

УДК 81-112.2

# ПАМЯТЬ КАК КОГНИТИВНЫЙ ОРИЕНТИР В ОСОЗНАНИИ ДИНАМИЧЕСКОЙ ПРИРОДЫ КОНЦЕПТА

**ГУДКОВА НАТАЛЬЯ НИКОЛАЕВНА**кандидат филологических наук, доцент  
Киевский национальный университет технологий и дизайна

**Аннотация:** Пристальное внимание к концепту как к сложному ментальному образованию динамического характера, семантика которого эволюционирует по оси диахронии, привела к пересмотру онтологической сущности концепта, в результате чего в поле зрения исследователей попал вопрос о предконцептуальной репрезентации концепта. Анализ концепта в контексте настоящего как следствия прошлого сопряжен с изучением механизмов человеческой памяти, которая представляет собой когнитивный процесс, обеспечивающий узнавание, запоминание, сохранение и восстановление информации.

**Ключевые слова:** концепт, когнитивная наука, ось диахронии, предконцептуальная фаза, человеческая память.

## MEMORY AS A COGNITIVE ORIENTATION IN THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF DYNAMIC NATURE OF CONCEPT

Gudkova Nataliia

**Abstract:** Focused attention to the concept as a complex mental formation of a dynamic nature, the semantics of which evolves along the diachronic axis, led to a revision of the ontological essence of the concept. The problem of pre-conceptual representation of the concept came in sight of researchers. Analysis of the concept in the context of the present as a consequence of the past involves the study of the mechanisms of human memory, which is being a cognitive process, provides recognition, memorization, preservation and recovery of information.

**Keywords:** concept, cognitive science, diachronic axis, pre-conceptual phase, human memory.

Many definitions of the term *concept* within the cognitive science which focuses on the different aspects of this item understanding and interpretation allow determining a number of features of the concept. The main of them are dynamism, versatility, constancy, abstraction, ability to be interactive and convergent, ability to act as a retranslator of cultural phenomena, imagery, emotional sensitivity, evaluativity, and some others [1, p. 128].

Variability and dynamism are characteristic features of the structures consciousness and thinking. The concept is recognized by many researchers as a dynamic system construct, but not all conceptualists accept diachrony as the output base for the study of concepts, and in most of the works this phenomenon is studied from the point of view of synchrony.

The necessity to expand on the modification of language phenomena in diachrony is of great current interest at the turn of the XXI century in respect of the aspect of cognitive linguistics. This is reflected in the papers of V. Kolesov [2], N. Krasavskiy [3], S. Vorkachov [4], V. Karasik [5]. Ye. Kubriakova highlights the possibility for the concept to develop, "to give way to improvement and modification" and cites Lawrence W. Barsalou: "Since people constantly learn new things in this world and as the world is constantly changing, hu-

man knowledge must have a form that is quickly adaptable to these changes" [6, p. 91]. A. Zalevskaia defines a concept as the objectively existing perception-cognitive-affective formation in a person's consciousness of a dynamic character [7, p. 39]. A researcher I. Vepreva mentions about the mobility of the concept: "The dynamism of contemporary conceptual consciousness implies the filling of the concepts with the new content existing in social consciousness" [8, p. 17]. According to Yu. Svyatyuk, the dynamic nature of the concept is evidenced by the fact that the content of the concept is constantly saturated, and its volume is enriched by new conceptual characteristics [9, p. 259]. L. Ivashchenko asserts that dynamic conceptual structures can exist simultaneously in themselves, as well as others, interacting with each other; they are re-created, alter, arise, develop, and degrade [10, p. 80]. Ye. Golovanova presents a number of conceptual remarks concerning the understanding of the concept, which are extremely important for cognitive linguistics, and one of them states: "Concepts are not static units, they exist in dynamics: they are being formed, changing their places in the system, becoming obsolete" [11, p. 87]. Thus, in recent studies the concept appears not just as a unit of mental representation level, but as a phenomenon that integrates consciousness, language, text and culture.

The dynamism of the concept is due to the fact that the unit which reflects the changing world around needs to be mobile and dynamic itself. The dynamism of the concept determines its dynamics. The concept *dynamics* was originally a physical term, but later it came to be used almost in all spheres of human activities. It is fixed by the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary where *dynamics* is not only 1) the science of the forces involved in movement, but also 2) the way in which people or things behave and react to each other in a particular situation [12, p. 394]. From a linguistic point of view, *dynamics* is defined as "the consideration of phenomena of language in relation to earlier phenomena of the same language and other languages of the same group" [13, p. 135].

Deeper insight into the dynamic nature of the concept in cognitive linguistics is based on the following ideas: a concept as a mental formation in the mind of the individual has access to the conceptual sphere of society, in other words, to culture; a concept as a unit of culture is the fixation of collective experience, which eventually becomes available to the individual [14, p. 49].

A concept and a sphere of concepts are in a relationship of interdependence as a "part-whole" combination of a pair of categories, which arose at the origins of ancient philosophy, and later transformed into the concept "system" in relation to "elements". Moreover, the conceptual sphere is a kind of complex anthroposociological and cultural system, which is historical in its way of existence, and which operates in the dynamics, so it is developing. The term *anthroposociological and cultural system* belongs to M. Kagan [15], who uses it to name a historically developing system with the structure, characterized by not only the synchronic aspect of its existence, but the diachronic one as well, and so it is defined by the researches as *chronostructure*.

The interdependence of the dynamics of a concept and a sphere of concepts is analyzed in the work of D. A. Morel Morel, which proves that the dynamics of extra-linguistic reality leads to certain changes 1) in the social world, 2) in the conceptual sphere, 3) in the linguistic view of the world (on the lexical and semantic levels) [16, p. 35]. The highest degree of the dynamism of concepts reveals itself with the change of sociopolitical orientations of the society, which leads to changes in the social sphere, and in the psychology of the people. According to G. Bogdanovich "our reality is characterized by various landmark events that objectively increase the interest of people to the political, economic, military, environmental, cultural problems... In this regard the lifestyle of a human being, the forms of his thinking undergo changes, the stereotypes behind the consciousness of a man and his language are re-analyzed" [17, p. 235]. The concepts are completely defined by the era in which they exist and change with the times. It is the fact that the content of concepts is defined by the theoretical context of the era. It allows to make a conclusion about possible inconsistencies between the conceptual systems at different stages of historical development of society and suggest that these inconsistencies reflect the diverse experience of humanity in each historical stage of reality understanding and find reflection in language expressions.

The dynamic nature of the concept, which is based on the awareness of the real world as a non-constant, varying system, defines one of its most important functions – to get the knowledge about the constantly changing world over to the people, as it is the concept as a multidimensional mental structure where the results of human exploration of the world are focused. The concept has the ability to develop; it accumulates knowledge about the

object, constantly comes under the influence of related and close concepts. Each concept can be interpreted in different ways depending on the context and cultural experience of concepts-bearer.

The realization of concept as a tool of cognition, as “a congelation of culture in human consciousness” [18, p. 42], gave impetus to the understanding of the heuristic potential of this phenomenon, and the term *concept*. As a result the derivation of this term presented to cognitive linguistics a range of new terminological word combinations, such as *conceptual*, *conceptualization*, *conceptualize*, *conceptualizer*, *re-conceptualization*, *sphere of concepts*, *system of concepts*, *macroconcept*, *microconcept*, *anticoncept*, *pre-concept*, *linguoconcept*, *linguoconceptology*, *conceptographics* [19, c. 86]. The most currently important term among them is the term *pre-concept*. This is evidenced by studies of cognitive science that combines cognitive linguistics and cognitive psychology which deal with “language of thought” – problems of thinking and cognition, keeping and processing information [20, p.58]. Rafal Dziurila, the Polish researcher in the field of higher mental functions of a man, identifies pre-concept as a potential concept, which is the highest level of generalization at which a meaning exists at the level of abstraction [21]. The formation of the pre-conceptual side of a verbal poetic image as “a meaning of the image..., which becomes more intense with the unconscious cognitive operations” [22, p. 149] is analyzed by L. Belehova. O. Petrichenko systematizes and structurizes the semantic fields of the images of the elements of being as an integral segment of the arch-typical pre-concept, and she also notes the promising directions in the study of the role of pre-conceptual forms of images in literary texts. The researcher clarifies the definition of pre-concept as the following: the pre-conceptual hypostasis of the image is a multisubstrate (conscious-unconscious) unit of semantic memory, internally organized and structured, which combines verbal and non-verbal information bits and which is determined ethnically, historically and individually [23, p. 78]. N. Shesterkina develops the idea that the archetypes of images are ancient, primal, primordial images of mankind; they are pre-concepts of modern structures of knowledge [24, p. 55]. In addition, E. Golovanova indicates the heuristic potential of the term pre-concept and its place in the modern scientific knowledge. The scientist establishes the connection between the ideas of cognitive linguistics and the contemporary development of terminology [11, p. 85].

Thus, attention to the concept as a complex mental phenomenon, the linear extent of which is not limited, the awareness of this phenomenon as a cultural protoconcept, the semantics of which evolves on the axis of diachrony, as well as new approaches to the study of linguistic phenomena, have led to the fact that their ontological nature appeared in a different light.

For the study of the phenomenon of pre-concept in the framework of the modern theory of categorization, which is understood as a mental operation aimed at the formation of categories and selection of prototype “carried out by the cognitive activity of a man” [25, p. 532], the study of the mechanisms of human memory takes on particular significance. The model of the formation of the prototype of central tendency developed by a cognitive psychology is based on the idea about the presence of functional and cognitive spaces of natural language. This model treats the prototype as a kept in the memory abstract image, which is something in between all the pertinent examples.

The prototype separates itself from the cognitive information which is contained in our memory, it is included in the structure of human knowledge and memory, and categorization process occurs within the presence of naive picture of the world in consciousness of a native speaker. The naive picture of the world reflects the material and spiritual experience of the people, therefore, the extra linguistic entities connected not to the language, but the thinking undergoes categorization. The extraction of categories has no logical order, it is beyond logic and inspired by pre-knowledge: “categorization of experience is mostly unconscious and automatic; it operates subject entities and abstractions, both rational and irrational ones” [26, p. 277].

One of the many dichotomies by which the mechanisms of human memory are differentiated, is the opposition between episodic and semantic memory. The distinction between semantic and episodic memory was conceptualized by psychologist Dr. Endel Tulving [27, p. 972], who proved that semantic knowledge is the stock of knowledge, acquired independently of time and place. The concepts episodic memory and semantic memory are operated primarily by experimental psychology, so these terms have more generalized interpretation in the researches of cognitive science. I. Smirnov understands episodic memory as “the information acquired by the individual, being a participant of social actions and a percipient of the physical world” [28, p.

233], and semantic memory is thought of as being “a repository of learned texts, messages, and signaling systems” [28, p. 233].

The ability of semantic memory to actualize experiences that go beyond the “biography of human experience” [29, p. 358], is determined by the existence of hypothetical memory traces – semantic engrams (from Greek “internal record”). Development of methods to study the structure of “traces” of the memory marked the beginning of a deeper understanding of the concept in modern cognitive linguistics. The problems of the engrams and subjective experiences connection attracted Carl Gustav Jung in his day. He believed that an engram is the original image and represents the residue of memory, formed by innumerable, similar processes.

Realizing the importance of the phenomenon of memory as a key instrument of cognition of the concept nature from the point of view of the evolution of its inner form has led to understanding of necessity of studying the concept in diachrony. As a result a pre-conceptual phase in its development began to be analyzed in the context of the present as a consequence of the past.

According to S. Vorkachev, one of the obligatory components of pragmatic semantics of a cultural concept is “cultural” or “cognitive memory of a word”, which has a specific meaning for the linguistic view of the world and which is formed in the process of development of national consciousness and national language [4, p. 66]. We are talking about the semantic characteristics of a linguistic sign associated with the national mentality – “the set of specific cognitive, emotive and behavioral stereotypes of a nation” [4, p. 84-85], with the system of spiritual values of native speakers [9, p. 260]. Cognitive memory of a word is interpreted by the researchers as the “etymological” [30, p. 170], “archetypical” [32, p. 90], “semantic” [28, p. 233; 22, p. 5], “conceptual” [4, p. 123] “historical” [32, p. 107], “hidden” [33, p. 25], “genetic” [23, p. 77].

The results of the study of the mechanisms of human memory, which is realized as a cognitive process that provides recognition, memorization, keeping and restoration of information, is extremely important for understanding the nature of the concept, the potency of which depends on the cultural background of humanity.

### References

1. Слухай Н. В. Когнітологія та концептологія в лінгвістичному висвітленні: навч. посібник. – К.: “Київський університет”. – 2011. – 367 с.
2. Колесов В. В. Философия русского слова. – СПб.: Юна. – 2002. – 444 с.
3. Красавский Н. А. Динамика эмоциональных концептов в немецкой и русской лингвокультурах: автореф. дис. на соиск. научн. ст. док-ра филол. наук. – Волгоград. – 2001. – 40 с.
4. Воркачев С. Г. Концепт счастья в русском языковом сознании: опыт лингвокультурологического анализа. – Краснодар: КГТУ. – 2002а. – 142 с.
5. Карасик В. И. Эволюция и инволюция концептов // *Ethnohermeneutik und kognitive Linguistik*. – Landau: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik. – 2007. – С. 44-51.
6. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е. С. Кубрякова и др. – Москва: Филол. фак. МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова. – 1996. – 245 с.
7. Залевская А. А. Психолингвистический подход к проблеме концепта // *Методологические проблемы когн. лингвистики*. – Воронеж. – 2001. – С. 36-44.
8. Вепрева И. Т. Метаязыковой привкус эпохи // *Русское слово в мировой культуре. Материалы X Конгресса Международной ассоциации преподавателей русского языка и литературы. Концептосфера русского языка: константы и динамика изменений*. – СПб. – 2003. – С. 14-22.
9. Святюк Ю. В. Етнокультурна специфіка вербалізації концепту (на матеріалі сучасної англійської мови) // *Зб. наук. праць НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова*. – К.: Логос. – 2003. – Том XXXVII. – С. 258-264.
10. Іващенко В. Л. Концептуальна репрезентація фрагментів знання в науково-мистецькій картині світу (на матеріалі української мистецтвознавчої термінології). – К.: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго. – 2006. – 328 с.
11. Голованова Е. И. Базовые когнитивные понятия и развитие терминоведения // *Вестник Удмуртского университета*. – 2010. – Вып. 2. – С. 85-91.
12. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. – Oxford University Press. – 2000. – 1540 p.

13. Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: КомКнига. – 2005. – 576 с.
14. Фомина Т. Д. Динамика концепта в политическом дискурсе (на примере выступлений Д. Буша и Т. Блэра, посвященных второй военной кампании в Ираке): дис. ... кандидата филол. наук. – М. – 2006. – 197 с.
15. Каган М. С. Система и структура // Системные исследования. Методологические проблемы: Ежегодник. – М.: Наука. – 1983. – С. 86-106.
16. Морель Морель Д. А. К вопросу о системном характере динамики концептов и средств их лексикализации // Молодые ученые СГА. – М.: Изд-во СГУ. – 2009. – С. 31-37.
17. Богданович Г. Ю. Лингвокультурная ситуация и некоторые методы ее описания // Учебные записки Т.Н.У. им. В. И. Вернадского. – Симферополь. – 2004. – Т. 15 (54). – № 1: филологические науки. – С. 235-245.
18. Волошкина И. А. Когнитивные признаки фразеоконцепта (на материале французского языка) // Современная филология в международном пространстве языка и культуры: Материалы Международной научно-практической интернет-конференции. – Астрахань. – 2011. – С. 21-24.
19. Степанов Ю. С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры. – М.: Академический проект. – 2004. – 992 с.
20. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е. С. Кубрякова, В. З. Демьянков, Ю. Г. Панкрац, Л. Г. Лузина. – Москва: Филол. фак. МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова. – 1996. – 245 с.
21. Rafal Dziurila. Semiotics of Play in View of the Development of Higher Mental Functions: <http://webpages.charter.net/schmolze1/vygotsky/dziurla.html>.
22. Белехова Л. І. Словесний поетичний образ в історико-типологічній перспективі: лінгвокогнітивний аспект (на матеріалі американської поезії): [монографія] / Л. І. Белехова. – Херсон: Айлант, 2002. – 368 с.
23. Петриченко О. А. К проблеме определения понятия «предконцепт» // Новое в когнитивной лингвистике: Материалы международной конференции «Изменяющаяся Россия: новые парадигмы и новые решения в лингвистике». – Кемерово: КемГУ. – 2006. – С. 76-80.
24. Шестеркина Н. В. Теоморфные признаки концепта Himmel как отражение коллективного бессознательного (на материале фразеосочетаний) // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2009. – № 2. – С. 53-63.
25. Rosch E. Cognitive reference points // Cognitive Psychology. – 1975. – V. 7. – P. 532-547.
26. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: [підручник]. – Полтава: Довкілля-К. – 2008. – 712 с.
27. Tulving E. Episodic and semantic memory. – New York: Academic Press. – 1972. – P. 381-402.
28. Смирнов И. П. Смысл как таковой. – СПб.: Академич. Проект. – 2001. – 352 с.
29. Гроф С. За пределами мозга. Рождение, смерть и трансценденция в психотерапии. – М.: Издательство Института Психотерапии. – 2000. – 498.
30. Апресян Ю. Д. Избранные труды. – М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры». – 1995. – Т. 2. – 767 с.
31. Эсалнек А. Я. Архетип // Русская словесность. – М.: «Русская словесность». – 1997. – № 5. – С. 90-93.
32. Добродомов И. Г. Еще раз об исторической памяти в языке // Вопросы языкознания. – 2002. – № 2. – С. 103-108.
33. Николаева Т. М. «Скрытая память» языка: попытка постановки проблемы // ВЯ. – 2002. – № 4. – С. 25-41.