

У.И.Копжасарова, А.Ю.Шипицына, А.А.Нуржанова

Выражение национальной культуры во фразеологизмах русского и английского языков

В статье раскрывается роль фразеологизмов английского и русского языков как средства выражения национальной культуры. Авторами были рассмотрены специфические особенности фразеологизмов русской и английской культуры, отражающие образное мышление народа. Приводятся примеры фразеологизмов английского и русского языков, отражающих национальную специфику культур. Также были рассмотрены фразеологизмы английского и русского языков по различной тематике и из разных источников. В заключение авторы приходят к выводу о том, что фразеологизмы являются средством выражения национальной культуры, богатейшим источником о культурно-национальном опыте народа страны изучаемого языка.

References

- 1 Maslova V.A. *Linguocultural studies: the course book for university students*, Moscow: Academy, 2010, 208 p.
- 2 [ER]. Access mode: dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/michelson_old/3167/from
- 3 [ER]. Access mode: u.wiktionary.org/wiki/References
- 4 Kunin A.V. *The course of modern English phraseology: the course book for the students of foreign languages department*, Moscow: Phoenix, 1996, 381 p.
- 5 Kopylenko M.M., Popova S.T. *Essays on General phraseology*, Voronezh: publishing house of Voronezh University, 1989, 190 p.
- 6 Smith L.P. *Phraseology of English*, Moscow, 1998.
- 7 Pastushenko L.P. *English phraseological units as part of phraseological field*, Dis. cand. philol. Sciences, Kiev, 1982.
- 8 [ER]. Access mode: http://www.supermif.com/frazeologizm/rus/rus_fraz.html
- 9 Kiselevich D.I. *Russian-English technical dictionary*, Moscow: Russian language, 2001.
- 10 [ER]. Access mode: <http://www.gramota.ru/spravka/phrases>
- 11 Kiselevich D.I. *Modern Russian-English technical dictionary*, Moscow: Astrel, AST, 2002.
- 12 <http://www.ru.wiktionary.org/wiki>
- 13 Ter-Minasova S.G. *Language and intercultural communication*: Moscow University Publishing house, 2008.
- 14 Birikh A.K. *Dictionary of Russian phraseology. Historical and etymological directory*, SPb: Folio-Press, 1998, 704 p.
- 15 Kunin A.V. *English-Russian phraseological dictionary*, 4-e Izd., Moscow: Russik, 1984, 944 p.

UDC 378.147

G.Yu.Amanbayeva, A.T.Toleubekova

*Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University
(E-mail: Sulamita_t@mail.ru)*

Ontologic parameters of scientific research

The article deals with one of the objects of linguistic research — the category of discourse as well as its typology. The main components of the institutional dialogue are described on the basis of scientific type of discourse. Its integral differential features are analyzed. The criteria for this type of discourse and its genre space are identified. The so-called complex regulatory principles are considered, adherence to which optimizes the process of creation, transmission and use of knowledge.

Key words: text, discourse, scientific discourse, institutional discourse, classification of discourse types.

The current stage of linguistic science is characterized by linguists' interest in the problems of the text in general and scientific discourse in particular. It is determined by the complex, multidimensional nature of the object of research itself, the emergence of new methods for the study of this object, the processes of globalization covering all aspects of social life including science [1; 130, 131].

Category discourse, one of the main categories in communicative linguistics and modern social sciences like any widely used concept allows multiple scientific interpretations.

In colloquialistics a discourse can be understood as an oral-spoken work without clearly expressed textual organization [2; 50–57]. M.L.Makarov takes a different position offering to use the terms «text» and «discourse» as synonyms leaving for the last one «underlined processuality» [3; 75–87]. N.D.Arutunova defines discourse as «a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic, pragmatic, social and cultural, psychological and other factors» [4; 137]. The need to comment own understanding of the term «discourse» arises in connection with its belonging to a number of humanities [5] as well as because of the ambiguity of interpretations that exist for this concept directly in modern linguistics [5]. To explain the reasons for this situation it is enough to quote from the Dutch researcher T.A.Van Dyck's work «On the definition of discourse»: «the concept of discourse is as vague as the concept of language, society and ideology. We know that vague and difficult to define notions often become the most popular» [5]. Therefore the «discourse» can be briefly defined as «the text in a situation of real communication» [5].

If in the 80s under the discourse «communication, the transmission of ideas through words» [5] or simply «speech, lecture, sermon, treatise» [5] is understood but now the concept of discourse is expanded to «communicative event occurring between the speaker and the listener in the process of communicative action». In the modern definition of discourse it is important that its communicative nature is emphasized: speaker ↔ listener, author ↔ reader. The term «discourse» in modern linguistics is close in meaning to the concept of «text» but discourse emphasizes the dynamic nature of linguistic communication unfolding in time. The text is meant primarily as a static object, the result of verbal and cogitative activity. It is preferable to understand «discourse» as a result of speech activity, i.e. as text. Discourse is both similar and different from the language and speech. It is close to speech as it is also a process and activity. However unlike the speech discourse implies a system, it has the property of integrity, has internal organization, shape, the concepts of species, genre and style can be applied to it. Property of consistency makes discourse closer with the language. Language is a universal abstract microsystem whereas discourse is a specific mini-system [6]. Typology of discourse includes religious, political, literary, philosophical and other discursive genres. In such cases the notion of language is used too as it is considered that each culture area has its own language: literary, philosophical, scientific, etc.

In recent years discourse analysis has become one of the central sections of linguistics because cognitive settings in the science of language begin to change and the view according to which no linguistic phenomena can not be adequately understood and described beyond their use regardless of their discursive aspects is gaining momentum [7]. There are many classifications of discourse although any of them is largely arbitrary. The most important distinction in this area is the opposition of oral and written discourse. More specific differences between the varieties of discourse are described by the concept of genre.

V.I.Karasik developed a classification of types of discourse based on the typology of sociological criteria: discursive situation, status and role characteristics of discourse participants, and the distance (proxemics) of communication [8]. On the basis of these criteria the Russian linguist identifies two types of discourse: the person centered (personal) and status oriented (institutional) discourse. Let's consider the second type of discourse in details.

Institutional discourse is the communication limited by the scope of a social institution where each of the interlocutors plays a certain social role. Every institutional discourse uses a certain system of professionally oriented symbols or in other words has its own sublanguage (special vocabulary, phraseology) [9]. Institutional discourse is a very broad concept covering both the language system (its part that is specifically oriented to serve this area of communication) and speech activity (set of linguistic and extralinguistic factors) and text. Political, judicial, military, educational, medical, business, advertising, scientific and other types of institutional discourse are identified. The core of institutional discourse is communication of basic pair of participants of communication — teacher and student, a journalist and the reader performing regulated social roles [10]. Among some linguists there is an opinion that there is no structural organization at the level of discourse. Accordingly it is necessary to recognize that any conversation consists of randomly constructed sentences. But every statement cannot be placed after any other statements. The structure of discourse exists but it should be applied for the discourse with caution because in contrast to the structural determinism in the system of linguistic units «everything is possible» in the discourse [3; 75–87]. M.L.Makarov reasonably considers components of institutional discourse as the most structured types of discourse. Apparently in the discourse sphere we should speak primarily on the informational structure which in its turn determines the symbolic structure of this phenomenon. Difficulty of describing the discourse is that units and structures of very

various nature which perform different functions exist in the discourse. In addition to the structural characteristics discourse has a tonal and genre measures. Genre characteristics of discourse can be considered as a set of certain features [4].

As the parameters of structuring genre space of certain types of institutional discourse E.I. Sheigal considers the degree of institutionality, subject-targeted relationships, social and cultural variability, eventual localization. V.I. Karasik considers genres of institutional discourse as «real-life, naturally existing forms of communication for which we can distinguish the prototype units» (e.g. lesson, lecture, workshop in a pedagogical discourse) [11]. The main trend in the study of institutional discourse now is identifying the features of discourse as a cultural and situational essence, modeling its structure, covering linguocultural features of discourse in interlingual comparison, the determination of its type. The focus is on the organization of the genre space of institutional discourse, the determination of the functional hierarchy of its genres, their description. The study of institutional discourse inevitably involves an appeal to its intentional aspect, namely the study of the strategies and tactics (intentions of speech acts in a typical situation used by communicants to implement their own intentions).

The main task of the author of scientific discourse is to demonstrate the validity of their point of view in the process of perceiving the object of scientific research. In the construction of the statements the author must convince the recipient of the text and hence there is a property of scientific texts as the presence of dispute elements [8]. From other types of discourse scientific one differs by the fact that the level of the audience preparedness is almost correlated with the preparedness level of the author of the text, the author does not need to engage the recipient as he is motivated for the perception himself by virtue of their professional affiliation.

According to V.I. Karasik the main purpose of scientific discourse is «the process of developing the new knowledge about object, phenomenon, their properties and qualities presented in verbal form and caused by communicative canons of scientific communication — logical presentation, proof of the truth and falsity of certain provisions, limited abstraction of the speech subject» [8].

Scientific discourse is a specific scientific way of organizing speech activity. It is considered advisable to recognize institutional status of the scientific discourse as it has its own categorical features that distinguish it from the general system. Supporting the view of L.V. Slavgorodskoy we consider special purpose (specialized problem), the characteristics of typical participants and the form of the existence of discursive work as such constitutive features. Indeed studying of the specifics of scientific prose we agree that any scientific work is the «development, continuation or refutation of previously recognized provisions, polemics with other areas or individual scientists» [12; 66]. Every specific scientific text contains the results of research, opinions and views of other scholars; in other words a scientific text is created on the basis of a common mental and conceptual space of that science of which it is a means for fixing and development.

Scientific text is related retrospectively and prospectively with other scientific texts and acts as microtext in macrotext of scientific communication in the field of a certain branch of scientific knowledge as well as in the global general scientific communication [13; 1]. It means a high degree of intertextual and interdiscursive interaction of scientific texts. It comes against the ground of an extremely generalized conceptual area that synthesizes different notions of the world order consisting of sensory shaped models, ideological structures and fundamental theoretical knowledge about reality developed in the public (as well as a group, individual) consciousness which is called «the scientific image of the world». The specificity of the scientific discourse is related to a special kind of man's mental activity and obey strict laws of logic and pragmatism and therefore the possibilities of the author of the scientific text are limited and specified regarding to the use of borrowed fragments. Terms of communications between scientists require uniqueness and certainty in the interpretation of their thoughts so all references to other sources must be explicitly expressed and understood by the reader. Thus we must assume that the arsenal of means for intertextual expressions used in the scientific literature differs by mandatory labeling (enclosed in quotation marks, registration of footnotes, references indicating the source) and less diverse than in fiction. Creating a scientific text and its perception is an aesthetic, national and cultural activity. We need to know the culture of the nation representative of which created the text because it affects the level of perception and understanding of the text by the reader. Components implementing ultimately the features of the conceptual, mental, national and cultural identity of scientific communication are the cultural components of the scientific text. Scientific theory and concept can not be imagined regardless of the language as science as a way of understanding the world depends on the language. Process and results of cognition should be described in a certain way in order to gain scientific value and social significance.

Scientific discourse is the process of expressing the whole text of the new knowledge and its justification by interrelated arguments i.e. a dialogue between old and new knowledge in which there is a gradual formation of a new, conceptual scientific knowledge. In a such aspect of understanding of discourse the idea according to which the text «can not be regarded only as a product of mental activity or the source of information since it also performs corrective function in the development of speech» becomes particularly essential [14]. The specific nature of scientific discourse involves consideration of the scientific style as a specific register of communication. Scientific style is a functional style of science language used in various fields of knowledge (humanitarian, natural, technical) inside which stylistic and genre substyles should be distinguished. As for genre the scientific discourse genres can be represented as an official report, speech theses, articles, monographs, dissertations, abstracts, reviews, summaries, etc. In other words scientific style is implemented in large and small genre of science fiction. Semantic structure of scientific text combines two constitutive origins. On the one hand the text displays events of denotative sphere and in this case it is mediated by connections between the displayed events; on the other hand the text embodies intellectually communicative activity of the author of the text and its structure reflects the logical relationships between the communicative actions [15; 124]. Since any scientific text is generated in order to create new knowledge which has particular content then this new knowledge can be regarded as information of the text, its rheme. Just rema of scientific text is more relevant in terms of the subsequent data processing. Since addresser of the scientific text has its own scientific concept, its communicative purpose is to explain and prove some truth, to put the problem and try to solve it.

Semantic structure of scientific text is defined by both the process of cognition itself and its organization by a man for specific areas of scientific activity. Communication of scholars in a professional environment is carried out against the ground of well-defined communicative goals, a well-developed system of general knowledge about a certain subject area and thus prepared perception on the part of the addressees of scientific texts. More clearly pragmatic and communicative characteristics of texts are expressed, their genre features are more definite and clear, the degree of their uniqueness is more higher [16]. Scientific text has a number of essential functions the most important of which is the property of transferring information from one subject to another. Analyzing scientific text scientists pay attention to ist such constitutive factors such as the identity of the creator of the text, informative content of the text, the purpose of writing the text and the intended addressee, i.e. chain: the author-text-addressee.

Scientific style has necessary standards of rationality which are required for collaborative activity of communicative parties. Scientific discourse as a verbalized way of thinking, a way of conceptualizing knowledge should have defined communicative structure and pragmatics in order to be understood and accepted. Dialogue between the author and the recipient of a scientific text involves the transmission of new information contributing to the description of the scientific world. This new information in its turn presents the main object of the evaluation as part of the author and the addressee of the scientific message. First of all this evaluation concerns the validity of scientific judgments, their justification and liability. Such author's evaluation of the scientific text is realized through language means on the level of sentences or even paragraphs. Researchers note a high frequency of language means reflecting the author's position within the scientific text [17] which indicates their regulatory character and allows to predict that the evaluation is a specific stylistic feature of the scientific text. The concept of epistemic situation is also included into stylistics of scientific text, it can be defined as a set of interrelated features of communicative and cognitive activity of the subject in the unity of its composing ontological, methodological, axiological and communicative and pragmatic aspects implemented in the text with varying degree of completeness [18]. Scientific text being located within an informative and generative registers [19; 195] performs certain functions promoting its linguocultural analysis. As the communicative intention of the addressant basically has a purpose to influence the addressee in the process of informing and encourage him to interpret the text in line with the scientific outlook of the addressant then informative function and the function of motivation (influence) are immanent to the scientific text since it is designed for a particular addressee.

The main factor of stylistic scientific speech is its content side so the main features of the content of the scientific style are clearness of the framework of the statement subject and principally objective attitude. Through just the content aspect of scientific speech and communicative requirements of content the existence of its original — written form as well as its monological character and logical completeness are determined and because of this verbal form is secondary here. The main content units of scientific speech as well as units of logical thinking are concept, judgment and conclusion. Abstract and generalized nature, objective

presentation, accuracy, consistency and accordingly the impersonality of presentation are all stylistic features by which scientific style can be characterized [20].

Scientific discourse has a number of common features appearing regardless the nature of the sciences themselves and the differences between the genres of expression. According to A.V.Litvinova the main features of scientific discourse are such properties as abstraction, logic, objectivity and accuracy [21; 285].

- Abstraction in scientific discourse manifests itself in a distinct nominative, abstract and generalized statement. Under the abstract and generalized statement it is advisable to understand the functional and semantic «color» of scientific speech which manifests specificity of scientific thinking. In scientific speech it is necessary to reflect the objective properties of the phenomena considered.

- Consistency as one of the main characteristics is carried out in scientific speech which is a form of expression of ideas, opinions. In scientific discourse such language tools that meet the requirements of logical thought as much as possible, express conceptual content are used.

- The objectivity of scientific discourse is achieved due to the specificity of scientific cognition which establishes an objective scientific truth. Objectivity of scientific discourse is carried out due to the impersonality of linguistic expression, the desire to focus on the subject of the statement as well as in scientific texts there is a little degree of subjectivity.

- Accuracy as a feature of scientific discourse is related to the specific scientific cognition. Scientific cognition involves not only objective but also an accurate representation of reality. Without the accuracy of scientific cognition the progress of science is impossible. It is evidenced by the predominance of those linguistic means in scientific speech that are unambiguous and can accurately capture the essence of concepts. These linguistic means include terms and special terminology. Due to the special terms and signs, standard values and international, conventional signs the opportunity to give detailed definitions and characteristics of scientific facts, concepts, processes, phenomena in a brief and saving form is achieved.

E.A. Krotkov identifies and analyzes these so-called regulatory principles of scientific discourse as: [22].

- The validity of the statements is the most important feature of scientific discourse. The absence of this property leads to the phrasemongering and declarativity which is unacceptable in science. The essence of this principle is that if a certain provision is formulated or any hypothesis (theory) is offered it is necessary to give undeniable rational grounds (reasons, arguments) by virtue of which they should be accepted as true or more believable than before. Reasonable description of mentioned forms of knowledge means to give reasons (arguments) of a factual nature (empirical support), to deduce them from other previously recognized theoretical truths (rationale) or get them through reliable methods (methodological justification).

- Orientation for the search of truth. This imperative of scientific discourse assumes that any of our statements are not guaranteed against errors. Truth in its classical sense represents the relation of statement (hypothesis, theory) correspondence (adequate reflection) to a fragment of reality pointed out by it. In modern epistemology and philosophy of science there are two additional competing concepts of truth: coherent one in which the truth is in agreement of suggested provision with already adopted system of assertions and pragmatic one that characterizes truth as a 'capacity' of the idea or its usefulness. However a classical understanding of truth (correspondence theory) is still in the priority in science, others play an important but supporting role yet.

- Conceptuality. This norm assumes the use of category system in any area of scientific discourse which serves as a special coordinates of space of theoretical thinking. Firstly it is the philosophical category: ontological, epistemological and axiological. Secondly it is the scientific category, the system of which allocates a certain aspect of reality which composes the substantive content of science statements. The most important component of conceptuality of scientific discourse is the presence of theoretical laws in it. Substantive content of these laws is reproduced by a relation of content of their constituent scientific categories.

- Methodological consistency. It means that any scientific research can be done with a certain set of rational methods. Way of activity becomes a scientific method of cognition when a) it is intended to gain knowledge; b) it is not universal; c) the efficiency of its use is recognized by the scientific community. The successful application of any method is not purely algorithmic occupation, it assumes that the researcher has uncoded skills acquired in a personal experience. The methods are divided into disciplinary and interdisciplinary, methods of theoretical and empirical research, etc. There is not only methods of discovering new truths, algorithms of inventing new research ways.

- Empiricalness. The requirement according to which observations and experiments should play a decisive role in the recognition or dropping the provisions of the theoretical level of discourse (hypotheses,

laws and theories). According to verificationism (logical empirism) only feasibility of theory forecasts demonstrates its empiricalness: all what can not be verified experimentally is either false or meaningless. Falsificationism (critical rationalism) as a criterion of empiricalness takes refutability of the theory experimentally: not everything is empirical that can be confirmed by the facts. Compromise approach is more acceptable: rationality of scientific discourse is among other things not only in the use of empirical evidence to confirm the theory but also in the persistent search for facts that contradict it.

- Creativity. Innovative research starts from the moment when the impossibility of solving certain types of tasks (problems) on the existing theoretical and factual basis using previously established methods and means is fully realized. This fact encourages the researcher to formulate new ideas and hypotheses, invent non-traditional experimental methods, means for monitoring and measuring that in general is not the case for reproductive discourse. The process of birth of a new thing in scientific creativity in general does not lend itself to rationalization because a significant role in it is played by imagination, intuition and philosophical overtones.

- Criticism. New thing in science originally arises in the minds of a particular researcher as a rule a creative, willed and single-minded nature. However his innovation can be misleading: there is a position developed in European science a long time ago as per which the truth is hidden quite deep and it is extremely difficult to find it alone. Among other scientists engaged in research of the same area of phenomena there are always approaches and points of view that do not coincide with the author and sometimes opposing them. Criticism assumes the ability to listen to counterarguments, to try to think of another point of view, to look at own position as if from the outside and start a meaningful dialogue with other views.

Monotonous, uniqueness, a high degree of certainty (invariability) of linguistic units, argumentativeness, absence of new speech means and original features of their use, the use of well-established, stereotyped and therefore the usual forms of expression devoid of any allegories, allusions and etc. are also considered as the characteristic features of scientific style. Evaluativeness of statement is an important means for implementing the impact function of modern scientific text, it promotes the development of system of socially and linguoculturally significant values. In the modern scientific text trend to simplify syntax, the use of special form is observed. Authors often use analogies, comparisons and even the metaphors [23]. In addition to the main features the scientific discourse has minor properties namely emotionality and expressiveness.

It can be confirmed that discourse satisfying the following three main requirements is a scientific one: its issue should be the study of the world around, the status of its members should be equal and the way of its implementation should be a creative dialogue in the broadest sense of the word [24]. These features allows to identify the scientific discourse among the common system and distinguish it from other types of discourse. Thus the scientific discourse can be defined as institutionally conditioned communicative process with specific range of functions all of which meanwhile are subject to the implementation of the main pragmatic function of scientific discourse, to inform the recipient.

References

- 1 Кравицова Е.В. Научный дискурс как вид институционального типа дискурса // Вестн. Южно-Уральского гос. ун-та. Сер. Лингвистика. — 2012. — Вып. 25. — С. 130–131.
- 2 Колокольцева Т.Н. Роль диалога и диалогичности в современном коммуникативном пространстве // Проблемы речевой коммуникации. — Саратов: Изд-во Саратов. ун-та, 2000. — С. 50–57.
- 3 Макаров М.Л. Изучение структуры речевой коммуникации: От теории речевых актов к дискурс-анализу. — Англическая. — Тверь: Изд-во ТвГУ, 1999. — С. 75–87.
- 4 Арутюнова Н.Д. Дискурс / Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. — М.: Сов. энцикл., 1990. — С. 137.
- 5 Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. — М.: Прогресс, 1989.
- 6 Dijk van T.A. The Study of Discourse. Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction // New Delhi: SAGE Publications. — Vol. 1. — London: Thousand Oaks, 1997. — 352 p.
- 7 Gillian Brown., George Yule. Discourse Analysis, Cambridge: University Press, 1983.
- 8 Карасик В.И. О категориях дискурса // Тверской лингвистический меридиан: Сб. ст. — Тверь: Изд-во Твер. гос. ун-та, 2007. — С. 57–68.
- 9 Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. — Волгоград, 2000. — 368 с.
- 10 Карасик В.И. Язык социального статуса. — Волгоград, 1992.
- 11 Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепт, дискурс. — Волгоград, 1997. — 477 с.
- 12 Гальперин И.П. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. — М.: Наука, 1981.
- 13 Чернявская В.Е. Некоторые текстообразующие факторы научно-критического текста. — Акмола: Изд-во ЦНТИ, 1995.

- 14 Муканов М.М. К вопросу о роли объективации в развитии мысли (к постановке проблемы) // Исследования речемыслительной деятельности. — Вып. 3. — Алма-Ата, 1974. — С. 45–58.
- 15 Колианский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка. — М.: Наука, 1984.
- 16 Варгина Е.И. Научный текст и его воздействие (на материале английского языка). — СПб.: Филол. фак-т СПбГУ, 2004.
- 17 Разинкина Н.Н. Развитие языка английской научной литературы: лингвостилистические исследования. — М.: Наука, 1978.
- 18 Котюрова М.П. Об экстралингвистических основаниях смысловой структуры научного текста. — Красноярск, 1988.
- 19 Всеволодова М.В. Научный текст в функционально-коммуникативном аспекте // Структура и семантика: Докл. VIII Междунар. конф. — Т. 1. — М., 2001. — С. 189–200.
- 20 Кашкин В.Б., Болдырева А.А. Научный дискурс: теория и практика: Учеб. пособие. — Воронеж: Воронежский гос. техн. ун-т, 2005.
- 21 Литвинов А.В. Научный дискурс в свете межкультурной коммуникации // Филология в системе современного университетского образования: материалы науч. конф., 22–23 июня 2004 г. — М.: Изд-во УРАО, 2004. — Вып. 7. — С. 283–289.
- 22 Кротков Е.А. Научный дискурс // Современный дискурс-анализ. — 2010. — Вып. 2. — Т. 1. — С. 4–18.
- 23 Баженова Е.А. Специфика смысловой структуры научного текста и его композиции. Стилистика научного текста (общие параметры). — Пермь, 1996. — С. 158–234.
- 24 Ахтаева Л.А. Научный дискурс как специфическая разновидность дискурсивной деятельности // Молодой учёный. — 2010. — № 7 (18). — С. 144–150.

Г.Ю.Аманбаева, Ә.Т.Төлеубекова

Ғылыми дискурстың онтологиялық өлшемдері

Мақалада лингвистикалық зерттеу нысандарының бірі — дискурс категориясы, сонымен қатар оның типологиясы қарастырылды. Дискурстың ғылыми типі негізінде институционалдық қарым-қатынастың негізгі компоненттері сипатталды. Оның интегралды-дифференциалдық нысандары талданып, осы дискурс типінің өлшемдері мен оның жанрлық кеңістігі анықталды. Авторлармен реттеуші қағидалар кешені зерттеліп, оларды ұстану білімді қалыптастыру, трансляциялау және қолдану үдерістері онтайландырылды.

Г.Ю.Аманбаева, А.Т.Төлеубекова

Онтологические параметры научного дискурса

В статье рассмотрена категория дискурса — один из объектов лингвистических исследований, а также отмечена его типология. Показаны основные компоненты институционального общения на основе научного типа дискурса. Проанализированы его интегральные дифференциальные признаки. Определены критерии данного типа дискурса и его жанровое пространство. Авторами выделен в статье так называемый комплекс регулятивных принципов, следование которым оптимизирует процесс создания, трансляции и использования знаний.

References

- 1 Kravtsova Ye.V. *Bull. of the Southern Ural State University. Series: Linguistics*, 2012, Is. 25, p. 130–131.
- 2 Kolokoltseva T.N. *Problems of speech communication*, Saratov: Izd. of Saratov university, 2000, p. 50–57.
- 3 Makarov M.L. *Studying of structure of speech communication: From the theory of speech acts to a discourse analysis*, Anglistics studies, Tver: Publ. TvGU, 1999, p. 75–87.
- 4 Arutyunova N.D. *Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary*, Moscow: The Soviet encyclopedia, 1990, p. 137.
- 5 Van Dake T.A. *Language. Knowledge. Communication*, Moscow: Progress, 1989.
- 6 Van Dake T.A. *The Study of Discourse. Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* // New Delhi: SAGE Publications, vol. 1, London: Thousand Oaks, 1997, 352 p.
- 7 Gillian Brown., George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: University Press, 1983.
- 8 Karasik V.I. *The Tver linguistic meridian: collection of articles*, Tver: Publ. house of Tver the state university, 2007, p. 57–68.
- 9 Sheiygal Ye.I. *Semiotika of a political discourse*, Volgograd, 2000, 368 p.
- 10 Karasik V.I. *Language of the social status*, Volgograd, 1992.
- 11 Karasik V.I. *Language circle: personality, concept, discourse*, Volgograd, 1997, 477 p.
- 12 Galperin I.R. *Text as object of linguistic research*, Moscow: Nauka, 1981.

- 13 Chernyavskaya V.Ye. *Some the text forming factors of the scientific and critical text*, Akmla: Izd. CNTI, 1995.
- 14 Mukanov M.M. *Researches of rechemyslitelny activity*, Is. 3, Alma-Ata, 1974, p. 45–58.
- 15 Kolshansky G.V. *Communicative function and structure of language*, Moscow: Nauka, 1984.
- 16 Vargina Ye.I. *The scientific text and its influence (on English material)*, SPb: Filol. fak-t St.Petersburg State University, 2004.
- 17 Razinkina N.N. *Development of language of English scientific literature: lingvostylistics researches*, Moscow: Nauka, 1978.
- 18 Kotyurova M.P. *About extralinguistic foundations of semantic structure of the scientific text*, Krasnoyarsk, 1988.
- 19 Vsevolodova M.V. *Structure and semantics: Reports of VIII international conference*, vol. 1, Moscow, 2001, p. 189–200.
- 20 Kashkin V.B., Boldyreva A.A. *Scientific discourse: theory and practice: Manual*, Voronezh: The Voronezh State Technical University, 2005.
- 21 Litvinov A.V. *Philology in system of modern university education: materials of scientific conference*, on June, 22–23, 2004, Moscow: Publ. house of URAO, 2004, Is. 7, p. 283–289.
- 22 Krotkov Ye.A. *Modern discourse analysis*, 2010, Is. 2, 1, p. 4–18.
- 23 Bazhenova Ye.A. *Spetsifik of semantic structure of the scientific text and its composition. Stylistics of the scientific text (general parameters)*, Perm, 1996, p. 158–234.
- 24 Akhtayeva L.A. *Young scientist*, 2010, 7 (18), p. 144–150.

UDC 811.161.1 (001)

G.Yu.Amanbayeva, N.F.Yushko

*Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University
(E-mail: nellyatarasova@gmail.ru)*

The concept of individual personality lexicon in modern psycholinguistic studies

The article deals with the question of the definition of «personal lexicon of personality» in modern linguistics. Individual lexicon is a complex of system that is formed under the influence of both linguistic and intralinguistic factors. The article systematizes the definition of individual identity on the basis of a lexicon of modern psycholinguistic theories stand factors influencing its formation in order to identify ways and approaches of studying lexicon. The characteristic of the individual lexicon, in its turn, is the key to unlocking and analysis of individual pictures of the world, helping to find answers to many pressing questions in the study of language phenomena.

Key words: personal lexicon, individual pictures of the world, individual vocabulary, psycholinguistic theories, linguistic identity.

In recent years all disciplines in one degree or another are related with language, characterized by an increased interest to the personal aspect of his study. Personal aspect came to the fore not only in linguistics, but also in philosophy, psychology, linguistics, and other humanities. In this regard, today topical issues relating to the «linguistic identity», «language picture of the world», «internal lexicon», «mental lexicon», «individual thesaurus», and «the lexicon of the individual» are relevant in science. Among these concepts of particular interest to us is the individual personality lexicon, since it allows giving a detailed description of the person in terms of different approaches.

In this article, we make an attempt to define the individual personality and lexicon to describe it, we describe the phenomena underlying the formation of individual vocabulary, and define the way for his holistic analysis. But before we talk about the lexicon of personality, you need to install as it is today in linguistics defines the concept of «personality».

Central to modern linguistics became anthropocentric concept of «linguistic identity», i.e. man in his ability to make speech acts — it was introduced in science by V.V.Vinogradov. Later, speaking on this subject, G.I.Bogin notes that he understands a language personality of a man who is considered «in terms of its readiness to produce speech acts to create and accept works of speech», while stressing that every man is by nature able to be a language person, but each person has yet to be it [1; 94].