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**THE ROLE OF THE CONCEPT IN REBVERBERATING OF CULTURE IN LANGUAGE**

**ANNOTATION**

Concept as a universal category plays a very important role in the culture of each nation; concepts in all the languages reflect not only universal notions, but also completely different meanings and properties of the objective world, which explains their different manifestation in the language. Culturally colored picture of the world affects humans and shapes their linguistic consciousness, and with it, their cultural and national identity. The impact of cultural and human factors on the formation and functioning of different linguistic units (lexemes, free and non-free word-combinations or idioms), the culturally marked content of which is embodied in the national cultural connotations. The mentality and cultural values of people can vary greatly, and even be the exactly opposite. Each ethnic group lives in the world made up of customs and traditions, which find expression in the peculiarities of behavior, religion, values and norms. People relate differently to each other, there is no person with the same lifestyle as everyone perceives the world differently: such notions as experience, failure, success, love, money, beauty, anger, friendship, etc. are perceived and understood by people very specifically and individually. Due to certain circumstances and factors, the existing stereotypes contribute to the formation of the unique private world, unique form of consciousness by every particular individual. It is this personal space and general patterns of social relations constitute the culture of the people.
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**Introduction:** This article dwells upon the basic unit of cognitive linguistics and linguocultuology , which is a concept. Firstly, we provide an overview of major scientific works written by foreign linguists who pay attention to special aspects and lines of research. Secondly, we analyse conclusions on modern problems in linguistics that are drawn in cognitological studies conducted since the end of the 20th century. We also touch upon the course and practice of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturogy while considering the connection between cognition and language.

Beginning with the XX century, linguo-culturology gradually ousted country study in the didactic plan as well. Since the last two decades of the XX century the term “linguoculturology” has been often used in association with the term “culture-through-language studies”. Linguoculturology focuses attention onto the reflection of spiritual state in the language of a man in the society. This is just fully mentioned in the works of Bashurina in which she demands changing of shape of system of didactic coordinates: instead of systems of “teaching a language – acquaintance with culture” [[1]](#footnote-0)in the centre of attention stands interrelation between communicative competence with linguoculturology and culture-oriented linguistics in the system of “teaching a language – acquaintance with culture – teaching a language”. Teliya, Maslova and the works of others serve to create these sources. As to Teliya methodological basis of linguoculturology serves “semiotic presentation indications of this interaction, considered as cognitive contents of mental procedures, the result of which is cultural liqualization of mental structures” [[2]](#footnote-1). Supporting this view point, at any rate it is necessary to mention that such vision of object of linguoculturology does not sufficiently distinguish its contours from adjacent scientific subjects. In any case it is necessary to consider object of culturology: language as a means of representation of cultures or culture, considered in the light of language. Despite their obvious “relationship”, it is necessary to distinguish cognitive culturology from cognitive linguistics. Different from “pure” cognitive science, culturology, as other fields of science, studying humanitarian meaning “can’t develop at the cost of ideals of “scientific character” and objective character of natural sciences, leaving alone formalized knowledge”. However linguoculturology is a science which can’t help doing a thing without principles of scientific understanding of the world. Accordingly, there exists non formalized “bastions” of scientific character, where ‘a certain portion of methodologism takes place and analytics successfully coordinate narrative character of “story” with free way of thinking and this takes place on the intersection of different “horizons” of culture, science and art (Mikeshina, 499-500). For the linguoculturology such an approach is quite natural, because on the determination of Ricker “from the point of view of narration, life in the world is just the life in the world, being already marked with the language practice, linked with this understanding beforehand” (Riker, 99). Necessity of combinative approach to the objects of culture, in which narrative, literary thinking and elements of methodological analysis are organically supposed to exist, are conditioned by the demand of linguoculturology in an indefinite discourse – thinking space; between strict scientific character and free fantasy. The first is unacceptable as to its abstractness and as to the reason in which exists methodological constraint on the products of discourse understanding and the second as absolutely non restricted imagination – as it is also unacceptable. The last example of harmonic combination of mentioned approaches is considered by the well-known “Fall of middle ages” of Heising, containing in itself, not only stylistics of “narration”; poetry, but also elements of deep methodological analysis. Nevertheless, Heising himself was not welcomed by “historical works written in belles-lettres style”. But his longing for free and creative thinking may serve to linguoculturology as a certain example of mutually completion of science and narrative. As to Prokhorov in linguoculturology more abstract level of description of the problem of mutual relationship of language and culture is given. Nevertheless the author puts the teaching of culture in the first place, but alongside with it, he indicates the necessity of complex consideration of three criteria: 1) language, criterion including frequency of usage of language units, taking the given borders into consideration; 2) acquainting criterion, being realized in the understanding of teaching-methodical purposefulness; 3) culturological criterion, surmising to take the degree of importance into account, and urgency of the information from the position of knowledge of the given field. In accordance with this, we may come to the conclusion that during the teaching of a foreign language in an auditorium, the usage of linguocultural approach is a must, because linguocultural information becomes a necessary communicative part of the competence of the student, specific manner realized in the semantics of language unit. Linguocultural knowledge makes forming linguocultural competence, as a part of communication, necessary. Linguoculturologic competence includes study of linguoculturology, phenomenon of culture, but not the phenomenon of language. As an example of the above mentioned we’ll consider the following text: *I was a very good student, if I may say so. I was tops at St. Michael’s College four years in a row. I got every possible award from the Department of Zoology… I would have received the Governor General’s Academic Medal, The University of Toronto’s,… were it not for a beef-eating pink boy with a neck like a tree trunk…* In the given extract we observe phenomenon of cultural framing, where absolutely negative attitude of the speaker is expressed implicitly in the word combinations: “beef-eating pink boy”, which indicates cultural, religious, racial and social discrimination between the speaker and the discussed person. Analysis of methodic literature makes it possible to determine linguocultural approach as one of the most efficient one, aimed at formation and improvement of habits and skills of realization of intercultural intercourse by means of learning a language phenomenon of culture. The result of forming the second cognitive conscience in the student by means of mastering a foreign language is gaining by them the ability of intercultural communication. Alongside with the language with such an approach to the culture includes the main contents of teaching, which meets the psychological peculiarities of learning a foreign language. Linguocultural approach gives possibility to keep away from simplified factologic-fragmental acquaintance of the learned language, with definite aspects of culture, which makes it possible for the learners to form complete enough picture of “out of language activity” by means of investigating both lingual and out of language contents of chosen sphere for learning. As in the didactic interpretation of linguo-culturology introduces itself as theoretical foundation of forming the second language personality, of those communicative skills, which are necessary for learning different national pictures of the world and prevention of cultural interference, then linguocultural approach in learning the Russian language as a foreign language is one of the conditions of mastering lexis, supplying intercultural communication. A foreigner’s learning lexis and mastering it in the linguocultural aspect makes transition possible to another mark system, necessary for forming the second language personality. In the modern methodology by mastering a language we understand as ability to communicate with another person correctly, freely and adequately in the language that the person has mastered. So, as we see, the language picture of the world deepens till the linguo-cultural picture of the world as a system of knowledge on culture, expressed in a definite national language, but an individual usage of linguoculture is substituted by linguocultural competence as a socially meaningful system. Completing Vorobyov’s determination for the methodical purposes, Bashurina under the term of linguocultural competence understands system of knowledge on the culture, used in a definite national language and the complex of skills of operating with this knowledge.[[3]](#footnote-2) The author proves, that ability to intercultural communication is the result of forming the second cognitive conscience in the learners by means of learning any foreign language which can be achieved in the process of culturological learning, representing fragments of culture. So, culturological approach to culture becomes the object of cognition and teaching. As it is known, linguoculturology studies interrelation of language and culture, but being different from culture-oriented linguistics, the main attention is focused on the linguistic aspect. Linguoculturology is linked with culture-through-language studies as a system of ruling principles of solving general schooling and humanitarian tasks, but besides it, linguoculturology possesses a number of specific features: 1) it is a subject of synthetic type, occupying bordering position between science and, learners of culture and philology; 2) the main object of culturology is interrelation of language and culture and interpretation of this interaction; 3) as the subject of investigation of linguoculturology serves spiritual and material culture, verbalized artefacts, forming “the language picture of the world”; 4) linguoculturology is oriented to the new system of cultural values, put forth by the modern life in the society, to the objective information on the cultural life of the country[[4]](#footnote-3). Being busy learning cognitive semantics at the XX-XXI centuries sometimes, consciously or unconsciously some people think that systematic-structural aspects of linguistic analysis has expired its heuristic potential. Bondarko, criticizing such a mistaken conception, puts forth his understanding, stressing the fact that development of cognitive semantics does not contradict systematic-structural approach, but on the contrary it completes it. Concept can be termed as an abstract idea, a mental symbol, a unit of thought, associated with a corresponding representation in language, that denotes all of the objects in a given category or class of entities, interactions, phenomena, or relationships between them, formed by mentally combining some or all the characteristics of a concrete or abstract, real or imaginary object. Concepts exist in the mind as abstract entities independent of terms used to express them. The meaningful contents of the key concepts determine national concept sphere, that demonstrates, guards, national cultural heritage. Through singling out the concept sphere and defining the linguistic means verbalizing concepts we can reveal peculiar national and cultural values perceived by this ethnos. Concept heart is confirmed the existence and a certain relationship between these concepts in a linguistic cultures. The research of concept heart, as images of culture, forming the basis of the Kazakh and English national picture of the world and is one of the fundamental cultural concepts, helps to identify the ethnic peculiarities of thinking and spiritual life of these people. Today the theory and practice of international communication attract more and more scholars, as it has become evident that the examination of their problems requires expertise from the different areas of study. It’s well known that misunderstanding can destroy the relationship between members of a family as well as interrelation between different communities of a modern multicultural world. The latter fact can lead to the inevitable fateful consequences even to the vanish of civilization due to an armed conflict. This evidence forces wide circles of scientific societies to develop acceptable means for improving the situation. In the light of it, it is no wonder that the tendency of integration‚ of various fields science-based knowledge become distinctive features of the contemporary studies. At present there are reasonable grounds for supposing that studying of a foreign language barely, without supplying some cultural awareness is not enough to provide for mutual benefit in the international relationships. This foundation serves as a starting point for the origin of a new science. Consequently the appearance of linguoculturology is an appropriate result of developing of philosophic and linguistic theory. Initially the proposition that there is a correlation between language and culture can be traced back to the views of Humboldt. In other words the better we make acquaintance with the culture of a nation the more successful we master the language. The most distinctive areas distinguished in Russia and based on the interrelation of language and culture are as follows: Linguo-country study. The research in this area mostly has an applied character and is a valuable source of information, which reflects the interrelation of language and culture. According to the representatives of cultural linguistics (V. N. Teliya, V. V. Vorobyov, V. A. Maslova), this branch of linguistics has recently appeared “to the study and description of the correspondence of language and culture in their synchronic interaction”. V. A. Maslova points out the following objects of cultural linguistics:

1) words and phrases, which have no equivalents in another language;

2) archetypes, rituals, beliefs, and superstitions reflected in a language;

3) there are proverbs and sayings;

4) idioms;

5) symbols and stereotypes;

6) metaphors and images; end the list stylistic of norms and speech behavior.

C**onclusion*:*** In spite of the fact that the present state of linguoculturology research is characterized by a lack of general methodological foundations and common conceptual approaches; additionally there is no clear theoretical basis, commonly accepted terminology, fundamental assumptions, which would allow representatives of different directions and trends achieve mutual understanding. What is more, opinions differ as to what should be seen as linguoculturology and some investigators ignore the fact that linguoculturology study is an independent area with its own system of notions and an impressive history of scholarly research; nevertheless linguoculturology has its own conceptual apparatus and the notion “concept’ which becomes the base of synthesis research. Nowadays, cognitive-discursive paradigm has become traditional, and in the context of its priorities, the language has not already considered as something that exists “in itself and for itself”. Today, the term “concept” has gained great popularity in science, which is the crystallization of thought. The image of concept is as bilateral unity of knowledge, on the one handis facing the language, the other is to the mental world of man. Considering the concepts “a bunch of culture in human consciousness”, the researchers N.D.Arutiunova, Y.S.Stepanov, A.D.Shmelev, E.S.Yakovlevshow thebasic conceptsthat existsin each andactual for every person, however, they arenot only universal, but also are nationally specific.

Linguoculturology studies the relations and connections of culture and language in its functioning. The notion of concept is central in linguoculturology. Irrespective of the diversity of views on the nature of the concept, all researchers believe that it is the concept that performs the role of a mediator between cultures, language, and individuals. This is because it is a complicated mental concept tat includes only semantic content, evaluation and the attitude of the people to a particularly reflected object of reality..
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