LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECTS OF THE DISCURSIVE SYNERGY

Elena Anatolievna Ogneva[1], Olga Alexandrovna Moiseenko[2], Alexei Anatolievich Kolesnikov[3], Alina Alexandrovna Kutsenko[4], Olga Nikolaevna Yarygina[5]

[1]Chair of the Foreign Languages Department, Doctor of Philology,
[2]Associate professor of the Foreign Languages Department, Candidate of Pedagogy,
[3]Dean of the Foreign Languages Faculty, Candidate of Philology,
[4,5]Post-graduate student, assistant of the Foreign Languages Department,
Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod, 30801 **(RUSSIA)**
E-mails: ogneva@bsu.edu.ru, moiseenko@bsu.edu.ru, kolesnikov@bsu.edu.ru,
kutsenko_a@bsu.edu.ru, yarygina@bsu.ed.ru

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the basic principles of the innovative "discursive synergy of cultural linguistics" concept. The relation of language and culture in the format of linguocultural concept as the basis of linguocultural discourse, which is a nonlinear communication model is researched. The prerequisites for the realization of discursive model and its correlation with other models in the conceptual sphere of the national language are clarified. The role of linguistic worldview in the formation of the cultural code of the people, where the code appears as stable background of linguocultural discourse, its synergy formation is examined. The discursive parameters of studied linguocultural model synergy are clarified.

Key words: cultural linguistics, discourse, concept, linguocultural concept, architectonics, model, synergy

1. INTRODUCTION

At the present stage of cultural linguistics development special emphasis is given to the study of cognitive prerequisites for the formation of semantic structures and their interaction with cognitive structures, "as the basic units of cognitive linguistics study" [1]. Conjunction of semantic and cognitive structures in the conceptual model of a language worldview, i.e. the aspect ratio of conjugation in the conceptual system of consciousness and semantic system of language reveals the discursive nature of its synergy. In this discursive synergy model the discourse "is verbal and cogitative formation of eventful nature in conjunction with the pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, paralinguistic and other factors" [2].

The conceptual structures determine the semantic structures in this model, and at the same time are exposed to a semantic system because, according to V. Sulimov, "the conceptual basis of language is, above all, a certain prism, based on cultural and genetic basis of individual consciousness, which has features of collective (socio-cultural) consciousness" [3], therefore the study of cultural linguistics and cognitive linguistics correlation reveals deep connections through which discursive synergy is realized, and the research itself determine the appearance of the innovative concept of Discursive synergy of cultural linguistics" because "the innovative vector of global world development represents the unit of different scientific vector including at the sphere of its influence" [4]. A set of innovative and classical approaches contribute to the formation of a coherent scientific model of the world.

2. METHODOLOGY

Discursive synergies of linguocultural model of the world study is based on the principles of cognitive-discursive analysis of the material involving innovative techniques of semantic units cognitive-comparative analysis on the language level, and at the speech level in order to identify the relationship between language units and speech units on the one hand and the factors which led to their situational demand on the other hand.

Consideration of nominative field of a single linguocultural concept of architectonics, establishing the synergy principles of its correlation with other concepts in a unified cognitive concept-sphere grid of a national language is based primarily on field methods of studying the material, followed by access to the interpretive level within linguocultural model of the world that promotes deep knowledge of this model discursive synergy formation, preservation and transferring principles.

3. MAIN PART

In the basis of concept of "cultural linguistics discursive synergy" is a classic understanding that language defines the logical structure of thinking and the process of establishing the language depending on the nature of reality knowledge, the possibility of the use of language as a source of information about the world.

It is well known that knowledge is formed and accumulated only during verbal and cogitative human cognitive activity, however, two concepts require the differentiation: the process of thinking and content of thinking. Processes and forms of thinking are common to all mankind, and proceed according to the same laws of the brain work. The content of thinking, in contrast, has a national character. Mental make-up and the spiritual aspect of people, features of their everyday life, culture and language, which provides a conceptual understanding of the categories of culture are reflected in it. The famous formula of L. Wittgenstein, "the limits of my language define the limits of my world" [5] emphasizes mediation of reality by language, which thereby creates an image of the world, including forms and linguocultural model of the world, where the world conceptualization plays an important role.

The conceptual framework of language is always individual, but has the appearance of collective forms of thinking, including value system. Joining the ideological paradigm of individual consciousness, the conceptual framework of language includes this ideological paradigm in the overall socio-cultural context. As a result of a long process of internalization of knowledge in the mankind consciousness there is an image of the world/linguistic worldview that forms the framework of semiotic subsequent changes of consciousness in ethnic group. The linguistic worldview, followed by E. Kubryakova, is understood as "the treasure of all knowledge, concepts and ways of thinking, beliefs and evaluations" [6]. Units of world knowledge laid in the linguistic worldview, including units, reflecting the way of perceiving the world by human, and that compose ethnospektrum of concept-sphere: aphorisms, phraseological units, frames of typical situations, sayings and proverbs, winged words, metaphors, precedent texts of culture, prototypical images of national culture, sustainable assessment of the facts and phenomena. According to Yu. Karaulov, "the totality of these elements do not form a sequence tending to complete the worldview. Rather, they form a mosaic, fragmentary filling, fundamentally incomplete and sometimes contradictory linguistic worldview, strongly nationally coloured" [7].

Cognitive function of language is embodied in the linguistic worldview and is developed in the human consciousness under the influence of interaction, which remains in the consciousness as a result of verbal cooperation. Since language is an open sign system capable of unlimited development in relation to culture, the spiritual culture world is in the boundaries of linguistic worldview. The language sphere is broader than the sphere of real diversity in the world and in a society by its possibilities, that is predetermined by breadth of "person mentality" [8, 9], however, language and culture are closely linked with the help of some intermediate formation, which is perfectly realized in the language as the value and provides the ontological unity of language and culture. "Type of culture is due to the dominant type of communication and the dominant type of personality correspondingly" [10], due to the fact that the language objectifies the world perceived by a human and categorized it by consciousness.

Linguistic signs, acquiring the ability to function as signs of culture and thus serve as a means of presenting the basic units of culture, so the language is "capable of displaying cultural and national mentality of its speakers" [11], and generate code of culture. In cognitive linguistics "code of culture" is defined as the grid that culture sprinkles on the world around us, divide into parts, categorizes, structures and evaluates it. Scientists relate codes of culture with ancient archetypal representations of humankind. Thus, the prototype theory asserts that the variety of oppositions depends on significant content of individual characters [12]. There are two kinds of prototypes [13]: a) a unit that shows most marked characteristics in common with other units of the group, b) a unit that implements these properties in the most pure and most fully way, without any admixture of other properties [14]. Practical, theoretical and cultural knowledge and experience, that is, the code of culture are restored by means of semantic and conceptual analysis in the form of linguistic worldview, which, according to A. Babushkin is considered "as a guide in the communication process of the person with the environment, which enables it to reflect objectively the perception of the world by particular culture-bearers. The structure of the worldview is largely determined by the principle of ordering of objects, its components, so the linguistic worldview is a fragment of the general reality mapping by human consciousness" [15].

According to L. Vasilyev, linguistic knowledge is a part of non-linguistic knowledge and linguistic worldview as if "built-in" in the cognitive structure, and semantics is a part of such a structure [16], that is, linguistic worldview is based on specific logical-linguistic units – concepts that are structural components of the "language of mental constructs" mediating the connection between thinking and natural language.

The two concepts require differentiation at the present stage of science development: the concept and concept-sphere. The concept is defined as "a special way to structure the content of the consciousness act, embodiment of image in the substantial form of knowable object. It is a kind of engram (sediment in memory) mentally formulated figurative content, collective archetype of culture" [17].

The term concept reveals its mental entity, its intensional representation of a sign, i.e. a notion that conveys the worldview of a human being belonging to a definite culture and epoche, and having a defined nationality. The term concept-sphere, however, is connected with cognitive potential, background knowledge and skills, cultural experience of a person or a people as a whole. Thus, by linguistic worldview which represents a system open to the linguistic analysis, we may judge about mental language space being hidden from a direct observation, about its concept-sphere.

The priority of introducing the term concept-sphere for scientific use belongs to academician D. Likhatchev, who pointed out that "concepts make up varied spheres, and being taken together, create the concept-sphere of the national language" [18].

Developing academician D. Likhatchev's idea, A. Babushkin considers concept-sphere of a language a set of concepts of different kinds, i.e. cogitative pictures, schemes, frames and scenarios [19].

Studies indicate that concepts appear to come into conflict with the concepts of the concept-sphere, with the latter being extraneous to the former. In most cases it shows up when "valuable components do not coincide with the corresponding concepts" [20].

Lexical system of a language partly represents national concept-sphere which has a systemic character. It is so as the process of systematization and categorization of extralinguistic reality is a cognitive process.

The study of concept as "a global mental (cogitative) unit in its national uniqueness is aimed at defining the concept position in the national concept-sphere" [21].

The linguocultural component is known as a relative mental unit intended for integrated study of the language, consciousness and culture. The structure can be seen as a model. This model is "a tripartite model that has three components, i.e. axiological, factual and figurative. The axiological and factual components of the linguocultural concept are verbally stored in consciousness and can be directly reproduced in speech whereas the figurative element is nonverbal and can be described only" [22].

The linguocultural concept is multivariate and consists of three layers: a) system potential, i.e. the range of means of appealing to the concept which are suggested to the native speaker as linguistic heritage accumulated by culture and fixed in lexicography; b) subject potential, i.e. a set of linguistic means, being stored in a person's consciousness; c) the layer of multivariate existence of a single concept in culture's and individual's memory where it is subdivided into subconcepts" [23].

The criterion for differentiation between linguocultural concepts lies in their belonging to the sphere of knowledge/consciousness which they serve forming intensional base of ethical, psychological, logical and religious terms that denote spiritual values. There is no doubt that the latter, within the framework of one language as well as interlingual science paradigm, may be ethnoculturally marked.

Discourse "concentrating around a supporting concept, creates a general verbal and cogitative context" [24], in which all the layers of linguocultural concepts are implied/realized.

4. CONCLUSION

Linguocultural studies indicate that culture and language structurally have both similarities and peculiarities. Despite the fact that language and culture are different semiotic systems, culture is similar to language in structure. The semantic space of culture as well as human's consciousness is determined by the borders of ethnic language to a certain extent.

The connection between language and culture is ontologically defined for both language and culture are the products of creative mental human activity in his "communicative field as the whole range of signs" [25]. The interaction "language↔culture" is realized in a linguocultural discourse, i.e. the nonlinear linguistic format of representation and knowledge exchange.

5. SUMMARY

Language is the integral and significant part of national culture that is why the study of the concept-sphere structure as a national language on the whole as well as the concept-sphere of separate fragments of a nation's worldview is supposed to reveal rather an integrated paradigm of linguocultural concepts of the basic level, with these concepts playing a leading part in the process of the world's categorization and conceptualization.

The research of nominative fields' architectonics of linguocultural concepts exposes correlation principles of this group of concepts' different types within the framework of general discursive model. It is true as precisely with the help of world's categorization and conceptualization process, the communicative model is made up, the discursive potential of which is in its synergy.

The synergy of linguocultural aspects of discourse is based on the inner energy of separate linguistic and speech units, the conjugation of which within one theme communicative field causes the realization of situationally determined pragmatic purposes. In the exploratory field, nevertheless, it results in the methodology formation of contemporary linguistic culture discursive synergy.

REFERENCES

1. Croft, W., Cruse D.A., 2004. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 356.
2. Alefirenko, N.F., 2009. Zhivoe slovo: problemyi funktsionalnoy leksikologii: monografiya. M. Flinta: Nauka, pp. 344. (In Russian).
3. Sulimov, V.A., 2006. Kognitivnoe opisanie yazyika i ego kulturologicheskaya interpretatsiya: kognitivnyie transformatsii: Filologicheskie nauki, 1: 40-47. (In Russian).
4. Ogneva, E.A., 2014. Cognitive-Discursive Paradigm as the Complex Research Program of Humanities: International Journal of Applied and Fundamental Research, 2. Date Views 07.12.2014 www.science-sd.com/457-24679. (In Russian).
5. Wittgenstein, L., 1969. The blue and brown books: Preliminary studies for the 'Philosophical investigations'. O.: Blackwell.
6. Kubryakova, E.S., 1999. Yazyikovoe soznanie i kartina mira: Filologiya i kultura: Tambov University Conference, pp. 13-16. (In Russian).
7. Karaulov, Yu.N., 2001. Yazyikovoe soznanie kak protsess (teoreticheskie predposyilki odnogo eksperimenta): Slovo. Sofiya, pp. 128-129. (In Russian).
8. Johnson-Laird, P.N. Mental Models, 1983. Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference, and Consciousness. Cambridge [et al.]: Cambridge University Press, pp. 513.
9. Lakoff, G., 1984. Categories and Cognitive Models: Berkeley Cognitive Science Report. Berkeley: Institute for Human Learning [U. of California], pp. 275-304.
10. Karasik, V.I., 2013. Yazyikovaya matritsa kulturyi. M.: Gnozis, pp. 320. (In Russian).
11. Holland, D., Quinn N., 1987. Cultural Models in Language and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 220.
12. Geeraerts, D., 1993. Cognitive semantics and the history of philosophical epistemology: Conceptualizations and mental processing in language. B.; N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 53-79.
13. Holenstein, E., 1985. Sprachliche Universalien: Eine Untersuchung zur Natur des menschlichen Geistes. Bochum: Brockmeyer, x.
14. Givón, T., 1984. Syntax: A functional-typological introduction: V.1. A.; Ph.: Benjamins, xx.
15. Babushkin, A.P., 2003. Kartina mira i kontseptosfera yazyika: Problemyi verbalizatsii kontseptov v semantike yazyika i teksta: Volgograd University Press, pp. 12-13. (In Russian).
16. Vasilev, L.M., 2000. Sovremennaya lingvisticheskaya semantika v svete kognitivnoy teorii yazyika: Germanica. Slavica. Turkica. Ufa, pp. 249. (In Russian)
17. Alefirenko, N.F., 2006. Yazyik, poznanie, kultura: kognitivno-semiologicheskaya sinergetika slova: monografiya. Volgograd University Press, pp. 228. (In Russian).
18. Lihachev, D.S., 1997. Kontseptosfera russkogo yazyika: Russkaya slovesnost. Ot Teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta. Antologiya pod red. V.P. Neroznaka. M. pp. 280-289. (In Russian).
19. Babushkin, A.P., 2003. Kartina mira i kontseptosfera yazyika: Problemyi verbalizatsii kontseptov v semantike yazyika i teksta: Volgograd University Symposium, pp. 12-13. (In Russian).
20. Karasik, V.I., Slyishkin G.G., 2001. Lingvokulturnyiy kontsept kak edinitsa issledovaniya: Metodologicheskie problemyi kognitivnoy lingvistiki. Voroneg University Pres, pp. 75-80. (In Russian).
21. Popova, Z.D., Sternin I.A., 2006. Semantiko-kognitivnyiy analiz yazyika: Monografiya. Voronezh: Istoki, pp. 220. (In Russian).
22. Ogneva, E., 2011. Modelirovanie etnokognitivnoy arhitektoniki literaturnyih proizvedeniy: monografiya. Germany: LAP LAMBER Academic Publishing, pp. 294. (In Russian).

23. Slyishkin, G.G., 2004. Lingvokulturnyiy kontsept kak sistemnoe obrazovanie: Vestnik VGU, Seriya Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya, 1: 29-34. (In Russian).

24. Alefirenko, N.F, 2009. Zhivoe slovo: problemyi funktsionalnoy leksikologii: monografiya. M. Flinta: Nauka, pp. 344. (In Russian).

25. Harris, R., 1996. Signs, Language and Communication: Integrational and Segregational Approaches. L., N.Y.: Routledge, pp. 220.