

## UNDERLYING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COGNITIVE AND LINGUOCULTURAL CONCEPTS IN THE FIELD OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND LINGUOCULTUROLOGY

Sanam Rustamovna FAYZIEVA

Master's degree student

Faculty of Linguistics (English language)

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

## КОГНИТИВ ТИЛШУНОСЛИК ВА ЛИНГВОМАДАНИЯТШУНОСЛИК СОҶАСИДА КОГНИТИВ ВА ЛИНГВОМАДАНИЙ КОНЦЕПТ ТУШУНЧАСИНИНГ ФАРҚЛАРИНИ АНИҚЛАШ

Санам Рустамовна ФАЙЗИЕВА

Магистрант

Лингвистика (внглиз тили) факултети

Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети

Тошкент, Ўзбекистон

## ВЫЯВЛЕНИЕ РАЗЛИЧИЙ МЕЖДУ КОГНИТИВНЫМ И ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫМ ПОНИМАНИЕМ КОНЦЕПТА В ОБЛАСТИ КОГНИТИВНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ И ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

Санам Рустамовна ФАЙЗИЕВА

Магистрант

Факультет лингвистики (английского языка)

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Ташкент, Узбекистан [Saikramova@inbox.ru](mailto:Saikramova@inbox.ru)

UDC (УЎК, УДК): 81-11

**For citation (иктибос келтириш учун,  
для цитирования):**

Fayzieva S.R. Underlying differences between  
cognitive and linguocultural concepts in the field  
of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology //  
Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. — 2021. — №  
6 (41). — Б. 60-68.

<https://doi.org/10.36078/1643721879>

**Received:** October 18, 2021

**Accepted:** December 17, 2021

**Published:** December 20, 2021

Copyright © 2021 by author(s) and Scientific  
Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative  
Commons Attribution International License  
(CC BY 4.0).

**Abstract.** The article attempts to present a thorough analyses of concept from the position of two linguistic perspectives. The notion of concept is shared property and means of representation for both linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics. The concept is viewed as a mental representation, fragments from human life experience, abstract and rational categories shaped in the individual's world picture. Having numerous ways of representation through language units in language, concepts create conceptual spaces and are classified into universal, national and individual divisions. A substantial and perspicuous explanation is presented in the given article, first to throw light on different angles of research of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology; secondly, to develop thorough methodological comparative evaluation which outlines major similarities and differences between linguocultural and cognitive concepts. A comparative analysis allows to conclude that the value component reflected in national collective mentality is considered as the most significant aspect of linguocultural concept; while, cognitive concepts are inextricably intertwined with linguocultural concepts, the focal point of the study is directed to the investigation of processes of human cognition and information processing along with the attempt to identify the major concepts that help to organize conceptual world picture.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



**Keywords:** concept; linguoculturology; cognitive linguistics; anthropocentric paradigm; cognition; culture; consciousness; human factor; mentality.

**Аннотация.** Мақолада тилшуносликнинг икки нуктаи назаридан концепт тахлили амалга оширилган. Концепт тушунчаси лингвомаданиятшунослик ҳамда когнитив тилшунослик учун ўзини намоён қилиш хусусияти ва воситаси ҳисобланади. Концепт дунёнинг индивидуал харитасида шаклланган ментал (ақлий) тасаввур, инсон ҳаётининг тажрибаси лавҳалари, абстракт ва рационал категория сифатида ўрганилади. Концепт тилдаги тил бирликлари орқали кўплаб намоён бўлиш усулларига эга бўлиб, концептуал майдон ҳосил қилади ва универсал, миллий ва индивидуал турларга бўлинади. Ушбу мақолада, авваламбор, когнитив лингвистика ва лингвомаданиятшунослик тадқиқотларининг турли жиҳатларига ойдинлик киритиш, шунингдек, лингвомаданият ва когнитив концептлар орасидаги асосий ўхшашликлар ва тафовутларни аниқлаш имконини берувчи батафсил методологик қиёсий баҳолашни ишлаб чиқиш учун таркибий ҳамда аниқ изоҳ келтирилган. Қиёсий таҳлил миллий жамоавий менталитетда ўз аксини топган қийматли таркибий лингвомаданият концептнинг энг муҳим омил сифатида эътироф этилиши ҳақида хулосага келиш имконини беради. Бунда когнитив концептнинг лингвомаданият концептлар билан ҳамбарчас боғлиқ бўлиб, тадқиқотлар инсон онгидаги жараёнларни ўрганиш ва дунёнинг концептуал харитасини ташкил қилишига имкон берувчи асосий концептларни аниқлаш ва маълумотларга ишлов беришга қаратилгандир.

**Калит сўзлар:** концепт; лингвомаданиятшунослик; когнитив тилшунослик; антропоцентрик парадигма; онг; маданият; инсон; ақл; менталлик.

**Аннотация.** В статье проводится анализ концепта с позиций двух лингвистических аспектов. Понятие концепта является общим свойством и средством представления как для лингвокультурологии, так и для когнитивной лингвистики. Концепт рассматривается как ментальное представление, фрагмент человеческого жизненного опыта, абстрактная и рациональная категория, сформированная в индивидуальной картине мира. Имея множество способов представления через языковые единицы в языке, концепт создает концептуальные пространства и подразделяется на универсальные, национальные и индивидуальные типы. В данной статье дается объяснение тому, как, во-первых, концепт рассматривается с позиции когнитивной лингвистики и лингвокультурологии; во-вторых, как провести тщательный анализ, в ходе которого возможно выявить основные сходства и различия между лингвокультурными и когнитивными концептами. Сравнительный анализ позволяет сделать вывод, что ценностная составляющая, отраженная в национальном коллективном менталитете, рассматривается как наиболее значимый аспект лингвокультурного концепта; в то же время как когнитивный концепт неразрывно связан с лингвокультурным концептом, однако при этом исследования сосредоточены на изучении процессов человеческого познания и обработки информации наряду с попыткой определить основу

концепта, который помогает организовать концептуальную картину мира.

**Ключевые слова:** концепт; лингвокультурология; когнитивная лингвистика; антропоцентрическая парадигма; познание; культура; человеческий фактор; сознание; ментальность.

**Introduction.** Nowadays, since international communication takes place all over the globe, it is considered to be a driving force in various aspects of our lives, be it political, economic or cultural advances. Even though in some cases of international interaction the intended meaning is fully understood and the communicative aim is adequately fulfilled, as contemporary literature suggests, more often than not, individuals of different language backgrounds encounter conflicts that arise due to cultural differences. Supposedly, in the process of communication, representatives of two different cultures may experience linguistic mismatches. The primary reason for those conflict areas is the restricted vision of cultural mentality. As language transmits and reflects cultural input of native speakers and active users of that language, it is evident that communication breakdowns might experience a person studying a foreign language who is an outsider to the national mentality of native speakers, for example, problems often arise while reading foreign literature samples, watching a movie, and etc. In such cases, it is essential to perceive that “every foreign word reflects not only a foreign world but also foreign culture; every word is conditioned by national consciousness” (7, 14). Therefore, language is set to be considered culture-dependent, it constantly shapes and represents culture-specific linguistic means that make every single language unique with culturally-charged implicit informational content.

Despite the fact that contemporary TESOL methodology offers a wide range of approaches to acquire a language, language learning practices are commonly restricted to the most basic, easily observed language properties. Those are abstract rules of grammar, isolated from contextual meaning vocabulary input and phonetic representations. At best, the cultural input of the targeted language is widely neglected for the sake of more prioritized requirements of curriculum; as a result, language learners leave classrooms with sufficient gaps in knowledge of pragmatic and socio-cultural aspects of language. It is not possible to develop a broad vision of the language, since one cannot penetrate deeply into the culture, but only superficially studies aspects of the given culture. Some scholars believe that, “a deep cognition into the plane of the language, into its semantics... implies an attempt to understand the mentality of the nation, to look at the world from their point of view” (2, 48–49). In fact, one of the fundamentals for better perception of the cultural background is the notion of a cultural concept.

It is accepted to perceive a concept as a product of mental activity of people. In the process of cognition, a person thinks and acts within the framework of mental categories which possess certain set of signs and properties that represent universal, national, social and individual conceptual information. The notion of concept holds an interdisciplinary status as it is the object of study of a number of sciences, such as cognitive linguistics, cultural studies, and linguoculturology. It is worth mentioning that a considerable difference is noted in the way how cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology approach the notion of concept and its basic properties.

**Main part.** The term “concept” appeared in scientific literature only in the middle of the twentieth century, but its use was noticed as early as 1928 in the article by S. A. Askoldov “Concept and Word”. Under the “concept” the author considered “mental education that replaces us in the process of thinking with an

indefinite set of similar objects” (1, 267–276). D. S. Likhachev accepting the definition of S. A. Askoldov as a whole believes that the concept exists for each dictionary meaning, and proposes to consider the concept as an algebraic expression of meaning. In general, representatives of this direction understand the concept as the entire potential of the meaning of a word together with its connotative element.

In linguoculturology, such scientists as N. D. Arutyunova, Z. Kh. Bizheva, A. V. Vezhbitskaya, S. G. Vorkachev, V. I. Karasik, V. A. Stepanova, V. N. Telia, G. V. Tokareva, R. M. Frumkina dedicated their works to the study of concepts. Researchers consider the concept as a mental unit that is formed in the mind of a person under the influence of many factors, for example, social environment, religion, culture, and etc.

Whilst the notion of "concept" has many interpretations due to its multi-functionality and numerous applications, the focus of this article is restricted to consider this term mainly from the position of linguistics that helps to fully recognize concepts as cultural constants. In line with that, we also feel the need to make a distinction between linguocultural and cognitive concept; albeit a group of language specialists believe that linguocultural and cognitive concepts are developing at the same level of the scientific sphere since they are characterized by overlapping "language-human" dual relationship.

In traditional linguistic literature a number of cultural studies belong to S. Yu. Stepanov, V. I. Karasik, I. A. Sternin, V. V. Kolesov and G. G. Slyshkin. The basic definition offered by A. V. Vezhbitskaya proposes that the concept is represented as an object that consists of a name and reflects certain culturally conditioned ideas of a person about the world. Based on that, the analysis of reality comes to a person thinking in the native language (5, 97). In relation of information processing theories, V. A. Maslova's interpretation is remarkable in a sense that the function of the concept is the processing, storage and transfer of knowledge. From the point of view of the social concept, this is associated with the real effect of actions, as the basis of pragmatism (14, 269). It is paramount to mention that concepts are complex constructs with several layers that embrace not only the semantic meaning of the word but also accompanying emotional input, schemata of knowledge structures, associative links or representations, positive and negative attitudes, along with supporting views and contradicting perspectives. The concept is presented as a basis of culture, where every human experience is preserved, that represents an idea of the world, which is reflected with the help of words. Similar view point is noted in V. Karasik's description of concept. The researcher notes that concepts should be viewed as cultural primary formations that express the objective content of words and have meaning; besides, he assumes that they are transferred to various spheres of human being in particular, to the spheres of conceptual, figurative and active development of the world (8, 98–101). He defines the figurative component as follows: "a trace of sensory representation in memory in unity with metaphorical transfers" (11, 27). M. R. Galieva notes that the figurative component "also differs in its value significance, since metaphors, in their ontological essence, include emotional, evaluative, expressive and value characteristics" (6, 136–152). As well as the conceptual component is "a set of essential features of an object or situation and the result of their cognition" (10, 4). From a cultural point of view, the most culturally significant is the value component. The value component is formed on the basis of emotional assessments of behavioral norms, the attitude of the carriers of a certain culture to any object or phenomenon, which are value dominants, which in turn makes it possible to identify conceptual signs that are of axiological value for a particular linguistic culture. That signals that not every single word might be a cultural concept.

Contrastingly, in order for a word to become a cultural concept, it should acquire a set of valuable characteristic features and properties with many ways and means of verbal representation in different aspects of life such as artistic, historical, religious, social and literary. Generally, culturally significant concepts are reflected in nation's literary and musical compositions and works. The discourse is the definite marker to define whether the particular concept possesses the value component. Concepts with value components are also presented in the phraseological layer of language as well as sage sayings, proverbs, bywords and long-standing folklore productions. National concepts embody recognizable symbolic meanings, serve as etalons in national contexts and demonstrate cultural knowledge of the given society or a nation. Consequently, perceived as valuable entities in the life of a certain community, cultural concepts have a lasting influence on individuals; in other words, they define the particular way of thinking, the mentality of individuals and justify their actions.

It is worth noting that the evolution of concepts as mental structures with cultural input were profoundly investigated by prominent scholar S. Yu. Stepanov. Thanks to his prolific output in the early 1990s, the concept underwent the era of "Linguistic Renaissance". S. Yu. Stepanov presented a detailed interpretation of the term, as well as the active use of the "concept" in the paradigm of linguistic conceptualism. The concept, according to S. Yu. Stepanov's definition, is "a basic cultural in the human mental world". The researcher assumes that cognition enters the mental world of a person in reality, concepts are not only thought, but they are experienced through emotions, and personal preferences (15, 288–306). In addition, materialization and objectification of the concept can pass through the language. The concepts impersonate basic representations, ordinary and scientific notions, cultural attitudes, norms and beliefs, and stereotypes (16, 25). For their part, the form of linguistic expression of a linguocultural concept can be lexemes, various phraseological formations (idioms, proverbs, sayings, aphorisms). That means "the concept includes everything that makes it a factor of culture". In accordance with S. Yu. Stepanov's vision, the concepts possess complex multi-structured mental compositions. The principal component is called "the main actual property" — a means of communication, it is a language that represents a certain nation. The next is "additional or several additional passive properties that are no longer relevant, but historical" — these are attributive features of the concept that have already been tested and conceptualized in the course of time; they serve as markers of certain nation and are rather limited in terms of meaning and usage. The last property of the concept is "an internal form, usually unconscious, captured in an external verbal form" — etymological signs or an internal form that is relevant for the carriers of concepts, mainly for specialists in specific sciences (4, 43–44).

Alternatively, cognitivist linguists approach to the study of the concept from a different angle. The key questions that cognitive linguistics explores are how a person learns the world, how a person verbalizes this knowledge, and in what ways linguistic world picture is shaped. Representatives of the linguocognitive approach are N. D. Arutyunova, E. S. Kubryakova, Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin, V. N. Telia, G. G. Slyshkin, V. G. Kostomarov, A. P. Babushkin and others. Conventionally, the term "cognitive science" includes a specific range of scientific disciplines that have come together to jointly study the processes associated with receiving and processing, storage and use, organization and accumulation of knowledge structures, as well as with the formation of these structures in the human brain. Cognitive science is related to mathematics, logic, philosophy, anthropology and linguistics. Each component takes its own position in cognitive science, has a special weight. The present stage of cognitive linguistics reflects a stage in its development when the solution of the mass of pressing problems of conceptual

analysis is seen in the consistent study of the linguistic manifestations of the activity of human consciousness. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, the concept is localized in consciousness: concepts are complex discrete units with the help of which the process of human thinking is carried out. Concepts act as storage units for human knowledge. E. S. Kubryakova also notes that “concepts” should be spoken about if this area can be comprehended in the linguistic consciousness and is denoted by one word (13, 34–38). M. R. Galieva noted a cognitive concept as to “any “notion/word”, as it conveys certain information and contains various types of structures of knowledge, from the standpoint of cultural linguistics, concepts are only those concepts that include a number of cognitive features: conceptual, emotional and evaluative, associative, figurative, connotative value” (6, 141). Retrospectively, the cognitive concept is a segment of thinking reflecting the mental work of a human brain, information processing and its retention activities. This idea might be illustrated with one simple example. A table or a chair as words with semantic meanings for cognitivist will represent units of information placed in knowledge structures of a human mind that define and conceptualize certain objects with the given notions as a piece of furniture along with accompanying information about the application, material, type and style of those objects. Therefore, cognitive researcher accepts these notions as concepts that constitute the model of linguistic picture. Being said that, the focal point of cognitive linguistics is to identify the macro concepts that help to construct the entire conceptual space in language. V. A. Maslova suggests that significant concepts are the constructs that form the crux of linguistic world picture and help in dividing it into meaningful conceptual spaces (14, 39). For illustrative purposes, we might mention a few examples such as time, eternity, space, evil, virtue, justice, law, happiness, death, life and so on. These concepts are viewed as umbrella terms embedding basic universal features that are present in all language systems and serving as navigations for other secondary micro concepts scattered on the continuum of coordinates in conceptual and linguistic world pictures.

Of necessity, we need to outline that normally concepts are subdivided into three largely defined categories. Universal concepts, as we underscored above, these constructs in the foci of study of cognitive linguistics. They are central and exist in every conceptual space within and across conceptual spaces of many languages. For example, the universal concept of faith and virtue are represented in English; in German: *Glaube/Tugend*; in French: *foi/vertu*; in Spanish: *fe/virtud*; in Italian: *fede/virtù*; рус: *Вера/Добродетель*; узб: *Имон/Фазилат*. Concepts are also subsumed under the notion of national-cultural specifics; they are unique to the particular cultural space and possess a number of peculiar features that represent the collective mentality of people united in the community. In addition to universal and national concepts, there are individual concepts to be distinguished as well. These constructs acquire personal value in the position when the personal experience of an individual is threaded onto the semantic meaning of a particular language unit. To be more precise, concepts are individualized and shaped when a person projects his or her beliefs, concerns, and views to the semantic construction; subsequently, the individual concept becomes potentially exclusive and distinctive to someone in particular with implicit meaning and value that are not explicitly showcased for someone else. For instance, in Russian language, such language units as “бабайка” (meaning — scary, ugly, scruffy-looking person or someone wicked) or “бьяка” (meaning — something unhygienic, dirty, gross or someone rotten, unscrupulous and immoral) are individualized concepts.

Having defined what is meant by linguocultural and cognitive concepts, it is obvious that linguocultural concept is different from cognitive concept in a number of respects. V. I. Karasik writes that “the approaches differ in vectors of relation to

the individual: the linguo-cognitive concept is the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the linguocultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness" (9, 387–390). The researcher also proposes to accept this direction as something conditional such as "a research device"; in reality, however, this movement is an integral multidimensional process (9, 387–390). A further definition is given by S. G. Vorkachev who proposes to accept that "linguocognitive studies have a typological orientation and are focused on identifying general patterns in the formation of mental representations" (15, 40–43). Conversely, that means linguoculturology attempts to outline distinctive features of specific cultural concepts and to create a framework of systematized mental units. E. S. Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov, G. Ya. Pankratz believe that the cognitive concept is "an operationally significant unit of memory, mental vocabulary, conceptual system and language of the brain (*lingua mentalis*), an integral picture of the world, reflected in the human psyche" (12, p.90). Most linguistic sciences are united around Language and Human relationship framework. In relation to Cognitive linguistics that dual relationship is complemented with cognitive mechanism and its reflection, so, there is a paradigm Language — Human — Cognition that interests cognitive linguists in an effort to perceive the way information is processed and represented through language. In turn, linguoculturology studies the relations between language and culture taking into account cognition and the human factor. This line of thinking linguocultural concept is a basic element of cultural input, its representation stretched beyond material concepts towards abstract concepts existent in cultural space. Concerning meaning and language correspondence between concepts and means of their representation is directly connected, in cognitive linguistics, the cognitive concept is identical to the given language unit meaning, that is each word has its concept; while in linguoculturology, the cultural concept is presented through a number of language units and not all words might be recognized as cultural concepts. Specifically, in order for the concept to be accepted as a cultural one, it has to be abstract in nature and to possess culturally distinctive features that place this concept in the national world picture. Expanding on this view E. V. Babaeva proposes the idea that the linguocultural concept is the structure of consciousness in which the values of the society are fixed. The center of a linguocultural concept is always value (3, 110–111). Taking into account the views of the scholar, we might assume that linguocultural concepts are important in identifying accepted value systems of social norms and attitudes.

**Conclusion.** Hence, following thoughtful deliberation, we might draw a conclusion on the difference in approaches to the study of concepts:

- Linguoculturology and Cognitive linguistics are two mutually complemented and overlapping disciplines with interdisciplinary status. In reference to the concept study, the former's object of research is a cognitive concept, while the latter's is linguocultural concept.

- Emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm brought a complete shift to the way how much attention is distributed to the role of human factor in linguistics. Cognitive linguistics shed light on the relationship Language — Human factor — Cognition; in turn, Linguoculturology is more concerned with how cultural input interplays with cognition and in what ways this input is presented through language.

- The majority of researchers view the concept as a construct of knowledge that accumulates the results of a nation's evolving development. The concept is the result of the denotative meaning of the word blended and infused with individual experience and collective mentality.

- The cognitive concept strives to identify the types of conceptual information. It is not limited only to concepts, there are other models of conceptual representation verbalized and non-verbalized such as frames, script, scheme, etc. In the cognitive approach, every word can be a concept in itself. The cognitive concept is studied in reference to the information processing capabilities of the brain.

- Linguocultural concepts possess a number of distinctive features that make them unique and a part of the national world picture. They are value-oriented and outline the accepted social value system of norms and attitudes. Cultural concepts are represented through a number of language units and are oftentimes abstract in their nature.

- Different ratio to the individual: the linguo-cognitive concept is the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the linguocultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness (15, 40–43).

- Overall, following the thread of the discursive points, it is concluded that linguocultural research of the concepts topical cognitive research as well. In other words, cognitive concepts being mental representations open an individual's cognition to the collective mentality and cultural space, while linguocultural concepts influence and transmit accepted cultural insights to an individual's cognition.

#### List of used literature

1. Аскольдов С. А. Концепт и слово // Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста: антология. — М.: Языки русской культуры, 1997. — С.267–279.
2. Аксенова Г.Н., Кожухова Н.Е., Шарапа А.А. Понятия «язык» и «культура», их соотношение в современной лингвокультурологии (тезисы) // Теория и практика преподавания русского языка как иностранного: достижения, проблемы и перспективы развития. — Минск, 2006. — С. 48–49.
3. Бабаева, Е. В. Лингвокультурологические характеристики русской и немецкой аксиологических картин мира: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. — Волгоград, 2004. — 438 с.
4. Воркачев, С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании // Филологические науки. — 2001. — № 1. — С. 43–44.
5. Вежбицкая В.А. Язык. Культура. Познание. — М., 1996. — 416 с.
6. Галиева М.Р. Метафорическая репрезентация концепта Слово в художественном тексте// Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. — 2020. —№ 2 (31). — С. 139–152.
7. Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира. — М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. — 560 с.
8. Карасик В.И. Модельная личность как лингвокультурный концепт // Филология и культура. Мат-лы III международной конференции. Ч.2 — Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ, 2001 — с. 98–101.
9. Карасик, В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс (Текст) / В. И. Карасик. — Гнозис, 2004. — 477 с.
10. Карасик В.И. Культурные концепты; проблема ценностей// Языковая личность. — Волгоград. 1996. — С. 3–16.
11. Карасик В.И., Прохвачева О.Г., Зубкова Я.В., Иная ментальность. — М.: Гнозис, 2005. — 352 с.
12. Курбьякова В.И., Демьянов В.З., Панкратц Ю.Г., Лузина Л.Г., Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. — М.: Филол. фак. МГУ, 1996. — 245 с.

13. Кубрякова, Е. С. Начальные этапы становления когнитивизма: лингвистика, психология, когнитивная наука // Вопросы языкознания. — 1994. — № 4. — С.34–38
14. Маслова В.А. Введение в когнитивную лингвистику: Учебное пособие. — М.: Флинта: Наука, 2004. — 293 с.
15. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. — М., 1997. — 824 с.
16. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. — М., 2000. — 261 с.

### References

1. Askol'dov S. A. *Russkaya slovesnost'. Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta: antologiya* (Russian Literature. From the Theory of Literature to the Structure of the Text: an Anthology), Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1997, pp. 267–279.
2. Aksenova G.N., Kozhukhova N.E., Sharapa A.A. *Teoriya i praktika prepodavaniya russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo: dostizheniya, problemy i perspektivy razvitiya* (Theory and Practice of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language: Achievements, Problems and Development Prospects), Minsk, 2006, pp. 48–49.
3. Babaeva, E. V. *Lingvokul'turologicheskie kharakteristiki russkoi i nemetskoi aksiologicheskikh kartin mira* (Linguistic and Cultural Characteristics of Russian and German Axiological Pictures of the World), Doctor's thesis, Volgograd, 2004, 438 p.
4. Vorkachev, S. G. *Filologicheskie nauki*, 2001, No. 1, pp. 43–44.
5. Vezhbitskaya V.A. *Yazyk. Kul'tura. Poznanie* (Language. Culture. Cognition), Moscow, 1996, 416 p.
6. Galieva M.R. *Uzbekistonda khorizhii tillar*, 2020, No. 2 (31), pp. 139–152.
7. Kubryakova E.S. *Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoi tochki zreniya. Rol' yazyka v poznanii mira* (Language and Knowledge: On the Way to Gaining Knowledge about Language: Parts of Speech from a Cognitive Point of View. The role of Language in the Knowledge of the World), Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoi kul'tury 2004, 560 p.
8. Karasik V.I. *Filologiya i kul'tura*. Proceedings of the 3<sup>d</sup> International Conference, Part 2, Tambov: Izd-vo TGU, 2001, pp. 98–101.
9. Karasik, V. I. *Yazykovoi krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs* (Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse), Moscow: Gnozis, 2004, 477 p.
10. Karasik V.I. *Yazykovaya lichnost'* (Language Personality), Volgograd, 1996, pp. 3–16.
11. Karasik V.I., Prokhvacheva O.G., Zubkova Ya.V., *Inaya mental'nost'* (Other Mentality), Moscow: Gnozis, 2005, 352 p.
12. Kurbyakova V.I., Dem'yanov V.Z., Pankratts Yu.G, Luzina L.G., *Kratkii slovar' kognitivnykh terminov* (Concise Dictionary of Cognitive Terms), Moscow: Filol. fak. MGU, 1996, 245 p.
13. Kubryakova, E. S. *Voprosy yazykoznaneya*, 1994, No. 4, pp. 34–38.
14. Maslova V.A. *Vvedenie v kognitivnyuyu lingvistiku* (Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics), Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2004, 293 p.
15. Stepanov Yu.S. *Konstanty. Slovar' russkoi kul'tury. Opyt issledovaniya* (Constants. Dictionary of Russian Culture. Research Experience), Moscow, 1997, 824 p.
16. Ter-Minasova S.G. *Yazyk i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya* (Language and Intercultural Communication), Moscow, 2000, 261 p.