realization” could be modeled on the basis of an antonymic paradigm in vocabulary that fixes “differences within the same essence” (joy-sorrow, happiness-trouble, love-hate, etc.), but the semantic the invariant that unites this paradigm - a concept, as a rule, does not find a name in the language and, thus, is of little significance for language consciousness.

Concepts, should not necessarily have, in our vision, a verbalized form, although, as a rule, they materially exist, i.e. sign decorated. It is known that concepts are included in the area correlated with the mentality as a multitude of cognitive, emotive and behavioral stereotypes of the nation. The border separating mentality - in a broad and narrowly understood concepts - are not quite clear. The only criterion here is the degree of mass character and invariance of cognitive and psychological stereotypes, reflected in the lexical semantics of the language [6, p. 37-48]. Concepts transformed into cultural concepts in their primary form exist in the human mind as a kind of diffuse, fuzzy, not enough clearly grasped by the language “clot of meaning” (the term of U.S. Stepanova) carrier. Consequently, their isolation from the text or discourse is associated with numerous difficulties. These still not fully formed, but already “conceived” “clots of meaning” Stepanov calls the preforms of potential concepts that can in the future become concepts, that is, concepts, accompanied by certain assessments. Reasonings of the linguist can be presented in the form of the following scheme: concept = concept + idea about it. According to the author, before the preforms of concepts are understood by a primitive man, become his intellectual property being the germs of potential mental constructs - impressions, sensations, ideas - are certainly experienced at the level of the unconscious. As the archaic person turns into a civilized person, the consciousness is gradually extracted from the unconscious. Then, real concepts crystallize into certain clear semantic fragments that carry in themselves the reflection of the results of “worked out” by man sensations and impressions as perceptual images emanating from the environment. Answering the question “how can a person get to the point?”, We recall the words of A. Wezhibitskaya: “We can reach the idea only through words [4, p. 293]”. And if a concept is a verbally meaning, the linguistic problematics in its study are connected with determining the area of existence of this meaning and the level of its communicative realization: it is a fact of idiolectic or national language consciousness, a fact of speech in the same language, the fact of a situational one-time implementation or a unit of a dictionary, if a dictionary, then whether it is correlated with a word or with its lexico-semantic variants. The concept is correlated with categories of meaning. The meaning of a name is an object (denotation) bearing a given

name, a meaning is the concept of this denotation, information that makes it possible to assign a name to a given object. In the linguistic-culturological interpretation, the concept is identified with the typical representation “prototype, Gestalt structure” (terms of Telia) [18, p. 94-97] and here, as you can see, the logical-semantic meaning is almost reversed. Necessary and sufficient to distinguish a class of objects — it is replaced by the denotate itself — in a typical manner, representing the class in the undifferentiated completeness of features. Meaning is, by definition, GP Shchedrovitsky “general correlation and connection of all phenomena relating to a situation”, derived from the meaning, socially institutionalized and formulated, in contrast to the meanings created by each and every one, exclusively by the compilers of dictionaries [19].

### Conclusion

Summarizing the above, we conclude that the concept in the dichotomy of meaning is correlated with meaning, since it belongs to the national linguistic consciousness. Speaking about the classification of concepts, it is necessary to emphasize that different scientists put different signs into the basis of classifications. Let's start with the structural-5 semantic typology. So, A.P. Babushkin classifies concepts into lexical and phraseological [2, p. 12]. From the structural-semantic point of view, it is legitimate to separate prepositional, postpositional, and other concepts into independent types. The basis of the discourse classification S.A. Askoldov and V.I. Karasik put the “principle of ways of mastering” the world - scientific, artistic and everyday, and distinguish scientific, artistic and everyday concepts as a separate type [1, p. 267-279]

Another criterion for distinguishing linguocultural concepts is obviously their belonging to the sphere of knowledge or consciousness that they serve. Concepts can be typologized not only structurally, semantically, discursively, but also sociologically. So, D.S. Likhachev classifies all concepts into the following groups; universal (for example, “death”, “life”), ethnic (“motherland”, “intelligentsia”), group (“scene” for the actor and the spectator), individual (they are completely dependent on personal experience, value systems, cultural level of a specific person) [14, p. 280-287]. It is from the degree of ownership of the culture, i.e. level of education, intelligence, depends on the conceptual sphere of a particular person.

Summarizing all the above about the concept, it should be emphasized that the category of the concept receives interdisciplinary status, as it is used in two new paradigms: linguocognitology and linguoculturology. Representatives of the first direction (E.S. Kubryakova, N.A. Boldyrev, I.A. Sternin, A.P. Babushkin) interpret the concept as a unit of operational consciousness, acting as a



## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

complete, undifferentiated reflection of the fact of reality. Being formed in the process of mental design (conceptualization) of objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, concepts reflect the content of knowledge, experience, the results of all human activity and the results of cognition of the world around them in the form of certain units, “quanta” of knowledge. Representatives of the second cultural direction (A. Vezhbickaja, N.D. Arutyunova, V.I. Karasik, D.S. Likhachev, U.S. Stepanov, L.O. Cheinenko, S.Kh. Lyapin, V.I. Shakhovskiy, S.G. Vorkachev) consider the concept as a mental entity, marked in varying degrees by ethno-semantic specificity. [7, p. 6-7] So, in the linguistic understanding of the concept, there are three main approaches. First, in the broadest sense, the concept includes lexemes, the meanings of which constitute the content of the national language consciousness and form a ‘naive picture of the world’ of native speakers. D.S. Likhachev suggests that the combination of such concepts forms the concept sphere of the language [13, p. 280-287], in which the culture of a nation is concentrated. The determining factor in this approach is a way of conceptualizing

the world in lexical semantics, the main research tool is a conceptual model by which the basic components of the concept semantics are identified and stable links between them are identified. Secondly, in a narrower sense, among the concepts of U.S. Stepanov and Neroznak include semantic formations marked by linguocultural specificity and characterizing the carriers of a certain ethnic culture in one way or another [10, p. 78-89]. The combination of such concepts does not form the concept-sphere as a kind of integral and structured semantic space, but occupies a certain part in it - the conceptual area. And finally, among the concepts include only semantic formations, the list of which is sufficiently limited and which are key to understanding the national mentality as a specific relationship to the world of its carriers. The generalization of the points of view on the concept and its definitions in linguistics leads to the following conclusion: a concept is a unit of collective consciousness (sending to higher spiritual values), having a linguistic expression and marked by ethnocultural specificity.

## References:

1. Askol'dov, S.A. (1997). *Koncept i slovo. Russkaja slovesnost'. Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta*. Antologija, Moscow, pp.267-279.
2. Babushkin, A.P. (1996). *Tipy konceptov v leksiko-frazeologicheskoj semantike jazyka*. Voronezh, p.12, pp.50-53.
3. Benvenist, J. (1974). *Obshhaja lingvistika*. Moscow, p.45.
4. Vezhbickaja, A. (1999). *Semanticheskie universalii i opisanie jazyka*. Moscow, p.293.
5. Vorkachev, S.G. (1997). Bezrazlichie kak jetnosemanticheskaja karakteristika lichnosti: opyt sopostavitel'noj paremiologii. *Voprosy jazykoznanija, № 4*, 115-124.
6. Dobrovol'skij, D.O. (1997). Nacional'no-kul'turnaja specifika vo frazeologii (1). *Voprosy jazykoznanija, № 6*, 37-48.
7. Dorofeeva, N.V. (2002). *Udivlenie kak jemocional'nyj koncept (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo jazykov)*. AKD, Volgograd, pp.6-7.
8. El'mslev, L. (1960). Prolegomeny k teorii jazyka. *Novoe v lingvistike, Vyp.I*, Moscow, 131-256.
9. Karasik, V.I. (1996). *Kul'turnye dominanty v jazyke. Jazykovaja lichnost': kul'turnye koncepty*. Volgograd-Arhangel'sk. pp.3-16.
10. Karasik, V.I. (2001). *O kategorijah lingvokul'turologii. Jazykovaja lichnost': problemy kommunikativnoj dejatel'nosti*. Volgograd, pp.3-16.
11. Krasavskij, N.A. (2000). Koncept “Zorn” v poslovichno-pogovorochnom fonde nemeckogo jazyka. *Teoreticheskaja i prikladnaja lingvistika, Vypusk 2, Jazyk i social'naja sreda*, Voronezh: Izd-vo VGTU, 78-89.
12. Krasavskij, N.A. (2001). *Jemocional'nye koncepty v nemeckoj i russoj lingvokul'turah*. Monografija, Volgograd, pp.40-59.
13. Likhachev, D.S. (1991). *Logicheskij analiz jazyka. Kul'turnye koncepty*. Moscow, pp.280-287.
14. Ljapin, S.H. (1997). Konceptologija: k stanovleniju podhoda. *Koncepty. Vyp. I*. Arhangel'sk, 11-35.
15. Maslova, V.A. (2001). *Lingvokul'turologija*. Moscow, p.28.
16. Perelygina, E.M. (1993). *Katarticheskaja funkcija teksta*. AKD, Tver', p.5.



**Impact Factor:**

<b>ISRA</b> (India) = <b>1.344</b>	<b>SIS</b> (USA) = <b>0.912</b>	<b>ICV</b> (Poland) = <b>6.630</b>
<b>ISI</b> (Dubai, UAE) = <b>0.829</b>	<b>PIHII</b> (Russia) = <b>0.156</b>	<b>PIF</b> (India) = <b>1.940</b>
<b>GIF</b> (Australia) = <b>0.564</b>	<b>ESJI</b> (KZ) = <b>4.102</b>	<b>IBI</b> (India) = <b>4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b> = <b>1.500</b>	<b>SJIF</b> (Morocco) = <b>5.667</b>	

17. Stepanov, J.S. (1997). *Konstanty. Slovar' russkoj kul'tury. Opyt issledovanija*. Moscow, pp.40-43.
18. Telija, V.N. (1996). *Russkaja frazeologija. Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij i lingvokul'turologicheskij aspekty*. Moscow, pp.94-97, 216-135.
19. Shhedrovickij, G.P. (1995). *Smysl i znachenie. Izbrannye trudy*. Moscow, pp.546-57.

