Philological Sciences

Филологические науки

UDC 81

Systemness of Terminological Triads "Mentality – Mindset – Mental Space", "Concept – Text Concept – Discourse Concept": Linguo-rhetoric Aspect*

[1] Alexandra A.Vorozhbitova
[2] Gaukhar I. Issina

[1] Sochi State University, Russia
Dr. (Philology), Dr (Education), Professor
26-a Sovetskaya St., Sochi 354000
E-mail: alvorozhbitova@mail.ru
[2] Karaganda State University named on E.A.Buketov, Kazakhstan
28 Universitetskaya street, Karaganda city 100028
Dr. (Philology), Professor
E-mail: g.issina@mail.ru

Abstract. From the perspective of integrative linguo-rhetoric approach, terminological triads "mentality – mindset – mental space" and "concept – text concept – discourse concept" are systematically characterized as topical ones in the aspect of theory and methodology of modern linguistic research and comparative studies.

Keywords: linguo-rhetoric (RL) paradigm; mentality; mental space; concept; text concept; discourse concept.

Introduction. When developing theoretical and methodological foundations of the discursive layer study in linguo-rhetoric (LR) paradigm, it is necessary to uncover systematically the content of two-row basic concepts, relevant to the linguistic – and more broadly – philological science in their mutual relation: 1) mentality, mindset, mental space; and 2) concept, text concept, discourse concept [1].

Materials and methods. The works of scientists in the field of anthropocentric and cognitive linguistics, linguoculturology, axiological linguistics, intercultural communication theory, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, classical rhetoric and neo-rhetoric, discourse theory and text served as the sources of theoretical research. The following general scientific methods were used: methods of modeling and system analysis; elements of conceptual analysis; methods of contextual, narrative, component analysis; LR paradigm as an integrative branch of philological science.

Translated American and Russian texts of the popular success series books [2] served as the empirical basis in specifying the first terminological triad, selected texts by prominent representatives of Russian philosophical cosmizm (Florenskiy, NA Berdyaev, K. Tsiolkovsky, VI Vernadsky and others [3] – for the second triad.

Discussion. The problem of differentiating "mentality" and "mindset" seems to be rather complicated, but a clear distinction between these concepts in anthropocentric linguistics is necessary to overcome the terminological uncertainty and more accurately express semantic nuances that reflect the cognitive and socio-cultural aspects of these phenomena. The analysis of different interpretations of the concepts "mentality" and "mindset" in foreign and domestic science has revealed that mentality means stable cognitive reactions at the level of public linguistic consciousness, that is, thesaurus of collective linguistic identity determining also the collective pragmatikon and verbal associative network that has developed in this or that ethnic society.

Mentality is a term rapidly emerged into the lexicon of everyday life and many human sciences. Modern social and humanitarian knowledge uses theoretical conclusions of several researches of mentality – Levy-Bruhl, M.Block, Z.Freud, K.G.Jung, etc.

This term was used to explain the fact that the collective and individual consciousness is determined not only by mind, knowledge and the logic of being, but the norms, values and traditions of culture, historical experience of generations and general spiritual disposition of the ethnos as well. The formation of nation's mentality is a long process involving the life of a number of generations and providing a significant impact on the changes occurring in the society under the influence of its stereotypical reactions.

Ethnic mentality of each nation is a set of special characteristics originating from intellectual, mental and psychological abilities of the people, endowed with the historical, geopolitical, climatic, ethnographic, ethnic and social conditions of their lives [4].

Terminological combination "mental space" (G. Fauconnier, M. Turner, and others) takes into account the dynamics of social setting in static of ethnic representations, which is essential in the study of linguistic means of national-specific value expression at a particular historical stage of society development. The concept of "mental space" implies some kind of structure, organizing principle, where some elements are characterized by stability, while the others – by qualitative and quantitative variation, due to socio-cultural changes in the consciousness of collective linguistic identity. In linguistic studies such term extends the idea of abstract concepts, beyond the structural units of cognitive linguistics, for example, frame and gestalt.

As the element of the terminological triad system, mental space serves as the actualized intersection of mentality and mindset in the dynamics of socium representations. Parameters, setting, regulations of current mental space are represented with the linguistic units, embedded in the rhetorical structures in the whole universe of discourse, i.e. an array of texts produced and perceived by the collective language personality of ethnic society at the definite cultural and historical period. This universe of discourse is the current version of LR world view, the elements of which – texts and discourses (discursive layers) of different styles, types and genres operate in various forms, modes, registers of speech communication, entering into the relationship of discourse of paradigmatics and discourse of syntagmatics [5]. In this case, the source of mentality study is "any text" (A.J. Gurevich), but to a greater extent – axiologically saturated "anthropological text", i.e. text, considered from the linguistic anthropological point of view that takes into account "human manifestations in all aspects of his life" [6] and, respectively, the "anthropological discourse."

Cognitive field of the discourse-universe of the definite era and culture, verbalized in the text array, reflects the mentality and mindset of the nation, the dominant traits of ethnocultural mental space in its broadest sense. Performed analysis and scientific generalization on the example of psychological and pragmatic discourse ('discourse of success ") allows us postulating a derivative concept – "mental space of discursive layer and corpus of texts-representants". At the next stage of theoretical and methodological understanding of this concept in line with the ideas of the Sochi LR school the following conceptual and terminological triad "concept – text concept– discourse concept" was developed. The latter concept was postulated, justified and subjected to categorical development.

Concept in our understanding is a universal unit of mental field of the multi-level set of knowledge about any fragment of reality, which includes conceptual, definitional and associative characteristics [7]. The text concept is a "mental formation in the mind of an individual or a group of people, formed on the basis of a particular text" [8]. An obvious opportunity (and theoretical necessity) – extrapolation of the "text concept" to the next level of generalization and categorization development in relation to the whole in the conceptual plan discursive stratum of the "discourse concept".

General strategy of the discursive layer verbalization on the linguistic level is a systematic use of linguistic resources set, organizing the functioning of the concept lexemes-representants in sectors of its nuclear zone and the periphery on the basis of the concept-discourse and other members of the relevant derivational nest. At the rhetorical level, thus a basic linguistic and mental structure as a cognitive-type (by A. Baranov [9]) of the definite discursive layer is implemented, that includes the propositional, modal and textual components. In general, the linguistic component of cognitive-type is based on specific cognitive-typical fields of propositional and modal

form, which are realized in the texts through linguistic expressions, which are in the arsenal of the subject and serve as a kind of work piece to implement communicative intent.

In LR paradigm a propositional component of cognitive-type refers to the concept of discourse "inventive net" and its text-representants on which interconnected functioning of toposes – cultural concepts (elements of LR world view) and tops – functional-notional models of statements (structure elements of LR worldview) are deployed. Modal component of cognitive-type corresponds to the notions of "discretionary nomination" and "elocutive arrangement" of discursive formation. In the analysis of the first notion reference points for that designation are recorded in the aspects of constructing a common architectonics of discursive formation and private composite solutions at its individual texts-representants. "Elocutive arrangement" is analyzed at levels of linguistic operations, text operations and communication activities of collegial linguistic identity – the aggregate producer of the discursive formation.

Linguo-rhetoric, synergetic approach to the study of the triad "concept – text concept – discourse concept" is based on the self-organization of discourse and text, in particular, the concept of a fractal, because generally it is correct to speak of the fractal nature of the conceptual sense [10].

Individual texts of producers – representatives of a conceptually coherent discursive formation – can be analyzed not as independent units, but as system elements – in continuation of levels of language system on the text-discursive level: phonemes, morphemes, word types, lexemes, phrases, sentences, texts, discourses (including any discursive layers as conceptual and holistic unities). Each text is presented as a "holographic cleavage" of discursive text-forming process of a combined linguistic identity (e.g., collegial linguistic identity of philosophers-cosmists) within the circuitry of LR approach. The last is formed by means of intersecting of three categorical series: 1) ethos, logos and pathos (moral-philosophical, verbal-intellectual and emotional beginnings of speech) as the ideology of any speech act, and 2) levels of linguistic identity structure (verbal-semantic, linguistic and cognitive motivation) as a carrier of ideology, 3) phases of universal ideo-speech cycle "from thought to word" (invention, disposition, elocution) as a way of ideology explication, technology of verbalization in a discursive text-forming process.

Conclusion. The comprehension of members' dialectical relationship built and characterized from LR conceptual positions of categorical triads contributes to the development of theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of language mentality problems, verbalization and conceptualization of the national consciousness. The proposed material is needed when considering the linguistic identity (bi- and poli-lingual as well, f.e. see [11–14]) – the subject of discourse processes, in various aspects of effective cross-cultural communication, including literary one [15, 16]; when studying the linguistic means of expression of speech-thinking and textual-discursive phenomena national specificity.

Примечания:
1. Ворожбитова А.А. Комплексное исследование дискурсивных процессов в российском социокультурно-образовательном пространстве XIX–XXI вв.: программные установки лингвориторической парадигмы // Вестник Сочинского государственного университета туризма и курортного дела. 2012. № 1 (19). С. 182–185.
2. Берсенева О.Ю. Лингвориторическая организация психолого-прагматического дискурса (на материале популярных книжных серий о достижении успеха): Автореф. ... канд. фил. наук. Краснодар: КубГУ, 2011. 23 с.
3. Тихонова А.Б. Особенности тезауруса коллегиальной языковой личности продуцента русского космофилософского дискурса: лингвориторический подход // Вестник Сочинского государственного университета туризма и курортного дела. 2011. №4 (18). С. 193–196.
4. Issina G.I. Language as an indicator of mentality. Kazakhstan's Higher Education. Reformation and Modernization. – International Center for Education and Technology, LLC/USA, 2012. P.79-81.
5. Ворожбитова А.А. Теория текста: антропоцентрическое направление: Учебное пособие. М.: Высшая школа, 2005. 367 с.
6. Голев Н.Д., Чернышова Т.В. Публицистический антропотекст как отражение социальной позиции адресата // 2009. http://lingvo.asu.ru/golev/articles/v85.html.
7. Исина Г.И. Стереотипы и национальная языковая картина. Караганды: Изд-во КарГУ, 2007.

8. Димитрова Е.В. Трансляция эмотивных смыслов русского концепта «тоска» во французскую лингвокультуру. Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Волгоград, 2001. С. 5.

9. Баранов А.Г. Прагматика как методологическая перспектива языка. Краснодар: Просвещение-Юг, 2008. С. 39.

10. Бронник Л.В. Динамическая сложность концепта в дискурсе: когнитивно-синергетический подход: монография. Краснодар: Изд-во Краснодарский ЦНТИ – филиал ФГУ «Объединение «Росинформресурс», 2010. С. 84.

11. Башиева С.К., Дохова З.Р., Чепракова Т.А., Шогенова М.Ч. Речевой портрет молодежи в условиях полиэтнической Кабардино-Балкарии: к постановке проблемы // Лингвориторическая парадигма: теоретические и прикладные аспекты: Межвуз. сб. науч. тр. Вып. 13 / Под ред. проф. А.А. Ворожбитовой. Сочи: РИО СГУТ и КД, 2009. С. 26–32.

12. Башиева С.К., Шогенова М.Ч. Концепт «патриотизм» как фрагмент вербальной, ассоциативно-семантической сети в организации языковой личности (результаты ассоциативного эксперимента) // Вестник Самарского государственного университета. – Самара, 2010. № 3 (77). С. 107–112.

13. Башиева С.К., Дохова З.Р. Особенности формирования языковой личности учащихся в полилингвальной школе (на материале Кабардино-Балкарской Республики) // Актуальные проблемы современного образования // Сборник научных трудов // Материалы Всероссийской конференции под ред. Р.П. Бибиловой. Часть 1. Владикавказ: Изд-во СОГУ, 2011. С. 163-169.

14. Башиева С.К., Дохова З.Р., Шогенова М.Ч., Безрокова М.Б. Социальный статус как фактор формирования языковой личности // Известия Кабардино-Балкарского государственного университета. 2012. Т.II. № 3. С. 78–82.

15. Казиева А.М., Кузнецова А.В. Значимость символов национального образа мира для современной северокавказской культуры // Гуманитарные исследования. Журнал фундаментальных и прикладных исследований. Астраханский государственный университет. Издат. дом «Астраханский университет», 2012. № 3 (43). С. 161–165.

16. Кузнецова А.В. Феномен билингвального художественного текста: семантико-прагматический статус // Вестник ПГЛУ. Пятигорск, 2012. № 1. С. 80–84.

References:

1. Vorozhbitova A.A. Kompleksnoe issledovanie diskursivnykh protsessov v rossiiskom sotsiokul'turno-obrazovatel'nom prostranstve KhIKh–KhKhI vv.: programmnye ustanovki lingvoritoricheskoi paradigmy // Vestnik Sochinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta turizma i kurortnogo dela. 2012. № 1 (19). S. 182–185.

2. Berseneva O.Yu. Lingvoritoricheskaya organizatsiya psikhologo-pragmaticheskogo diskursa (na materiale populyarnykh knizhnykh serii o dostizhenii uspekha): Avtoref. ... kand. fil. nauk. Krasnodar: KubGU, 2011. 23 s.

3. Tikhonova A.V. Osobennosti tezaurusa kollegial'noi yazykovoi lichnosti produtsenta russkogo kosmofilosofskogo diskursa: lingvoritoricheskii podkhod // Vestnik Sochinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta turizma i kurortnogo dela. 2011. №4 (18). S. 193–196.

4. Issina G.I. Language as an indicator of mentality. Kazakhstan's Higher Education. Reformation and Modernization. – International Center for Education and Technology, LLC/USA, 2012. P.79-81.

5. Vorozhbitova A.A. Teoriya teksta: antropotsentricheskoe napravlenie: Uchebnoe posobie. M.: Vysshaya shkola, 2005. 367 s.

6. Golev N.D., Chernyshova T.V. Publitsisticheskii antropotekst kak otrazhenie sotsial'noi pozitsii adresata // 2009. http://lingvo.asu.ru/golev/articles/v85.html.

7. Isina G.I. Stereotipy i natsional'naya yazykovaya kartina. Karagandy: Izd-vo KarGU, 2007.

8. Dimitrova E.V. Translyatsiya emotivnykh smyslov russkogo kontsepta «toska» vo frantsuzskuyu lingvokul'turu. Dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Volgograd, 2001. S. 5.

9. Baranov A.G. Pragmatika kak metodologicheskaya perspektiva yazyka. Krasnodar: Prosveshchenie-Yug, 2008. S. 39.

10. Bronnik L.V. Dinamicheskaya slozhnost' kontsepta v diskurse: kognitivno-sinergeticheskii podkhod: monografiya. Krasnodar: Izd-vo Krasnodarskii TsNTI – filial FGU «Ob"edinenie «Rosinformresurs», 2010. S. 84.

11. Bashieva S.K., Dokhova Z.R., Cheprakova T.A., Shogenova M.Ch. Rechevoi portret molodezhi v usloviyakh polietnicheskoi Kabardino-Balkarii: k postanovke problemy // Lingvoritoricheskaya paradigma: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty: Mezhvuz. sb. nauch. tr. Vyp. 13 / Pod red. prof. A.A. Vorozhbitovoi. Sochi: RIO SGUT i KD, 2009. S. 26–32.

12. Bashieva S.K., Shogenova M.Ch. Kontsept «patriotizm» kak fragment verbal'noi, assotsiativno-semanticheskoi seti v organizatsii yazykovoi lichnosti (rezul'taty assotsiativnogo eksperimenta) // Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. – Samara, 2010. № 3 (77). S. 107–112.

13. Bashieva S.K., Dokhova Z.R. Osobennosti formirovaniya yazykovoi lichnosti uchashchikhsya v polilingval'noi shkole (na materiale Kabardino-Balkarskoi Respubliki) // Aktual'nye problemy sovremennogo obrazovaniya // Sbornik nauchnykh trudov // Materialy Vserossiiskoi konferentsii pod red. R.P. Bibilovoi. Chast' 1. Vladikavkaz: Izd-vo SOGU, 2011. S. 163-169.

14. Bashieva S.K., Dokhova Z.R., Shogenova M.Ch., Bezrokova M.B. Sotsial'nyi status kak faktor formirovaniya yazykovoi lichnosti // Izvestiya Kabardino-Balkarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2012. T.II. № 3. S. 78–82.

15. Kazieva A.M., Kuznetsova A.V. Znachimost' simvolov natsional'nogo obraza mira dlya sovremennoi severokavkazskoi kul'tury // Gumanitarnye issledovaniya. Zhurnal fundamental'nykh i prikladnykh issledovanii. Astrakhanskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. Izdat. dom «Astrakhanskii universitet», 2012. № 3 (43). S. 161–165.

16. Kuznetsova A.V. Fenomen bilingval'nogo khudozhestvennogo teksta: semantiko-pragmaticheskii status // Vestnik PGLU. Pyatigorsk, 2012. № 1. S. 80–84.

УДК 81

Системность терминологических триад «ментальность – менталитет – ментальное пространство», «концепт – концепт текста – концепт дискурса»: лингвориторический аспект

[1] Александра Анатольевна Ворожбитова
[2] Гаухар Иликешевна Исина

[1] Сочинский государственный университет, Россия
354000, г. Сочи, ул. Советская, 26а
Доктор филологических наук, доктор педагогических наук, профессор
E-mail: alvorozhbitova@mail.ru
[2] Карагандинский государственный университет, Казахстан
Доктор филологических наук, профессор
100028, г. Караганда, ул. Университетская 28
E-mail: g.issina@mail.ru

Аннотация. С позиций интегративного лингвориторического подхода системно охарактеризованы в их соотношении терминологические триады «ментальность – менталитет – ментальное пространство» и «концепт – концепт текста – концепт дискурса», актуальные в аспекте теории и методологии современных языковедческих исследований и компаративистики.

Ключевые слова: лингвориторическая (ЛР) парадигма; ментальность; менталитет; ментальное пространство; концепт; концепт текста; концепт дискурса.