UDC 811.111'37 + 811.161.1'37

Saratov State Legal Academy
Candidate of Philology, associate
professor of the English and Spanish
languages department of FSBEE HPE SSLA
email: balashovaelena@yandex.ru

E.Yu. Balashova

DISCOURSE-ANALYSIS THROUGH THE SYSTEM OF CONCEPTUAL FIELDS (ON THE NEW TESTAMENT'S TEXT)

In the article the methods of discourse analysis through the system of conceptual fields are represented. Informative, associative-and-semantic, linguocultural and genre specific characters of the conceptual field *love* in the Orthodox and Protestant discourse are defined.The linguocognitive and linguophilosophical analysis of the parable about Prodigal Son is conducted.

Key words: religious Christian discourse, Biblical philology, conceptual field, associative-semantic field, religious genres, lexical systematization, discourse specifics of functionning.

In modern conditions of cross-cultural contacts it is necessary to create a basis for a successful cross-cultural communication [1, 2]. The research of cultural codes and the peculiarities of this or that community's mentality helps to do it. In the process of Orthodox [3, 4, 5] and Protestant [6] discourse modeling there is the opportunity to reveal the specifics of Russian and American language mind and to get to know the basic values of Russian and American linguocultures which depend upon moral ideals dictated by the religion being an inseparable part of a nation's culture and history. So comparative studies of different types of discourse (and religious too) are extremely actual in modern linguistics and linguoculturology [7, 8, 9].

Besides the designing of methods of discourse analysis through the system of conceptual fields is also an actual scientific and practical problem as the majority of researchers point out the difficulty of discourse structuring and impossibility of its description only on the basis of socio-communicative, linguocultural, communicative and language models. The term "discourse" is understood by some investigators as a complex of texts conditioned by the communication sphere and in a special way grammatically, lexically and stylistically arranged, communicative-and-purposeful ones in combination with extra-linguistic (socio-cultural, pragmatic, psychological, etc.) factors [10]. The research of specifics of discourse functioning of the conceptual field *love* in the lexico-semantic structure of the New Testament allows to single out various linguocultural and linguophilosophical segments as its compounds (theological, associative- moral and pragmatic).

semantic field (ASF) which is built from semas, lexemas, collocational groups and microconcept and also the antonymic ASF. The structure of the antonymic ASF is not homogeneous and is determined by not only the general semantics of the word *love,* but the theologocal peculiarities of understanding of such value as love in the New Testament.

Besides the conceptual field *love* has a genre specifics in the New Testament text. The most vivid representation it gets in the parable of the Lost Son. Because the parables are a

special religious genre one can say about genre variety of the above-mentioned conceptual field.

The analysis of the content of the conceptual field *love* is contextual. It allows to single out the cognitive units making the different aspects of the mentioned field. So *the theological aspect* is the most significant one in the religious Christian discourse and it is expressed by 60 contextual units (*«For God so loved the world that he gave His only Son, so that everyone who believes in him might not perish but might have eternal life»* (Jn. 3: 16); *«And to love him with all your heart, with all your understanding, with all your strength, and to love your neighbor as yourself»* (Mk. 12: 33); *«For the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have come to believe that I came from God»* (Jn. 16: 27) и т.д.). The degree of love for God determines a man's personality and his relations with the outer world. Unlike the other kinds of love this one has two-way direction because God loves a man with a perfect love and sent His only Son to save the world (Jn. 3: 16).

The love for neighbor constituting *the moral aspect* maybe one-way because a faithful man must love even those who hates him (Mt. 5: 44-47). In this aspect there are 44 units (*«But to you who hear I say, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you»* (Lk. 6: 27-28); *«This is my commandment: love one another as I love you»* (Jn. 15: 12); *«No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends»* (Jn. 15: 13) and so on).

At last the pragmatic aspect of the conceptual field *love* is a certain set of laws and rules which a family life and spouse relations must be built up according to. The stress is made not on a couple's feelings but on their responsibilities (*«Likewise, you wives should be subordinate to your husbands so that, even if some disobey the word, they may be won over without a word by their wives' conduct»* (1 Pt. 3: 1)), and a physiological love lacks spiritual traits (*«but because of cases of immorality every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband»* (1 Cor. 7: 2); *«A wife does not have authority over her own body, but rather her husband, and similarly a husband does not have authority over his own body, but rather his wife»* (1 Cor. 7: 4)). In general there is a certain neutralization of physiological love in religious Christian discourse (*«Now to the unmarried and to widows, I say: It is a good thing for them to remain as they are, as I do»* (1 Cor. 7: 8)), and its pragmatic aspect is not such significant as theological or moral ones and contains only 26 units.

The semantic-cognitive analysis of the New Testament text allows to say that the contents of the conceptual field *love* in the religious Christian discourse is not homogenious. Besides it represents the place of the three kinds of love in the discourse structure: the theological aspect belongs to the nuclear zone (60 units), the moral aspect is in the near-nuclear zone (44 units), and the pragmatic aspect is in the periphery (26 units). So in the basis of contextual units ranging and their further structuring there are quantitative characteristics, usage frequency of this or that unit in the text.

It is noteworthy that in the process of modeling the ASF *love* the sema «God» must be placed in the nuclear zone both in the Orthodox and Protestant discourses. This sema has the greatest number of representations. It is possible to make a conclusion that the sema «God» (and connected with it the cognitive feature «connection of love with God») is a deep semantic foundation of the whole Christian discourse in general. The sema «positive moral properties» also belongs the near-nuclear zone in both kinds of discourses. The semas «connection of love and faith» and «the absence of love» belong to the nuclear zone in the Orthodox discourse and to the periphery in the Protestant one. The sema «perfection» quite the contrary belongs to the near-nuclear zone in the Protestant discourse and to the periphery in the Orthodox one.

In general structuring the ASF *love* we can say about the tendency discovered earlier: the compounds of Orthodox and Protestant discourses are alike but their rating in two kinds of discourses is different. The semas belonging to both kinds of discourse are the following: «God», «God / spirit», «the absence of love», «the positive moral properties», «connection of

love with faith», «perfection», «activity», «truthfulness», «connection of love and hope», «intensity», «connection of love, faith and hope», «joy», «connection / unity». Semas specific for the Orthodox discourse, are the following: «sin / passion», «necessity», «tolerance», «mutuality», «grace», «constancy», «belonging to human nature», «prove», «peace / quietness», «law / commandment», «salvation». Semas specific for the Protestant discourse, are the following: «continuance», «neighbor», «loving unity», «obedience», «clod», «soul / heart», «representation», «labor / effort», «sincerity». One can say about religious connotations of the majority of semas in both kinds of discourses. It is noteworthy that the semas «God» – «clod» which can be considered a double opposition, are rather permanent and have a great number of contextual representations in the ASF *love*. This fact allows to make a conclusion about importance of this semantic pair for the whole religious Christian discourse in general and its linguocultural dominant *faith, hope, love* in particular.

The analysis of collocations of the word *love* allows to make a conclusion that the collocation group with its derivatives has the highest frequency (273) and the verbal derivatives are the most frequent ones (120). The group of verbal collocations is also in the nuclear zone of ASF *love*, the collocations with the words *faith, hope, love* are in the near-nuclear zone (41), in the close periphery there are genitive (27) and attributive collocations (24), in the remote periphery there are predicative collocations (9). So in the nuclear of the ASF *love* there are the noun «love», the verb «to love» (72) and the adjective «beloved» (57). In the near-nuclear zone there are the verbs «to love» (23) and «to commit adultery» (10). It is noteworthy that in the remote periphery there are many units with a negative connotation («adultery» (6); «covetousness» (5); «immoral» (3); «fornication» (3); «adulterer» (3); «adulteress» (3); «strife» (3)).

In general we can speak of the tendency of the dominating the verbal derivatives and adjective derivatives in the nuclear of ASF *love* in the Orthodox discourse. As noun derivatives have a low frequency the greatest number of usages belongs to the basic lexema.

The analysis of the English material allows to discover a similar tendency of dominating verbal collocations (73) and the collocations with the derivatives of the word *love* (192). The verbal derivatives have the highest frequency (122). These groups of collocations are in the nuclear of ASF *love*. In the near-nuclear zone there are genitive collocations (37) and the collocations with the words *faith, hope, love* (33). In the close periphery there are predicative (16) and attributive (18) collocations. At last in the remote periphery there is the group of prepositional collocations (2). In general both in Orthodox and in Protestant discourses the verbal collocations, collocations with the words *faith, hope, love* and the collocations with the derivatives of the word *love* have the highest frequency. In their turn the attributive collocations are common for the Orthodox discourse and the predicative collocations determine the specifics of the Protestant discourse. The group of prepositional collocations in the remote periphery of the ASF *love* in the Protestant discourse is not found in the Orthodox discourse at all.

The contextual analysis of the derivatives of the word *love* allows to single out the following units in the nuclear of its ASF in the Protestant discourse: «love», «to love» (119), «beloved» (47). The adjective «loved» (17) belongs to the near-nuclear zone, the noun «lovers» (4) is in the close periphery, the units «like», «want», «favor», «affection», «lovely», «loving» are in the remote periphery.

It is necessary to determine the number of microconcepts in the ASF *love* in the Orthodox discourse and to range them in the field. So in the nuclear zone there is the concept *God* (40) which has the greatest number of representations in the text of the New Testament. In the near-nuclear zone there are the microconcepts *kindness* (27) and *chastity* (18). The microconcepts *spirit* (13), *truth* (10), *peace* (10), *endurance* (8) are in the close periphery and

the microconcepts *cognition* (3), *mercy* (2), *strength* (1) are in the remote periphery. It is noteworthy that in the nuclear zone there is the microconcept *God* and in the close periphery there is the microconcept *endurance*. So the above-mentioned microconcepts can be considered the cognitive units structuring the ASF *love* and basing it.

In general we can speak of the tendency of dominating the religious microconcepts (which have the greater number of representations than the language microconcepts) in the nuclear and near-nuclear zones (*God, kindness, purity, spirit*), as in the close periphery and the remote periphery there are the universal microconcepts (*truth, peace, endurance, cognition, mercy, strength*).

The semantic-cognitive analysis of the English version of the New Testament allowed to single out the following microconcepts in the ASF *love*: *joy, mercy, peace, truth, kindness, goodness, gentleness, holiness, purity, endurance*.

So in the nuclear of ASF *love* of both the Orthodox and Protestant discourses there are the microconcepts *kindness, purity, peace, endurance, mercy, truth*. Unlike the nuclear of ASF *hope,* including mostly religious microconcepts, the nuclear of ASF *love* has a universal character and contains only 2 religious microconcepts (*kindness, purity*).

In the periphery there are such universal microconcepts as *joy, goodness, gentleness, holiness*. In general we can say about the low degree of religious connotations in ASF *love* in the Protestant discourse, where it has universal but theological character. In its turn in the Orthodox discourse in the nuclear and near-nuclear zones there the microconcepts *God, kindness, purity* determining the general character of ASF as religious one.

In the process of structuring the ASF *love* in the Orthodox discourse we have singled out the whole layer of units constituting the special antonymic ASF. We can divide this ASF into three parts to model its semantic and cognitive structure.

The first part can be nominated as *«love - hatred»,* where the word *love* has a language semantics. There are 34 units in this part: to hate – to love (5); to be zealous – to slack (2); bless those who hate you; to be zealous about God's love; loving – hating; unloving; God's children – Devil's children; unloving his neighbor (4); life – death; hating his neighbor; those who does not love does not know God because God is love; fear; misery; there is anguish in fear; evil - kindness (2); unloved; to fall in love – to come to hate (3); to act without love; those who does not love Jesus Christ, anathema; less loved; love – hatred; not to accept truth's love; not loving kindness.

It is noteworthy that we can single out such oppositions in this part as «to love – to hate», «to be zealous – to slack», «to fall in love – to come to hate». There are no such oppositions in other two parts.

So the semantic-cognitive analysis of the part *«love - hatred»* allows to single out a number of microconcepts in the antonymic ASF *love* in the text of New Testament. These are the microconcepts *hatred, devil, evil, death, fear, misery*. The most frequent lexemas in this type of ASF are *unloving (6), to hate (5), to come to hate (3), to slack / sloth (3), hating (3), to dislike (2), hatred*.

In the second part the word *love* realizes the theological aspects of its meaning. So this part is represented by 71 units: to commit adultery (15); to commit adultery in one's heart; the fault of fornication; to give grounds for adultery; sly and adulterous generation (2); fornication (9), adulterous and sinful generation; adulterers (4); adultery (9); adulteress (5); whoring (3); whoredom (3); lechers (8); lasciviousness (2); impurity (4); impure; unrighteous seduction; lust (2). The most frequent lexemas in the nuclear of antonymic ASF are *to commit adultery (17), fornication (9), lechers (8)*. In the close periphery there are the lexemas *adultery (10), impurity (4), adulterers (4), adulteress (3); whoring (3), whoredom (3)*. In the remote periphery there are the units *sly and adulterous generation (2); adulterous and sinful generation; whore (2), lasciviousness (2); impure, lust, unrighteous seduction*.

We can single out the following microconcepts in this part: *fornication / adultery, sin, lust, impurity.*

The third part we nominated «*love – sin / passion*», where the word *love* realizes one of its language meanings *«love as an inclination, partiality, passion for smbd.»*. It is necessary to point out that in this meaning love is directed at an inanimate object. This can be seen from its vocabulary definitions: *«inclination, partiality for smth.»* - SRYa. So we can note the lowered connotation of the word *love* in the above-mentioned definition. Quite the contrary the object of love, which is defined by the dictionaries as *«the feeling of attachment, hearted inclination»*, is considered to be animated *(«inclination, affection for the opposite sex person»* - SS.); *«affection for smbd.»* - SRYa).

This part consists of 37 units. The most frequent words in the part *«love – sin / passion»* are *covetousness (5), avarice (5), idolatry (3), strife (3)*. In this part it is possible to point out the following microconcepts: *passion, money, lie, impurity, sin, delusion*.

So in the nuclear of the antonymic ASF *love* in religious Christian discourse there is the part «*love – adultery / fornication*» (71). The parts *«love - hatred»* (34) and *«love – sin / passion»* are in the near-nuclear zone. So the opposition of love according to the theological understanding is adultery. Moreover exactly in this part there are a great number of religious microconcepts modeling the antonymic ASF *love* (*fornication / adultery, sin, lust, impurity*). The part *«love – adultery / fornication»* does not contain any universal microconcepts and in its turn the part *«love - hatred»* has a lowered religious connotation. It contains only one religious microconcept – *a devil*. All other microconcepts are of universal character (*hatred, evil, death, fear, misery*). We can speak of the neutral character of the part *«love – sin / passion»*, which contains 4 universal microconcepts (*passion, money, lie, delusion*) and 2 religious ones (*sin, impurity*).

It is possible to single out the microconcepts which are general for all the parts. These are the microconcepts *sin* and *impurity*. Taking into account the character of the nuclear part and above-mentioned microconcepts we can speak of high degree of religious connotation of the whole antonymic ASF of the conceptual field *love* in New Testament.

It is noteworthy that many microconcepts in the antonymic ASF have cognitive correlations in the conceptual field *love*. So the following oppositions have been singled out: *God – devil; truth – lie; kindness – evil; mercy – evil; chastity – fornication; chastity – lust; peace – anguish; cognition – delusion.*

The analysis of the English version of New Testament allows to single out the same parts in the structure of the antonymic ASF of the conceptual field *love* in the Protestant discourse. So the part *«love – hatred»* consists of 12 units. As in the Orthodox discourse it is this part that contains oppositions *«love – hate», «to devote – to despise», «to be loyal – to despise», «righteousness – lawlessness»*. As for the rest two parts they are more homogeneous structurally and contain units belonging to a single semantic field.

The most frequent lexemas in the part *«love – hatred»* are *hate (4), to despise (3), unloving (2).*

The microconcepts constituting the antonymic ASF *love* in the Protestant discourse are *hatred, disdain, lawlessness.* The microconcept *hatred* was singled out in the structure of the antonymic ASF of the conceptual field in the Orthodox discourse too. As for the others they reflect the specifics of the Protestant discourse. So one can speak of the universal cognitive nuclear of the part *«love - hatred»* in the religious Christian discourse.

The part *«love – adultery / immorality»* consists of 61 units. In the nuclear of the antonymic ASF there are lexemas *adultery (19), immorality (20).* In the near-nuclear periphery there is the word *immoral (7).* In the remote periphery there are lexemas *adulterer (3), unchastity (2), adulterous (3), adulteresses (3).*

The semantic-cognitive analysis of the part *«love – adultery / immorality»* allows to single out the following microconcepts in its structure: *adultery, immorality, unchastity, impurity.* The microconcepts *immorality, adultery, impurity* were singled out in the Orthodox discourse too.

At last the part *«love – sin / passion»* contains 5 units in the Protestant discourse. The most frequent words in this part are *lovers (3), money (2).* The basic microconcepts structuring the whole part *«love – sin»* are the lexemas *pleasure, money, selfishness.* The microconcept *money* was singled out in the antonymic ASF of the conceptual field **love** in the Orthodox discourse too.

So the basic microconcepts, which are the cognitive center of the antonymic ASF of the above-mentioned conceptual field in the religious Christian discourse, are *hatred, immorality, adultery, impurity, money.* The microconcepts *hatred* and *money* have universal character, as other units have religious connotations. It is possible to say that both in Orthodox and Protestant discourses in the structure of the antonymic ASF the units with religious connotation are prevailing. This fact determines its character and general semantics. The most representative is the microconcept *impurity,* singled out in all the parts of the antonymic ASF in the Orthodox discourse and in one part in the Protestant. The given microconcept has a special value in the religious Christian discourse.

As we mentioned before along with the semantic-cognitive specifics in the religious Christian discourse the conceptual field **love** is represented on the base of various genres material: New Testament text, parables, prayers, psalms, patristic writings and so on. In spite of the fact that parables are included in New Testament text, they are a special religious genre taking a peculiar position between primary and secondary religious genres.

From the point of view of Russian and Western Bible scholars and theologians and other researchers of New Testament the conceptual field **love** is especially vividly represented in the parable of the Lost Son revealing its deep religious and philosophical meaning.

As in linguocultural and theological sources the parable of the Lost Son is thematically connected with the parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt. 18: 12-13; Lk. 15: 3-7) and the parable of the Lost Coin (Lk. 15: 8-10), because these parables constitute the series of the parables about «lost», which only the apostle Luke describes.

However E.M. Verechshagin and V.G. Kostomarov single out such supplementary aspects of the parable's analysis as psychological motivation of the lost son's repentance and his return home. By this they shift the accent from the subject of God's love to its object, to a man. The researchers represent 5 steps of the repentance:
1)   the awareness of fatality of his sinful state: «I am dying» (Lk. 15: 17);
2)   the necessity of acknowledgement and confession of his sins: «Father, I have sinned against heaven and against you» (Lk. 15: 21);
3)   the presence of shame, humility and self-condemnation: «I no longer deserve to be called your son» (Lk. 15: 21);
4)   the readiness to accept and suffer the deserved punishment: «Treat me as you would treat one of your hired workers» (Lk. 15: 19);
5)   the presence not only of intention but an action, a real conversion to the righteous path: «I shall get up and go to my father» (Lk. 15: 18) [11, p. 746].

In her turn in the center of the given parable's analysis A. Vezhbitska places God's love to all people describing its effects and manifestations but properties and qualities (the last is more characteristic for theological interpretations). So it is possible to speak of dominating a pragmatic aspect in the interpretation of the parable worked out by A, Vezhbitska. The researcher presents 5 part structure of the discussed parable's analysis:

1)   the part A points at overall love of God and at the possibility to live with God for everybody;

2)   the part B points at the possibility to turn from God and at the fact that it is a great loss for a man;

3)   the part C describes the unceasing interest of God in every person who turned away from Him and at the permanent God's desire to forgive and to take this person back;

4)   the part D points at the fact the it is always possible to come back to God;

5)   the part E points at the fact that God wants not only all people but a concrete person as an individual to live with God eternally and at God's love for a concrete person [12, p. 272].

The presented review of the linguocultural sources of the interpretation of the parable of the Lost Son allows to single out the following double cognitive components in its structure: «the break with the subject because of the object's sinfulness – desire / stimulating activity of the subject towards the return of pre-sinful state; the repentance of the object – all-forgiving love of the subject».

The same set of cognitive pairs may be singled out in the theological interpretations of the given parable. However the mentioned cognitive correlations acquire supplementary semantic components.

So B.I. Gladkov stresses that the forgiveness and love of God are absolute and have no any kind of rebuke in comparison with a human forgiveness, this is a joyful forgiveness: «…*A sinner is enough to wake, to come to himself, to look back at his past, to convict himself in repentance, let it be forced, to remember about God's mercy and say: «I shall go to my Father»* – *and to go actually* (E.M. Verechshagin and V.G. Kostomarov also single out the necessity of the action, not only one inclination); *and God will happily take a lost son who was dead and revived, disappeared and was found*» [11, p. 511]. E.M. Verechshagin and V.G. Kostomarov point out the compulsion of the repentance taking into account that fact that a lost son repented under the influence of the life failure. That is why the life failure or the life success acts as a stimulus to repentance [11, p. 747].

It is noteworthy that in the Bible the state of sin is compared with the state of death. Adam became mortal exactly after his sin, and mortality became punishment for his disobedience.

A human forgiveness do not have that <u>absolute fullness</u> which is present in God's forgiveness: «*And we, sinners, when asked to forgive, point all the sins to a sinner, very often exaggerating them, mocking him, making him suffer in heart bitterly and then after such moral torture forgive him. Doing all this we justify ourselves by the argument that these measures are for our neighbor's good and by this we lead him to the repentance, acknowledgement of his sin, but a person who expresses regrets and who says: «I have sinned against heaven and against you» has already acknowledged his sin and confessed and consequently there is no need to lead him to the repentance.* [13, p.510-511].

However B.I. Gladkov singles out such properties of God's love as immensity and boundless mercy: «*We often decline from God as we think we do not deserve God's forgiveness because of our sins' burden and by this we attribute God our faults: we would not forgive a neighbor who has sinned against us so much and that is why we think that God would not forgive us even if we turned to Him*» [13, p.511].

So the materials of theological sources of interpretation of the parable of the Lost Son allow to single out the following cognitive units in the structure of the conceptual field ***love*** in the Orthodox discourse: *the absolute fullness; mercy; immensity; forcefulness*.

To determine the cognitive components of the genre segment of the conceptual field *love* in the Protestant discourse it is necessary to conduct the analysis of specifics of the given parable's interpretations in Western sources. So Cr. Blomberg notes the triadic structure of this parable: the lost son – the father – the older son [14, p.184].

The traditional subtitle of the parable of the Lost Son singles out such main topic as appeal of sinners to repentance no matter how much they demoralized [15, 16]. In the first turn it is this peculiarity of the parable which attracts the attention of the majority of readers because it opposes their natural readiness to condemn the lost son severely. In this case the main topic is Christians' duty to be happy about anyone's salvation.

On the basis of Protestant theological sources it is possible to single out the following cognitive units in the conceptual field *love* in the Protestant discourse: *repentance; salvation; God; love; angelic patience.*

The cognitive units *God* and *love* were singled out in the process of the analysis of the discussed parable's Orthodox interpretations too. It is possible to state that they structure the whole cognitive nuclear of the parable in particular and the genre segment of the conceptual field *love* in general. It is noteworthy that the units special for the Protestant discourse (*repentance, salvation*) have a man as their object and are directed at him and the units special for the Orthodox discourse (*immensity, forcefulness*) have God's love as their object and reveal its properties.

So the research of genre organization of the conceptual field in this or that kind of discourse allows to determine its deep cognitive structures. In general one can say that a conceptual field is a holistic cognitive continuum with content, cognitive, associative-semantic and genre specifics. The modeling of any kind of discourse's linguocultural specifics is not possible without structuring conceptual fields comprising it. A conceptual field may consist of such different structural elements as semas and cognitive attributes as the simplest ones and ASF (and as its variant antonymic ASF) and Gospel parables as the largest cognitive units.

The methods of discourse modeling through conceptual fields and textual systematic of the lexical means promote the determining its deep cognitive structures, revealing their linguocultural specifics and studying the mechanisms of this or that discourse's organization. In its turn the research of semantic-cognitive content of the conceptual field presupposes first of all the contextual analysis of collocations of the basic lexema and its derivatives and then modeling the ASF of the macroconcept constituting the holistic conceptual continuum in the definite kind of discourse.

The lexico-semantic, content and at last conceptual systematic of the Gospel text is not only the basis of structuring of the whole religious Christian discourse, but a special instrument for modeling such complex cognitive unit as a conceptual field. Research of linguocultural and discourse specifics of conceptual fields is in singling out various layers in discourse structure and further determining their cognitive organization.

Bibliographic list

1.   Fomina Z.E. Innovatsii v sfere russkogo kommunikativnogo povedeniya kak sotsial'no obuslovlennye refleksii novoj rossijskoj dejstvitel'nosti / Z.E. Fomina // Nauchnyj vestnik Voronezh. gos. arh.-stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvisticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskie issledovaniya. 2011. - Vyp. 1 (15). - S. 166-179.

2.   Fomina Z.E., Konovalova YU.S. Gerontologicheskie kategorii Youth (Molodost') i Old Age (Starost') v anglo-amerikanskih yazykovyh refleksiyah / Z.E. Fomina, YU.S. Konovalova // Nauchnyj vestnik Voronezh. gos. arh.-stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvisticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskie issledovaniya. 2011. - Vyp. 2 (16). - S.27-42.

3.   .Bobyreva E.V. Religioznyj diskurs: tsennosti, zhanry, strategii (na materiale pravoslavnogo veroucheniya). / E.V. Bobyreva Volgograd: Peremena, 2007.

4.   Dorofeeva N.V. K voprosu o russkoy natsional'noy samobytnosti: kontsept "udivlenie" v pravoslavno-bytiynom discurse / N.V. Dorofeeva // Ecolinguistica: teoriya, problemy, metody. – Saratov: Nauchnaya kniga, 2003. P. 139-145.

5.   Karasik V.I. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, discurs / V.I. Karasik – Volgograd: Peremena, 2002.

6.   Mechkovskaya N.B. Yazyk i religiya. / N.B. Mechkovskaya – M.: Agentstvo "FAIR", 1998.

7.   Plisov V.E. Functsional'no-stilisticheskoe svoeobrazie tipa teksta "Andachtsbuch" / E.V. Plisov // Nauchny vestnik Voronez. gos. arh.- stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvisticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskie issledovaniya. – 2010. – Vyp. 2 (14). – S. 13-24.

8.   Sergeeva E.V. Religiozno-philosofsky discurs V.S. Solov'eva: lexichesky aspect. / E.V. Sergeeva – SPb., Izd-vo RGPU im. A.I. Gertsena; "SAGA", 2002.

9.   Fomina Z.E. Metaforicheskie reprezentacii prirody v pojeticheskoj kartine mira Ingeborg Bahman i Sergeja Esenina v aspekte ih differenciacii i universaliza-cii / Z.E. Fomina // Nauchnyj vestnik Voronezh. gos. arh.-stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvisticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskieissledovanija. - 2012. - Vyp. 2 (18). - S. 135-142.

10.   Tsygankova Ye. A. Concept «ARCHITEKTUR» («ARCHITECTURE») in the discourse of popular science as an object of evaluation / Ye. A. Tsygankova // Nauchny vestnik Voronez. gos. arh.- stroit. un-ta. Sovremennye lingvisticheskie i metodiko-didakticheskie issledovaniya. – 2010. – Vyp. 2 (14). – S. 69-76.

11.   Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Yazyk i kultura. / E.M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov. – M.: Indrik, 2005.

12.   Vezhbitskaya A. Sopostavleniye kultur cherez posredstvo leksiki i pragmatiki. / A. Vezhbitskaya. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 2001.

13.   Gladkov B.I. Tolkovaniye Evangeliya. / Boris Gladkov. – 4-e izd. – Svyato-Troitskaya Sergieva Lavra, 2004.

14.   Blomberg K. Interpretatsiya pritchey [per. s angl.] / Kreig Blomberg. – M.: Bibleisko-bogoslovsky institute sv. Apostola Andreya, 2005.

15.   Wilcock M. The Saviour of the World: The Message of Luke's Gospel. / Michael Wilcock. – Leicester and Downers Grove: IVP, 1979.

16.   Arndt W.F. The Gospel according to St. Luke. / William F. Arndt – St. Louis: Concordia, 1956.

Sources and accepted shortenings

1.   Novy Zavet Gospoda nashego Iisusa Hrista. Saratov: Izdatelstvo Saratovskoy eparhii, 2006.

2.   The New American Bible revised New Testament. Costello Publishing Co., Wm. B.Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.

3.   SRYa – Ozhegov S.I. Slovar' russkogo yazyka. – Moskva: Rus. yaz., 1984.

4.   SS – Slovar' sinonymov. – Leningrad: Nauka, 1975.