

THE LINGUISTIC REALITY AND THE MODERN ASPECTS OF ITS STUDIES VIEWED THROUGH SCIENTIFIC PARADIGMS

Viktoriya KARPUKHINA

Associate Professor, Ph.D.

(Altai State University of Barnaul, Russian Federation)

vkarpukhina@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0145-1906>

Abstract

The article considers the interpretation of the linguistic reality from the cognitive and discursive aspect. The phenomena under consideration are the objects of the linguistic reality (the text, the discourse, the intertext, the hypertext). The article deals with the scientific paradigms viewed through the epistemological "tradition – modern – postmodern" triad. The main purpose of the article is to reveal the most important aspects of studying the objects of the linguistic reality through the scientific paradigms of XXth - XXIst centuries.

Keywords: *reality, paradigm, scientific, study, linguistic*

Rezumat

Articolul analizează interpretarea realității glotice din punct de vedere cognitive și discursiv. Fenomenele luate în considerare sunt obiectele realității lingvistice (textul, discursul, intertextul, hipertextul). Articolul tratează paradigmele științifice privite prin triada epistemologică „tradiție – modern – postmodern”. Scopul principal al articolului este de a releva cele mai importante aspecte ale studierii obiectelor realității glotice paradigmele științifice ale secolelor XX-XXI.

Cuvinte-cheie: *realitate, paradigmă, științific, cercetare, lingvistic*

The linguistic reality in the article is appreciated like the system of three co-ordinates of "space – time – subject", construed or reconstructed by a linguist. There are the objects of this reality existing and functioning inside it (a text, a discourse, an intertext, a hypertext). The linguistic reality might be appreciated in another way. M. Devitt, e.g., thinks the linguistic reality is made of such "outputs/products" as "physical sentence tokens", "the spoken, written, etc., symbols that speakers produce" (Devitt, 2006, p. 483). The paradoxical thought of M. Yampolskii that "a reality is more or less either a construct or a chaotic indefinite phenomenon which defies any description" (Ямпольский/Jampol'skij, 2010, p. 61) is correct when discussing the construed/reconstructed phenomenon of the linguistic reality.

Drastic changes in the linguistic reality can be shown using the examples of translation of children's literature. The evolution of language forms, largely connected to the public conscience changes, may be foreseen by translators in their linguistic work (see Karpukhina, 2012, p. 52). Appeared in the 1990s, the postmodern translation of A. A. Milne's "Winnie-the-Pooh" by V. Rudnev (Руднев/Rudnev, 2000) anticipated the deep changes of the Russian lan-

language stylistic standards which can be easily grasped in any Russian contemporary text (especially in mass-media and scientific texts, not only in translated children's literature).

The analytical translation theory, made by V. Rudnev and embodied into the translation of A. A. Milne's stories, has failed from the communication point of view. V. Rudnev fills his target text of "Winnie-the-Pooh" with speech fragments in English (either transcribed or transposed without changes and translation); he keeps to the English syntax constructions, especially standard word order, preserves English punctuation, etc. All these strategies, however, make the target text interesting for different recipients. This new audience is the audience of linguists, philosophers, semioticians, researchers, etc. The main aim of the translation by V. Rudnev was reached, because his new translation of "Winnie-the-Pooh" aimed to broaden the interpretation potential of children's classical books traditionally translated into Russian. The texts of the new translations into Russian of J. Rowling's, J. R. R. Tolkien's, C. Lewis's books, which have appeared in the Internet, show the stylistic shift in the Russian language which was pointed out in the translations made by V. Rudnev.

Language creolization, hybridizing of different languages grammar forms, global usage of English (which turns out to be a kind of "postmodern Latin"), changes in the speech etiquette standard are used now in the language of mass-media and children's literature. It influences, in its turn, the changes of the value system in the contemporary society. Globalization and some cosmopolitanism, inherent for the translators in their activity, were appreciated negatively some time before, but now they can be evaluated as the leading trends in language which determine the contemporary society development and the formation of the contemporary linguistic reality.

From the traditional point of view, the linguistic reality should be studied within the so-called "semantic" language paradigm (see Степанов/ Stepanov, 1985, p. 5). At that moment the main linguistic reality object under consideration is not a text, but a word, "a name". The characteristics of the word in a fiction world and its imagery would become the object of research of the functional stylistics and the reference theory (though the last one would be developed in postmodern era). The linguistic works in the fields of lexicology and lexicography formed the basis of the paradigmatic aspects in the studies of lexemes when the word is seen as the main systematic unit of the language (cf. the works of Apresjan, Šmelev, Kuznecov, Komlev, etc.).

The most widespread pattern of a linguistic reality unit is the "semantic triangle" well-known from C. Ogden's and I. Richards' works. The pattern is considered to be the individual's point of view to the world (see Карпухина/ Karpuhina, 2013, p. 49). Turning to the dynamic cognitive pattern representing both the syntagmatic and paradigmatic characteristics of a lexeme as a sign

correlated to some denotation and significance, the pattern appears when the semantic fields were construed to model the linguistic reality (see Щyp/Šur, 1974). Syntagmatic, semantic and functional fields were the most obvious examples of the alterations to the so-called “modern” stage of the scientific linguistic paradigm.

On this “modern” stage (see Паршин/Paršin, 1998) the word is thought of as an object of the linguistic reality existing in the context (in the text, and later – in the discourse). It gives the possibility to research the structures which are more extensive than the word and the sentence. This new, “syntactic” paradigm (Степанов/Stepanov, 1985, p. 125) is oriented to the connections rather than the paradigm units studying. Taking the postulates of structuralism, functionalism, and generative grammar (see Кубрякова/Kubryakova, 1995) as a basic point, the researchers see the text being the main linguistic reality object. The appearance and development of text linguistics was a fine prerequisite for text grammar studies, and these studies were directed into the formal, but not semantic structure of the text as the linguistic reality object.

Being “the alternative” to the traditional studies, text linguistics emphasized not the systems of a language elements, but the structures of a language objects.

Denoting this linguistic paradigm as the “syntactic” one shows the linguistic turn from lexis to grammar, on the one side. On the other side, the main cognitive pattern considered now by the linguists is the proposition with the verb as a center of it: “The predicates correlate to the connections, not the things, but at the same time the predicates do not denote these connections” (Степанов/Stepanov, 1985, p. 127). Different “case grammars” (see Chafe, Fillmore, etc.) developed the ideas of N. Chomsky only in particular ways. The way out was in searching for some “underlying” or sub-text structure which should construct the text itself and could work as a link to global textual and intertextual structures.

The development of the postmodern, then the cognitive-discursive paradigm of linguistic knowledge is marked by two main differences from the previous paradigms (traditional and “modern”). In the postmodern paradigm the basics are anthropocentrism and relativity of the most important concepts used in the language description. The synthesis is made there by the subject (a human being – speaker, listener, interpreter). The situation of the traditional and modern views onto the linguistic reality is obviously changed. The linguistic reality object under consideration is not only the text now, but the discourse preeminently. It is appreciated as the habitat for the text (see Арутюнова/Arutjunova, 1999; Кубрякова/Kubryakova, 2004). The forms of the linguistic reality more complicated than a text come into the sphere of interests of the linguists at the moment of considering more and

more complicated communication process. The linguists start studying such objects as the *intertext* (Neubert, 1992; Beaugrande, 1997; Смирнов/ Smirnov, 1997; Кузьмина/Kuz'mina, 2009 etc.) and *hypertext* (Черняк/Černjak, 2008; Рязанцева/Rjazanceva, 2008). More complex forms of the linguistic reality objects demand more complex models to be represented. The cognitive models such as frame, scenario, script are changed now to macroframes, hyperframes in the traditional version of the cognitive-discursive studies or to the models construed in the cross-point of human and natural sciences (e.g. fractal models of a text, discourse, intertext in the psycholinguistic and synergetic linguistics studies (Кузьмина/Kuz'mina, 2009)). Communication process considered more and more complex nowadays could be appreciated as the most accessible form of the linguistic reality. It leads to the turn from the static cognitive models (proposition, scheme, script) to the dynamic models (frame, scenario, thesaurus). When the linguists use instruments and methods of social and natural sciences, it seems logical in the era of postmodern. It shows the tendency to create integrative theories within the still existing linguistics paradigm. But, on the other side, the demand on the object of linguistic studies and the methods of these studies being not in a conflict is on the agenda in the postmodern stage of the linguistics development. E.g., the study of the physiological response of an individual at the environment surroundings where the data of the autopoiesis theory were used would be the study made in the field of cognitive psychology or the interaction theory rather than in the field of linguistics.

A paradoxical thought of G. Guillaume of the linguistic instruments ("the highest linguistics can open only those cognitive instruments for a researcher which he has already had and which he can use better only in the case he knows them" (Guillaume, 2010, p. 17)) shows the linguistic reality should be studied by using the linguistic methods, preferably, although using the instruments of some other sciences could be very effective in some cases, too. The scientists working out the cognitive-discursive paradigm use the methods and the data of the sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, philosophical studies in the process of their research to construe the integrative cognitive models of the text, discourse, intertext, hypertext so those models correlate to the most important characteristics of the objects modeled precisely. The so called "interpretationism" of the cognitive-discursive paradigm is the result of the two main characteristics of that paradigm discussed above – anthropocentrism and relativity. The anthropocentric principle on the stage of postmodern takes the interpreter back into the sphere of the linguistic interests. This subject who interprets the linguistic reality is located on the line of the "near-by horizon" (*idem*, p. 160). The relativity principle lets reconstruct another subject – an author – at the line of "the far away horizon". We reconstruct the axiological linguistic strategies of the text and discourse production

which were used by this subject. And the unity of those two processes – text and discourse production and interpretation – is crucial in the cognitive-discursive paradigm while modeling the contemporary linguistic reality.

References

Beaugrande, R. de. (1997). *New Foundations for a Science of Text and Discourse: Cognition, Communication, and the Freedom of Access to Knowledge and Society*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Devitt, M. (2006). Intuitions in Linguistics. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 57, 481-513. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axl017>.

Guillaume, G. (2010). *Principes de linguistique théorique*. Presses de l'Université Laval.

Karpukhina, V. (2012). The Language of Children's Literature in the Society Institutionalization. B: *Materiały VIII Międzynarodowej naukowo-praktycznej konferencji «Dynamika naukowych badań»* (vol. 11). Nauka i studia.

Neubert, A. (1992). *Translation as Text*. Kent State University Press.

Апресян, Ю. (1974). *Лексическая семантика: синонимические средства языка*. Изд-во «Наука» / Apresjan, Ju. (1974). *Leksičeskaja semantika: sinonimičeskie sredstva jazyka*. Izd-vo «Nauka» (= Апресян/Аpresjan, 1974).

Арутюнова, Н. (1999). *Язык и мир человека*. Изд-во «Языки русской культуры» / Arutjunova, N. (1999). *Jazyk i mir čeloveka*. Izd-vo «Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury» (= Арутюнова/Arutjunova, 1999).

Карпухина, В. (2013). *Конструирование лингвистической реальности при смене семиотического кода культуры*. Изд-во Алтайского государственного университета / Karpuhina, V. (2013). *Konstruирование lingvističeskoj real'nosti pri smene semiotičeskogo koda kul'tury*. Izd-vo Altajskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (= Karpuhina/Karpuhina, 2013).

Комлев, Н. (1992). *Слово в речи: денотативные аспекты*. Изд-во МГУ / Komlev, N. (1992). *Slovo v reči: denotativnye aspekty*. Izd-vo MGU (= Комлев/Komlev, 1992).

Кубрякова, Е. (1995). Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX-го века (опыт парадигматического анализа). В: *Язык и наука конца XX-го века* (с. 144–238). Изд-во РГГУ / Kubrjakova, E. (1995). *Ėvoljucija lingvističeskih idej vo vtoroj polovine XX-go veka* (opyt paradigmatičeskogo analiza). V: *Jazyk i nauka konca XX-go veka* (s. 144–238). Izd-vo RGGU (= Кубрякова/Kubrjakova, 1995).

Кубрякова, Е. (2004). *Язык и знание. На пути получения знаний о языке. Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира*. Изд-во «Языки славянских культур» / Kubrjakova, E. (2004). *Jazyk i znanie. Na puti polučenija znanij o jazyke. Časti reči s kognitivnoj točki zrenija. Rol' jazyka v poznanii mira*. Izd-vo «Jazyki slavjanskih kul'tur». <https://www.klex.ru/n1s> (= Кубрякова/Kubrjakova, 2004).

Кузнецов, А. (1986). *От компонентного анализа к компонентному синтезу*. Изд-во «Наука» / Kuznecov, A. (1986). *Ot komponentnogo analiza k komponentnomu sintezu*. Izd-vo «Nauka» (= Кузнецов/Кuznecov, 1986).

Кузьмина, Н. (2009). *Интертекст и его роль в процессах эволюции поэтического языка*. Изд-во «Книжный дом «Либроком» / Kuz'mina, N. (2009). *Intertekst i ego rol' v processah evoljucii poetičeskogo jazyka*. Izd-vo «Knížnyj dom «Librokom» (= Кузьмина/Кuz'mina, 2009).

Паршин, П. (1996). Теоретические перевороты и методологический мятеж в лингвистике XX века. В: *Вопросы языкознания*, 2, 19-42 / Paršin, P. (1996). *Teoretičeskie perevoroty i metodologičeskij mjatež v linvistike XX veka*. V: *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 2, 19-42. <https://vja.ruslang.ru/ru/archive/1996-2/19-42> (= Паршин/Paršin, 1996).

Руднев, В. (2000). *Винни Пух и философия обыденного языка*. Изд-во «Аграф» / Rudnev, V. (2000). *Vinni Puh i filosofija obydenного jazyka*. Izd-vo «Agraf». https://royallib.com/book/rudnev_vadim/vinni_puh_i_filosofiya_obidennogo_yazi_ka.html (= Руднев/Rudnev, 2000).

Рязанцева, Т. (2008). *Теория и практика работы с гипертекстом (на материале английского языка)*. Издательский дом «Академия» / Rjazanceva, T. (2008). *Teorija i praktika raboty s gipertekstom (na materiale anglijsogo jazyka)*. Izdatel'skij dom «Akademija» (= Рязанцева/Rjazanceva, 2008).

Смирнов, И. (1995). *Порождение интертекста. Элементы интертекстуального анализа с примерами из творчества В. Пастернака*. Изд-во Санкт-Петербургского университета / Smirnov, I. (1995). *Poroždenie interteksta. Èlementy intertekstual'nogo analiza s primerami iz tvorčestva V. Pasternaka*. Izd-vo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta (= Смирнов/Smirnov, 1995).

Степанов, Ю. (1985). *В трехмерном пространстве языка. Семиотические проблемы лингвистики, философии, искусства*. Изд-во «Наука» / Stepanov, Ju. (1985). *V trehmernom prostranstve jazyka. Semiotičeskie problemy lingvistiki, filosofii, iskusstva*. Izd-vo «Nauka» (= Степанов/Stepanov, 1985).

Черняк, М. *Массовая литература XX-го века: учебное пособие*. Наука / Černjak, M. *Massovaja literatura XX-go veka: učebное posobie*. Nauka (= Черняк/Černjak, 2007).

Щур, Г. (1974). *Теории поля в лингвистике*. Изд-во «Наука» / Šur, G. (1974). *Teorii polja v linvistike*. Izd-vo «Nauka» (= Щур/Šur, 1974).

Ямпольский, М. (2010). *Сквозь тусклое стекло: 20 глав о неопределенности*. Изд-во «Новое литературное обозрение» / Jampol'skij, M. (2010). *Skvoz' tuskloe steklo: 20 glav o neopredelennosti*. Izd-vo «Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie» (= Ямпольский/Jampol'skij, 2010).