

Victorian period is emphasized. The books by Edit Nesbith, which are not well-known to the country's readers, are shown as a contrast to the samples of children's literature of the mentioned previous period. The British authors of the pre-war period D. M. Barrie, R. Kipling, K. Graham, A. Blighton are mentioned in the article where their main works are analyzed. Some new types of fairy-tales are examined ("The Wizard of Oz", "Peter Pan", "Just So Stories" and others) as well as the realistic stories by Jack London with animals thinking and making decisions like people. Illustrated books for children are also touched upon where illustrations are inseparable from the texts ("Winnie the Pooh", "Peter Rabbit"). The genre of adventures is mentioned in the article too, though its representatives are not very outstanding in the given span of time. The biggest attention is given to the children's books which appeared in the period after WWII. The works by C. S. Lewis and J. R. Tolkien occupy the top position in the hierarchy of books for children for they raised in them the humanistic ideas and moral values as those of ultimate importance. The ideas of Christianity living in the fairy-tales by C. S. Lewis and the genre of fantasy coming to perfection in the novels by J. R. Tolkien complete this research. The article can be regarded as a variant of systematic structure of English literature in the 20th century for children. It naturally can be developed in various involving directions and widely researched with more detail and analysis.

Key words: fiction, genre, fairy-tale, adventure, illustrations, fantasy.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 28.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – д. філол. н., проф. Глущенко В. А.

УДК 37.016 : 811

N. V. Khomyak

COGNITIVE METHOD IN LANGUAGE STUDY

*"The one great barrier between
the brute and the man is Language Man speaks,
and no brute has ever uttered a word.
Language is our Rubicon, and no brute will dare to cross it"*
Max Müller, 1861

The problem of Language and Thought interaction always attracted a close attention within language studies and this interest was not only exclusively linguistic, but also broad philosophic, cultural and historical. The nature of language and thought is an ancient field of debate and still in ancient Greek philosophy universal relationships of these phenomena had been

recognized. It was in Ancient world that foundations had been laid for a view of man as a language-user which was enough to provide the basis for all subsequent linguistic studies in Europe taking into account the fact of communicative acts taking place only by the will of a man. Even if to compare in language discourse the notion of “objective” as the world reflection in human mind and the notion of “subjective” as every other individual perception and evaluation of the outside world, these two procedures are fully pragmatic because the leading role here belongs to a man [1, p. 60], hence here works the anthropic principle meaning that the Universe is built in agreement with a human factor, correlating to the particular perceptions of a man. The mechanism of interaction of a man and the Universe finds its reflection in Language organization: at different historic periods the World picture as “objective entity” took on various interpretations first in individual mind, then in collective mind of a human community. Not in vain the anthropological principle of language analysis so frequently was used in language studies, especially in linguistic semantics. And though the thesis of Language dichotomy appeared to be the corner stone of all linguistic studies in the XX century and unanimously accepted by the most part of scholars, there arose a fully justified question, how is it possible to call up to study language as free and continuous creative activity of human imagination (as put by F. de Saussure), without any information concerning the mechanism that rules that activity.

The general principle of his conception that language is always a dual object consisting of the two planes, one of which functions by force of existing another one [2] runs through all his work. Accordingly, every language phenomenon is to be studied on the principle of dual opposition: in such correlations ‘sound//meaning’; ‘individuum//society’; ‘language//speech’; ‘ideal//real’; ‘association (paradigmatics)//‘syntagmatics’; ‘diachrony//synchrony’; ‘the whole// the part’; ‘virtual//actual’; ‘objective // subjective’. The similar views that work within the framework of the same ontological problem had been expressed by other famous scholars ‘dynamics//statics’; ‘competence//performance’; ‘norm/standard//usage’ (de Courteney; N. Chomsky; L. Hjelmslev). In all cases it makes evident that the first, paradigmatic, plane presupposes a thought as the act of reflecting and processing the information and the result of a thought fixed in a language, while the second, syntagmatic plane – the realized communicative acts. With such disposition of language roles falls out one, rather significant link, the predestination of which is to analyze the information of any kind, empirical or intellectual, and envelop the result into some sound and graphic form and exactly on this stage all the faculties of a human brain get involved into those analytical procedures which in the end give ready material for Language as a system in a shape nominative signs as material representation of human contacts with multifarious phenomena of objective and subjective nature. When reflected in mind and analyzed, the information is to be designated and placed in a language system, first, in agreement with the particular experience of a man and, second, relying upon all the domain of human knowledge what

is impossible without Thought as an indispensable constituent part of Language ontology. When investigating the ways how a man enters into the contact with the world we simultaneously study the processes with the help of which the objective reality is reflected in human mind with the following procedures of its fixation with the nominative signs. As far as any knowledge is anthropological, all the facts concerning thinking and speech activity make the essence in analysis of language facts. That is why there came time to regard Language as a tri-unity: Language as a system of linguistic signs, Language as a sphere of actualization for the linguistic units in speech activity and Thought as a conceptual sphere which provides language viability.

The linguistic signs are not dead symbols with some meaning once and forever fixed what seems quiet natural for artificial semiotic systems. As had been not once postulated in this work every linguistic sign is a reflection in our mind of a certain fragment of reality in a state of constant evolution including not only language synchronic state but all preceding stages of development. The remark that 'language is a semiotic flesh of our thinking' is put rather neatly by a representative of the soviet linguistics [3]. Here comes to mind one more metaphoric and not less neat expression by of a word as a face of a notion' [4].

All language studies in this direction contain to a less or more degree similar views on the mechanism of Language functioning. Philosophers, psychologists, cognitive scientists and artificial intelligence researchers who, for example, study embodied (interiorized) cognition and the embodied mind argue that all the aspects of cognition include high level mental constructs such as concepts and categories and human performance on various cognitive tasks such as reasoning or judgment[5; 6; 7]. Johnson argues that his and Lakoff's recent research [8] on the role of such bodily schemas in cognition and language shows the ways in which aesthetic aspects of experience structure every dimension of our experience and understanding, such as in our ethical reasoning. Lakoff claims that all our abstract conceptualization and reasoning, all our thought and language – all our symbolic expression and interaction – are tied intimately to our embodiment and to the pervasive aesthetic characteristics of all experience.

Just to the point here to remind of 'inner structure of a language' as the mode of language existence in early works of such scholars of Russian and Soviet linguistics as Potebnya, Courteney, Scherba, Meschaninov, Marr, Abayev, etc. Embodied cognition generally reflects the idea that the motor system influences our cognition, just as the mind influences bodily actions. These are reactions of empirical and intellectual nature – body's interactions with the environment followed by the ontological assumptions about the world that are built into the brain. The very term of the trend technically refers to the study of so-called "semantic reactions" [9], or reactions of the whole human organism in its environment to some event – any event, not just perceiving a human-made symbol in respect of that event's meaning. It is to remember that not all reactions – delayed reactions – immediately result in a concrete

nominative sign, creating some long-term associative memory in human consciousness that may take the foreground in a shape of a nominative unit only when there arises some particular situation. The people most commonly use the name to mean the particular system of semantic reactions as the most useful for human survival – “signal reactions” (immediate, unthinking ones, short-term), opposed to delayed ones. If the names for delayed reactions make the vocabulary system on the principle of classification, the signal reactions quite often get short-term, occasional names for which the guarantee to enter the paradigmatic sphere of a language seems not always evident.

In agreement with some common, prototypical, invariant features the information of the world of things or feelings, real or fantastic events being reflected, generalized, designated and orderly arranged in a human consciousness into special groupings are known as paradigmatic systems. The system of language displays systemic characteristics in the mode of language organization. The ‘system’ is a synthesizing notion which implies that a complex object is the whole made up of separate parts. The elements of a system are the constituents of the multitude. As the members of a given system they possess an invariant meaning – some potential function, either semantic or structural or grammatical, common for all these members but differing in semantic, functional or structural nuances. The elements have no value apart from a system and can be conceived only through the systemic relations of other elements in a system known in linguistics as a paradigm. It makes evident that the very notion presents some associative sphere of knowledge, received by means of several procedures as the subsequent steps in a search of the final answer to the puzzle of the world. Accordingly when we want to discern the mechanism of reflection and fixation the objective reality in human mind we work in agreement with the principles of a cognitive method of analysis involving all the spheres of language making – reflection, generalization and representation in linguistic signs. The relations of language and world make the essence of a global language function – representation of thinking in a process of communication. The real functioning of language presents a ceaseless process of verbal communication among the people, so language becomes a necessary mechanism for a human society to accumulate knowledge and experience and pass them to oncoming generations. Language generalizes and differentiates the properties and relations of the outside world, keeps social and historical information reflected in meanings and names at the same time satisfying the needs of the people, expressing all emphatic and pragmatic peculiarities characteristic of a communicative act. And as we not once stressed it is a factor of interaction of the three language entities that makes Language the mighty weapon for a man in his contact with the world.

Within this problem we state that existence and functioning of language is possible only with the process of thinking being involved. As the result of logical operation of abstraction and generalization the objective reality in all its manifestation takes a shape of a linguistic sign on the level of human consciousness: all the facts of reality are registered here in a form of

nominative signs making in the end that ontological phenomenon which we call as language. Aristotle, for instance, described words as ‘symbols or signs of affections of the soul’ [cit.in4]. In him these affections were ‘representations, likenesses, images, or copies’ of things. Just as the external world of things was the same for all mankind, so also was the inner world of affections’. Every individual experience in the outside world is embodied in human consciousness in a shape of linguistic symbols – signs. Without consciousness in action or a living thought no plane of language can exist and function and to try to prove the opposite is a futile occupation.

So the role of Thought penetrating language and speech lies in the basis of all the global epistemological processes the essence of which is to study “how we know what we know of knowledge”. The cognitive method of linguistic analysis is very complex, because it gives an insight into the inner working mind that is outside the interest of those who prefer to study only the production of language which, nevertheless, embodies all the content and riches of a thought, and a world of a thought for a man was and remains the reflection of the whole objective world presenting a unique cognitive system adequately transmitted by any human language. The notion of language is to a certain degree a notion of meaning which accumulates all the riches of the World and Man.

Now, when we have shown that the ontological essence of language as the unity of objective, subjective and virtual makes the main task for all linguistic science and makes the essence of cognitive approach in language study we’d like to review a few positions as to usage of the terms as cognitivism, cognition, cognitive analysis which got rather popular, though in their interpretation the scholars take some liberties, sometimes justified, sometimes not. Even if used, it demands special explanation what was meant. The presence of a term ‘cognitive’ in a composition of multifarious word combinations does not mean, in fact, that a corresponding work is done in the framework of a cognitive paradigm and the term is understood in appropriate way [10].

Many specialists formed the opinion that quite often a term ‘cognitive’ sounds ‘as diffuse and ‘empty’ [11, p. 55]. As an illustration may serve the very combination ‘cognitive paradigm’, too often used in linguistics and by tradition in our case too. If once again to admit that ‘paradigm’ is the subset of entities (here: linguistic signs) united by some common function or feature but differing in nuances, disposed in a language system, simultaneously reflecting the facts of human experience in the contact with the objective world, the attribute ‘cognitive’ seems to be irrelevant and even pleonastic because the very term ‘paradigm’ presupposes a piece of knowledge, resulting a number of different analytical procedures. If to regard ‘cognitive linguistics’ here seems more justified to treat it as a research aimed at the solution the epistemological problems concerning language nature. Cognitive theory ‘is investigation of mental information’ [12, p. 35]. Structure of knowledge fixed in Language are, first of all ‘natural structures’, structures of experience, world realization and

evaluation shared by all the members of language community and by this presenting so-called 'shared knowledge'. 'Cognitive semantics' being developed within cognitive linguistics movement abroad, rests on the principles of conceptualization and, motivation, which do not contradict to the acknowledgement language as a system of human knowledge reflected, generalized and designated in human mind.

'Cognition' is usually determined as acquisition of knowledge, usage and mastering a lot of practical habits and skills in the process of adaptation of a man to the outside world and his survival, in classification of the data received and disposition of information in a collective memory, etc. [13]. In other words, 'cognition' means the acts of manipulation with knowledge, the work with information.

The mental processes described as cognitive may be presented with the two broad categories: objective – how we know the world), and subjective – how we understand the world through feelings and emotions. Accordingly this description presupposes to apply to processes such as memory (short-term/long-term), associative thinking relying upon the two types of memory, concept formation, pattern recognition, language attention, perception and action. In other words, cognitive linguistics studies Language in form and content on all its levels what goes in agreement with the teaching on Language ontology as the unity of 'objective', 'subjective' and 'virtual' presented with human consciousness as a spiritual category and secondary phenomenon in relation to the material world reflected in a thought. Human consciousness exists only in its language flesh, which is not a mere fixation of conscious acts but meant to globally convey all the content of human thinking. In semiotic reality of language the individual consciousness is to be simultaneously abstracted and represented as a social phenomenon. The very essence of communication lies in the fact that the individuals enter into relations through that means which we call 'language', moreover, these relations are purposeful, teleologically relevant because, with the help of their languages, the peoples get information, change in results of practical and theoretical cognition of the world beginning with the most elementary units of information and ending in the general laws of the Universe. All the facts of knowledge in human society, including those, actually existing in the act of communication, make nothing but the objectified moment of cognitive activity of a human fixed in a language form. Teaching on associative aspect of language organization predetermined the direct participation of a human thought in a process of forming the content of a human language and in this connection there appeared many works in which is used the associative principle of recognition and subsequent arrangement of a received information in a shape of a field structure [14], frames(frame semantics) [15], prototypes and invariants [16], image schemata [5; 6], ideosemantic superstructure [17], semantic paradigm [18, p. 4 – 5; 19]. Though in all cases lies the principle of conceptual organization of a human knowledge of the outside world reflected, generalized and registered in human memory with the help of the nominative signs.

Language simultaneously is a weapon of cognition, weapon of accumulation the information of the world (or so often used in present-day linguistics ‘world picture’) and a weapon of Language progress within the nominative processes, the essence of which lies in the fact that a man simultaneously renders the information about something reflected in his mind and designates this something. According to W. von Humboldt “Language is a formative organ of thought. Intellectual activity, entirely mental, entirely internal and to some extent passing without trace, becomes through sound externalized in speech and perceptible to the senses. Thought and language are therefore one and inseparable from each other [20].

Thus, a method of discussion in this article makes a reliable means in investigation all the linguistic problems irrespective of a linguistic status, stylistic coloring, style and genre of a unit in question. We can postulate that the cognitive method within language study presents the row of analytical procedures determining the nature of a newly acquired experience, either physical, or intellectual, and its further disposition in a system of human knowledge.

References

- 1. Фуко М.** Порядок дискурса / М. Фуко // Воля к истине. – М., 1996. – С. 60.
- 2. Godel R.** Les Sources manuscrites du Cours de linguistique générale de Ferdinand de Saussure. / R. Godel. // Genève – Paris, 1957.
- 3. Колшанский Г. В.** Некоторые вопросы семантики языка в гносеологическом аспекте / Г. В. Колшанский // В кн.: Принципы и методы семантических исследований. – М. : Наука, 1976.
- 4. Гумбольдт В.** Избранные труды по языкознанию. / В. Гумбольдт // М. : Прогресс, 2000. – 400 с.
- 5. Johnson M.** The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason. / Mark Johnson. // University of Chicago, 1987.
- 6. Johnson M.** Moral Imagination: Implications of Cognitive Science for Ethics / Mark Johnson // University of Chicago, 1993.
- 7. Lakoff G.** Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought. // G. Lakoff, M. Johnson / N.Y. : Perseus Books – 1999. – 624 p.
- 8. Ревзина О. Г.** Дискурс и дискурсивные формации / О. Г. Ревзина // Критика и семиотика. – Вып. 8. – Новосибирск, 2005. – С. 66 – 78.
- 9. Korzybski A.** Time-Binding: The General Theory. Two Papers 1924–1926. / Alfred Korzybski // Lakeville, CT: Institute of General Semantics. 1974. – P. 5 – 54.
- 10. Кубрякова Е. С.** О когнитивной лингвистике и семантике термина „когнитивный”: Вестн. Воронежского гос. ун-та. / Е. С. Кубрякова // Сер.: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. – Воронеж, 2001. – С. 4 – 10.
- 11. Фрумкина Р. М.** „Теории среднего уровня” в современной лингвистике / Р. М. Фрумкина // Вопросы языкознания. – 1996. – №2. – С. 55 – 67.
- 12. Jackendoff R.** Semantics and Cognition. 6th ed. Cambridge (Mass.) / R. Jackendoff // The MIT Press. 1993. – 283 p.
- 13. Reed St. R.** Cognition. Theory and Application. / R. St. Reed // 4th ed. San Diego : Brooks. – 1996 – 479 p.
- 14. Адмони В. Г.** Полевая природа частей речи на материале

числительных / В. Г. Адмони // В кн.: Вопросы теории частей речи. – Л. : Наука, 1868. – С. 98 – 106. **15. Fillmore Ch. J.** The Case for Case. In Bach and Harms (Ed.): Universals in Linguistic Theory. / Ch. J. Fillmore. // NY. : Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. – 1968. – P. 1 – 88. **16. Вежбицкая А.** Прототипы и инварианты / А. Вежбицкая // В кн.: Язык. Культура. Познание. – М., 1996. – С. 201 – 231. **17. Абаев В. И.** Понятие идеосемантики – Известия АН СССР. / В. И. Абаев. // Отделение литературы и языка. – Т. XI. – Вып.16 М., – 1948. – С. 13 – 18. **18. Khomyak N. V.** Some aspects of language making. / N. V. Khomyak. // Вісн. Луган. нац. ун-ту ім. Т. Шевченка. – 2012. – № 14 (229). – С. 234 – 246. **19. Хомяк Н. В.** Формирование номинативного значения / Н. В. Хомяк // Сб. Язык: история и современность (междунар. сб. науч. статей) – Луганск, 1999. – С. 111 – 119. **20. Skotko B.** Relationship Between Language and Thought from a Cross-Cultural Perspective / Brian Skotko // Exploring the Mind : Duke Univ. Durham, North Carolina, 1999. **21. Croft W.** Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge / Croft William, D. Alan Cruse // Cambridge University Press, 2004. – P. 11. **22. Harris R.** Language and Speech. In Approaches to Language / Roy Harris. // Univ. of Oxford, Pergamon Press, Oxford-NY., Toronto-Sydney, Paris–Frankfurt, 1983. – P. 2.

Хомяк Н. В. Когнітивний метод при вивченні мови

Значення терміну „когнітивний метод аналізу” повинно відповідати поставленій меті у межах лінгвістичного дослідження. Визначитися з цією проблемою було вирішено за допомогою ретельного розгляду мовної природи та особливостей функціонування мови. Вивчення особливостей функціонування мови у якості засобу накопичення і передачі інформації про об’єктивне оточення людини як відбитку діяльності людської свідомості займає центральну позицію і усіх мовознавчих дослідженнях різної направленості.

Тобто те, що мова для людства є необхідним інструментом збереження отриманих знань для майбутніх поколінь, і є її гносеологічною функцією. Когнітивний метод аналізу мовних явищ містить набір найбільш інформативних аналітичних процедур, що визначають природу емпіричного і інтелектуального досвіду у межах мовної онтології, залучаючи усі рівні пізнання, а саме логічні процедури як засіб обробки отриманого та відбитого у свідомості досвіду, номинативні процеси фіксації цього досвіду та особливості вживання мовних одиниць у мовленнєвій діяльності і подальше їх закріплення у системі мовних засобів за допомогою процедур номінації.

Ключові слова: когнітивний метод, лінгвістика, мова, аспект, діяльність.

Хомяк Н. В. Когнитивный метод при изучении языка

Смысл термина „когнитивный метод анализа” должен соответствовать поставленной задаче в рамках лингвистического исследования. Решение данной проблемы мы решили искать путем

рассмотрения природы языка и особенностей его функционирования. Изучение особенностей функционирования языка как средства накопления и передачи информации об окружающей действительности в результате отражательной деятельности человеческого сознания занимает центральную позицию в лингвистических исследованиях различной направленности. Поэтому каждая из упомянутых проблем является лишь отдельным, но неотъемлемым аспектом единого объекта изучения, а именно, языка со всеми особенностями его организации и функционирования.

Прежде всего язык является для человечества необходимым инструментом накопления и сохранения знаний с целью передачи их будущим поколениям, и в этом состоит его гносеологическая функция. На этом основании мы заявляем, что когнитивный метод представляет ряд аналитических процедур, определяющих природу вновь полученного опыта физического или интеллектуального плана в рамках онтологии языка – речевой деятельности с учетом объективности и субъективности полученной информации, и дальнейшим закреплением в системе языковых средств посредством процедур номинации.

Ключевые слова: когнитивный метод, лингвистика, язык, аспект, деятельность.

Khomyak N. V. Cognitive method in language study

The meaning of the term “cognitive method of analysis” should correspond to the definite task within linguistic research. We decided to look for the solution of this problem through the consideration of the language nature and the features of its functioning. Studying the peculiarities of language functioning as a means of accumulation and transmission of information about the reality as a result of the reflection of the human consciousness occupies the central position in linguistic studies of different orientation. Therefore, each of these problems is separate, but an integral aspect of a single object of studying, namely, the language with all the features of its organization and functioning.

First of all, the language is a necessary tool for humanity accumulation and preservation of knowledge with the aim of their transmission to future generations, and this is its epistemological function. On this basis, we declare that the cognitive method presents a number of analytical procedures, defining the nature of newly acquired experience of physical or intellectual plan within the ontology of the language – speech activity based on objectivity and subjectivity of the information received, and further strengthen in the system of linguistic resources through nomination procedures.

Key words: cognitive method, linguistic, language, aspect, activity.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 12.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – к. філос. н., доц. Степикіна Т. В.