

**COGNITIVE AND SYNERGETIC BASES FOR DESCRIBING
LANGUAGE PHENOMENA: CONDITIONS FOR MUTUAL
COMPLEMENTARITY**

**КОГНИТИВНЫЕ И СИНЕРГЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВАНИЯ
ОПИСАНИЯ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ ЯВЛЕНИЙ: УСЛОВИЯ
ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ВЗАИМОДОПОЛНИТЕЛЬНОСТИ**

A. И. Милостивая

A. I. Milostivaya

Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет
Ставрополь, Россия

North Caucasus Federal University
Stavropol, Russia

e-mail: amilostivaya@inbox.ru

This article focuses on the comparative analysis of the features pertaining to the semantic and functional architectonics within the cognitive and synergetic approaches to the theoretical and linguistic understanding of communication verbal aspects, in an attempt to validate the potential for a comprehensive cognitive and synergetic description of linguistic phenomena. Special emphasis here is put on the isomorphism of the approaches under consideration, which is viewed as a coherency-shaping mechanism ensuring their combinatorics.

Keywords: cognitive linguistics; linguosynergetics; umbrella methodology; natural-science aspects of linguistics; linguistic episteme.

Статья посвящена сопоставительному анализу особенностей семантико-функциональной архитектоники когнитивного и синергетического подходов к теоретико-лингвистическому осмыслению вербальных аспектов коммуникативного действия с тем, чтобы обосновать возможность комплексного когнитивно-синергетического описания языковых явлений. При этом особый акцент сделан на изоморфизме рассматриваемых подходов как когерентообразующем механизме, обеспечивающем возможность их комбинаторики.

Ключевые слова: когнитивная лингвистика; лингвосинергетика; зонтичная методология; естественнонаучные аспекты лингвистики; лингвистическая эпистема.

The famous Russian linguist R.G. Piotrovsky was right stating that “modern linguistics is a mosaic of facts, separate experiments, clichés and assumptions. For the past two centuries, several generations of theoretical linguists and scholars representing both related and non-related sciences have been trying to turn this mosaic into a single model picture of the immanent nature of language and speech. Their effort has not been in vain” [11, p. 58].

Therefore, the well-known principle of epistemological complementarity can be considered the driving force for modern language theory progress.

The purpose of this article is to carry out a comparative analysis of the specificity within the cognitive and synergetic approaches for analyzing verbal communication, as well as to identify their common points and mutual complementarity. Also, we find it important to point out that the analysis we are offering here is not aimed at evaluating the relevance or the heuristic value of the cognitive and synergetic ways in terms of studying verbal phenomena. On the contrary, the analysis is intended to offer a description for the ontology of the modern state of linguistic episteme where “knowledge taken with no criteria for its rational value or for the objectivity of its forms, claims to be positive and thus reveals a history, which is not the history of its increasing improvement yet the history of its ontology” [17, p. 400].

Therefore, both the cognitive science and synergy that emerged about the same time, were fast to go beyond the limits of donor-disciplines, and presented their claims to get the status of panmethodologies. In this regard, the statements by certain experts representing the respective paradigms would be worth citing:

- E.S. Kubryakova: “We have already got disciplines like cognitive anthropology, cognitive sociology, and even cognitive literary studies, i.e. almost every branch of the humanities has a special area associated with the application of the cognitive approach and cognitive analysis to the respective objects within this science” [5, c. 10–11];

- V.G. Budanov: “Today, in the times of anthropological turn, the synergetics of human-like systems is creating a special meta-level of culture, a reflexive tool for analyzing its progress – synergetic methodology, the methodology for interdisciplinary communication and for modeling the reality” [1, c. 73];

As we can see here, both the cognitive and the synergetic components in the modern research are of umbrella nature, which is largely due to the fact that these approaches specify the traditional object of linguistic description, rather than construct it. These are some kind of epistemological modifiers in the modern language theory. They were the focus of the following idea expressed by V.A. Pischalnikova and A.G. Sonin: “Many modern linguistic disciplines differ only in terms of the perspective (the view offered on this or that particular aspect, a specific feature of the object), and not in terms of offering a new object as it is” [13, p. 426]. Other researchers discuss the uncertainty of the term “cognitive”, pointing, in particular, to the fact that there is no cognitive linguistics, the simplest reason behind this being the fact that there is no non-cognitive linguistics [4, p. 14-21]. A similar description to the epistemological character analysis of synergetics was offered by

L.S. Pikhtovnikov: “Unlike physics, chemistry, psychology, etc., synergetics has no separate subject of study. Synergetics takes on research in any area that features complex systems prone to evolution” [12, p. 51]. We believe that its conclusions – which are definitely correct – can be applied to the linguo-cognitive science as well.

Another factor contributing to considering cognitive linguistics and linguosynergetics as research disciplines with a similar epistemological status is their focus on the natural-science model of scientific knowledge structure. Further on, when describing the constitutive features of this model, we will rely on Yu.V. Rozhdestvensky’s vision of it, which has already become a classical one [16, p. 220-221], and which has gained relevance due to being applied G.G. Moskalchuk’s monographic work “Text Structure as a Synergetic Process” [7, p. 15] in order to describe the natural-science foundations of linguistic synergetics. Now, following Rozhdestvensky, natural sciences can be represented in general terms as a set of the following statements:

- The world is uniform.
- The meaningful part is a spatial and temporal localization of cultural facts.
- Analysis in practice can be reversed into synthesis; the fact of nature is not unique, actually.
- Relations involving energy are significant.
- Things are characterized by their physical essence; cultural and social significance is not essential [16, p. 221].

The first principle of the scientific orientation of cognition is to be seen in the frame of linguosynergetic concepts, and above all – in presenting language as a world of “instabilities and fluctuations, which ultimately are responsible for the striking diversity and richness of forms and structures” [10, p. 7]. Within the cognitive paradigm, the emphasis is put on the holistic nature of the world and language as a derivative of the human mind: “Language is a natural object, a component of the human mind, which is physically present in the brain and is part of the biological heritage of the species” [18, p. 12]. J.R. Searle wrote the same: “Cognitive science focuses on the brain cognitive functioning and its relation to the rest of the body as well as to the rest of the world” [19, p. 106].

Speaking of the relevance pertaining to the space-and-time attributes of the objects within the disciplines in question we shall note that the linguosynergetic concepts stressed the priority of analyzing the material form of the language, which can be calculated in pre-set modeling parameters that can be systematized. During the analysis, the major restriction on the variety of the form and the content of the text is imposed by “the irreversibility of the text in time and space, which acts as a unidirectional orientation of the physical

(material) aspect of the text” [7, p. 7]. For cognitive linguistics, the space-and-time arrangement of the speech chronotope – even though less conceptually significant – is still of some interest, especially in studying scenarios, i.e., stereotypical episodes in their dynamics. Researchers involved in cognitive studies emphasize that “actually, these are frames unfolding in time and space as a sequence of individual episodes, stages, items” [14, p. 119]. All this suggests that both the material-ideal synergetic phenomenon and the cognitive model are not unique, in principle, and can be studied as objects of nature.

The energy-related component is considered as the object’s key parameter in the synergetic theory and methodology, including the cases where linguistic phenomena are analyzed. In this regard, mention is to be made of the etymology of the term “synergetics” that is derived from the word “*synergeia*” (“joint action”, Greek) and that is used to mean “fusion of energies”. N.L. Myshkina, in particular, mentions the linguo-energy-dynamic approach to the text with a focus on the description of textual units’ self-movement, which allows to “identify the conditions giving rise to the text’s specific energy properties (e.g., the dynamic systematicity-asystematicity, singularity, force, potential)” [8, p. 11]. However, there have been no clear criteria developed yet regarding the text’s capacity for self-organization as well as concerning the nature of this specific energy of language units self-movement, all this being a fair explanation for the criticism that can be found in the linguistic literature of N.L. Myshkina’s approach [6, p. 131]. We believe, even despite such objections, that an energy-oriented view on language and text is one of the promising areas in the modern linguistic thought. Research projects focusing on cognitive linguistics, do not regard energy relations as something significant, which, in our opinion, will never diminish their natural scientific status based on other (as described above) parameters.

The statement that we cited the latest of those describing the point of the natural scientific vision of the world according to Rozhdestvensky, proclaims the priority of the thing’s physical essence over its cultural and social significance. This can be fully applied onto both issues belonging to the linguo-cognitive science and onto the area of linguosynergetic concepts. Experts in the cognitive science “claim the method of serial or, if you like, “industrial” solution for the problems related to the human thought” [3, p.18], which will often cause criticism due to the asocial nature of its conclusions concerning the informative aspects of human cognition: “A system that processes information does not care whether it is another of Shakespeare’s sonnets or a numerical matrix. The only part that does matter is that the message must be informative, i.e. offering some contrast against the background of an alternative choice of symbols, getting settled within a pre-set code” [2, p. 20].

Modern literature considers the rejection of such a perspective on cognitive structures, and leaning towards linguistic determinism of socio-cultural processes, to be the Russian trend in cognitive linguistics [9, p. 280]. Besides, there is always a strong emphasis on “the need to review the provisions of the exaggerated anthropocentrism, which is too much represented in certain works belonging to the field of (pseudo) cognitive linguistics” [15, p. 111]. Linguistic studies “should be preferably moved to a new paradigm of knowledge – the global paradigm of the dialogue between the human being and nature” [15, p. 111].

Summing up our thoughts on the implementation conditions for the principle of complementarity in doing research within linguosynergetics and cognitive linguistics, we should point at the fundamental possibility of synthesizing theoretical and methodological programs under consideration, which can be verified both through analyzing the objective natural-science bases of these sciences, and through referring to the metatheoretical reasons proposed by experts in these respective areas of linguistic thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Буданов, В.Г. О методологии синергетики / В.Г. Буданов // Новое в синергетике. – М.: Радиотехника, 2006. – № 2. – С. 70–87.
2. Демьянков, В.З. Когнитивная лингвистика как разновидность интерпретирующего подхода / В.З. Демьянков // Вопросы языкознания. – 1994. – № 4. – С. 17–33.
3. Демьянков, В.З. Проблемы представления знаний в современной науке и роль лингвистики в решении этих проблем / В. З. Демьянков // Язык и структуры представления знаний. – М.: ИНИОН, 1992. – С. 4–77.
4. Касевич, В.Б. О когнитивной лингвистике / В.Б. Касевич // Общее языкознание и теория грамматики. – СПб.: Наука, 1998. – С. 14–21.
5. Кубрякова, Е.С. Об установках когнитивной науки и актуальных проблемах когнитивной лингвистики / Е.С. Кубрякова // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2004. – № 1. – С. 6–17.
6. Левицкий, Ю.А. Лингвистика текста / Ю.А. Левицкий. – М.: Высшая школа, 2006. – 207 с.
7. Москальчук, Г.Г. Структура текста как синергетический процесс / Г.Г. Москальчук. – М.: УРСС, 2003. – 296 с.
8. Мышкина, Н.Л. Внутренняя жизнь текста: механизмы, формы, характеристики / Н. Л. Мышкина. – Пермь: Изд-во Пермского ун-та, 1998. – 152 с.
9. Никитин, М.В. Российский уклон в когнитивной лингвистике / М.В. Никитин // Интерпретация. Понимание. Перевод. – СПб.: СПбГУЭФ, 2005. – С. 278–286.
10. Николис, Г. Познание сложного / Г. Николис, И. Пригожин. – М.: УРСС, 2003. – 344 с.
11. Пиотровский, Р.Г. Лингвистическая синергетика: Исходные положения, первые результаты, перспективы / Р. Г. Пиотровский. – СПб.: СПбГУ, 2006. – 159 с.

12. Пихтовникова, Л.С. Синергетический метод для исследования дискурса в прагматилистическом аспекте / Л.С. Пихтовникова // Вісник ХНУ. – № 848. – 2009. – С. 48–52.
13. Пищальникова, В.А. Общее языкознание / В.А. Пищальникова, А.Г. Сонин. – М.: Академия, 2009. – 448 с.
14. Попова, З.Д. Когнитивная лингвистика / З.Д. Попова, И.А. Стернин. – М.: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2007. – 314 с.
15. Прохоров, В.Ф. Принципы синергетики в языкознании / В.Ф. Прохоров // Colloquium. – Белгород-Бергамо: Изд-во БелГУ, 2005. – С. 108–112.
16. Рождественский, Ю.В. Общая филология / Ю.В. Рождественский. – М.: Фонд «Новое тысячелетие», 1996. – 336 с.
17. Фуко, М. Слова и вещи / М. Фуко // Западная философия. Вторая половина XIX-начало XX века. – М.: Владос, 2001. – С. 400–406.
18. Хомский, Н. О природе и языке / Н. Хомский. – М.: Комкнига, 2005. – 288 с.
19. Searle, J.R. Consciousness and Language / J.R. Searle. – Cambridge: Cambridge-University Press, 2002. – 269 p.

ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЗАЦИЯ И ДЕТЕРМИНОЛОГИЗАЦИЯ ЛЕКСИКИ КАК СПОСОБЫ ОБОГАЩЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

TERMINOLOGICAL AND NON-TERMINOLOGICAL VOCABULARY AS A WAY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ENRICHMENT

М. С. Небышинец

M. S. Nebyshinets

Белорусский государственный университет

Минск, Беларусь

Belarusian State University

Minsk, Belarus

e-mail: mashamolko@gmail.com

Научный руководитель – канд. филол. наук, доцент А.О. Долгова

Рассматриваются пути и методы проникновения терминологической лексики в словарный состав общелитературного английского языка, а также факторы, способствующие этому процессу. Делается вывод о том, что данное явление расширяет синонимические ряды общепотребительных лексических средств, тем самым дополняя словарный состав общепотребительного языка новыми лексическими средствами. Дается описание механизмов вхождения обиходно-разговорной лексики в статус терминологической.

Ключевые слова: термин; терминосистема; английский язык.