component referring to China and the Chinese (e.g. the lexical unit китаец in certain contexts can represent a personalized symbol of cunning; the phraseological unit китайская стена stands for a symbol of strength and insularity or excessive length of a building etc.). Knowledge of these units is urgent for foreign learners because it enables them to avoid culture shock and communicative shock when dealing with the Russians and facilitates communication with them. The method presupposes familiarizing students with symbolic meaning, etymology and usage specificity of the Russian lexical and phraseological units about China and the Chinese (китаец, шанхай, китайская грамота, китайская стена, китайские церемонии, последнее китайское предупреждение, etc.), practicing usage of these units in speech, comparing them with the Chinese ethnic stereotypes about the Russians. Tab.1, Ref. 12.

Auth.

1.6.2.1.7. Culture Contact and Values Conflict in Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language. /L. Bogdanova/. Journal WEST-EAST. – 2019. – v. 2. – #1. – pp. 139-143. – rus.; – abs.: eng., rus., geo.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-139-143

The article discusses the interaction of cultural values in teaching Russian. The purpose of the article is to show the universal and national-specific in the cultural spaces of languages that come into contact in learning of Russian as a foreign language. During the research various methods and operational procedures were used including analysis of definitions, component analysis, context transformation, equivalent replacement, modeling, linguistic experiment, etc. In the article the ways of reflection of cultural values in language are considered. The special attention is paid to the research of values conflict in the conditions of culture contact. The estimated sign of evaluation can be changed depending on the point of view that the value fixes: the view from the inside or the view from the outside. The structure of views about the same event can not correspond in different cultural communities. This work is deeply connected with such topical questions as formation of associative potential of words, national and cultural specificity of connotations, the means of its lexicographical representation, decoding of speaker's value system. Ref. 19.

Auth.

1.6.2.1.8. Lexical Manifestations of the Cultural Specificity of Emotions in the Context of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language. /E. Fatyushina, V. Popova/. Journal WEST-EAST. – 2019. – v. 2. – #1. – pp. 147-151. – rus.; abs.: eng., rus., geo.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2019-2-147-151

The aim of the study is to identify and describe various ways of manifestation of cultural specificity of emotions in the vocabulary of the language, as well as to examine the possibility of using this specificity in the formation of a secondary language personality in the process of mastering Russian as a foreign language. The article uses the following methods: comparative, context analysis, case study, questioning. The cultural peculiarity of emotions is lexically manifested in the degree of their specification, which is expressed in the number of synonyms denoting the same emotional state in different languages or in the presence of additional lexemes to denote a specific variety of an emotion. Emotional vocabulary of languages can differ by potential semes, and semantic specificity entails differences in combinability. The choice of emotional vocabulary with a particular connotation also depends on the language situation. When studying a language, at the level of vocabulary semantization, it is necessary to analyze synonymic rows, to take into account the peculiarities of the compatibility and contextual use of words in the language, the specifics of functioning in different areas of language, as well as peculiarities of connotation. Ref. 15.

Auth.

1.6.2.1.9. The Issue of Qualification of Evidential-Epistemic Screeves in Megrelian. /M. Lomia/. Journal Language and Culture. – 2020. – #23. – pp. 51-57. – geo.; abs.: geo., eng.

In Megrelian, like other Kartvelian languages and, in general, numerous languages of the world, there are two types of evidentiality: modalized and non-modalized. When information is obtained from an inferential source based on background knowledge, such information is considered as *dubitable*, *probable*, *likely*. Based on such evaluation, the forms expressing *epistemic modality* are created. These forms are expressed both