

Language Mind as a Mediator of Culture Interiorization

T. M. Agibalova, O. V. Alpatova

Kharkiv Institute of Finance of Kyiv National University of Trade And Economics, Kharkiv, Ukraine
Corresponding authors. E-mails: alpatova.olena@gmail.com, tanika.fem@gmail.com

Paper received 05.04.17; Accepted for publication 14.05.17.

Abstract. The article is devoted to the peculiarities of language mind as a mediator of speakers' intellectual capacity in discourse of language intellectualization. The objective of investigation is focused on speaker's interpretation of lingual symbols' transferred sense, and therefore, his language behavior. Verbalized symbols evolve in time and space of culture that defines coordinates and patterns of languages functioning, such as civilizational, aesthetic, idiosyncrastic factors. Verbal forms of mentality reveal the inherent peculiarities of intellection in the development of language personality from nomination to the symbol, from physically appointed picture of reality to the structured semantic and conceptual paradigms.

Key words: *language cognition, language behavior, mentality, verbalized symbol, language intellectualization.*

Introduction. As a notion that combines linguistic, philosophical, psychological set of features, a concept of individual language mind is considered to base on speaker's linguo-cultural competence and social experience, which identify person's unique style and distinguish his language performance, in which human individuals differ from each other. The following option must be due to the differences in people's ability to acquire a community's language. In its turn, it means those distinguish features may occur in biological, social, personal-psychological, random field of human development. Speakers' performance might be relatable to differences in memory skills, processing speed, social skills, etc.

In human cognition the following theory issue refers to the two ways of knowledge acquisition. In order to use particular expressive means we should be aware, first, of existence of special graphic symbols with referable meanings. Then, being a part of society, we are going to be taught how to apply them in order to transfer our thoughts and intentions. This competency is generally obtained through everyday communicative practice. In other words, there co-exist two types of «knowing» – knowing the units of expressive means and knowing how to use them appropriately.

Short review on scientific sources, methods and publications. At the present stage of linguistics and cognitive linguistics study the problem of linguo-ethnic mind in reference for nature, assimilation and use of knowledge transferring is one of the most actual issue. Researchers offer the three directions of study to define the character of the mentioned categories' 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 [1; 3; 4; 5].

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 aesthetic 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 purpose of present paper, therefore, is to clarify the nature and factors of language mind development through interpretation and recontextualization of socio-cultural reality.

Statement of the problem. Discussion and interpretation of results. Language system as a correlate of mentality subsists in discourse of cultural background and social context. In terms of intellectualization study, it is always motivated by world view peculiarities at any stage of human development. Therefore, language personality is revealed through a set of expressive means in everyday communicative practice that distinguishes one individual from other ethnic features keepers. The prominent concernment occurs in the field of individual recontextualization of the commonly used language units' meaning and application, that reflect the national picture of the world, but being reconstructed, at the same time, in a creator's individualized language performance by the means of intellectual capacity.

Analysis of linguized ideological preferences enables us to comprehend the nature of historical paradigms of cognition, accommodated to ethnic background, the ability to indicate the convention of philosophical thought and cultural development, regarding to the history of world civilizations. Remodeled in every language cognition, the following complex of factors implies a progression of language enrichment and intellectualization.

Traditionally, ethnic self-identity of individual is connected with detection of the level of intellectual capacity, communication skills acquisition, and gained through the whole life cultural development. These categories are engaged in the mental space formation, that is dynamic form of experience, objectified in evolution of existing civilization values in conditions of intellectual activity. Linguistic format of the concept of mentality transfers an idea of language memory. Outlined in terms of linguistic thought, the theory of comprehending culture through language acquisition is applied by the means of conceptual and language world view.

The space of national picture of the world is formed by a system of symbolic representations of meanings. Verbalized symbols evolve in time and space of culture that defines coordinates and patterns of languages functioning, such as civilizational, aesthetic, idiosyncrastic factors. Progress and regression in the national language are motivated by stadial change of culture, and intellectualization of

symbolic forms defines vectors of development from specific associative categories to the universal abstract forms. Therefore, 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.

Intellectual capacity of national language personality regards a concept that defines a set of capabilities and characteristics of a person who creates and receives texts [7; 8]. These peculiarities and characteristics are reflected in communication process. Therefore, language mind designates and measures social, ethnic, cultural, psychological, aesthetic formats, as with every newly-created verbal interpretation germinates further shades of language dimensions. Applying means of national experience, spirits and wisdom in non-predictable circumstances; recognizing guiding organizational principles of language as communicative tool; reproducing mental content and comprehending the structure of expressed ideas; originating, integrating, and combining single speech intentions and ideas into more complicated units in order to produce new patterns or structures; making language choices based on reasoned argument and the value of the evidence, language personality provides the implementation of important practical output in national communicative discourse.

The following abilities emphasize an issue of extremely importance of accomplishing a co-called balance between language as concerned with conveying information and language as more inter-personally oriented matter. Appropriately, the concept of language mind requires a comprehensive study of its individual settings and items. For the first time, it was described by Humboldt in his work «On the differences in human languages structure and their influence on the spiritual development of mankind». According his vision, language takes active part in important manifestations of cultural discourse and interpretation of the reality. «Language in accordance with the considered conception, is a universal form of the initial conceptualization of the world, expresser and safe-keeper of unconscious, spontaneous knowledge on the world, historical memory on the socially meaningful events in the human life. Language is a mirror of culture reflecting the images of passed culture, intuition and categories of world outlook» [9].

Evolving in this cultural discourse, intellectual capacity of language personality determines the character of reality interiorization. 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 [6, p. 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) [2, p. 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 form 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 current language mind development in the study of intellectualization advance depends on causes and sources of accretion and combines linguo-external and linguo-internal reasons:

1. Every epoch introduces not only novel words but new notions to be denoted.

2. 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.

3. Innovations fill in existent lexical, phraseological and stylistic lacunae.

4. Common and terminological lexicons, professional language cliches within certain language community come into usage, following the models of current language development and organization.

5. New dictionaries and reference books officialize up-to-date set of language units. Revealed in scientific research articles, novel approaches to linguistic study offer innovative ways and mechanisms of language standardization.

6. Particular part of language units originate from foreign languages.

7. Individual contextual applications are carried from author's idyostyle.

8. Certain lexemes, providing extension capacity, denote concepts, ideas, or signs as a result of metaphorical nomination.

9. Due to current worldwide tendency of globalization, notions of different spheres tend to contiguity, therefore standardized forms of certain lingual symbols acquire novel meaning shades.

Conclusion. To sum up, we state that language mind as a linguo-philosophical category is developed to produce complexities of variation in Lexicology, Grammar, Syntax, Stylistics communicative output, limited by speakers` intellectual capacity. Therefore, individual symbolic representations of cultural experience designates

and measures social, ethnic, psychological, aesthetic formats, as with every newly-created verbal interpretation germinates further shades of personality`s language dimensions. Originating and integrating particular speech intentions and fixed concepts into more complicated units in order to produce new patterns or structures, language personality provides the implementation of continuity and the ability to interpret the mental consciousness in the context of civilizations rational evolution.

The investigation of developed by Ukrainian researchers methodologies that contribute to the study of individual variations of speakers` language performance outlines a **prospective of research.**

REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Язык и мир человека / Н. Д. Арутюнова. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1998. – 896с.
2. Бацевич Ф. С. Нариси з комунікативної лінгвістики : [монографія] / Ф. С. Бацевич. – Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2003. – 281 с.
3. Голубовська І. О. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу / І. О. Голубовська. – К. : Лотос, 2004. – 284 с.
4. Стернин И. А. Методика исследования структуры концепта / И. А. Стернин // Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики. – Воронеж : Воронеж. гос. ун-т, 2001. – С. 58 – 65.
5. Телия В. Н. Типы языковых значений. Связанные значения слова в языке / В. Н. Телия. – М. : Наука, 1981. – 270 с.
6. Шевченко Л. І. Інтелектуальна еволюція української літературної мови : теорія аналізу : [монографія] / Л. І. Шевченко. – К. : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр «Київський університет», 2001. – 478 с.
7. Fauconnier, G. Mental Spaces and Cognitive Mappings. Stockholm : University of Stockholm, 1996.
8. Fillmore, Charles. On Fluency // Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behaviour. London, 1979. P. 85 – 102.
9. Humboldt, W. von. Language and cultural philosophy / W. von Humboldt. M : Progress, 1985. – 450 p.

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N. D. A Language and a World of Human. M. : Languages of Russian Culture, 1998. – 896 p.
2. Batcevyich, F. S. Essays in Communicative Linguistics : [monograph]. Lviv : The publishing center named after Ivan Franko, 2003. – 281 p.
3. Holubovska, I. O. Ethnic Peculiarities of Different World Views. K. : Lotos, 2004. – 284 p.
4. Sternyn, I. A. The Methodology of a Structure of Concept Investigation // Methodological Problems of Cognitive Linguistics. Voronezh : Voronezh State University, 2001. P. 58 – 65.
5. Teliya, V. N. Types of Language Meanings. Connected Meanings of the Word in Language. M. : Nauka, 1981. – 270 p.
6. Shevchenko, L. I. The Intellectual Evolution of the Ukrainian Literary Language : the theory of analysis : [monograph]. K. : The publishing and polygraph center «Kyiv University», 2001. – 478 p.

Языковое сознание как медиатор интериоризации культуры

Агібалова Т. Н., Алпатова Е. В.

Аннотация. В статье проанализирована специфика формирования языкового сознания как медиатора рационального ресурса личности в аспекте теории интеллектуализации языка. Внимание акцентировано на природе интерпретации говорящим семантического наполнения лингвальных знаков и, как следствие, его языковом поведении. Значение таких вербализированных символов меняется в процессе эволюции во времени и пространстве культуры, что, в свою очередь, определяет векторы функционирования языка – цивилизационный, эстетический, идиостилистический. Вербальные формы ментальности раскрывают картину развития интеллекта в процессе становления языковой личности – от номинации к символу, от физически объективированной картины мира к структурированным семантическим и концептуальным парадигмам.

Ключевые слова: языковое сознание, языковое поведение, ментальность, вербализированный символ, интеллектуализация языка.