

T. M. Agibalova

Kharkiv Institute of Finance

The theoretical aspects of lingual illustration of ethno-language cognition in the discourse of language intellectualization

Агібалова Т. М. Теоретичні аспекти лінгвальної ілюстрації етномовної свідомості в дискурсі інтелектуалізації мови. У статті досліджено особливості вербалізації етномовної свідомості в індивідуальній концептуальній картині світу з огляду на лінгвоментальні засади особистості. Окреслено змістове поле інтелектуалізації мови як процесу об'єктивації нових знань/уявлень у лінгвальній системі знаків, семантичне наповнення яких умотивовано не індуктивними факторами, а індивідуальною інтерпретацією та реінтеріоризацією реальності.

Ключові слова: інтелектуалізація мови, етномовна свідомість, лінгвальна ілюстрація, мовна картина світу, мовна особистість.

Агибалова Т. Н. Теоретические аспекты лингвальной иллюстрации этноязыкового сознания в теории интеллектуализации языка. В статье исследуются особенности вербализации этноязыкового сознания в индивидуальной концептуальной картине мира в проекции на лингвоментальный потенциал личности. Определено содержательное поле интеллектуализации языка как процесса объективации новых знаний/представлений в рамках лингвальной системы знаков, семантическое наполнение которых мотивируется не индуктивным фактором, а индивидуальной интерпретацией и реинтериоризацией реальности.

Ключевые слова: интеллектуализация языка, этноязыковое сознание, лингвальная иллюстрация, языковая картина мира, языковая личность.

Agibalova T. M. The theoretical aspects of lingual illustration of ethno-language cognition in the discourse of language intellectualization. The article deals with the peculiarities of verbalization of ethno-language cognition through individualized conceptual picture of the world and with the means of linguo-mental capacity. It expounds the language intellectualization as a process of objectifying of new knowledge/conceptions with language symbols, that are reviewed not as motivated by inductive principle of consequence but through individual interpretation and reinteriorization of initial input reality.

Key words: language intellectualization, ethno-language cognition, lingual illustration, language picture of the world, language personality.

Current approach to language study is concerned to be outlined in terms of aesthetic code of an ethnos as much as actualizing the rational resource of meanings, implemented with lingual symbols. Accordingly, extending this approach beyond the verbal capacity, an issue of individualized conceptual picture of the world reflects back on the question of what concernment occurs in the field of individual recontextualization of the commonly used language units` meaning or application and what output follows from remodelled, in a creator`s language mind and by the means of intellectual capacity, objective reality. The connection of language to vision, as much as to evolution of existing forms, subsists in discourse of congenital cultural background and empirical development of social context. It follows from cognitive approach to human perception as a relatively modern method of human behaviour interpretation, that focuses on how we think, with the belief that such thought processes affect the way in which we lingualize our world view hierarchy (other approaches take other factors into account, such as a biological approach, which acknowledges the influences of genetics and chemical imbalances on our comportment).

The approach came about in part due to the dissatisfaction with the behavioural method, which focused on our language behaviour without

understanding the internal processes that create it. It`s commonly based on the principle that humans` verbal manner is generated by series of stimuli and responses to these by particular language output. In terms of intellectualization study, language option is always motivated by world view peculiarities at any stage of human development. Therefore, according to Humboldt`s concept, language personality is revealed through a set of expressive means in everyday communicative practice that distinguishes one individual from other ethnic features keepers [9]. «Upbringing» by the circumstances of social context and *with* the means of national identity, language mentality interprets different social myths to explode a false one about etymological identity of new established meaning and its background on which it has been created. It concerns the language units with significant cultural, historyosophical, philosophical, linguosophical semantic capacity, which is motivated or intensified by contextual environment. The intellectual content of them is formed/revealed through implementation of language units` stylistic, derivational, metaphorical peculiarities.

At the present stage of linguistics and cognitive linguistics study the problem of linguo-ethnic code as means of natural assimilation and use of knowledge transferring is one of the most actual issue. Researchers

offer the three directions of study to define their character of interrelation: 1) investigation the types of knowledge, presented in language symbols, and discovering a mechanisms of knowledge obtaining; 2) analysis of language symbols origin and development, and understanding regulating laws and conditions of their applying; 3) detection link lines between language symbols and cultural realities they reflect [2; 3; 5; 6; 8].

In theoretical and practical context, the following issue is investigated as the most multifaceted aspect of current philological study. From this perspective, the series of linguistics research on cognitive models of humans` ideological paradigms, on language as a mediator of aesthetical nation resource become the most significant. The intellectual progress in language is seen as condition of its existence, as cognitive resource, as a key factor in its cultural codes conformation (A. Wierzbicka, G. Lakoff, L. Talmy, W. Chafe, N. Arutyunova, L. Shevchenko, S. Yermolenko, L. Lysychenko, Y. Karpenko, K. Goloborodko, O. Malenko, A. Taranenko, O Selivanova, L. Matsko). The problem of investigation of language national identity, within the intellectual evolution of lingual paradigms of knowledge, remains one of the most relevant point for research. Therefore, the purpose of present paper is to clarify the nature of ethno-language consciousness implementation, through lingual interiorization of reality, as means of realization of language intellectual capacity. The mentioned feature of language intellectual dimension is recognized as the highest level of lingual system evolution and it's all about complicated cognitive process and its output.

At every stage of its development, language is being developed, and at the same time, is developing new, more complicated senses and contexts as a background for further intellectualization. On the one hand, we observe constant standardization and rationalization of intralinguistic modality, but not only orally/visually perceived by humans` sensory system and revealed by such structural branches of language study as Phonology and Orthoepy, Grammar and Syntax, Lexicology and Phraseology. The anthropological principle of current scientific discourse determines human-oriented model of any contemporary field of study, so connects far more naturally to such larger issue in cognitive linguistics as language processing, objectified with *connotations*, *informativity*, *implicitness*, *autosemantization*. On the other hand, in present-day global environment, the fundamental principles of society structure are rather flexible, so in order to serve as means of communication language is concerned to overcome existing borders, established for this cultural/ethnic group. Therefore, in spite of geographical, political and historical processes, a particular set of extralinguistic factors is always regulated by socio-lingual features of the nation. The mentioned observation confirms Lévi-Strauss`s theory of structural anthropology. According to Lévi-Strauss`s concepts, universal patterns in cultural systems are products of the invariant structure of the human mind [4]. The fact that «the essence of the myth isn`t regulated by style, form of the narration, or syntax, but by the story described» [7]. Moreover, at any next stage of evolution

language tends to «separate» itself from the linguistic basis on which it was formed.

Since the word is a tool and means of understanding the intellectual meaning of any reality, considering it a mediator of the aesthetical meaning enables identification of intellectualism as one of the key features of speech. According L. Shevchenko, conceptuality of the theory of literary language intellectualization is established as based on the synthesis of linguistic and epistemological knowledge, due to lingual objectivity, and offered as: 1) dynamics of the literary language evolution in historical and psychological chronotropic guidelines with a prevalence of inherently defined peculiarities and functions; 2) theoretical paradigms transformation given as ordered system of knowledge of the language, its status, functions and further development; 3) theoretical and epistemological methods of investigation: correlation of linguistic knowledge with anthropologically oriented interpretive methodologies of modern science. Therefore, intellectual capacity determines linguistic experience, its encoding in the form of language and mental symbolism [8:127].

For our research, in terms of psycholinguistics, the fundamental idea of intellect emerges as a representation of the universal structured system of linguistic symbols which evolve in ethnic culture space, form its integrity, continuity and the ability to interpret the mental consciousness. Lingualization of mental experience defines dimension of intellectualization existence. F. Batsevych notes that this kind of reversal of philosophical points of view, exposing nature of lingual reality, provides specific images of language in scientific study. Thus, within the linguistic nature of language comprehension, there are two polar opposite approaches: 1) inherent and semiological (language is considered as itself and for itself); 2) anthropological (within that approach language is motivated in the context of human mind boundaries) [1:27]. Therefore, language intellectualism criteria are seen as the interrelation of thinking and communicative performance and reflects the human inner sense of language. However, not any actualized in language combination of facts may be innovative, not every innovation is a contribution in the process of intellectualization. As analysis reveals, lingual symbols with significant meaning capacity (cultural, historyosophical, philosophical, linguosophical), motivated by contextual words and phrases environment, aestheticize speech, so we consider them the most representative means of intellectualization.

The nature of intellectual capacity and peculiarities of contemporary language depends on causes and sources of accretion and combines linguo-external and linguo-internal factors. From the very beginning, every historical/cultural era of civilization development, even at any sublevel, introduces not only novel lexical and phraseological units but new notions to be denoted. Due to current worldwide tendency of collaboration, following from anthropocentric character of modern science, notions of different spheres tend to contiguity, therefore standardized forms of certain lingual symbols acquire novel meaning shades. As methodology of scientific study improves, the need for denoting innovative category notions increases. Innovations fill in

existent lexical, phraseological and stylistic lacunae. To describe and standardize new units, current language system develops new models and even branches of research.

In terms of linguistic needs, intellectualization takes place when the existing terminological system cannot satisfy current requirements. In addition, in globalized environment, these branches of research are no longer monoblocks, but rather multiplied with different intra- and extralingual issues. Accordingly, common and terminological lexicons, professional language clichés within certain language community come into usage, following the models of current language development and organization. New dictionaries and reference books officialize up-to-date set of language units. In their turn, revealed in scientific research articles, novel approaches to linguistic study offer innovative ways and mechanisms of language standardization. Moreover, as a basis and, at the same time, result of human intellectual activity, literary developed language tends to completely perform the variety of functional styles.

To serve as means of universal communication national language must develop lingual resource to nominate the existing and emerging values of aesthetic resource of civilization, or more specifically, of world

environment. Particular part of language units originate from foreign languages as much as individual contextual applications are carried from author's idyostyle. Certain lexemes, providing extension capacity, denote concepts, ideas, or signs as a result of metaphorical nomination. The communicative barriers become more flexible or even partly absorb by universality of intercultural emergence. With growing humankind's cognition complexity, the paradigm of emotional content generates new lexical formations of antonym and synonymic connotations.

To sum up, we state that mental forms of personal identity, represented by the means of cultural memory, are defined as compositions of evolutionary transformed symbols that «remember» or «remodel» culture. Language forms of mentality reveal the inherent peculiarities of intellection in the development of lingual mind from nomination to the symbol, from physically appointed picture of reality to the structured semantic and conceptual paradigms. A detailed study of lingual symbols with significant meaning capacity (cultural, historyosophical, philosophical, linguosophical), manifested by individual literary styles, requires further investigation in terms of the theory of language intellectualization and outlines a perspective of research.

References

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Нариси з комунікативної лінгвістики : [монографія] / Ф. С. Бацевич. – Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2003. – 281 с.
2. Єрмоленко С. Я. Нариси з української словесності (стилістика та культура мови) / С. Я. Єрмоленко. – К. : Довіра, 1999. – 431 с.
3. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг : личность, концепты, дискурс / В. И. Карасик. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. – 477 с.
4. Леви-Строс К. Структурная антропология / [Пер. с фр. Вяч. Вс. Иванова] / К. Леви-Строс. – М. : Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2001. – 512 с. (Серия «Психология без границ»).
5. Серебренников Б. А. Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира / Б. А. Серебренников. – М. : Наука, 1988. – 212 с.
6. Стернин И. А. Методика исследования структуры концепта / И. А. Стернин // Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики : [науч. изд]. – Воронеж : Воронеж. гос. ун-т, 2001. – С. 58 – 65.
7. Топоров В. Н. О структуре некоторых архаических текстов, соотносимых с концепцией «мирового дерева» / В. Н. Топоров. – ТЗС. – Т. 5, 1971.
8. Шевченко Л. І. Інтелектуальна еволюція української літературної мови : теорія аналізу : [монографія] / Л. І. Шевченко. – К. : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр «Київський університет», 2001. – 478 с.
9. Humboldt, W. von. Language and cultural philosophy / W. von Humboldt. – М. : Progress, 1985. – 450 p.