

искусственная коммуникативная система – калькирующая жестовая речь, которая повторяет грамматику устного русского языка.

Таким образом, на протяжении почти всей истории воспитания и обучения глухих русский жестовый язык не воспринимался в нашей стране как самостоятельная языковая система. Первоначально язык жестов использовался для обучения глухих русскому языку (письменному и устному), позже он был объявлен «непригодным». Однако в XX – начале XXI века произошли значительные изменения, которые привели к изменению ситуации в нашей стране, и русский жестовый язык приобрел государственный статус.

Литература

1. Зайцева Г. Л., Фрумкина Р. М. Психолингвистические аспекты изучения жестового языка // Дефектология. 1981. № 1. С. 14–21.
2. Теория и практика русского жестового языка: учеб. пособие. М.: ДГСК МВД России, 2018. 174 с.
3. Corson H. J. Deaf studies: A framework for learning and teaching // Deaf Studies for educators. Washington DC: Gallaudet University, College for Continuing Education, 1992. P. 7–16.
4. Galieva D. A., Naurazbaeva L. V. Comparative analysis of origin and evolution of sign languages // Modern Studies of Social Issues. 2021. Vol. 13. N 4. P. 592–604.
5. Stokoe W. C. Sign language structure: an outline of the visual communication systems of the American deaf // Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education. 2005. Vol. 10(1). P. 3–37.

УДК 811.11-12

D. A. Galieva (Ufa, Russia)

Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia

The cognitive approach in studying concept

Цель статьи – рассмотреть когнитивный подход к изучению концепта. Предметом научной работы является концепт «закон». Результаты анализа дефиниций термина «концепт» позволяют сделать следующий вывод: несмотря на то, что термин «концепт» и его производные широко употребляются в современной лингвистике, однозначного толкования он не имеет. Делается вывод о том, что концепты могут быть представлены не только отдельными словами, но и целыми фразеологизмами. Сложная структура концепта, в которую входят этимология, краткие исторические сведения, всевозможные современные ассоциации, оценки, дает полное основание рассматривать «концепт» в качестве предмета лингвокультурологического исследования.

Ключевые слова: концепт, концептуальный анализ, концептуализация, концептуальная картина мира, когнитивный подход, концептосфера

The **purpose** of scientific research is to consider the cognitive approach in studying a concept. To achieve the purpose, the definitions presented by domestic and foreign linguists have been analyzed. The **subject** of scientific work is the concept of “law”. When studying the issues about the concept, such **methods** as a theoretical analysis of the works of domestic and foreign linguists devoted to this problem as well as a comparative analysis have been used. The **results** of the analysis of the definitions of the term “concept” allow us to conclude that despite the fact that the term “concept” and its derivatives are widely used in modern linguistics, it has no unique interpretation. It is concluded that concepts can be represented not only by individual words, but also by phraseological units. The complex structure of the concept, which includes etymology, brief historical information, all kinds of modern associations, assessments, gives grounds for considering the “concept” as the subject of linguoculturological research.

Keywords: concept, conceptual analysis, conceptualization, conceptual picture of the world, cognitive approach, concept sphere

The range of modern linguistic research is quite broad and is based on the ontological, epistemological and methodological levels of cognition. Undoubtedly, each science should have its own special perspective in looking at the subject and object of research, emphasizing in them special distinctive markers. However, the current general scientific trends in the development of linguistics and related sciences have led to the need to rethink many linguistic phenomena, taking into account an integrated approach to identifying their essence.

Language is studied in the aspect of human activity, traditional objects of linguistic research are considered from the point of view of their significance for a person, that is, we are talking about anthropological linguistics as an integral science that studies “man in language”, “language in man”, “language for man”, in all its manifestations [5, p. 5–6].

Philosophy and dynamics of scientific knowledge necessitate the correlation of the latest scientific paradigms in linguistics (logical analysis of language, logical-cognitive analysis of language, linguo-pragmatic analysis of language, cognitive and discourse analysis, linguo-cognitive modeling of utterance, etc.), which provides a methodological basis for finding new ways to solve problems that arise before the researcher.

As we know, cognition, that is, the modeling of the world in the human mind, is carried out with the help of various concepts that reflect fragments of the reality around us. It should be noted that the theoretical and practical problems associated with the study of concepts attract the attention of many researchers in the field of philosophy, logic, psychology, linguistics, cultural studies, cognitive science both abroad (R. I. Pavilionis, R. Jackendoff, R. P. Abelson, G. Lakoff, A. Wierzbicka and others), and in our country (V. A. Zvegintsev, A. A. Zalevskaya, N. D. Arutyunova, D. S. Likhachev, Yu. S. Stepanov, Yu. N. Karaulov, E. A. Kubryakova and others).

Cognition occurs according to the following scheme: from the sensory to the rational (sensations – perceptions – ideas – concepts), and the concept is considered

the highest level of knowledge. The cognitive approach has proved that the traditional handling of concepts as logical categories does not fit into the framework of modern research. In many works on linguistics, the terms concept and notion are identified, especially when it comes to the content of the notion.

From the etymology of the words, it is clear that the terms concept and notion are phenomena of the same order: the concept is a direct translation of the Latin word “conceptus” that means “notion”. On the other hand, the term notion (in its classical sense) is replaced by the term concept when talking about the so-called mental constructs and mental representations.

In domestic science, the problem of the concept, in particular its substitute function, began to be considered starting from the work of S. A. Askoldov in 1928 [3, p. 280]. Pondering over the concepts that are instantly highlighted in the mental horizon of a person, and at the same time lead to clear conclusions, S. A. Askoldov comes to the conclusion that the function of substitution is performed by a special structure called the concept.

In contrast, D. S. Likhachev believes that “the concept exists not for the word itself, but for each main (dictionary) meaning of the word separately, and proposes to consider the concept as a kind of “algebraic” expression of the meaning that we use in our written and oral speech, because a person simply does not have time to grasp the meaning in all its complexity; sometimes a person cannot, and sometimes interprets it in his / her own way (depending on education, personal experience, belonging to a certain environment, profession, etc.). Which of the dictionary meanings of the word the concept replaces is usually found out from the context, and sometimes even from the general situation. The 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 personal and folk experience of a person [3, p. 281].

V. N. Teliya has a slightly different opinion. “The fulfillment of the sign function,” she writes, “in all likelihood consists not in the “replacement” of an object from the world “Real”, but in the projection of the concept of the name onto the referent as a reality named in a linguistic expression – a genuine object from the world “Real”, the sensual perception of which can be reproduced from memory: otherwise we could only report what is directly perceived”. Therefore, according to V. N. Teliya, it would be more correct, following L. Wittgenstein, to speak about the projective relation of a linguistic sign or concept name to the world, and not about substitution [8, p. 98]. Despite the fact that the term concept and its derivatives (conceptual analysis, conceptualization, conceptual picture of the world, etc.) have become widely used in modern domestic linguistics, it does not have a precise interpretation.

The concept is considered in the work of Yu. S. Stepanov “Constants. Dictionary of Russian Culture” in the aspect of its culturological content. According to the author, “a concept is kind of a clot of culture in the mind of a person; it is that in the form of which culture enters the mental world of man. And, on the other hand, the

concept is something through which a person – an ordinary person, not a “creator of cultural values” – enters culture himself, and in some cases influences it. The concept has a complex structure. On the one hand, everything that belongs to the structure of the notion belongs to it, on the other hand, the structure of the concept includes everything that makes it a factor of culture – the original form (etymology); a history compressed to the main features of the content; contemporary associations; grades, etc.” [7, p. 43]. In other words, the concept has a “layered” structure, and each layer is the result, the “sediment” of the cultural life of different eras.

According to Anna Wierzbicka, a concept is “an object from the world “Ideal”, having a name and reflecting certain culturally conditioned ideas of a person about the world “Reality”. Reality itself, in her opinion, is given to us in thinking (not in perception!) precisely through language, and not directly” [8, p. 97]. Here one can clearly see the closeness of A. Wierzbicka’s approach to the ideas of W. Humboldt, who understood language as a world lying between the world of external phenomena and the inner world of a person. It is impossible to study meanings without the inner worlds of their speakers, that is, without that, without which they lose their mode of existence.

Yu. D. Apresyan calls concepts “a kind of linguo-cultural isoglosses and bundles of isoglosses” [1, p. 350]. E. S. Kubryakova considers the concepts “quanta of knowledge”: “The notion of concepts corresponds to the idea of those meanings that a person operates in the processes of thinking and which reflect the content of the results of all human activity and the processes of cognition of the world in the form of some “quanta” of knowledge. Concepts arise in the process of constructing information about objects and their properties, and this information can include both information about the objective state of affairs in the world, and information about imaginary worlds and the possible state of affairs in these worlds” [2, p. 90].

As you can see, all these interpretations have something in common, namely: concepts are the meanings that a person is guided by, these are the knowledge that a person has regarding some subject or object. In other words, a concept is a mental structure that is inextricably linked with language, consciousness and thinking. But the most important thing in the concept, according to S. Kh. Lyapin, is “the multidimensionality and discrete integrity of the meaning, which nevertheless exists in a continuous cultural-historical space and, therefore, is prone to cultural (and culturogenic!) transmission from one subject area to another” [4, p. 11].

Changing the term notion as a set of essential features to the term concept is not just a terminological replacement: a concept is always knowledge structured into a frame, which means that it reflects not just the essential features of an object, but all those that are filled with knowledge about essence in a given language community. From this follows that the concept should receive a cultural and national “registration” [8, p. 96].

As you know, the best access to the description and definition of concepts is provided by the language. There are different opinions about which units can be considered as concepts. “A compromise point of view,” says E. S. Kubryakova, is shared by those scientists who believe that part of the conceptual information has a linguistic “binding”, that is, the ways of their linguistic expression, but some of this information is presented in the psyche in a fundamentally different way, i.e., by the mental representations of another type – images, pictures, diagrams, etc.” [2, p. 90–91]. In other words, the concepts of any subjects and objects can be presented in the human brain in the form of prints, traces, images, pictures.

Thus, concepts can be represented not only by individual words (right, law, crime, justice, etc.), but also by phraseological units (draconian laws, Lynch law, the jungle law, to be at law with somebody, etc.). Concepts can also arise on the basis of the titles of literary works (“Crime and Punishment” by Fyodor Dostoevsky), fables (“The Wolf in Sheep’s Clothing” by Aesop), proverbs and sayings (laws catch flies, but let hornets go free; necessity has no law; one law for the rich, and another for the poor, etc.). Phrases from fiction (Elementary, my dear Watson – Sherlock Holmes), plays (To be or not to be? – Hamlet), movies (I’ll be back – Terminator), songs and poems can have concepts.

Thanks to academician D. S. Likhachev, a well-known researcher of culture, the term “conceptual sphere of language” appeared in science, which denoted a special field of language, since words, their meanings and concepts of these meanings do not exist abstractly, not by themselves, but in a certain human “ideosphere”. According to the scientist, the notion of the conceptual sphere is inseparable from the cognitive potential, stocks of knowledge and skills, cultural experience of an individual and the people as a whole. In fact, the conceptual sphere of language is the conceptual sphere of culture. And the national language is not only a means of communication, a sign system for transmitting messages, but also like a “substitute” for national culture, a kind of concentrate of the culture of the nation. And “the richness of a language is determined not only by the richness of the “vocabulary” and grammatical possibilities, but also by the richness of the conceptual world, the conceptual sphere, which is the language of man and his nation” [3, p. 286].

So, the concept is a “quantum of knowledge”, a “clot of culture” in the human mind, through which an ordinary person enters the culture, and sometimes influences it. For example, representations, of an ordinary person, not a lawyer, about “legality” and “illegality” are concentrated primarily in the concept of “law”. And this concept exists in the mind (mental world) of such a person not in the form of clear notions of state power, the rule of law, the historical evolution of the concept of law, but in the form of ideas about crime, punishment, court, police, militia, etc. The “bundle” of ideas, notions, knowledge, associations, experiences that accompanies the word law is the concept of “law”. Unlike the notions in the proper sense of the term (such as “decree”; “legal act”, “text of the law”, etc.), the concepts are not only thought about,

they are experienced. They are the subject of emotions, likes and dislikes, and sometimes collisions. Moreover, the complex, “layered” structure of the concept, which includes (besides everything that belongs to the structure of the concept) etymology, brief historical information, all kinds of modern associations, assessments – all this allows to consider the “concept” as a subject of linguoculturological research.

So, cognition itself is inseparable from the semantics of language, which studies the information reflected in the language and is a link between the theory of language and the theories of other cognitive abilities (including visual and auditory perception, etc.). Therefore, when studying the semantics of natural language, we necessarily study the structure of thinking.

References

1. Апресян Ю. Д. Образ человека по данным языка: Опыт системного описания // Апресян Ю. Д. Избранные труды. Т. 2. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. М., 1995. С. 348–388.
2. Кубрякова Е. С., Демьянков В. З., Панкрац Ю. Г., Лузина Л. Г. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. М., 1996. 245 с.
3. Лихачев Д. С. Концептосфера русского языка // Русская словесность. Антология. М.: Academia, 1997. С. 280–287.
4. Ляпин С. Х. Концептология: К становлению подхода // Научные труды Центроконцепта. Архангельск: Изд-во Поморского госуниверситета, 1997. Вып. 1. С. 11–35.
5. Петрова Е. А. Логико-когнитивная интерпретация субстантивно-номинативных пропозем в диктемной дискурсивации: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Уфа, 2012.
6. Петрова Е. А. Истоки и векторы логико-когнитивного направления в изучении языка: монография. Уфа: УЮИ МВД России, 2013. 127 с.
7. Степанов Ю. С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. М., 2001. 990 с.
8. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. 288 с.
9. Фрумкина Р. М. Концептуальный анализ с точки зрения лингвиста и психолога // НТИ. Сер. 2: Информационные процессы и системы. 1992. № 3. С. 1–8.
10. Харитончик З. А. Способы концептуальной организации знаний в лексике языка // Язык и структура представления знаний: сб. науч.-аналит. обзоров. М., 1992. С. 97–123.
11. Barsalou L. W. Frames, concepts, and conceptual fields // Frames, fields, and contrasts. Hillsdale, 1992. P. 21–74.
12. Jackendoff R. What is a concept? // Frames, fields, and contrasts. New essays in semantics and lexical organisation. Hillsdale, 1992. P. 191–209.
13. Lakoff R. Hedges: FA study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts // CLS. 1972. Vol. 8. P. 183–228.
14. Wierzbicka A. *Lingua mentalis: The semantics of natural language*. Sydney; New York: Academic Press, 1980.
15. Wierzbicka A. *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 1985. 368 p.