

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

descriptively and organically. In Megrelian, modalized evidentiality is also expressed lexically (descriptively) and grammatically (by means of verb paradigms i.e. screeves). The given paper focuses on the issue of qualification of epistemic-evidential screeves in Megrelian. It should be mentioned that such verb-forms were noted, distinguished and described in the Georgian scientific literature at the end of the past century, yet, they were qualified differently. When speaking of the organic (morphological) formation of evidential-epistemic forms, we imply complex forms expressed by means of **Present Subjunctive** or **Conditional I**, as well as **additional means** (*i"/i"uapu „may be“*, *i"idu/i"uapudu „would be“*). **Initially**, the distinction of these forms was closely related to the formation of the future tense, and the forms of both types were termed as follows: **Future Continuous**: *arundas i"/i"uapu „he/she may be writing“*; *arunduko i"idu/i"uapudu „would be writing“*. Later, the forms were separately termed as: **Future Continuous**: *arundas i"/i"uapu „may be writing“* and **Conditional Continuous**: *arunduko i"idu/i"uapudu „would be writing“*. Later, the forms expressed by means of **Present Subjunctive** and **additional means** were termed as **Present Continuous Subjunctive**. It should be noted that consideration of opinions of different authors (Z. Chumburidze, I. Kobalava, K. Margiani) and the evaluation of the forms in question from the viewpoint of evidentiality have enabled their qualification as evidential-epistemic screeves. Namely, based on the corresponding methodological approach, it has been concluded that: 1. In Megrelian, there are two evidential-epistemic screeves: *Evidential-Epistemic Present* and *Evidential-Epistemic Imperfect I*. 2. *Evidential-Epistemic Presentis* expressed by means of Present Subjunctive and *i"/i"uapu „may be“* modal form. 3. *Evidential-Epistemic Imperfect I* is expressed by means of Conditional I and the modal form *i"idu/i"uapudu „would be“*. 4. The complex forms of evidential-epistemic screeves express dubitable-probable actions in the present and past. In this, they are opposed to actions expressed by means of neutral present and continuous tenses. 5. The Megrelian complex forms of evidential-epistemic screeves are expressed in Georgian by means of neutral present or continuous verb-forms and the modality adverb „probably“. 6. In spite of the fact that evidential-epistemic screeves consist of two parts and are of complex structure, they are semantically unified and they perfectly fall within the tense system. Ref. 8.

Auth.

1.6.2.1.10. To express the semantics of diversity in Georgian. /T. Mamardashvili/. Journal Language and Culture. – 2020. – #23. – pp. 58-63. – geo.; abs.: geo., eng.

The form of a quality is obtained on the basis of a confrontation, relationship and comparison of a certain sign or trait of objects, and indicates the sign of the object. We usually talk about quality in relation to adjectives, because it directly expresses a trait that can be more or less quantity, the ability to produce different quality and quality is mainly related to situational adjectives, rarely to relative ones, and if one acquires this skill, it passes into the situational group. A lesser degree of subject matter is expressed in the form of a slight degree of quality. The relation to the positive of the form of the superior quality is not the same as the relation of the minor to the same positive, because the sign of the object is expressed by the superior in more quantity, indefinitely, and the slightest in lesser quantity, but with a kind of approximation. Descriptive production, though, is more a matter of conveying the content of a subject's mark, but sometimes it can also convey the slightest, lesser. Understandably, the understanding of singularity goes beyond the realm of the adjective, and the role of some prepositions more or less clearly in language is evident in the indication of the scarcity, infallibility, or slightness of action with verbs and in some forms even with the adverb. In modern Georgian, the prepositions *mo-*, *tša-*, *cha-*, *she-*, *tsamo-* are used to express the smallness of the action, the small size, the relative lack of quality or volume, which, along with the main function, combine this understanding. This semantics is even more diverse in the dialects of the Georgian language. Ref. 7.

Auth.

1.6.2.1.11. On non-manual grammatical marking in GESL. /T. Makharoblidze/. Journal Language and Culture. – 2020. – #23. – pp. 64-69. – geo.; abs.: geo., eng.

In GESL there are a few types of non-manual marking. One very interesting case is eye gaze argument marking (EGA). It may occur as a subject and/or an indirect object. Incorporated verbs with EGA are shortening the verbal kinetics. Plain verbs can have the EGA including body anchored verbs, such as 'love'. Thus, EGA makes