

In summary, the Metaverse is a rapidly developing technology with significant potential for the future. Existing platforms offer a glimpse into the potential of the Metaverse, while blockchain technology provides solutions to some of the technical challenges. The economic opportunities in the Metaverse are vast, making it a promising area of innovation and exploration.

The Metaverse represents a new frontier for innovation, communication and exploration. While there are challenges and risks associated with this technology, the potential benefits are significant. It is up to all of us to shape the future of the Metaverse and ensure that it is a safe, equitable, and inclusive space for all.

#### References

1. *What Is the Metaverse?* URL: [https://academy.binance.com/en/articles/what-is-the-metaverse?utm\\_campaign=googleadsxacademy&utm\\_source=googleadwords\\_int&utm\\_medium=cpc&ref=HDYAHEES&gclid=Cj0KCQjwk7ugBhDIARIsAGuygPanhc-wKP6FKgdxzqFme0ovwnHvtCwtpV6gyXqD\\_yAMM7JREep685oaAmlAEALw\\_wcB](https://academy.binance.com/en/articles/what-is-the-metaverse?utm_campaign=googleadsxacademy&utm_source=googleadwords_int&utm_medium=cpc&ref=HDYAHEES&gclid=Cj0KCQjwk7ugBhDIARIsAGuygPanhc-wKP6FKgdxzqFme0ovwnHvtCwtpV6gyXqD_yAMM7JREep685oaAmlAEALw_wcB).
2. *Metaverse.* URL: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metaverse>.
3. *What is the metaverse? An explanation and in-depth guide.* URL: <https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/feature/The-metaverse-explained-Everything-you-need-to-know>.

**UDC 81**

*V. Chernyshov, PhD, Associate Professor,  
R. Shkola, student, group 201-HO  
National University  
“Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic”*

## **RONALD W. LANGACKER’S “CONCEPTUALISATION” AS A TERMINOLOGICAL UNIT OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS**

It is generally acknowledged that the concept of *conceptualization* was introduced into the linguistic and general scientific circulation by Ronald Wayne Langacker, who is credited to be one of the key founders of cognitive linguistics.

Defining this concept that acquires the character and value of a terminological unit, Langacker interprets conceptualization quite broadly, he says that “it encompasses novel conceptions as well as fixed concepts; sensory, kinesthetic, and emotive experience; recognition of the immediate context (social, physical, and linguistic); and so on” [1, p. 2].

According to Ronald Langacker, the “conceptualization resides in cognitive processing” [ibid.], that is why the ultimate objective of his study is defined as “to characterize the types of cognitive events whose occurrence constitutes a given mental experience” [ibid.]. However, Langacker is quite aware of the

ambitiousness of this task, saying that “The remoteness of this goal is not a valid argument for denying the conceptual basis of meaning” [ibid.].

As a terminological unit of cognitive linguistics, conceptualization deals primarily with the conventional meaning of lexical items. These items do not go by themselves as they have “a considerable array of interrelated senses, which define the range of their conventionally sanctioned usage” [2, p. 2]. These senses, however, are far from being the same: some of them are “schematic” as the other represent “extensions”. There arise, what Langacker calls it, *some conflict in specifications*.

As a starting point of any conceptualization, the senses create, therefore, a kind of network the nodes and categorizing relationships of which “differ in their degree of entrenchment and cognitive salience” [ibid.]. Therefore, there arise the question of a speaker’s knowledge and the inadequacy of any reductionist description of lexical meaning. This speaker’s knowledge of the conventional value of a lexical item cannot be reduced to a single structure, such as the prototype or the highest-level schema. Because, according to Langacker, “not every lexical category has a single, clearly determined prototype, nor can we invariably assume a high-level schema fully compatible with the specifications of every node in the network” [2, p.3]. Therefore, the “conventional meaning of a lexical item must be equated with the entire network, not with any single node” [ibid.].

Trying to answer the question of what are the adequate characteristics of any particular sense of a linguistic expression, Langacker rejects both the idea of semantic structure as a set of semantic markers or features, as well as the notion that any meaning can be fully described in terms of semantic primitives. He claims instead that conceptualization creates a number of domains that come from the less abstract perceptual experience through the realm of concepts, conceptual complexes to the elaborate knowledge system, and so on; and semantics structures or predications (as Langacker puts it) are characterized with respect to these *cognitive domains*. The cognitive domains in their own turn may create “hierarchies of conceptual complexity, where structures at a given level arise through cognitive operations (including simple coordination) performed on the structures at lower levels. Crucially, the cognitive domains required by linguistic predications can occur at any level in such hierarchies” [2, p.3].

Trying to clarify the concept of *predications* (semantics structures) Langacker is writing: “Most predications also require more than one domain for their full description, in which case I refer to the set as a “complex matrix”, (...). There is no sharp dividing line such that all specifications on one side are linguistically relevant and all those on the other side clearly irrelevant. Any facet of our knowledge of an entity is capable in principle of playing a role in determining the linguistic behavior of an expression that designates it (e.g. in semantic extension, or in its combination with other expressions)” [2, p. 4].

Thus, it may be said that conceptualisation as a terminological unit of cognitive linguistics encompasses the cognitive processing which includes a number of speakers' conventions with respect to (shared) experience to endow it with meaning, that is to render it meaningful. Langacker describes the process of conceptualization as a process based on the principles of abstraction and creating hierarchies of conceptual complexity.

#### *References*

1. Dirven R., Langacker R.W., *Concept, Image, and Symbol The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991.

2. Langacker R.W. *Introduction to Concept, Image, and Symbol. Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin, New-York, 2006. Vol. 34. P. 29-67.

**UDC 801:81'23**

*V. Chernyshov, PhD, Associate Professor  
Y. Yevtushenko, student, group 201-HO  
National University  
"Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic"*

### **CONCEPT VS NOTION: DEFINITIONS AND ANALYSIS**

The problem of analysis, definition and correlation between the concept and the notion is one of the basic terminological problems in cognitive linguistics.

Olga Zaichenko rightly observes that "We observe the problem of conceptualization even in Humboldt in his works on language and culture" [2, p. 78]. Askoldov-Alekseev was one of the first researchers of conceptualization. He was the first who used the word "concept" in 1928 to denote the semiotic function of a verbal sign; that is, the function of substitution, and called the concept a mental formation that in the process of thought stands for many objects that represent the same genus, real objects, their individual aspects and real actions [2, p. 78].

Thus, the concept acts as a multi-level informational structure of consciousness, a unit of memory organized in a certain way, containing verbally and non-verbally expressed knowledge about the object of knowledge, acquired through the interaction of the conscious and unconscious [3, p. 410]. O. Zaichenko also agrees with this opinion, adding that the concept is the basis of the structure of speech, which plays a significant role "in the depth and significance of our communication" [2, p. 81].

An important aspect of concept research is making a distinction between a concept and a notion. The concept is traditionally understood as a general notion. In this case, the core of the concept is declared to be a notion, which is interpreted as the meaning of a word or knowledge about the object. Another interpretation of the concept is the awareness of the concept as a named ideal object that reflects a person's culturally determined knowledge of the real world. Accordingly, the distinction between notion and concept (despite the fact that for a long time they