

“CONCEPT” IN RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN LINGUISTICS, OR ABOUT THE IDEOLOGICAL FACTORS OF TERMINOLOGICAL SYNONYMY FORMATION

Hanna **Chernenko**, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine,
hanna.chernenko@gmail.com

Original scientific paper
DOI: 10.31902/fl.45.2023.1
UDC: 811.161.1'42(091)
811.111(73)'42(091)

Abstract: The article explores the formation of *ponyatie* (back translation: *concept* or *notion*) and *kontsept* (back translation: *concept*) terminological synonymy in the Russian and Soviet linguistics, considering also the interference of ideological factors. During the Soviet times the interpretation of *ponyatie* as a term was debatable. On the one hand, dialectic materialism dictated objectivity, abstract nature, and a lack of component that were sensory, image-derived or which involved assessment. On the other hand, the Soviet scholars made attempts to re-interpret the accepted assumptions, though the new conception of *ponyatie* could not gain traction within Marxism-Leninism, which discarded the subjective distinctions of reality in categorization. Post-Soviet linguists then got rid of any aspects that were attributed to the innovative opinions on the essence of *ponyatie*. In order to label the more controversial aspects (subjectivity, sensory, image-derived, axiological components and so on), they have adopted the borrowed term *kontsept*. Scholars started to discuss the relevance or redundancy of *kontsept*, along with differentiation between the lexemes *kontsept* and *ponyatie*. At the same time, the linguistic schools of the English-speaking countries (most notably in the USA) debated the various aspects of concept rather than a difference in terms. The author attributes these distinctions to the Western Humanities lacking the ideological restrictions imposed on the sense of *ponyatie* in the USSR.

Keywords: concept theory, ideology and language, terminological synonymy, Russian linguistics, Soviet linguistics, USA cognitive linguistics.

1. Introduction. Object and Objective.

Based on the distinctions in use of the *ponyatie* (back translation: concept or notion) and *kontsept* (back translation: *concept*) lexemes in Russian, along with *concept* lexeme use in English, the study demonstrates the ideological factors effect on the term formation and functioning, namely on the terminological synonymy as a phenomenon. Due to the action of those factors, a terminological concept may develop in various ethnic and cultural communities in a different manner.

The Russian lexemes of *kontsept* and *ponyatie* are equivalent in their terminological sense to the English lexeme of *concept* (Hvorostin 2007: 30; Kocherhin 2016: 729). They are both used to denote the mental, conceptual units, i.e. conceptual system components representing human experience and knowledge. Moreover, V.Z. Demyankov (2007) points out that *ponyatie* derives from the verb *ponyat'* (to understand) whose etymology is traced to the ancient Slavic word *jęti* (to have, to take (*vzyat'*)) (Fasmer 1987, v II: 326; v. IV: 569). At the same time, *kontsept's* roots go back to the Latin *to take, to capture* (*concipio*). In this regard, the phonological similarity of both terms originates from the parallel development of their etymology.

Before 1990s, the Russian theoretical linguistics restricted itself to the use of *ponyatie* while *kontsept* occurred in the rare studies of individual scholars (Askoldov 1997, Pavilyonis 1983). There was no entry on *kontsept* found in O. Akhmanova's Dictionary of linguistic terms (1966) and the Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary edited by V.N. Jartseva (1990), although Dictionary of Linguistic Terms includes an item on *Ponyatijnyj* (back translation: *conceptual*) (Akhmanova 1966: 328), and the Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary contains one on *Ponyatie* (Jartseva 1990: 383-385).

The 1990s have been marked by a different tendency. We observe an absence of *Ponyatie* item in Ye.S. Kubryakova's edited Dictionary of Cognitive Terms (1997), in T. Matveeva's Comprehensive Dictionary of Linguistic Terms (2010). The trend is observed also in the Ukrainian linguistic school: *poniattia* (back translation: *concept* or *notion*) is absent in The Ukrainian-English Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology (Kolomiets et al. 2013) and A. Martynyuk's Dictionary of Principal Conceptual and Discourse Study Linguistic Terms (2011).

The term of *ponyatie* was thus gradually replaced by *kontsept* at the turn of 21st century with a simultaneous grasp of similarities and disparities existing between them (Krapivkina 2017; Mishlanova 2004; Maslova 2004; Subbotin 2012; Shahovskij 2008, and many others). Even at present, there are studies which accompany the term of *kontsept* by a long explanation of its meaning and distinctions from *ponyatie* (Nagovitsyna 2021). Some scholars consider these terms to be full doublets, though rarely attempt to make this point consistently (Khudyakov 2001). It is worthy of note that most scholars, who do not stand by *the kontsept* term, are avoiding it without making any comment on the subject.

The phenomenon of terminological synonymy is nothing out of the ordinary. It was treated as irreversible by the end of previous century (Sager 1990). Since then, this phenomenon turned into the object of specialized study (Freixa 2006; Reinton 1978; Onysko 2011; Dupuch et al. 2012). The issue of synonymy between *ponyatie* and *kontsept* gets even more contentious, considering the English language backdrop with its single equivalent for both, i.e. *concept*. Differentiation between the two or a confirmed redundancy of either would enable the specification of terminological compendium of the

Russian linguistic studies. It would also prove useful for the translatology. Besides, the findings demonstrate the extent to which the interpretations of seemingly similar terms may vary in different cultures and ideologies (Xiangqing Wei 2018).

2. Hypothesis and Methods of Proof.

According to the author's own hypothesis, dropping the *ponyatie* term was not essential, or based on its conceptual deficiency; rather, it was a symbolic, though rarely conscious, act of renounced ideological associations. *The ponyatie* played a role of an allusive name in the ideologically-marked texts, substantiating the theory of dialectic materialism, associated with the Soviet propaganda.

In order to prove this hypothesis, it is necessary:

1. To detect the differentiating aspects of *kontsept* vs. *ponyatie* using the content and contextual analysis.

2. To analyze the Soviet and post-Soviet Humanities-related studies, where the term of *ponyatie* becomes a focus of specialized study, and to explore whether the differentiating aspects of *kontsept* belong to the *ponyatie*'s intentional. By means of discourse analysis, one may confirm or refute the similarity of referential and significant meanings of *ponyatie* and *kontsept* in the Soviet and Russian academic sources. Their similarity would signal that the terms' differentiation is not due to their conceptual distinctions, but due to a subjective acceptance/rejection of either. The sources in question were texts on *ponyatie* written during the Soviet times, as well as those underpinning the relevant ideology: i.e. the pillars of Marxist-Leninist ideology, supporting the Soviet *ponyatie*-based theory, the works by K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. Lenin. We analyzed the encyclopaediae, manuals, papers and monographs on linguistics, philosophy and logics which delve into the general *ponyatie* theory and its special niche in linguistics. Those findings were partially presented in the author's monograph *Lingual Effect on the Value Systems: Scope of Probability* (Chernenko 2019: 38-42).

3. To compare interpretation of the *ponyatie* term in the Soviet and Russian linguistics with its rethinking in the US cognitive linguistics and highlight in such a way the specificity of their development depending on cultural and ideological context.

4. To draw a parallel between a gradual appropriation of *kontsept* and ousting of *ponyatie*, on one hand, and destruction of the Soviet ideological tenets, on the other hand. The temporal match of both processes and their beginnings may be an indirect confirmation of their association.

3. Results.

3.1. Differentiating Aspects of *Kontsept* and *Ponyatie* in the Russian Linguistic School of 1990-2000s.

The common differentiating aspects of *kontsept* and *ponyatie* referred to by most Russian linguistic studies of 1990-2000s are the following:

- The *ponyatie* reflects only essential aspects of an object, while *kontsept* reflects both essential and minor aspects (Demyankov 2007; Zalevskaya 2001; 2005; Maslova 2004; Teliya 1996; Chernejko 1995, Yusupova 2021 et al.).
- *The kontsept* encompasses the sensory image of the reflected object, with various ideas and associations related to it. *The ponyatie*, by contrast, encompasses mental abstractions (Zalevskaya 2001; Zusman 2003; Karasik, Slyshkin 2001; Kolesov 1995; Popova, Sternin 2007, Krapivkina 2017 et al.).
- *The kontsept* is subjective and culturally-conditioned, while the *ponyatie* reflects the reality objectively, and it is universal (Arutyunova 1993; Vorkachyov 2004; Kasyan 2010; Stepanov 2004: 43, Krapivkina 2017 et al.).
- Unlike *the ponyatie*, *the kontsept* includes an evaluative component (Karasik 1996: 4-6; Moskvina, Alefirenko 2000: 140; Vorkachyov 2004: 41; Karasik, Slyshkin 2001; Krasnyh 2003: 5, 9 et al.).

3.2. *The Ponyatie* Term in the Soviet Linguistic Studies.

It was found that the Soviet academic studies on *the ponyatie* in fact emphasized the essential properties of an object. For instance, the Logical Reference Dictionary by the Soviet Academy of Sciences says that *ponyatie* is “a cumulative complex of ideas, or thoughts, on the aspects of the studied object whose nucleus is made by the ideas on the most general and, at the same time, essential aspects of this object” (Kondakov 1975: 457). S. Krymskij writes that *ponyatie* is “<...> a commonplace name whose sense is made by the idea of the object’s essential aspects” (1980: 85).

The implication that a *ponyatie*, unlike a *kontsept*, does not encompass the products of emotive-sensory perception (images, imaginings, associations) is made clear by the Soviet texts: *ponyatie* “is not a direct sensory association” (Kopnin 1969: 239); *ponyatie* “is relegated to the abstract and generalized idea”, according to G.I. Sadovskij (Sadovskij 1982: 30).

The abstract nature, remoteness of the *ponyatie* from the world’s concrete sensory realities were declared by V. Lenin: “The nature is both concrete and abstract, it is a phenomenon and an essence, it is a moment and relations. The human concepts (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) are subjective in their abstract nature” (Lenin 1969: 190).

While analyzing the dichotomies of “objective, universal/ subjective, national” and “axiologically marked/ axiologically neutral”, we have noted an interesting phenomenon. Within the range of accessible Soviet reference sources that we have reviewed, and the classical works of the Marxism-Leninism

on the *ponyatie*, there are no explicit claims to the concept's universality or absence of axiological marking. The lack of evaluative component and universal nature of *ponyatie* seem to have been treated as an apriori truism, which does not require any verbalization.

The conclusion, drawn from the fact that the theory of dialectic materialism confers the universal, subjective modality-devoid properties on the *ponyatie*, may be extrapolated from the figures of contrast and negation. For instance, the linguists claim that *ponyatie* is a component of lexical meaning which is shared by all native speakers: "... social meaning of a word" (Serebrennikov 1983: 46). The *ponyatie* is contrasted with lexical meaning: "When we relegate the lexical meaning to a concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.), we are automatically identifying the language and cognition, and negating the national and historical specifics of any natural language" (Olshanskij 1983: 52). That is, lexical meanings and language's systemic organization may have national specifics, whereas *ponyatie* may not. The above-mentioned contrast proves that the latter is of a universal value.

Ponyatie interpreted as a cognitive phenomenon was viewed as a derivative of reality. The encyclopedic references referred to it as being an objective form of replicated reality – "a thought reflecting a generalized form of objects and existing phenomena, as well as the relations existing between them" (Gorskij 1989: 494); "... the essence of dialectics, the criterion of truth, a unity of concept and reality" (Lenin 1969: 210). Any reference to the subjective opinion was lambasted: "The logic of the Marxist-Leninist class approach vehemently opposes subjectivism <...> in favor of the objective scientific truth" (Sadovskij 1982: 164).

It seems that in the light of the above-mentioned interpretation of *ponyatie* the dichotomy of *kontsept* / *ponyatie* is quite evidence-based. *Ponyatie* doesn't encompass the features relevant to *kontsept*. However, next to the fragments we have quoted earlier, one also finds references contradicting the dialectic materialism tenets. This alternative interpretation may be observed in the works written by the Marxism-Leninism founding fathers.

To support our claim, we would like to quote a long fragment from an encyclopedia entry on the *ponyatie* written by N. Kondakov, citing F. Engels and opposing the idea that *ponyatie* is made of essential characteristics only:

The concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) is a comprehensive complex of ideas, i.e. thoughts, which implies distinctive aspects of the studied object, its nucleus being made by the judgment on the most general and, at the same time, essential aspects of this object. The concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) is thus not to be limited <...> to a definition, i.e. a short list of object's essential aspects <...>. The definition, according to F. Engels, "turns out inefficient..." <...> What is to define, for instance, the "production forces"? It is to say outright: "Production forces are the means of production and people owning the

production and scientific expertise, working skills". However, this definition is too short. The concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) of production forces includes numerous facts of this object. The definition does not provide information on the fact, for instance, that the key production force is the producers, the workers who are constantly improving their labor means <...> And if the students are not in possession of such knowledge, how can they form a concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) of this essential object of historical materialism? <...> One may claim that our interpretation of the concept (*ponyatie* in original text – H.Ch.) makes this form of cognition equivalent to any knowledge on the studied object. However, first and foremost, we are restricting the complex of aspects to the most essential ones, excluding various secondary aspects, while putting the reflection of essential aspects at the core (Kondakov 1975: 456).

The presented structure of the concept resembles descriptions of the *kontsept's* structure: the author outlines a nuclear area, consisting of essential aspects, and a peripheral one, including all other distinctive aspects. This is why, the question whether the *ponyatie* may include the non-essential aspects, and thus become equal to *kontsept*, is answered positively by some scholars. We shall note that the modern Russian Dictionary of Philosophical Terms (2010) defines the *ponyatie* without any reference to the essential aspects as "a thought, selecting objects from one domain, and generalizing them by mentioning their common and distinctive aspects" (Kuznetsova 2010: 430).

While objecting to the sensory imaging nature of *ponyatie*, P. Kopnin expounds on the relation between the *ponyatie* and imagery conception: "The living being has a confirmed association among the concept (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.), imagery conception and perception. Cognition is often attended by the sensory images" (Kopnin 1969: 239). We are mostly interested here in the reference to "the living being". By declaring the independence of *ponyatie* from sensory influences, the author seems to understand that in reality "the living being" should not have the declared segregation of the abstract from the sensory. A similar claim may be gleaned from some of V. Lenin's tenets, also cited by encyclopedia: "The concept's (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) correlation with 'synthesis', a sum, an amalgamation of empirics, feelings, senses, is shared by the philosophers of all schools" (quoted by Kondakov 1975: 456). N. Kondakov writes that "via concept the human brain makes a dialectic synthesis of the distinct and essential aspects of an object or phenomenon reflected in a thought into a cumulative image" (ibid, 457). The cumulative image is a summarized definition of gestalt, which, according to the post-Soviet scholars, is one of the existing patterns of *kontsept* (Popova, Sternin 2007).

P. Kopnin's study, refuting the equivalence of *ponyatie*, conception, sensory perceptions and associations, despite a claim to their inextricable connection, was published in 1969 (Kopnin 1969). The item by N. Kondakov was published in

the Logical Reference Dictionary by the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1975 (Kondakov 1975).

Then, in the late 1980s, B. Serebrennikov (1988) and O. Snitko (1990) explored the individual and national variants of *ponyatie* while de facto referring to their sensory image-derived nature. They analyzed internal form (semantic motivation) of words, associative complex, created by certain lexemes. Both authors use the term of *ponyatie*, mentioning *kontsept* only in passing (Serebrennikov 1988, 89); (Snitko 1990: 22).

B. Serebrennikov, in his book "The role of human factor in the language: Language picture of the world" of 1988, includes fragments where the *ponyatie* and image are interchangeable: "The 'collation' of concepts (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) (images) may reflect the deeper intended intention of the world picture" (Serebrennikov 1988: 85). In the same book we find the following fragment: "For people, the common concepts are created at the stage of sensory perception of reality" (ibid, 211).

The fact that *ponyatie* is a product of world perception by various subjects – nations and individuals – is inevitably bringing us to the idea of its subjective modality. The latter also includes axiological components. If a certain object of reality gets to be noticed and categorized, it means that this object has a certain value for a human being, satisfies some of his/her needs. We don't pay attention to the unnecessary objects and don't include them into our conceptual system:

"The human brain focuses attention on those objects and their aspects which are practically useful and necessary" (Kopnin 1969: 251). Ye. Iljenkov assumes a direct relation between *ponyatie* and values: "Any concept (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) is interpreted as a projection of subjective wishes, aspirations and urges on the 'chaos' of sensory-derived phenomena" (Iljenkov 1960).

Thus, while exploring *ponyatie*, the Soviet scholars were opting for one of two approaches. The first is dogmatic, postulating that *ponyatie* is a phenomenon reflecting essential aspects of objective reality at the logical and abstract level of reasoning. *Ponyatie* has a universal nature, devoid of any subjective reflection: sensory images and axiological components. Another approach is revisionist, imbuing *ponyatie* with the same aspects that are associated with *kontsept* in modern Russian linguistics. It is worthy of note that contradictions involved in both interpretations may often be found in the works by one and the same author.

One cannot claim that the Soviet scholars abstained from any intellectual pursuits due to censorship, or that their ideas on the concept remained intact during the entire 20th century. However, those pursuits were restricted by the ruling ideological canon. The scholars had to support the interpretation of *ponyatie* as being an abstract, objective replica of reality devoid of any

subjective reflections and modalities. This canon had a theoretical purpose: it preserved the assumed veracity of the Marxist-Leninist classic statements.

3.4. *The Concept Term in the US Cognitive Linguistic Studies*

While the Soviet scholars were toeing the line between dogmas and intellectual pursuits, the US linguists formulated the new theory of concept. We observe the gradual demolishing of classical concept's status of an objective abstraction in E. Rosch's theory of prototypes (Rosch 1978), G. Lakoff's theory of a conceptual metaphor (Lakoff 1987), C. Peacocke's philosophical treatises (Peacocke 1992; 2005), R. Langacker's theory of cognitive grammar (Langacker 2013: 351), and later in the studies specifying or casting doubt over that theory (Armstrong, Gleitman 2020; Fodor, 1998, Watson 2019). The scholarly Humanitarian findings were corroborated by the experiments of G. Edelman, the Nobel Prize winner (Edelman 1992), and presented as a theory of dynamic mental complexes.

The discussions and reflections on the concept's nature are ongoing in the US (Colin McGinn 2017: 328; Margolis, Laurence 2015; Hill 2021) and other countries (Almeida, Gleitman 2017; Löhr 2021). Until now, they have been anchored to the 1980 G. Lakoff's theses and antitheses, differentiating between the new and accepted interpretations of concept. The accepted tradition is traced back to Aristotle's study of categories:

From the time of Aristotle to the later work of Wittgenstein, categories were thought to be well understood and unproblematic. They were assumed to be abstract containers, with things either inside or outside the category (Lakoff 1987: 6).

G. Lakoff suggested that E. Rosch's theory of prototypes is an alternative to the traditional interpretation of concept, where conceptual categories are viewed as a combination of stable essential aspects abstracted from the sensory image:

Prototype theory, as it is evolving, is changing our idea of the most fundamental of human capacities – the capacity to categorize – and with it, our idea of what the human mind and human reason are like. Reason, in the West, has long been assumed to be disembodied and abstract-distinct on the one hand from perception and the body and culture, and on the other hand from the mechanisms of imagination (Lakoff 1987: 7).

At the turn of 20th century, the studies of US cognitive linguists feature the following transformations of the concept's interpretation.

1. It is declared that the concept is capable of encompassing both essential and any other distinctive aspects of an object. Even more, there are scholars who are hesitant as to the stable complex of aspects corresponding to the objective reality:

“If concepts are stable, how can people use them so flexibly? Here we explore a possible answer: maybe this stability is an illusion. Perhaps all concepts, categories, and word meanings (CC&Ms) are constructed ad hoc, each time we use them” (Daniel Casasanto and Gary Lupyan 2015); “There are many structural properties of Conceptual Semantics that make little sense as properties of Reality, but a great deal of sense as properties of mind” (Jackendoff 1989: 77).

2. It is accepted that the concept is subjective, and prone to the individual and national variation:

“...one and the same concept may be differently represented, and have different computational or associative procedures, operating on its mental representations, in different individual thinkers” (Peacocke 2005: 168); “... even if two people have a CAT-concept with the same general type of structure (e.g., prototype structure), the concepts might still be rather different” (Margolis, Laurence 2011).

N. Shea considers a concept’s correspondence to a certain group of subjective assumptions (Shea 2020). Furthermore, the recent studies by cognitive linguists attest to the existence of concepts of non-human consciousness, i.e. animals and androids (Shevlin 2021).

3. It is confirmed that the concept has an imaginative and sensory nature: “Dynamicity bears on the fundamental issue of whether conceptual structure is basically propositional in nature or whether it has an imagistic character. <...> Cognitive linguists incline more to imagistic accounts” (Langacker 2013, 32); “By coupling the outputs of multiple maps that are reentrantly connected to the sensorimotor behavior of the animal” (Edelman 1992: 32); “Thought is also imaginative in a less obvious way: every time we categorize something in a way that does not mirror nature, we are using general human imaginative capacities” (Lakoff 1987: XIV); “Overall, results support multiple representation views indicating that sensorimotor, inner, linguistic, and social experience have different weights in characterizing different kinds of abstract concepts” (Villani et al. 2019).

Thus, S. Villani et al. are affirming the presence of sensorimotor component in the concept’s structure.

4. It is granted that the concept has modal, axiological dimensions: “They are <..> at the same time, value and perception” (Malrieu 1999: 58); “The existence of directly meaningful concepts-basic-level concepts and image schemas-provides certain fixed points in the objective evaluation of situations” (Lakoff 1987: 32).

It is worthy of note that these discussions did not bury the classical idea of concept. For instance, the Glossary of terms compiled by Bruni de Besse et al. in the Terminology journal suggests that the concept should be interpreted as a complex of essential aspects only:

Concepts are formed on chosen and limited characteristics only. In general denotation “blue” covers a fairly wide range of hues, the limits of which are set by convention but which are flexible enough to allow interpretation. As a concept, “blue” is more restricted, and its limits are set by the domain in which it is defined. Ex.: The concept of “blue” in a colour chart is limited by the contiguous colours that appear in it; in optics it is limited by the other colours in the spectral band (Besse et al., 124-125).

3.5. The Concept Term Penetrating the Soviet and Russian Linguistic Studies.

The aspects of concept, used by the US linguists to contrast the new and traditional cognitive theories of it, were similar to those aspects outlined by the adepts of non-dogmatic interpretation of the term *ponyatie* in the Russian Humanities field. Before the early 1990s, the theories of *ponyatie* in the USSR and concept in the US took similar steps. The only difference was in the fact that in the US the old and new theories were presenting clearly-crystallized views of concept, while in the USSR the new interpretations of *ponyatie* were inextricably linked with the older ones in the papers by the same authors. The contradiction resolved itself as soon as the Soviet scholars appropriated the new term – *kontsept*.

The *kontsept* lexeme penetrated the Russian linguistic studies via the academic sources translated from English, and mostly written by the above-mentioned US cognitive linguists. For instance, in 1998 the paper by C. Fillmor “Frames and the semantics of understanding” (Fillmor 1988: 53, 59, 66, 75) was published in Volume 23 of “New in Foreign Linguistics” collection of articles (Shperber, Wilson 1988). V. Baranov, while rendering C. Fillmor, uses *kontsept* to denote the mental complex (Ibid, 53):

“concept (*kontsept* – H.Ch.) of ‘field’” (Ibid: 59); “Pre-theoretical understanding of the ‘color’ undoubtedly includes the black and white colors; however, such “uncolored” perceptions are excluded from scientific reflections on this concept (*kontsept* – H.Ch.)” (Ibid, 75).

The *ponyatie* is applied by V. Baranov as an equivalent to the *notion* term: “the notion (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) of truth” (Ibid: 53); “the notion (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) of presupposition” (Ibid: 53); “the notion (*ponyatie* – H.Ch.) of frame” (Ibid: 57).

According to M. Teresa Cabré Castellví, contrasting interpretations of one and the same issue by different cultures promotes the translation’s role of either informing the cultures about this divergent interpretation or transplanting a

piece of another reality into a target academic culture (Cabré Castellví 2012: 195). Does it mean that translations brought the new understanding of *kontsept* into the Soviet, particularly the Russian terminological culture? Yes and no. Yes, because in linguistic terms, it was a new product of cognitive reality. No, because it was already present in the Soviet philosophical and linguophilosophical studies, though unpopular and undeveloped as yet.

In 1991, *the kontsept* made the title: “*Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Kulturnye kontsepty*” [Logical analysis of language: Cultural concepts] (Arutyunova 1991). After that, we observe its swift penetration into the linguistic field of the post-Soviet countries, Russian among others.

As it was mentioned at the beginning of our paper, *the kontsept* started to be used as a label for reality characterization outcomes with a subjective coloring. They are culture-specific, marked by evaluative modality and sensory image-derived components.

4. Conclusion

It is high time to answer the question: how well-grounded is the use of *kontsept* along with *ponyatie*, and whether it is possible for one to oust the other? We consider that the referential and significative meanings of *kontsept* are overlapping entirely with *ponyatie*, interpreted in the entirety of its senses, taking into account few known works of those philosophers and linguists who proposed a different view on categorization. The above-mentioned studies by B. Serebrennikov (1998) and O. Snitko (1990) prove that *ponyatie* had its chance to expand the intentional in the times of the USSR nearing its collapse and the dialectic materialism’s stature being disputed.

However, one should note that the broad understanding of *ponyatie* did not gain any special currency outside the narrow scholarly circle. It contradicted the ideological foundations of dialectic materialism, whose cornerstone was the theory of concept (*ponyatie*), based on the idea of objective categorization of the world and disregard for any subjective variation of opinions. For the broad circle of the Humanitarian scholars of the former USSR, *ponyatie* retains its aspects of abstract replica of objective reality with no alternatives or possible variations. Instead of developing and deepening the meaning of *ponyatie*, the scholars chose at first sight an easier tactic. They have dropped any contentious element of its meaning and introduced *kontsept* in order to label the subject-colored results of world categorization, i.e. the sense perception-derived, axiological and culture-specific aspects.

The terminological system may develop along two main pathways: by creating a new terminological notion and putting the new lexeme into circulation, or by a major transformation of an old lexeme, up to a complete re-interpretation of its meaning (Nersessian 2005). Our findings show that in the late 20th century, with an urgent need for a revision of *ponyatie*’s terminological

sense, the Russian linguistic school has chosen the first pathway. The linguistic schools of the English-speaking countries were, by contrast, disputing the extant term and enriching it with a new accrued sense. This is why we consider the claim that “the terms are developing in different cultures and language communities following divergent ways, depending on the professional, technical, scientific, social, economic, linguistic, cultural and other factors” (Zubkov et al. 2017) to be quite fair. However, one should also add the cognitive and ideological ones to this list.

The above-mentioned changes of the Soviet linguistic terminology coincide with the rebuttal of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the USSR’s disintegration and thus provide an indirect proof of the ideological influence on this process. We consider that the reason may be traced to the close ties which connect the ponyatie term with the dialectic materialism theory. If it weren’t for that, the studies distinguishing ponyatie and kontsept would exclusively delve on the disputed interpretations of ponyatie as it happened to concept term in US science.

Works cited

- Almeida, Roberto G. de Gleitman, Lila R. (ed.). *On Concepts, Modules, and Language: Cognitive Science at Its Core*. Oxford University, 2017.
- Ahmanova, O.S. *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov [A dictionary of linguistic terms]*. Moskva: Sovetskaya entsyklopediya, 1966.
- Armstrong, S.L. Gleitman, L.R. Gleitman, H. “What Some Concepts Might Not Be”. In *Sentence First, Arguments Afterward*, 669-712. Oxford University, 2020.
- Arutyunova, N.D. (red.). *Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Kulturnye kontsepty [The logical analysis of language. Cultural concepts]*. Moskva: Nauka, 1991.
- Arutyunova, N.D. “Vvedenie” [Introduction]. In *Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Mentalnye dejstviya [The logical analysis of language. Mental actions]*, red. Arutyunova N.D., Ryabtseva N.K., 3–6. Moskva: Nauka, 1993.
- Askoldov, S.A. “Koncept i slovo [Concept and word]”. In *Russkaya slovesnost’. Ot teorii slovesnosti k structure slova [Russian literature. From theory of literature to the structure of a word]*, red. Neroznak V.P., Moskva: Academiya, 1997, 267-279.
- Besse, Bruni de, Nkwenti-Azeh, Blaise, and C. Sager, Juan. “Glossary of Terms Used in Terminology”. *Termonology* 4 (1), 1997, 117-156
<<https://benjamins.com/catalog/getpdf?uuid=4ed058d0-b243-4764-9058-d0b24357646f&href=%2Fterm%2Fterm.4.1%2Fterm.4.1.08bes%2Fterm.4.1.08bes.pdf>.
- Cabré Castellví, M. Teresa. “Theories of Terminology”. *Terminology* 9 (2), 2003, 163–199.
- Casasanto, Daniel, and Lupyan, Gary. “All Concepts Are Ad Hoc Concepts”. In *The Conceptual Mind: New Directions in the Study of Concepts*. The MIT Press, 2015, 543-566.
- Chernejko, L.O. “Heshtaltnaya struktura abstraktnogo imeni [Heshtalt structure of an abstract name]”. *Filologicheskie nauki [Philological sciences]*, № 4, 1995, 78–83.

- Chernenko, Hanna A. *Movlennevyi vplyv na tsinnisni systemy: diapason imovirnostei [The impact of language on a value system: range of probabilities]*. Kyiv: Vydav. dim D.Buraho, 2018.
- Demyankov, V.Z. "Termin "kontsept" kak element terminologicheskoy kultury [The term "kontsept" as an element of terminological culture]". In *Yazyk kak materiya smysla [Language as the matter of meaning]*, ed. M.V. Lapon. Moskva: Azbukovnik, 2007, 606-622.
- Dupuch, M., Dupuch, L., Hamon, T., Grabar, N. "Semantic distance and terminology structuring methods for the detection of semantically close terms". In *BioNLP '12 Proceedings of the 2012 Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing, 2012*, 20-28.
- Edelman, Gerald M. *Bright Air, Brilliant Fire: On the Matter of the Mind*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Fasmer, M. *Etimologicheskij slovar russkogo yazyka. [Etymological dictionary of Russian language]*. V. I-IV. Translated from Germ. by O.N.Trubachyov, ed. B. A. Larin, V. 3, Moskva, 1987.
- Fillmore, Ch. "Frejmy i semantika ponimaniya [Frames and the semantics of understanding]". In *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Vyp. 23: Kognitivnye aspekty yazyka [The new trends in cognitive linguistics. Issue 23: Cognitive aspects of language]*, Moskva: Progress, 1988, 52-93.
- Fodor, J.A. *Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1998.
- Freixa, Judit. "Causes of Denominative Variation in Terminology: A Typology Proposal". *Terminology* 12 (1), 2006, 51-77.
- Gorskij D.P. "Ponyatie [Concept]". In *Filosofskij enciklopedicheskij slovar [Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary]*, ed. N.M. Landa. Moskva. Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1989.
- Hill, Christopher. "What Is a Concept?". In *Common Sense Metaphysics*, ed. by Luis R.G. Oliveira and Kevin J. Corcoran, 13-38. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. NY and London, 2021.
- Ilyenkov, E.V. *Dialektika abstraktnogo i konkretnogo v "Kapitale" K. Marksa [Dialectics of the Abstract & the Concrete in Marx's Capital]*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960.
- Jackendoff, R. "What is a Concept, that a Person May Grasp It?". *Mind and Language*, 4 (1-2) 1989, 68-102.
- Karasik, V.I. "Kulturnye dominanty v yazyke [Cultural concepts in language]". In *Yazykovaya lichnost': kulturnye kontsepty*, red. V.I. Karasik, Volgograd; Arhangel'sk: Peremena, 1996, 3-16.
- Karasik, V.I., Slyshkin G.G. "Lingvokulturnyj kontsept kak yedinita issledovaniya [Linguistic and cultural concepts as a unit of investigation]". In *Metodologicheskie problemy kognitivnoj lingvistiki*, red. I.A. Sternin, Voronezh: VGU, 2001, 75-80.
- Kasyan, L.A. "Termin "kontsept" v sovremennoj lingvistike: razlichnye ego tolkovaniya [The term "kontsept in the modern linguistics and its various interpretations]". *Vestnik Yugorskogo gos. universiteta*, 2(17), 2010, 50-53.
- Khvorostin, D. *Anglo-russkij slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov [English-Russian dictionary of linguistic terms]*. Chelyabynsk, 2007.

- https://edu.semgu.kz/ebook/umm/cafd0896-ae81-11e3-b0bc-f6d299da70eeslovar_lingvisticheskikh_terminov.pdf. Accessed 23 Sep. 2021.
- Khudyakov, A.A. "Poniatie i konsept: opyt terminologicheskogo analiza [Poniatie and kontsept: practice of the terminological analysis]". In *Filologiya i kultura: Materialy III mezhdunar. nauch. konf. (16–18 maya 2001)*, Tambov: Izd-vo Tambov. gos. un-ta im. G.R. Derzhavina, 2001, 32–37.
- Kochergin, V.I. *Bolshoj anglo-russkij tolkovyj nauchno-tehnicheskij slovar kompiuternyh informatsionnyh tehnologij i radioelektroniki [The large defining English-Russian scientific and technical dictionary of the computer information technologies]*. Tomsk: Izdatelstvo Tomskogo Universiteta, 2016.
- Kolesov, V.V. "Mentalnaya harakteristika slova v leksikologicheskikh trudah V.V. Vinogradova [The mental characteristic of a word in lexicological papers by V.V. Vinogradov]". *Vestnik MGU. Seriya Filologiya*, 9 (3), 1995, 132.
- Kolomiets, L.V., Palamarchuk O.L., Strelchuk G.P., Shevchenko M.V. *Ukrainsko-angliiskii slovnyk lingvistichnoi terminologii / Ukrainian-English Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology*. Kyiv: Osvita, 2013.
- Kondakov, N.I. *Logicheskij slovar'-spravochnik [Logical Reference Dictionary]*. Moskva: Nauka, 1975.
- Kopnin, P.V. *Filosofskie idei V.I. Lenina i logika [The philosophical ideas of Lenin and logics]*. Moskva: Nauka, 1969.
- Krapivkina, O.A. "Lingvosemioticheskij analiz kontsepta i ponyatiya (na materiale tekstov nauchnogo i nauchno-popularnogo diskursa) [Linguistic and culturological analysis of kontsept and ponyatie in the texts of scientific and popular-science discourse]". *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, №4, 2017, 209-222.
- Krasnyh, V.V. "Kontsept "Ja" v svete lingvokontseptologii [Concept "I" in the light of linguistic conceptology]". *Yazyk. Soznanie. Kommunikatsiya*, №23, 2017, 4-14.
- Krymskij, S.B. "Logiko-gnoseologicheskij analiz universalnyh kategorij [Logic and gnoseological analysis of the universal categories]". In *Logiko-gnoseologicheskie issledovaniya kategorialnoj struktury myshleniya*, ed. M.V. Popovich. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1980, 5-47.
- Kubryakova, E.S. "Ob ustanovkah kognitivnoj nauki i aktualnyh problemah kognitivnoj lingvistiki [About adjustments of cognitive science and active problems of cognitive linguistics]". *Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki*, №1, 2004, 6–17.
- Kubryakova, E.S., Demyankov V.Z., Pankrats L.G., and Luzina G. *Kratkij slovar kognitivnyh terminov [A compendious dictionary of cognitive terms]*, ed. E.S. Kubryakova. Moskva: Filologicheskij fakultet MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova, 1997.
- Kuznetsova, V.G. *Slovar filosofskih terminov [A dictionary of philosophical terms]*. Moskva: Infra, 2010.
- Lakoff, G. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago, 1987.
- Langacker, R.W. *Essentials of Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford University, 2013.
- Lenin, V.I. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij [Complete works]*. V. 29. Moskva: Izdatelstvo politicheskoy literatury, 1969.
- Löhr, Guido. "What Are Abstract Concepts? On Lexical Ambiguity and Concreteness Ratings". *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, №20 (10), 2021, 1-18.

- Malrieu, J. P. *Evaluative semantics. Language, Cognition and Ideology*. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Martynuk A.P. *Slovnýk osnovnykh terminiv kognityvno-diskursyvoi lingvistyky [A dictionary of the basic terms of cognitive and discursive linguistics]*. Kharkiv: KhNU imeni V.N. Karazina, 2011.
- Margolis, Eric, Laurence, Stephen. *The Conceptual Mind: New Directions in the Study of Concepts*. The MIT Press, 2015.
- Maslova, V.A. *Kognitivnafya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics]*. Moskva: Tetra-sistems, 2004.
- Matveeva, T.V. *Polnyj slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov [The complete dictionary of linguistics terms]*. Rostov-na-Donu, 2010.
- McGinn, Colin. *Philosophical Provocations: 55 Short Essays*. The MIT Press, 2017.
- Moskvin, V.M., Alefirenko, N.F. "Spornye problemy semantiki [Controversial issues of semantics]". *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, №6, 2000, 137-140.
- Mishlanova, S.L., Permyakova T.M. *Sovremennaya konseptosfera: napravleniya i perspektivy [The modern conceptual sphere: trends and outlooks]*. In *Stereotipnost i tvorcestvo v tekste: Mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, Perm: PHU, 2004, 351–364.
- Nagovitsyna, N.V. *Smyslovaya napolnennost kontsepta "Patriotizm" i yego yazykovaya objektivatsiya v sovremennoj russkoj rechi*. Dissertatsiya na soisk. uch. st. kandidata filol. nauk [The meaning of the concept "Patriotism" and its linguistic objectivation in the modern Russian language. Thesis for obtaining the Candidate of philological science academic degree]. Natsionalnyj issledovatel'skij Nizhegorodskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. N. Lobachevskogo, 2021.
- Nersessian, Nancy J. "Conceptual Innovation on the Frontiers of Science". In *The Conceptual Mind: New Directions in the Study of Concepts*, ed. E. Margolis & S. Laurence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015, 455-474.
- Olshanskij, I.G. "Vzaimodejstvie semantiki slova i predlozheniya [Interaction of the word and sentence semantics]". *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, №3, 1983, 52-62.
- Onysko, A. "Necessary Loans – Luxury Loans?: Exploring the Pragmatic Dimension of Borrowing". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, Issue 6, 2011, 1550-1567.
- Pavilyonys, R. Y. *Problema smysla: sovremennyy logiko-filosofskij analiz yazyka [The meaning problem: the modern logical and philosophical analysis of a language]*. Moskva: Mysl, 1983.
- Peacocke, Ch. "Rationale and Maxims in the Study of Concepts". *Noûs* 39 (1), 2005, 167–178.
- Peacocke, Ch. *A Study of Concepts*. The MIT, 1992.
- Petrov, Ju. A. *Metodologicheskie voprosy primeneniya i razvitiya nauchnykh ponyatij [Methodological issues of usage and development of scientific concepts]*. Moskva: Znanie, 1980.
- Popova, Z.D., Sternin I.A. *Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics]*. Moskva: AST, 2007.
- Prokhorov, Yu.E. *V poiskakh kontsepta [Looking for a concept]*. M.: Flinta, 2016.
- Reinton, J. E. "The Relationship Between English Loanwords and Their Synonyms in Russian Sport Terminology". *Scando-Slavica* 24, Issue 1, 1978, 217-237.

- Rosch, E. "Principles of Categorization". In *Cognition and Categorization*, 27-48. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978.
- Sadovskij, G.I. *Dialektika mysli. Logika ponyatij kak teoriya otrazheniya sushchnosti razvitiya [Dialectics of a thoughts. Logics as the theory of development essence reflection]*. Minsk: Vys. shkola, 1982.
- Sager, Juan C. *A practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co, 1990.
- Serebrennikov, B.A. *Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v jazyke. Jazykovaya kartina mira [The role of human factor in the language: Language picture of the world]*. Moskva: Nauka, 1988.
- Shakhovskij, V.Y. *Lingvisticheskaya teoriya emotsij [Linguistic theory of emotions]*. Moskva: Gnozis, 2008.
- Shea, Nicholas. "Concept-Metacognition". *Mind & Language* 35 (5), 2020, 565-582.
- Shevlin, Henry. "Non-human Consciousness and the Specificity Problem: A Modest Theoretical Proposa". *Mind & Language* 36 (2), 2021, 297-314.
- Shperber, D., Wilson D. (ed.). *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Vyp. 23. Kognitivnye aspekty yazyka [The new trends in cognitive linguistics. Issue 23: Cognitive aspects of language]*. Moskva: Progress, 1988.
- Snitko, Ye. S. *Vnutrennyaya forma nominativnykh yedinit [The inner form of nominative entities]*. Lvov: Svit, 1990.
- Stepanov, Yu. S. *Konsept. Konstanty: slovar russkoj kultury [A concept. Constants: the dictionary of Russian culture]*. Moskva: Akademicheskij proekt, 2004.
- Subbotin, A.Y. "Kognitsiya i konsept: struktura, funktsii i rol v kulture [Cognition and concept: structure, functions and the role in culture]". In *Kognitivnye issledovaniya na sovremennom etape. KISE-2012: materialy Tretej Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii (29-30 marta 2012 g.)*, Rostov n/D: Izdatelstvo SKNTs VSh YuFU, 2012, 351-364.
- Telija, V.N. *Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij i lingvokulturologicheskij aspekty [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects]*. Moskva: Yazyki russkoj kultury, 1996.
- Villani, C., Lugli, L., Liuzza, M., & Borghil, A. "Varieties of Abstract Concepts and Their Multiple Dimensions". *Language and Cognition* 11(3), 2019, 403-430.
- Vorkachyov, S.G. Shchastje kak lingvokulturnyj koncept [Happiness as a linguocultural concept]. Moskva: Gnozis, 2004.
- Watson, R. "Language as Category: Using Prototype Theory to Create Reference Points for the Study of Multilingual Data". *Language and Cognition* 11(1), 2019, 125-164.
- Xiangqing, Wei. "Conceptualization and Theorization of Terminology Translation in Humanities and Social Sciences. Some reflections on NUTermBank Development". *Terminology* 24 (2), 2018, 262-288.
- Yartseva, V. (ed.). *Lingvisticheskij entsiklopedicheskij slovar [Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary]*. Moskva" Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1990.
- Yusupova, L.H. "Soderzhatelnoe yadro mnogoznachnogo slova i konsept [Content core of a polysemantic word and concept]". In *Aktualnye voprosy lingvistiki, mezhkulturnoj kommunikatsii i metodiki prepodavaniya inostrannykh yazykov v vuze. Materialy IV Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii*, ed. L.H.

- Yusupova, Yu.M. Myasnikova, Ekaterinburg: Uralskij gosudarstvennyj gornyj universitet (Ekaterinburg), 2021, 254-259.
- Zalevskaya, A.A. "Kontsept kak dostoyanie individa [Concept as the property of an individual]". In *Psiholingvisticheskie issledovaniya: Slovo, tekst. Izbran. trydy*, Moskva: Gnozis, 2005, 234-244.
- Zalevskaya, A.A. "Psiholingvisticheskiy podhod k probleme koncepta [Psycholinguistic approach to the problem of a concept]". In *Metodologicheskie problemy kognitivnoj lingvistiki*, ed. I.A. Sternin, 36-45. Voronezh: Izdatelstvo VGU, 2001.
- Zubkov, M., Mikulchik, R., and Misak R. "Rozroblannia novoi redaktsii DSTU ISO 860 "Terminologichna robota. Garmonizuvannia poniat' i terminiv" [Elaborating the new edition of the National Ukrainian Standard ISO 860 "Terminological work. Harmonization of concepts and terms"]". *Terminolohiia* 869, 2017, 50 – 53.
- Zusman, V. "Kontsept v sisteme gumanitarnogo znaniya [Concept in the system of humanitarian knowledge]". *Voprosy literatury* 2, 2003, 3-29.

КОНЦЕПТ В РОСІЙСЬКІЙ ТА АМЕРИКАНСЬКІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ: АБО ПРО ІДЕОЛОГІЧНІ ФАКТОРИ ФОРМУВАННЯ ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЧНОЇ СИНОНІМІЇ

У статті розглядається формування термінологічної синонімії між лексемами *поняття* та *концепт* в радянському та російському мовознавстві, а також вплив на цей процес ідеологічних чинників.

У радянські часи тлумачення терміна *поняття* було дискусійним. Діалектичний матеріалізм зобов'язував розглядати його як об'єктивну, абстрактну сутність, позбавлену чуттєвого, образного та оцінного компонентів. З іншого боку, радянські вчені робили спроби переосмислити усталені положення, проте нові погляди на теорію поняття не могли закріпитися в ідеології марксизму-ленінізму, яка заперечує суб'єктивні особливості категоризації дійсності. Пострадянські лінгвісти позбулися всіх дискусійних, новаторських аспектів в інтерпретації поняття. Для позначення суперечливих характеристик (суб'єктивність, наявність сенсорного, образного, ціннісного компонентів тощо) стали використовувати запозичений термін *концепт*. Вчені почали обговорювати потрібність чи надмірність цього терміна, а також критерії розмежування лексем *концепт* та *поняття*. У той самий час лінгвістичні школи англомовних країн (насамперед США) продовжували дискутувати про різні аспекти теорії поняття (*concept*), а не про різницю в термінах. Ці відмінності автор пояснює тим, що у західній гуманітарній школі були відсутні ідеологічні обмеження, що накладалися на зміст терміна *поняття* в СРСР.

Keywords: теорія поняття, ідеологія та мова, термінологічна синонімія, російське мовознавство, радянське мовознавство, когнітивна лінгвістика США.

"КОНЦЕПТ" В РУССКОЙ И АМЕРИКАНСКОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ, ИЛИ ОБ ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ФАКТОРАХ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ СИНОНИМИИ

В статье рассматривается формирование терминологической синонимии между лексемами *понятие* и *концепт* в советском и русском языкознании, а также влияние на этот процесс идеологических факторов.

В советское время толкование термина *понятие* было дискуссионным. Диалектический материализм предписывал рассматривать его как объективную, абстрактную сущность, лишенную чувственного, образного и оценочного компонентов. С другой стороны, советские ученые предпринимали попытки переосмыслить установленные положения, однако новые взгляды на теорию понятия не могли закрепиться в идеологии марксизма-ленинизма, отрицающей субъективные особенности категоризации действительности. Постсоветские лингвисты избавились от всех дискуссионных, новаторских аспектов в интерпретации понятия. Для обозначения спорных характеристик (субъективность, наличие сенсорного, образного, ценностного компонентов и т. д.) стали использовать заимствованный термин *концепт*. Ученые начали обсуждать необходимость или избыточность этого термина, а также критерии разграничения лексем *концепт* и *понятие*. В то же время лингвистические школы англоязычных стран (прежде всего США) продолжали дискутировать о различных аспектах теории понятия (*concept*), а не о разнице в терминах. Эти различия автор объясняет тем, что в западной гуманитарной школе отсутствовали идеологические ограничения, накладываемые на смысл термина *понятие* в СССР.

Ключевые слова: теория понятия, идеология и язык, терминологическая синонимия, русское языкознание, советское языкознание, когнитивная лингвистика США