UDC 81 – 13

Golubovska I. O.,
Head of the Department of General Linguistics,
Classical Philology and Hellenistic Studies
Institute of Philology
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

LINGUAL CONCEPT: EPISTEMIC APPROACHES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN LINGUISTICS

Summary. In the article the problems of linguistics formation as a separate science are looked upon. Modern linguistics is developing in the frames of anthropological epistemic constants which are dominant in modern scientific knowledge. The term "concept" appears to be the basic notion of the linguistic conceptology and linguistic culturology. It has got double interpretation – "cognitively" and "culturally" marked. Within the latter interpretation of the concept's essence in the veine of "mental-spiritual" approach to its study has arised. This approach is more spread in modern Ukrainian concept studies (if compared with "experiental-mental" approach used by American concept researchers).

Grounding on the analysis of the numorous linguistic works of the Ukrainian linguists in the field of concept studies fulfilled on the material of Ukrainain, Russian, French, English, Chinese, Japanese and other languages the epistemic approaches characteristic for the modern period in the development of Ukrainian linguistic conceptology were generalized. Main vectors for the future ways in concepts' study were pointed out.

Key words: anthropological paradigm, epistemic constants, concept, concept studies, linguistic conceptology, linguistic culturology, the future ways in concepts' study.

Introduction. Millennium border is usually marked by frontal changes in social, political, literary, scientific and educational spheres of human life. There appears an urgent need to change the established views on human being and world in general, to review the scientific constants which considered to be right and unshakable for the long period of time. The borderline of the XX-th – XXI-th centuries activised these moods in the field of science, and what is more, scientists which belong to different branches of knowledge demonstrate the collective wish to get to "places" man has never gone before and to understand what is *a priori* not "allowed" ordinary people to understand. In this connection physics, this queen of sciences, which has been always determining the general philosophical model of the world, once again proposed the vectors for the science development.

American physicists Raymond Davis and David Bohm independently from one another have found evidence of substance disappearance. It has been experimentally proved: under certain conditions substance might disappear, and in other conditions of virtual waves interaction it might arise from nothing. Epistemological value of this discovery is hard to overvalue: the "basic" philosophical question about the primacy of **matter/spirit** seems to be solved in favour of the second component of this opposition. Nevertheless change of the research priorities and approaches in the linguistics of late XX-th – early XXI century began long before this epochal discovery: structural (materialistic in the Soviet Union) linguistics freed the way to anthropocentric linguistics (idealistic

in its essential epistemological constant). In the frames if this new science about language a Person with his/her consciousness, thinking, knowledge, "as medium for penetration into the speech" appeared in the focus of the research interests and became the object of study for new disciplines: linguistic cognitology and linguistic culturology. It is currently proved that culturally marked language entities are unsystematically spread throughout the whole semantic "skeleton" of natural language. They create no systemic groups (fields). This fact provides a basis for analogy with the behavior of particles-waves that are studied within modern quantum wave mechanics. Moving further through generalizations by analogy, one might reach some "taking breath away" assumptions about the holistic plan of Universe creation. But for us, mere human mortals, it is opened fragmentally, within different vectors of the scientific research aiming to discover the Scientific Verity. Change of the scientific paradigms is primarily determined by changes in research methodology, which is predetermined by certain metascience presumptions and beliefs about object's ontology. The correctness of these or that fundamental presumptions is not questioned until some new scientific data would provoke crisis in the development of the scientific trend. **Thus, change in scientific presumptions results in change of scientific paradigms.**

Basing on this postulate, it seems logical to admit the existence of only three paradigms in the history of linguistics: **comparative historical** one (*methods*: comparative historical, of internal and external renovation, historicism as a principle of understanding of the object's nature, diachronic approach as a basic value, *purpose:* reconstruction of protolanguage archaic forms and further outlining of divergent processes in its development (groups' selection within the language family); structural (*methods:* distributive, transformational, component all of them having a high degree of formalization; synchrony, systemic approach and sign character of language as basic values, *purpose:* discovering of language paradigmatic and syntagmatic oppositions and correlations); **anthropological** (*methods:* conceptual, prototypical, frame / Gestalt analysis – all of them with elements of internal introspection as a mean of obtaining knowledge; the basic value (presumption) – antecedence of cognitive structures in relation to lingual, *purpose:* study of cognitive structures for knowledge storage and their language reflextions.

In modern linguistics concept appears to be one of the most "loved" cognitive entity, that's why one can notice the steady growth of the number of conceptual studies devoted to the wide range of different concepts. This kind of epistemic situation alarms some linguists and even provokes pessimistic discussions about "avalanche-like" increase of the number of the scientific works devoted to the study of concepts in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics, "fashion" (O. Vorobjova), "conceptmania" (A. Prikhod'ko), ect. Moreover, according to O. Vorobjova, this Eastern

linguistic tendency appears to be in sharp contrast with the Western one within which "concept as a general notion appears from time to time only in the context of the theory of prototypes while the most attention is given to the phenomenon of categorization" [8, c. 11]. This author warns about serious threat which modern linguistic conceptology faces: loss of its heuristic power on the background of extensive tendencies in its development. Let's look deeper into this problem.

Dialectic character of correlation between "cognitive" and "cultural" definition of language concept as a reflection of its nature and essence. Language concept as a key notion of linguistic conceptology

As it is widely known, in modern linguistics the content of the term "concept" emerged at the crossroads of its two understandings: "cognitive" and "cultural" ones.

The first is rooted to ideas of S.Askoldov-Alexejev, who understood the concept as a certain kind of entity that replaces in the process of human thinking some unspecified but similar objects, actions, functions (concept of plant, justice, mathematical concepts) [1, c. 267].

This approach was developed in the works of O. Kubryakova: "concept is an operational unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system and language brain <...> quantum of knowledge. Key concepts have language presentation" [16, c. 91]; V. Karasyk: "<...> mental entities, which represent significant generalized fragments of experience in the memory of man" [13, c. 59], O. Zalewska understands concept in terms of "simultaneous multidimensional structure", as perceptual-cognitive-affective entity of dynamic nature, which objectively exists in human's mind in contradistinction to the notions and meanings−constructs of epistemological description [12, c. 358].

The same approach is characteristic for V. Krasnykh, who describes the concept as "a kind of minimized deepest meaning of the subject", "the most abstract <...> cognitively processed idea of the subject taken as a sum of all its possible valences including culturally marked ones" [15, c. 268–269]. This kind of understanding of the essence of the concept we believe to be "cognitively centered", which emphasizes the role of the concept in the processes of human cognitive activity.

The other approach to crystallization of the concept's nature arises on the ways of its "culturally affiliated" understanding launched by academician D. Likhachev: as "algebraic expression of the meaning" that implies the interaction between the concept's content <…> and personal / people's ethnic experiences (in which connection the richer conceptual sphere of this or that language community is, the richer the concept's content becomes) [Ibidem, c. 5]. "Culturally centered" definition of the concept found its development in a number of works of such authors as Ju. Stepanov: "a kind of matrix of culture in the human's mind; "coagulate of culture in human consciousness" [23, c. 40]; A. Wierzbicka : "Object from the "ideal world" that has a name and reflects certain culturally determined ideas of a human being about the "real world" [29, c. 90]. Understanding of the concept as culturally marked phenomenon found its reflection in wide use of such terms-notions as "lingual cultureme" (Ukr. лінгвокультурема), which represents a complex multilevel language unit that appears to be a carrier of ethnically marked knowledge [7, c. 44], "logoepisteme" (Ukr. логоепістема) which implies "knowledge embodied in the word and conveyed by its internal form, individual history, certain ties with the culture" [4, c. 7].

However, this kind of epistemic and metalanguage approach only confuses the consumer of linguistic information, simply emphasizing this or that research approach determined by certain scholar's goal. In the same time concept's essence and specifics of its functioning on the axis "culture –human consciousness –natural language" remain without any concrete explanation.

Understanding of this state of affairs is reflected in the works written by S. Vorkachov, which, on the one hand, defines the concept as "an operating unit of thought" [6, c. 43], and further on –as a "unit of collective knowledge <...> which is verbalized and marked by cultural ethnic specifics" [Ibidem, c. 51-52]. Even more, if mental unit has no ethno-cultural particularity, according to above mentioned scholar, it has to be eliminated from the number of concepts.

Given the fact that "In natural languages meaning <...> is subjective, anthropocentric, in many veines culturally determined and reflects both culturally conditioned types of social interaction and the objective features of the real world itself" [29, c. 16–17], one might make a conclusion about concept's nature and essence as a notion of "<...> mental, lingual, social, cultural, axiological character" [20, c. 30]. To the same conclusion results the application of cognitive notion of conceptualization of the reality in the format of concepts and conceptual structures (diagrams, pictures, frames, scripts, Gestalts), that form the conceptual system located in human's mind for which language forms serve as a tool of their manifestation.

Each type of conceptualizing reality by this or that ethnic consciousness and ethnic language (sensory-receptive, logical-conceptual, emotional-evaluative, moral-value) demonstrates bright national-specific characteristics researched in the monograph by I. Golubovs'ka "Ethnic Peculiarities of National Language Models" [9]. One of the main assertions of the modern anthropological linguistics might be formulated in such a way: the substantial-ideal language continuum, being single and sustained, simulates specific features of national mentality at all levels of the language system with the help of pre-sign, sign and supra-sign lingual elements, i.e. the convey of cultural and national peculiarity is carried out at every single level of the language system. In this regard it would be superfluous to recall that the distinguished American anthropologist and linguist E. Sapir who denied even the slightest communication between language, on the one hand, and national temperament, on the other, considering the search for correspondances between the structure of language and temperamental variation **worthless** [21, c. 242]. In this context observation, description and explanation of the nature of lingual embodiments of ethnic mentality might be considered to be a great achievement of modern contrastive language conceptology.

Thus, **concept** as an ideal quantum of knowledge, which is believed to be an operational unit of human cognitive processes, has a culturally determined character, whereby it is not only rationally comprehended, but also emotionally "experienced". Otherwise, when cultural component is absentl, we deal with **notion** which belongs to international encyclopaedic knowledge and represents logical, culturally neutral forms of thought, actually those which were described by M. Zhynkin in terms of "universal objective code" (UOC). Thereby, not every notion is a concept. Possibility of transaction from notion to concept is given only to such notions that appear to be of great importance and significance for certain ethnic group within certain ethnic culture, to those of them which are charged with concentrated cultural memory of this or that peoples.

Positively, there are no insurmountable walls between notions and concepts; under certain conditions (especially in the art and poetic discourse) notion's transition to the sphere of concepts is quite possible.

Considering all said above, concept as a mental phenomenon which is realized (verbalized, gets verbal forms, manifested) in particular linguoculture in modern Ukrainian linguistics is investigated on the crossroads of the two newest areas of linguistic knowledge: linguistic conceptology and linguistic culturology. The first trend might be named in terms of O. Vorobjova "expierence-cognitive", the other – "spiritual-cognitive": "The first of these schools is based on the philosophy of experiential realism, which serves as the basis for American cognitive tradition initiated by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson in their turn inspired by ideas of their predecessors – L.Wittgenstein, E. Sapir, B. Whorf, Ch. Fillmore and many others <...> tradition <…> objectively determined by the priorities of the Anglo-Saxon mentality. The second school in conceptology <... > is the development of ideas of A. Wierzbicka <...> which were embodied and found their further development in numerous works of the Russian school of logical analysis, led by N. Arutiunova" [8, c. 2–3].

Interestingly, in Ukrainian linguistics just "spiritual-cognitive" methodological approach to comprehension of the concept's essence as a complex multidimensional phenomenon is accentuateded. On the assumption of the constants of Ukrainian ethnic consciousness it would be probable to expect something else.

Mono-, bi- and polilingual researches of concepts in Ukraine (dissertations defended in Ukraine in 2005–2015).

Given that a data for the research might be chosen in the format of one, two or three/ more languages (it makes affiliation to the appropriate speciality approved by Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine), let us make an attempt to identify some taxa (classification units) based on the given above criteria:

10.02.01 – Ukrainian language: V. Ivashchenko (Kyiv, 2007), T. Wilczynska (Kyiv, 2009); Y. Sobolieva (Kyiv, 2014);

10.02.02 – Russian language: Fu Jing (Kyiv, 2011), N. Gudkova (Kyiv, 2012);

10.02.04 – Germanic Languages: O. Gorodets'ka (Kyiv, 2003), O. Borysov (Donets'k, 2005), G .Ogarkova (Kyiv, 2005), I. Zmijeva (Kharkiv, 2006), T. Luniova (Kyiv, 2006), I. Onischuk (Odessa, 2006) Yu.Abramova (Kharkiv, 2007), I. Gorobec' (Donets'k, 2007), O. Chornovol-Tkachenko (Kharkiv, 2007), O. Blagodarna (Kharkiv, 2009), L. Gaiduchenko (Kyiv, 2009), O.Putij (Kharkiv, 2010), A. Semenchuk (Kherson, 2011), T. Boyko (Kyiv, 2011), O. Zhulavs'ka (Kharkiv, 2011), N.Gach (Kyiv, 2014); I. Nabokova (Kharkiv, 2015);

10.02.05 – Romance languages: M. Yushchenko (Kyiv, 2007), M. Suslova (Kyiv, 2013), N. Lityns'ca (Kyiv, 2015);

10.02.13 – Languages of the Peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Aborigines of Australia: N. Sav'yak (Kyiv, 2012), N.V. Kolomiyets (Kyiv, 2014); M. Andriyets (Kyiv, 2014).

10.02.14 – Classical languages. Some Indo-European languages: G. Malunova (Kyiv, 2015).

10.02.15 – General Linguistics: O. Palchevs'ka (Donets'k, 2006), Yu. Pysmenna (Kyiv, 2008), V. Boguts'ky (Kyiv, 2010), O. Surmach (Kyiv, 2011), I. Myhovych (Donets'k, 2011), G. Vanina (Kyiv, 2011), O. Taranenko (Donets'k, 2011), A. Biliajeva (Donets'k, 2012), Yu. Yaskevich (Donets'k, 2013), O. Sakhnyuk (Kyiv, 2014), O. Dziubenko (Kyiv, 2014), Yu. Safiyan (Odessa, 2015);

10.02.16 – Translation: S. Zapols'kykh (Kyiv, 2005);

10.02.17 – Comparative-historical and typological linguistics: O. Bondarenko (Donets'k, 2005), O. Blyzniuk (Kyiv, 2006), T. Semyhyn (Kyiv, 2011), V. Kalinichenko (Donets'k, 2013).

As the analysis of the each of the above mentioned researches seems to be not possible in the frames of this article, let us focus our attention on the common features which bring together all these works.

1. Common methodological approach. Following N. Arutiunova, A. Wierzbicka, O. Kubriakova, Yu. Stepanov, I. Sternin all researchers recognize the statement about "probability of existence" in the human's mind of some "quants" of culturally marked information which is objectified in language forms.

2. After S.Vorkachov, V. Karasyk, G. Slyshkin the structure of the concept is seen as being represented by nuclear (conceptual/ logical), associative/ figurative (metaphorical) and evaluative components.

3. Such conceptual structure as frame is considered to be a device of concept's content deployment.

4. The methods of field modeling in the spirit of Z. Popova and I. Sternin and methods of cognitive-discursive interpretation are being applied (A. Prykhod'ko, A. Martyniuk).

5. In metalinguistic description such term as "linguocultural concept" (V. Karasyk) is widely used. In the same time terms like "linguocultureme" (V. Vorobjov) and "logoepisteme" (J. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov) are rarely used in linguistic texts.

6. Methods of concepts' analysis might be qualified as a sort of combination of the methods inherent for the structural paradigm of linguistic knowledge (methods of component, contextual analysis, method of distributive analysis, quantitative method); for traditional linguistics (descriptive, comparative method, etymological analysis of the nuclear lexemes-identificators); and those that emerged within the anthropological paradigm (cognitive interpretative method, of conceptual analysis, of frame modeling, prototype analysis, method of conceptual metaphor by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, method of internal introspection, of cognitive-discursive interpretation). For the verification of the obtained data some experimental methods are used: psycholinguistic experiments (free, directed, estimated scaling) and others.

Offered by A. Wierzbicka method of semantic primitives and method of profiling by J. Bartmiński remain practically unused alongside with method of vertical syntactic fields proposed by S. Prokhorova and method of prototypical scenario by R. Schenk and R. Abelson.

7. The priority in analysis is given to the so called teleonomic (GOOD, EVIL, TRUTH, FREEDOM, WILL, WISDOM, KNOWLEDGE, HARMONY, LIFE, DEATH), emotional teleonomic (LOVE, FEAR), gender (MAN, WOMAN), socially centric (SUCCESS, EXCLUSIVITY, PR, POWER, CRIMINAL, TERRORISM, TRAINING, EDUCATION, WEALTH), individually centric (VAMPIRE, WAY, INTIMACY, PAIN), sacred (GOD, OUR LADY, THE DEVIL, SECRET) concepts.

The presentation of the current state of Ukrainian concept studies on the material of different language cultures seems to be not full without dealing with the content of at least the most interesting works devoted to the concepts.

We'll choose among them the doctorate dissertation of T. Vilchyns'ka "Development of Sacral Conceptual Sphere in the Ukrainian Poetic Language of the XVII-th −XX-th Centuries" [5]; Ph.D Thesis of Y. Sobolieva "SECRET Concept and its Verbalization in Ukrainian linguoculture" [22]; Ph.D Thesis of N. Gudkova

"The Formation of Concept "EXCLUSIVITY" in Russian Printed Advertising Text of XIX-th −XXI-th centuries" [10].

The doctorate dissertation of T. Vilchyns'ka is of great interest in the area of methodological and methodical approaches to the study of the concepts that belong to the sacred sphere (GOD, OUR LADY, THE DEVIL). The author has proposed a method of semantic-axiological field, which basically being a kind of generalization of the previous instrumental achievements in concepts' practical processing (separation of kernel zone, near-kernel zone and periphery, etymological analysis of the name of concept, outlining of semantic-axiological characteristics, tracking the contextual and metaphorical realization of the concept), differs from the previous researches of that type by pioneering powerful approach: it gave the needed grounds for outworking an algorithm of analysis of correlation between authors' individual models of the world and overnational language models of the world. The proposed method allows to correlate the parameters of evaluative-cognitive categorization of the world by collective consciousness of a certain (not only Ukrainian) ethnic group, on the one hand, and individual consciousness of this or that writer, on the other, at any chosen chronological period in the development of certain linguoculture.

Candidate thesis of Y. Sobolieva attracts the attention thanks to extremely clear modus of integrative use of various methods of concepts' research prevailing in today's linguistic culturology (Vilchyns'ka's approaches are implemented, achievements of Voronezh Linguistic School of concepts' study (I. Sternin, Z. Popova), methods of concepts' profiling: word-formative, paradigmatic, syntagmatic, associative, idiomatic (Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics: J. Bartmiński, S. Niebrzegowska), though the term "profiling" is unfortunately not used at all. Attention is also drawn to rather rich and representative language empirical basis which gives all necessary evidence for recognition of seemingly universal concept SECRET as nationally specific, which arose in the result of "stress conditions" characteristic for the development of Ukrainian mental culture with its accentuated introvert vector [22, c. 6].

Dissertation of N. Gudkova "The Formation of Concept "EXCLUSIVITY" in Russian Printed Advertising Text of the XIX-th XXI-th centuries" is characterized by appeal to diachronic aspects of concepts' content formation, by attempt "<...> to open "the veil of secrecy" over the first steps of concept's life" [10, c. 1]. The author stresses the need to renew "the before-concept phase" of concept's formation (Ibidem: 3) given the fact that "<…> modern interpretation of concepts made from the standpoint of modern knowledge, modern traditions, modern culture to some extent <...> distorts the true language status of the realities belonging to the past" (Ibidem: 1). Basing on the study of texts of Russian print advertising of various time periods (before the October revolution until 1917), of the Soviet period (from 1917 to 1991) and post-Soviet (from 1991 to the present time) the author managed to deep dive into socio-historical conditions of the rise of the concept EXCLUSIVITY in the frames of advertising discourse, so that relevant conclusions about the degree of stability, variability, reduce or increase of the semantic and axiological potential of this concept were processed in the context of its formation and evolution beginning from the "pre-concept" stage until our days.

Thus, as the analysis of a number of works made in Ukraine in the field of language conceptology shows, concepts' research in modern Ukrainian linguistics is characterized, unfortunately, by extensive mode (not in depth, but in breadth) basing on approaches, metalanguage and research techniques developed both in Russian and western linguistics. Sadly, intense, heuristic vector of language concept's investigation which would be aimed at searching new formats, processing new techniques and perspectives of concepts' exploration vertually does not exist (just a few exceptions might be made).

Conclusion. How should we interpret this situation, this "case of concept" (paraphrasing Charles Fillmore)? Does this linguistic trend has already exhausted its epistemological potential, or we are just moving in the wrong direction?

Most likely the second suggestion is true. After all, in the Ukrainian linguistic conceptology (in contradistinction with Russian), very little attention is paid to lexicographical representation, which aims to put in order, categorize and lexicographically represent already studied concepts, create their thesaurus-based registry[1]. Meanwhile, lexicographical codification of the accumulated in this area data would be of great help not only in summarizing of the already done, but also in priorizing ways for the further studies of the verbalized culturally marked knowledge about the world, in the solution of the problems of ethnic and national identity in the context of those civilization changes that are currently "on agenda" for modern Ukraine. Taking into consideration the current socio-political context the study of such Ukrainian concepts-onims like THE CARPATHIANS (КАРПАТИ), DNIPRO (ДНІПРО); ORANTA (ОРАНТА); ZAPORIZHS'KA SICH (ЗАПОРІЗЬКА СІЧ), TARAS SHEVCHENKO (ТАРАС ШЕВЧЕНКО), BOGDAN KHMELNITS'KY (БОГДАН ХМЕЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ); PECHERS'KA LAVRA (ПЕЧЕРСЬКА ЛАВРА), KHRESH-CHATYK (ХРЕЩАТИК), MEZHYGIRYA (Межигір'я), NATALKA POLTAVKA (НАТАЛКА ПОЛТАВКА) etc. seems to be actual and expedient.

Taking into consideration negative processes of anomie, depreciation of the traditional ethical values in the contemporary world, it seems logic to refer to the diachronic study of teleonom concepts under the angle view of the dynamics of their axiological semantics changes, acquiring by them other, not inherent for them earlier semantic nuances of cognitive content, emergence of new concepts, that might be observed on the material of Ukrainian postmodern texts' processing (content of the blogosphere and forums in the internet space could be used).

Summarizing approaches, reflections, object and subject of the research, metalanguage of the scientific description, tools of modern cognitive and culturally affiliated linguistic areas (linguistic cognitology, linguistic conceptology, linguistic culturology, etc.), we get all grounds to state that episteme of priority and determinative power of human consciouness in relation to the essence of language phenomena (ontologically) and approaches to their study (epistemologically) is currently dominant in the theory and practice of the modern linguistic science, though the measure of this facts' comprehension in the scientific community seems to be rather low.

References:

1. Аскольдов-Алексеев С. Концепт и слово / С. Аскольдов // Русская словесность: От теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология. – М.: Academia, 1997. – С. 267–279.
2. Белянин В. Введение в психолингвистику / В. Белянин. – М.: ЧеРо, 1999. – 128 с.

---

[1] Among the Ukrainian works of this kind we may mention only Dictionary Directory set by V. Zhaivoronok "Signs of Ukrainian Ethnic Culture" – Ukr. «Знаки української етнокультури» (Kyiv, 2006). Meanwhile, on the territory of our northern neighbour eight volumes of "Anthology of concepts" – Russ. «Антология концептов» were published from 2005 to 2011 (editors V. Karasyk and J. Sternin).

3. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание /А. Вежбицкая. – М.: Русские словари, 1996. – 416 с.

4. Верещагин Е., Костомаров В. В поисках новых путей развития страноведения: Концепция речеповеденческих тактик / Е. Верещагин, В. Костомаров. – М.: Ин-т рус. яз. им. А.С. Пушкина, 1999. – 84 с.

5. Вільчинська Т. Розвиток концептосфери сакрального в українській поетичній мові XVII – XX ст. : автореф. дис. … докт. філол. наук : 10.02.01 «Українська мова» / Т. Вільчинська. – К., 2009. – 140 с.

6. Воркачев С. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт: [монография] / С. Воркачёв. – М.:ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004. – 236 с.

7. Воробьёв В. Лингвокультурология (теория и методы) / В. Воробьёв. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 1997. – 331 с.

8. Воробйова О. Концептологія в Україні: здобутки, проблеми, прорахунки / О. Воробйова // Вісник КНЛУ. Сер. Філологія. – 2011. – Т. 14. – № 2. – С. 53–64.

9. Голубовська І. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу / І. Голубовська. – К.: Логос, 2004. – 283 с.

10. Гудкова Н. Становлення концепту «ЕКСКЛЮЗИВНІСТЬ» у російському друкованому рекламному тексті XIX – XXI ст. : автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук : 10.02.02 «Російська мова» / Н. Гудкова. – К., 2012. – 20 с.

11. Етимологічний словник української мови: В 7-ми т. / Редкол. О. Мельничук (гол. ред.) та ін. – К.: Наук. думка, 1983. – Т. 2. Д – (Копці). – 570 с.

12. Залевская А. Психолингвистические исследования. Слово. Текст : Избранные труды / А. Залевская. – М. : Гнозис, 2005. – 543 с.

13. Карасик В. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В.

14. Карасик. – М.:Гнозис, 2004. – 389 с.

15. Кононенко І. Національно-мовна картина світу: зіставний аспект (на матеріалі української та російської мов) / І. Кононенко // Мовознавство. – 1996. – № 6. – С. 39–46.

16. Красных В.В. «Свій» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? / В.В. Красных. – М. : Гнозис, 2003. – 375 с.

17. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Под ред. Е.С. Кубряковой. – М.:Филол.ф-т МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 1997. – 245 с.

18. Кульчицький О. Світовідчування українців / О. Кульчицький // Українська душа. – К.: «Фенікс», 1992. – С. 51–70.

19. Лихачев Д. Концептосфера русского языка / Д. Лихачев // Известия АН СССР. Серия литературы и языка. – М.: Наука, 1993. – Т. 52. – № 1. – С. 3–9.

20. Кононенко А. та ін. Персонажи славянской мифологии. / А. Кононенко, А. Кононенко. – К.: Корсар, 1993. – 224 с.

21. Приходько А. Концепты и концептосистемы: монография / А. Приходько. – Днепропетровск: Издатель Белая Е.А., 2013. – 306 с.

22. Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии / Э. Сепир. – М.: Прогресс «Универс», 1993. – 656 с.

23. Соболєва Я. Концепт ТАЄМНИЦЯ та його вербалізація в українській лінгвокультурі : автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01 «Українська мова» / Я. Соболєва. – К., 2014. – 18 с.

24. Степанов Ю. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования / Ю. Степанов. – М.: Школа «Языки русской кульутры»,1997. – 524 с.

25. Українські народні прислів’я та приказки. Дожовтневий період.

26. К.: Держ. вид-во худ. літ-ри, 1963. – 791 с.

27. Фрумкина Р. Есть ли у современной лингвистики своя эпистемология? / Р. Фрумкина // Язык и наука конца XX века. – М., 1995. – С. 74–117.

28. Храмова В. До проблеми української ментальності / В. Храмова // Українська душа. – Київ, 1992. – С. 3–35.

29. Bruner J. Acts of Meaning / J. Bruner. – London, Cambridge, Mass., 1990. – 380 p.

30. Geertz C. "From the Native's Point of View": On the nature of anthropological understanding / C. Geertz // Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion / R.A. Shweder and R.A. LeVine, eds. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1984. – PP. 123–136.

31. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction / A. Wierzbicka. – Berlin – New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1991. – 502 p.

Голубовська І. О. Омовлений концепт: епістемічні підходи у сучасній українській лінгвістиці

Анотація. У статті розглядаються проблеми становлення лінгвістики як науки, яка нині перебуває у царині епістемологічних настанов антропологічної парадигми мовознавчого знання. Центральним термінопоняттям антропологічної парадигми постав концепт, який набув, з одного боку, «когнітологічного», а з іншого боку – «культурологічного» розуміння. Останнє визначення тяжіє до «духовно-менталістського» підходу в дослідженнях концептів і є більш характерним (порівняно з «експерієнційно-менталістським») для сучасної української лінгвоконцептології.

Узагальнюються епістемічні підходи, характерні для сучасної української лінгвоконцептології на основі аналізу великої кількості лінгвістичних праць з україністики, русистики, германістики, романістики, сходознавства, перекладознавства, загального мовознавства, класичної філології. Окреслюються вектори подальшого можливого розвитку лінгвістичної концептології в Україні.

Ключові слова: антропологічна парадигма, епістемічні настанови, концепт, концептологічні дослідження, лінгвоконцептологія, лінгвокультурологія, перспективи розвитку концептологічних досліджень.

Голубовская И. А. Ословленный концепт: эпистемические подходы в современной украинской лингвистике

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются проблемы становления лингвистики как науки, которая сейчас развивается в русле эпистемологических установок антропологической парадигмы научно-лингвистического знания. Центральным термино поняттям лингвокогнитологии и лингвокультурологии явился концепт, который получил две интерпретации – «когнитологическую» и «культурологическую». В рамках последнего понимания сущности концепта сформировался «духовно-менталистский» подход в исследовании концептов, выступающий более распространённым (по сравнению с «экспериенциально-менталистским») в современных лингвоконцептологических исследованиях в Украине.

На основе анализа большого количества лингвистических работ в области украинистики, русистики, германистики, романистики, востоковедения, переводоведения, общего языкознания, классической филологии были обобщены эпистемические подходы, характерные для современного этапа в развитии украинской лингвоконцептологии. Обозначены векторы дальнейших путей развития лингвистической концептологии в Украине.

Ключевые слова: антропологическая парадигма, эпистемические константы, концепт, концептологические исследования, лингвоконцептология, лингвокультурология, перспективы развития концептологических исследований.