
ФИЛОЛОГИЯНЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ФИЛОЛОГИИ ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF PHILOLOGY

UDC 81'1

A.Zh. Bakhralinova

*Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute
(E-mail: 87013271319@mail.ru)*

To the question about the dialogue of cultures

In this article interaction of two language cultures in one communicative space is considered that provides functioning of the bilingualism as a necessary condition of mutual understanding and overcoming of a language barrier. The bilingualism is studied from the point of view of functional approach which cornerstone idea of knowledge of two languages. Spatial representations in the Kazakh culture from the point of view of philosophy where the space and time act as spiritual entities are investigated. Ideas of space and time have substantial definiteness for the Kazakh people, which have made a daily way of life of the nomad, his life and communication with the nature. It is noted that the space sets key parameters of an image of the world of the Kazakh culture.

Key words: bilingualism, language situation, spatial representations, language picture of the world.

Characteristic feature of development of modern linguistics is «studying of the speech or anthropological approach of language units studying» [1; 149]. It is connected with approval of an anthropocentric paradigm of scientific knowledge, i.e. with «a turn of a linguistic perspective towards the person and his place in culture» where laws of language development are considered in close interrelation of the person with his thinking, consciousness and a worldview [2; 5].

The person learns the world through understanding of himself, the creative and subject activities, it leads to the fact that researchers consider language in cultural and historical content. So, C.Levi-Stross considers language as a culture product as its important component as an existence condition, a factor of forming of cultural codes.

E.Kassirer, developing the gumboldtian concept of language as properties of the person and ethnos, pays attention to studying of the semantic party of language in its indissoluble communication with culture of certain people which is understood as a product of the activities of the person mediated by speech symbolic [3; 167].

Thus, anthropocentrism at the present stage of evolution of linguistics sets prospect and ultimate goals of research taking into account «a human factor», determining the person in language. As B.K.Momynova fairly notes, «the principle of anthropocentrism requires studying of language not in itself and not for itself, and for deeper understanding and an explanation of the person speaking» [4; 24–26].

Social life of the person assumes his relations with the nature, a sociocultural environment and by itself. A natural condition of human existence is interaction with world around which acts as a transmission medium of culture forms and public experience, provides interethnic and cross-cultural communication, consolidates and integrates society as all activity of the person represents communication process.

Analyzing mutual understanding problems (or misunderstandings), the researcher N.V.Dmitryuk notes that in the course of communication there is not only a knowledge of different national cultures, but also national consciousnesses [5; 43, 44].

According to Z.K.Sabitova, dynamism, interference, continuous collision of different manifestations of a civilization inevitably leads to mutual enrichment of cultures. Any ethnos exists only in dialogue with other ethnoses. Being unique, original, independent, each ethnos as part of the biosphere of Earth constantly inter-

acts with other people as in general ethnoses represent the person of Earth. This «hopelessness» on dialogue with another causes interaction of the people: as the special, separate organism, each people defines activity and existence of the whole organism [6; 386].

At acquaintance to other language we appear in the world of other culture, having mastered foreign language, we receive the tool for knowledge acquisition, stored in foreign culture [7; 609–615], we enter the circle outlined by language around other people — it's carrier.

The aspiration to understand other culture, behavior of her representatives, to understand the reasons of cultural distinctions and coincidence has led researchers to studying of various mechanisms of development of other cultures. So, one of such mechanisms is offered by E.F.Tarasov, who offers two ways of development of «foreign» culture. The first way is that at first the individual in the culture looks for an equivalent image and knowledge which enters the maintenance of this image, and then transfers them regarding the culture. As an example of comprehension of foreign culture the explanation from Moscow guide for Germans and British is given: «The Moscow Kremlin for Russians the same that Big Ben for British». It is noted that at such acquaintance to foreign culture at the subject new knowledge isn't developed, and there is a manipulation old knowledge in an informative situation.

The second way of knowledge the stranger of culture assumes search of distinctions in the compared images the stranger and the cultures, at the same time the image of the culture doesn't cover or replaces an image of foreign culture, on the contrary, he induces to development of new knowledge which enriches the person, his consciousness at acquaintance to foreign culture [8; 18–28].

In the development mechanism the stranger of culture occurs dialogue of cultures at which bicultural of bilinguals, owning images of consciousness of personal and others' culture, reflexes, comprehends and interprets others image [8; 9].

Dialogue of cultures consists in an exchange of cultural objects and activity. At the same time new foreign culture activity is learned on the basis of images of objects, activity culture as «other way how to understand new through old (familiar) doesn't exist» [8].

Thus, in consciousness of the individual there is an appearance acquisition of others images language signs which are used by communicants for creation of statements. It is necessary for achievement of adequate mutual understanding that communicants possessed a community of linguistic (grammatical) knowledge and skills of speech behavior, and also and are formed by a community of knowledge of the world which is acquired in the course of long and labor-consuming adaptation in the conditions of accommodation in the foreign culture environment as images of national consciousnesses.

To master culture of other (foreign) linguaethnical community through assimilation (assignment) of images of his consciousness, their appearance acquisition, which will be available to the detached onlooker are necessary.

These appearance acquisition, according to E.F.Tarasov, act as an intersubjective form of existence of images which can be presented in the form of objects, actions and words. Appearance acquisitions are necessary for «transfer» of images of consciousness from one generation to another or at development of other culture.

A.I.Arnoldov as the development mechanism the stranger of culture offers «a mutual reflection» which is that in the course of communication change of culture in consciousness of the personality happens due to comprehension of other national culture that leads to their mutual enrichment. At the same time the cultural self-knowledge occurs only with the participation of other cultures that results it in boundary character [9; 139].

Thus, the offered mechanisms of development of foreign culture mean initial dialogue of cultures.

It is known that in the territory of Kazakhstan there is bilingualism thanks to what there is an interaction of two language cultures in one communicative space. The language situation in the Republic of Kazakhstan is nontrivial that is connected with sovereignization and changes in society. In Kazakhstan a large number genetically and typologically diverse languages since in the territory of the republic representatives more than 130 nations and nationalities live functions.

The language situation of Kazakhstan historically developed due to functioning of the Kazakh-Russian, national-Kazakh, national-Russian bilingualism, Russian-Kazakh-national a three languages and dominating a Russian language [10; 55]. It is important to note that Kazakhstan, having huge territories, covers a various geographical landscape which in many respects causes specifics of mentality of its inhabitants. Therefore in different regions (areas) also the unequal language situation was created. It is connected, first of all, with character of bilingualism: Russian-Kazakh and/or Kazakh-Russian. It, in turn, defines also prevalence in this or that region Kazakh-national and national-Kazakh (for example, Kazakh-Uigur or Uigur-Kazakh) or na-

tional-Russian and Russian-national (similarly, Russian-Uigur or Uigur-Russian) bilingualism. As for a language situation in the Pavlodar region, it is possible to state prevalence of the Russian-Kazakh and Kazakh-Russian bilingualism.

The social and communicative system of multiethnic society represents a difficult texture of different languages and their subsystems. In these conditions the bilingualism as necessary means of mutual understanding, overcoming of a linguistic barrier is inevitable.

Legal status of languages is enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the law «About Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan» in which it is told that on equal terms with the Kazakh (state) language Russian in the state organizations and local government bodies is officially used. In a state program of functioning and development of languages for 2011–2020 the most important issue is the language situation. The national unity is provided at the expense of the state status of Kazakh and preserving level of proficiency in Russian as competitive advantage of Kazakhstan citizens in communicative and language space (The presidential decree of the Republic of Kazakhstan of June 29, 2011 to No. 110 «About the State program of development and functioning of languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011–2020»). According to E.D.Suleymenova, Russian «promotes revival of national culture and spirituality, being powerful communicative tool» [11; 90].

The indisputable and essential characteristic of a language situation of Kazakhstan is the bilingualism which functioning was promoted by the following factors:

- transition of Kazakhs to settled life [12];
- multinational structure of the population living in the northern areas of Kazakhstan;
- proximity of borders with Russia [13];
- territorial contact of one people with another or joint moving of the different people in one territory;
- the demographic factor influencing moving and resettlement of the people.

Thus, the multinational structure of the population living in the Pavlodar region as the northern region of Kazakhstan, territorial contact of one people with another and proximity of borders with Russia were reflected in a language situation in the region that has led to functioning of the Kazakh-Russian and Russian-Kazakh bilingualism as component of a language situation in the territory of the Pavlodar region.

E.M.Verechshagin understands as a bilingualism alternate use of two languages [14; 19].

A.E.Karlinsky in researches on a bilingualism pays attention to features of culture in case of ownership of two languages and understands as a bilingualism «alternate use of two languages by the same individual or group of the individuals for the purpose of communication belonging to ethnic communities and differing not only languages, but also nature, and features of the culture» [15; 22].

In this research the bilingualism is considered from the point of view of functional approach which cornerstone idea of ownership of two languages (U.Vaynraykh, E.M.Verechshagin, A.E.Karlinsky, M.M.Kopylenko, R.K.Minyar-Beloruhev, E.D.Suleymenova, B.H.Chasanoff) is. That is the bilingualism is considered as a capability of the person to use two language systems for communication.

From a position of functional approach the bilingualism is understood as possession of two language systems in communication, at the same time individuals can belong to different nationalities, however mutual communication provides interaction of two linguacultures.

It is noted that situations of bilingualism are mobile, they change therefore in their qualification it is necessary to consider the geographical environment, education level, the social environment. A component of any kind of bilingualism is public language which realization depends on extent of possession of him. The term «public language» is understood as ethnic language of any people in total of all variable forms or functional a level [16; 301].

Any public language is considered as the very system formed of set of variable discrete forms. Language proficiency means ability to make and understand (to perceive) texts in this language, i.e. ability to a variation of language means.

In language — very system not primordial speech, i.e. the speech of native speakers for which it isn't native (primary) functions. As the reason of not primordial speech the bilingualism — the ability, skill allowing the person serves the people in general or his parts alternately to use (in writing or orally) two different languages depending on a situation and to try to obtain mutual understanding in the course of communication [16; 299–313].

Viability of language is defined by the width of its application, i.e. volume of the carried-out functions, geographical distribution, number of the people speaking on him. So, for considerable part of the Kazakh population the bilingualism remains and presently. Feature of a bilingualism of Kazakhs is that the second

component of a situation of bilingualism is functionally powerful Russian. As Russian is widely used in communicative space of Kazakhstan, bilinguals often it appears in situations not of just multilingual communication, but interaction of cultures.

As researchers note, the language situation in modern Kazakhstan is direct reflection of political, ethnic, demographic, social and economic changes in society. Revival of national culture and spirituality is followed by strengthening of vitality of the state Kazakh, and also maintenance of vitality of Russian which is recognized as official language in Kazakhstan. The Kazakh and Russian languages jointly function within single communicative space [11; 90].

The coexistence of the Kazakh and Russian languages in single communicative space provides functioning of a bilingualism as necessary condition of mutual understanding which cornerstone cultural and language interaction is. Acquisition of the second language conducts to judgment of other language picture of the world that is directly reflected in understanding and interpretation of a foreign-language linguaculturema. Thereof there is a crossing of two pictures of the world in consciousness of the bilingual personality that the lexicodes allows Russian-speaking respondents to comprehend the Kazakh linguaculturema both in Russian, and on Kazakh.

As an example we will consider spatial representations in the Kazakh and Russian language pictures of the world.

It is known that ideas of space belong to the major categories characterizing consciousness of the person. The space sets reference points of perception of world around, creates key parameters of «an image of the world» of a certain culture. With respect thereto studying of spatial characteristics of the Kazakh culture allows to isolate ethnocultural features, to understand mentality of the people.

Statement is axiomatic that the space of the person is determined by his habitat and a geographical landscape. The ethnic space assumes belonging of the person to a certain ethnos and a geographical landscape. So, for example, in the Russian language picture of the world the space is correlated with representations *a scope, breadth, the field, expanse, the house*.

According to G.Gachev, the Russian image of space represents the horizontal movement, the unidirectional infinity [17; 56]. The space in the Russian language picture of the world is associated with concept the world in value of the Universe, system of the universe. The world is perceived as «the rendered habitable space» [18; 87]. According to Yu.S.Stepanov, the space where there lives a person, represents the fenced-off space «from the outside world and only then — idea of it «the wide world» outside our world and the house» [18; 92]. A number of expressions like *to see the world, to show yourself* are connected with this, i.e. to look at the ultraboundary space which is «rendered habitable», to visit that place «on the earth, around us» which isn't experienced by your ethnos yet, i.e. «others» [18; 88].

In the Kazakh people as the nomadic nation the aspiration to comprehension of space is put. It is shown that the person in process of development of «its» space has a need of knowledge of new space, «others», absolutely novel for a certain ethnos.

In a national picture of the world there is a certain set of concepts which is defining concepts with spatial characteristics and precisely reflecting attitude and outlook of the people. The perception of space, according to G.D.Gachev, directly depends on national cultures. In Russian there are cognate words *the country, the side*; in French of *espace* has a Latin origin from *spatium* — the space created and measured by pacing» [17; 38].

As it has been already noted, the space is correlated to landscape characteristics therefore it is defined as *breadth, the steppe*. The Kazakh people carried all world around located under the sky, for example to space: *шөл* 'desert', *алқан* 'valley', *шөл дала* 'the desert street', *дала* 'steppe', *шөлейт* 'semi-desert', *аланқай* 'clearing' [19; 115].

In the Kazakh language picture of the world the space completely merges with the nature therefore the person, learning world around, expands an image of space. Sources of perception of space originate when the nomad and the nature made a single whole.

The maintenance of a concept «space» is important when forming a national picture of the world which base is the spatial model of a universum. It is embodied in myths, reflected in religious representations, is reproduced in cultural customs and ceremonies.

So, spatial representations of the Kazakh and Russian people are determined by a geographical landscape, habitat. In the Kazakh language picture of the world the space is determined by concepts *breadth, the steppe*, in the Russian language picture of the world the space corresponds to *open spaces, the field*. At the nomadic people the space has no borders, it is infinite therefore carry everything that is under the sky to it,

there is a merge of space to the nature therefore nomads develop «its» and «others» world. General is that in the Russian and Kazakh pictures of the world the space is associated with concept *the world as the Universe*.

Spatial characteristics were peculiar fixed in system of Kazakh where these categories are realized in the form of concepts. Ideas of Kazakhs of boundless space are reflected in language system by means of phrases, phraseological units, tropes which transfer the following values:

1) remoteness from the person, for example: *қол созым жерде* 'at the level of the given hand', *таяқ тастам жерде* 'at the level of the thrown stick', *бір қадам* 'in one step', *иек астында* 'under a chin', *қарға аттам жер* 'in a step of a crow';

2) uncertainty of a spatial arrangement, for example: *адам аяғы баспаған жер* 'the leg of the person did not go', *жердің түбі* 'end of the earth', *ит арқасы қиянда* 'where harness dogs', *алты қабат аспанның ар жағы* 'behind six layers of the sky';

3) uncertain spatiality in relation to inexact range or inexact proximity, for example: *көз көрмес, құлақ естімес жер* 'the eyes which were not seeing the ears which were not hearing the earth', *ит өлген жер* 'where dogs die' [20; 45].

Spatial representations in Kazakh are expressed by means of phrases and phraseological units with values of «remoteness from the person», «uncertainty to a spatial arrangement», «uncertain spatiality in relation to inexact range or inexact proximity», the bodies relating to parts (*hands, eyes, legs, a chin*).

According to R.B.Imanaliyeva, in all language pictures of the world of people expresses spatial representations in the lexemes calling parts of a body, thereby there is a hominifying of «universal space» [20; 47].

From this it follows that in the Kazakh language system spatial representations are presented in the phrases, tropes and phraseological units relating to parts of a body of the person with values of distance and remoteness.

Specifics of a concept *space* are shown in the communicative reactions of ethnos which are coming to light at invasion of the stranger on someone's territory that allows to see communicative and behavioral norms of the Kazakh people. Especially it should be noted that respect for the stranger — to the guest is characteristic of the Kazakh mentality. Kazakhs made long trips on boundless steppes therefore have been forced to remain for lodging for the night in the next yurtas. In that case the best place *төр* 'place' has been allocated to the guest, the rich table was laid, for him there was the best food and the lodging for the night was provided, before departure he was presented with gifts. In Kazakh there is such expression of *қазақ қонақсыз отыра алмайды* 'the Kazakh can't live without guests' [20; 53].

Thus, communicative and behavioral norms of ethnos as means of conceptualization of spatial characteristics represent mentality of the nation. Spatial representations in the Kazakh culture are connected with fundamental categories of philosophy — space and time which are considered as spiritual entities. According to the Tengrist dogmas developed as the theoretical version by the Soviet historian L.N.Gumilev, time and space fitted into vertical structure of archetypic, without having at the same time horizontal limitation [21].

The idea of uniform space time has found the reflection in consciousness of the nomad. So, according to L.N.Gumilev, «time is often measured by space and, on the contrary, the space is measured by time» [21]. Ideas of space and time have substantial definiteness for the Kazakh people which have made a daily way of life of the nomad, his life, and communication with the nature.

In traditional Kazakh culture the space represents the leading element in which the person «isn't mobile» in the movement. The immovability is shown that the Kazakh is always the traveler rider who, moving on steppes, doesn't line a route. «The eternal and infinite way movement on a spiral circle — is a basis of ideas of nomads of the World, his time and space, evolution and the place in logically ordered circulation» [21; 23, 24]. Other spatial horizontal which isn't measured in nomadic type of a cultural existential continuum is characteristic of representatives of settled culture.

The layer-by-layer partitioning of the world which is carrying out down since the horizontal space isn't staticized as rather significant is characteristic of the nomadic people.

A.B.Naurzabayeva pays attention to existence of the vertical and horizontal line in nomadical culture. In her opinion, the vertical model of the world is defined by existential perception, but it is remote and doesn't bear special value, the horizontal model of the world is open with dynamic character as it is constantly filled with new contents. These phenomena help to characterize mentality of the Kazakh ethnos where a significant figure in the vertical line of the universe is the person learning the world [22].

The traditional way of life of the person, the nature of economic activity connected with landscape type define spatial impressions, i.e. how there is a perception of surrounding space.

Such spatial impressions at repeated repetition form so-called spatial representations. For the first time this definition is used by A.Hildebrand, arguing on a form in art: «... and in particular representation of a form as limited space we have to consider spatial representation as the essential maintenance or essential reality of things» [23; 38].

Thus, is peculiar to consciousness of nomads the idea of a uniform existential continuum activity of the Kazakh people is reflected in ideas of which. In the Kazakh culture the existential relations are presented by crossing of vertical and horizontal axes. The vertical model is remote, in her center there is a person whereas the horizontal model of the world is open, has dynamic character and is constantly filled with new material contents. The spatial model is important when forming a national picture of the world which has been filled with special semantic contents. At the same time continuous movement in space both on horizontal, and on a vertical axis is connected with satisfaction requirements of the nomadic people.

Nomads needed huge space for movement as they needed the figurative dwelling, vehicles, housekeeping therefore the steppe was the convenient territory.

Thus, having analyzed spatial representations in the Kazakh culture, we have come to the following conclusions:

- 1) the space sets key parameters of an image of the world of the Kazakh culture;
- 2) the space in the Kazakh language picture of the world is defined by concepts *breadth, the steppe*;
- 3) the nomination of geographical concepts is carried out by means of the phrases, tropes and phraseological units relating to parts of a body of the person;
- 4) the spatial model of the Kazakh ethnos is filled with special semantic contents;
- 5) in the Kazakh language picture of the world the space merges with the nature;
- 6) movement in space was carried out both across, and down that is predetermined by initially nomadic way of life.

It should be noted that spatial representations have no constant character, it is dictated by time as they can change, gradually be grinded, be fixed and be systematized in language pictures of the world.

References

- 1 Кужбрюкова Е.С. Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX века (опыт парадигмального анализа) // Язык и наука конца XX века / Под ред. Ю.С.Степанова. — М.: Рос. гос. ун-т, 1995. — С. 149–238.
- 2 Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. — М.: Академия, 2001. — С. 64.
- 3 Кассирер Э. Философия символических форм. — Т. 2. Мифологическое мышление. — М.; СПб.: Университетская кн., 2001. — 280 с. — С. 167.
- 4 Момынова Б.К. Невербальные элементы коммуникации казахского языка // Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: Материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф. / Отв. ред. О.А.Александрова, О.С.Макарова. — Великий Новгород: НовГУ, 2009. — С. 24–26.
- 5 Дмитриук Н.В. Языковое сознание в негомогенной лингвокультурной среде: попытка теоретического обоснования. — Шымкент; М.: ИЯ РАН, 2000. — 136 с.
- 6 Сабитова З.К. Лингвокультурология: учебник. — М.: ФЛИНТА; Наука, 2013. — С. 521.
- 7 Уфимцева Н.В. Психоллингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация // Мир русского слова и русское слово в мире: материалы IX Конгресса МАПРЯЛ. — Т. 4. Язык, сознание, личность. — София: Heron press, 2007. — С. 609–615.
- 8 Тарасов Е.Ф. Межкультурное общение — новая онтология анализа языкового сознания // Этнокультурная специфика языкового сознания: сб. ст. / Отв. ред. Н.В.Уфимцева. — М.: Изд-во ИЯ РАН, 2000. — С. 18–28.
- 9 Арнольдов А.И. Человек и мир культуры: Введение в культурологию. — М.: Изд-во МГИК, 1992. — 240 с.
- 10 Бейсембаев А.Р. Парадигмы современного языкознания: учеб. пособие. — Павлодар: РИО ПГПИ, 2007. — 118 с.
- 11 Сулейменова Э.Д. Языковая ситуация и языковое планирование в Казахстане. — Алматы: Қазақ ун-ті, 2005. — 344 с.
- 12 Карлинский А.Е. Избранные труды по теории языка и лингводидактике. — Алматы, 2007. — 308 с.
- 13 Хасанов Б.Х. Казахско-русское двуязычие (социально-лингвистический аспект). — Алма-Ата: Наука, 1987. — 198 с.
- 14 Верецагин Е.М. Психологическая и методическая характеристика двуязычия (билингвизма). — М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1969. — 160 с.
- 15 Карлинский А.Е. Основы теории взаимодействия языков. — Алма-Ата: Гылым, 1990. — 181 с.
- 16 Туманян Э.Г. О методе изучения языка как социолингвистической архисистемы // Методы социолингвистических исследований. — М., 1995. — С. 299–313.
- 17 Гачев Г.Д. Национальные образы мира: курс лекций. — М.: Академия, 1998. — 432 с.
- 18 Степанов Ю.С. Язык и метод. К современной философии языка. — М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1998. — С. 40.
- 19 Бектурова А.Ш. Функционально-семантическое поле «пространство» в русском и казахском языках // Лингвокультурологическое сопоставление: Межвуз. сб. науч. ст. — Алматы: АГУ им. Абая, 1999. — С. 115.

20 *Иманалиева Р.Б.* О когнитивном аспекте этнолингвистических исследований // Мир языка: Материалы междунар. конф., посвящ. памяти проф. М.М.Копыленко. — Алматы, 1999. — С. 45.

21 *Гумилёв Л.Н.* Древние тюрки. — М.: История СССР, 1967. — 247 с.

22 *Наурызбаева А.Б.* Возвращение к мифу о вечном возвращении — опыт культурологической редукции историзма. — Алматы, 2005. — 156 с.

23 *Гильдебранд А.* Проблема формы в изобразительном искусстве. — М.: Логос, 2011. — 144 с.

Ә.Ж. Бахралинова

Мәдениет диалогы мәселесі

Мақалада екі тілдік мәдениеттің бір коммуникативтік кеңістіктегі қатынасы қарастырылған. Бұл тіл мәселесін бағындыру мен өзара түсіншіліктің қажеттілігі ретінде бейлингвалдық қызметті қамтамасыз етеді. Кеңістік пен уақыт жанның негізі ретінде, қазақ мәдениетінде философиялық көзқарастағы кеңістікте зерттелген. Қазақ халқы үшін кеңістік пен уақыт туралы түсініктер оның күнделікті көшпелі өмір салты, тұрмыс-тіршілігі, табиғатпен байланысында маңызды орын алатындығы атап өтілген.

А.Ж. Бахралинова

К вопросу о диалоге культур

В статье рассмотрено взаимодействие двух языковых культур в одном коммуникативном пространстве, что обеспечивает функционирование билингвизма как необходимого условия взаимопонимания и преодоления языкового барьера. Билингвизм, отмечено автором, изучается с точки зрения функционального подхода, в основе которого лежит представление о владении двумя языками. Исследованы пространственные представления в казахской культуре с точки зрения философии, где пространство и время выступают в качестве духовных сущностей. Подчеркнуто, что представления о пространстве и времени имеют содержательную определенность для казахского народа, которую составили повседневный образ жизни кочевника, его быт, общение с природой. Отмечено, что пространство задает основные параметры образа мира казахской культуры.

References

- 1 Kubryakova E.S. *Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the XX century (the experience of paradigmatic analysis)* // Language and science of the late XX century / Under the edit. Yu.S.Stepanov, Moscow: Russian State University, 1995, p. 149–238.
- 2 Maslova V.A. *Cultural Linguistics / Proc. a manual for students*. ouch. proc. institutions, Moscow: Academy, 2001, p. 64.
- 3 Cassirer E. *The Philosophy of symbolic forms*, 2. Mythological thinking, Moscow; Saint Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga, 2001.
- 4 Momynova B.K. *Non-Verbal elements of communication of the Kazakh language* // Language and intercultural communication: materials of Intern. scientific. scient. Conf., Ed. O.A.Aleksandrova, O.S.Makarova, Veliky Novgorod: Novgorod State University, 2009, p. 24–26.
- 5 Dmitryuk N.V. *Language consciousness in the non-homogeneous linguistic cultural environment: an attempt of theoretical justification*, Shymkent, Moscow: IE RAS, 2000, 136 p.
- 6 Sabitova Z.K. *Linguo-Cultural studies: textbook*, Moscow: FLINTA; Nauka, 2013, p. 521.
- 7 Ufimtseva N.V. *Psycholinguistics and intercultural communication* // The World of Russian word and Russian word in the world: materials of IX Congress of MAPRYAL, Language, consciousness, personality, Sofia: Heron press, 2007, p. 609–615.
- 8 Tarasov E.F. *Intercultural communication — new ontology analysis of language consciousness* // Ethnocultural specificity of language consciousness: Collection. articles / Ed. N.V.Ufimtseva, Moscow: Publ. house of the IE RAS, 2000, p. 18–28.
- 9 Arnoldov A.I. *Man and the world of culture: an Introduction to cultural studies*, Moscow: IPCC, 1992, 240 p.
- 10 Beisembaev A.R. *Paradigms of modern linguistics: teaching aid*, Pavlodar: RIO PSPI, 2007, 118 p.
- 11 Suleimenova E.D. *Language situation and language planning in Kazakhstan*, Almaty: Kazakh University publ., 2005, 344 p.
- 12 Carlinski A.E. *Selected works on the theory of language and language teaching*, Almaty, 2007, 308 p.
- 13 Khasanov B.Kh. *Kazakh-Russian bilingualism (socio-linguistic aspect)*, Alma-Ata: Gylym, 1987, 198 p.
- 14 Vereshchagin E.M. *Psychological and methodological characteristics of bilingualism (bilingualism)*, Moscow: Publ. house of Moscow University, 1969, 160 p.
- 15 Carlinski A.E. *Fundamentals of the theory of the interaction of languages*, Alma-Ata: Gylym, 1990, 181 p.

- 16 Tumanyan E.G. *About the method of language learning as a sociolinguistic archisystems* // Methods in sociolinguistic research, Moscow, 1995, p. 299–313.
- 17 Gachev G.D. *National images of the world: course of lectures*, Moscow: Academy, 1998, 432 p.
- 18 Stepanov Yu.S. *Language and method. To the modern philosophy of language*, Moscow: Shkola «Yazyki russkoi literatury», 1998, 784 p.
- 19 Bekturova A.Sh. *Functional-semantic field «space» in Russian and Kazakh languages* // Linguistic and cultural comparison: interuniversity collection of scientific articles, Almaty: Abay Almaty State University, 1999, p. 115.
- 20 Imanalieva R.B. *About the cognitive aspect of ethno-linguistic research* // The World of language. Proceedings of the international conference dedicated to the memory of Professor M.M.Kopylenko, Almaty, 1999, p. 45.
- 21 Gumilev L.N. *The ancient Turks*, Moscow: History of the USSR, 1967, 247 p.
- 22 Naurzbayeva A.B. *Return to the myth of the eternal return — the cultural experience of the reduction of historicism*, Almaty, 2005, 156 p.
- 23 Hildebrand A. *The Problem of form in the fine arts*, Moscow: Logos, 2011, 144 p.

Репозиторий КАРГУ