Perspectives for Methodological Symbiosis of Linguo-Pragmatics and Linguo-Conceptology in Ukraine

Kostiantyn Mizin *

Abstract: *The purpose of this article is to examine the theoretical and methodological basis of (1) cognitive-communicative (linguo-didactics), (2) cognitive-communicative (linguistics) and (3) cognitive-discursive frameworks within the current Ukrainian research area to determine their paradigmatic status and to explore the prospects of methodological symbiosis of the most common disciplines in today's Ukrainian linguistics – linguo-pragmatics and linguo-conceptology. It is clear that the analysis of two basic categories of the cognitive-communicative linguistic paradigm – concept and discourse – in light of their methodological tandem enables us to study them from two perspectives – (1) discourse analysis through different concepts and (2) a study of concept through different discourses. These two research means are of primary importance for both Ukrainian and foreign linguists.*

Key words: *cognitive-communicative paradigm, methodology, discourse, concept, linguo-didactics, linguo-conceptology, linguo-discoursology.*

---

*Prof. Dr. Kostiantyn Mizin, Department of Foreign Philology and Teaching Methodology, State Institution of Higher Learning "Hryhoriy Skovoroda State Pedagogical University of Pereyaslav-Khmelnytsky", Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, kmizin@i.ua.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries in the post-colonial (post-Soviet) linguistic space, the emergence of scientific papers focused on the national language through the study of its native speakers' mental and speech activities, which is inseparably linked to national identity, culture and education, gave a great impetus to the establishment of a bunch of new promising linguistic disciplines (e.g. Мізін 2012 and 2015). The reason for this was the fact that in the late 20th century linguistics concentrated on a study of human mind's infrastructure, regarded as an information system. This way linguistics adopted a new image firmly rooted in its cognitive orientation because the focus on cognitive research facilitated the understanding that the analysis of speech should not be limited to the study of an ideal language system that exists independently. That is why such studies involve data from several sciences.

The multidisciplinary characteristic of the new disciplines, the most urgent of which, at least in the post-colonial linguistic space, is certainly linguistics and cognitive linguistics, ensures that philology as a whole is expanding its methodological tools, being enriched with new knowledge, accumulating new ideas, procedures, and techniques of the analysis. As a consequence, the study of such models of knowledge representation as a picture of the world, a scenario, a frame, a stereotype, a concept and a cognitive (concept) metaphor has become urgent (e.g. Korostenski 2014). The most common and yet most criticized among these mental constructs is a concept described as the basic unit (category) of studies in cognitive linguistics (linguo-cognitology), linguo-conceptology and linguo-culturology, the fundamental idea of which is rethinking the structure and semantics of language units in the dimensions of ethno-, socio- and (sub)cultural categories.

The methodological basis for the disciplines, linguo-conceptology in particular, still remains, as well as it used to be before, the triad "form – meaning – function" but now this triad needs to be interpreted in a multidisciplinary perspective. This means that every facet of linguo-conceptology is "exposed" to this triad. It finds its own and original way of "bridging" a form and linguo-semiotics, a content and linguistics, a function and linguo-pragmatics (linguo-discoursology) (Приходько 2013, 7–8).

The later one, i.e. the spread of ideas of linguo-pragmatics and cognitive linguistics (linguo-conceptology) as well as interrelation of their methodologies at the turn of the 20th and 21st century, made Ukrainian researchers study the interaction between human cognitive mechanisms and their speech habits that contributed to the emergence of new scientific fields both in linguo-didactics and linguistics: 1) *cognitive-communicative* (linguo-didactics); 2) *cognitive-communicative* (linguistics); 3) *cognitive-discursive*. Thus, the purpose of this article is to provide the theoretical and methodological basis for these areas and to determine the perspectives of the most relevant methodological symbiosis, and, consequently, the most common disciplines in modern Ukrainian linguistics – linguo-pragmatics and linguo-conceptology.

2. COGNITIVE-COMMUNICATIVE TREND IN LINGUISTIC

As is well known, language is a tool for both communication and knowledge. This postulate corresponds to the general understanding of the essence of human communicative competence defined as an assemblage of the knowledge we have about a certain language along with our speech abilities and skills. Currently, foreign language teaching methodology considers the following important processes to be equal:

1. developing pupils'/students' adequate understanding of the lingual phenomenon they are taught;

2. skills development so that they could use this phenomenon in real communication.

Therefore, an essential condition for the effective foreign language teaching is its communicative and cognitive nature. It is the idea that allows researchers of modern linguo-didactics in Ukraine to claim that the cognitive approach to teaching is able to make communicative methodology more dynamic by giving rise to new ideas of teaching methodology. This, in turn, enables these scholars to state that in Ukrainian linguo-didactic area the dominant approach is communicative-cognitive or cognitive-communicative (e.g. Барабанова 2007; Зонтова 2005; Ковриго 2010). Some researchers even emphasize the existence of relevant scientific paradigm. This makes the idea of the fullest adoption of human cognitive mechanisms to the intensification of foreign language teaching to be especially pretentious.

However, I believe that it is too soon to talk about the existence or dominance of cognitive-communicative paradigm in Ukrainian linguo-didactics in view of the fact that so far there is no universally accepted name of this paradigm - whether it is a communicative-cognitive or cognitive-communicative paradigm. This differentiation is of great importance because it sets the priority of scientific research: if we choose the first name, the primary and crucial consequently for foreign language teaching methodology is a communicative aspect, if we choose the second, it is cognitive then.

Such an uncertainty appears to be related to the processes of adaptation of this borrowed linguo-didactic idea in Ukrainian scientific community. It is no secret that in the times of the Soviet Union, Ukrainian science had numerous leading positions but in many scientific areas it remained "in the shadow", namely its role was marginal and peripheral because research centers (schools) were outside Ukraine. That is why Ukrainian scientists had nothing to do with the exception of adapting and verifying the proposed new scientific ideas to Ukrainian scientific community. This is what once happened, for instance, to cognitive linguistics, cognitive pragmatics, frame semantics, and prototype theory. This is also true about so-called cognitive-communicative paradigm in Ukrainian linguo-didactics because the approach where the basic teaching principle was the principle of maximum use of mechanisms of consciousness in the process of gaining foreign language skills and abilities, first emerged in the USA and Canada and was called CALLA (Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) (e.g. Chamot and O'Malley 1987). Later

this approach "immigrated" to Russia, where it was transformed to some extent and split into several branches – cognitive-intellectual, cognitive-component and cognitive-communicative areas (e.g. Шатилов 2010) and Хрулева 2010) 1992; Юсупова 2010) 2010). However, the branches can be referred to as certain areas rather tentatively because in fact we are talking about different terms which denote the same linguo-didactic idea.

This terminological uncertainty caused "duality" in the Ukrainian linguo-didactics where the terms communicative-cognitive and cognitive-communicative are used interchangeably. This often confuses those researchers who want to know all about the essence and principles of linguo-didactic and cognitive-communicative approach. The later one's methodological principles are difficult to define since its communicative element has been explored theoretically in detail and its principles are widely used in practice, whereas the term "cognitive" is being adopted by the area of foreign language teaching in Ukraine. This communicative oriented teaching process is built similarly to the real process of speech communication. Grammar as well as reading and listening skills are obtained through the use of these types of speech activity under conditions that simulate real communication situations. Therefore, the most important characteristic of the communicative approach to language learning is the use of authentic materials, namely those that native speakers really use.

As concerns the use of cognitive aspect for intensifying the communicative oriented learning, this linguo-didactic symbiosis involves students' obtaining both cultural and regional information, and linguistic material that allows them to more fully realize the educative potential of the learning process. Here, the problem of foreign language teaching is defined not as language skills learning only, but as a transmission of knowledge about the world because the cognitive aspect in foreign language learning is largely based on the fact that by mastering a foreign language a pupil/student simultaneously acquires the people's image of the world, i.e. this or that vision of the world through the prism of national culture with language as one of its components. Hence, the main task of foreign language learning is to teach "foreign cultural" orientation in the objective world.

In addition, the social constructivist theory serves as a methodological basis for cognitive-communicative approach to foreign language teaching (e.g. Raskin 2006), according to which a pupil/student is an active participant in the learning process but not a subject of a teacher's training activities. Accordingly, the effectiveness of cognitive-communicative language teaching methodology is provided by a set of exercises which take into account pupils'/students' individual and personal characteristics, cognitive styles and strategies. This technique can reduce the time that a pupil/student spends gaining large amounts of professionally oriented foreign language information. It also helps to improve the speed and quality of its actualization for further use based on foreign language students' optimal speech and mental activity.

3. Cognitive-communicative paradigm in linguistics

In the late 20th century with the rise of cognitive linguistics and linguo-pragmatics as separate scientific fields, at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, linguistic thought focused on the study of cognitive and communicative aspects of human activity. In western European research space the priority is given to the study of pragmatics and mental processes based on the search of principles and mechanisms of decoding meanings as an output of speaker's intentions (Sperber and Wilson 2002), which even caused the emergence of a new research field – cognitive pragmatics (Carston 2002). It is noteworthy that mutual integration of cognitive and communicative research areas results in an expansion of both cognitive studies in the sphere of communication analysis and pragmalinguistic studies in cognitive science.

It is the focus on the synthesis of human cognitive and communicative mechanisms, speech and mental activities that formed the base for an integrated cognitive-communicative paradigm in linguistics in the post-Soviet space at the beginning of 21st century (e.g. Шевченко 2004). The latter's linguo-philosophical grounds recognize language as a universal form to conceptualize reality and to rationalize experiences. They methodologically enable speech activity analysis in the frame-work of internal mental (cognitive) processes.

4. Cognitive-communicative vs. cognitive-discursive paradigm: correspondence of linguo-philosophical and linguo-methodological foundation to paradigmatic status

Further extrapolation of this idea on the notion of "discourse" rather than on the notion of "communication" allowed linguists, mostly Russian, to declare the formation of cognitive-discourse paradigm in philology (e.g. Кубрякова 1995). This was also contributed by, on the one hand, the rapid development of such branches of cognitive linguistics as linguo-conceptology, frame semantics, prototype semantics, cognitive poetics and linguo-culturology, and, on the other hand, discoursology (linguo-discoursology, cognitive linguo-discoursology, political linguo-discoursology et al.), which has been seen in post-Soviet linguistic space in recent decades. This led to the logical transformation of cognitive-communicative paradigm of linguistics into cognitive-discursive one which some Ukrainian linguists consider to be eastern European version of cognitivisms (e.g. Морозова 2005). However, I believe that the transformation was not successful so the terms cognitive-communicative and cognitive-discursive are mostly used interchangeably. The notion of "discourse" is interpreted as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon (e.g. Шевченко 2015) which calls into question the necessity of identifying a new research paradigm.

As for the deeper disclosure of the reasons that compel scientists to doubt the paradigmatic status of cognitive-discursive trend in modern linguistics, here we should indicate the fact that methodologically incorrect to some extent is the combination of the notions of "cognitive" and "discursive" to name the declared paradigm. Obviously, this is due to the fact that the definition of "discourse" is

still "blur". However, no matter how different the opinions on the "discourse" are, scientists unanimously state that the result of discourse as a process is text:

1. discourse is a type of communicative activity, interactive phenomenon, a flow of speech that has different forms of manifestation (oral, written, paralingual), takes place in a specific channel of communication, is regulated by participants' strategies and tactics. It is a synthesis of cognitive, linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (social, mental, psychological, etc.) determined by the specific range of "life forms" which depend on the subject of communication (Бацевич 2004, 138);

2. a complex sociolinguistic phenomenon of modern communication environment which is, firstly, determined (directly or indirectly) by its socio-cultural, political, pragmatic and situational, psychological and other (cardinal or minor) factors. Secondly, it has "visible" – lingual (called connected text or its semantically meaningful or syntactically complete fragment) and "invisible" – extralingual structure (knowledge about the world, thoughts, intentions, addressee's purposes which one needs to understand the text). Finally, it is characterized by a common worldview which is "created" when a reproducer (author) deploys discourse and its recipient (listener, reader, etc.) interprets it (Сержим 2002, 13);

3. discourse is a set of thematically joint texts, each of which is perceived and identified as a linguistic correlate of a certain socio-cultural practice (Чернявская 2011, 93);

4. discourse is a text immersed in the situation of communication, i.e. communication which is mediated by the text (Карасик 2007, 350).

Thus, the abstraction "discourse" is materialized exclusively by means of real existing texts because "any discourse generates a text" (Манаенко 2008, 9). Accordingly, discourse is both a process (communication) and the result of this process (text). This means that methodologically the notions of "cognitive" and "discourse" can only be combined within the first hypostasis of discourse – communication. The result of this combination is epistemological or even somewhat heuristic tandem, where cognition "intertwined" in discourse and discourse in cognition. The purpose of this tandem is to study discourse, in fact, human speech activities based on its internal mental process. As we can see, the mentioned purpose is equal to the purpose of cognitive-communicative paradigm in modern linguistics. The purpose, as we can see, is completely identical to the purpose of cognitive and communicative paradigm in modern linguistics. The combination of the notions of "cognitive" and "discourse" based on the second hypostasis of discourse – text is slightly incorrect methodologically because cognitive study of the text as a result of speech activity requires not so much the analysis of the cognitive mechanisms that facilitate the communication process but a reconstruction of mental abstractions that generate these mechanisms – concepts, frames, cognitive metaphors and the like. The later contradicts the very notion of "discourse" to some extent which, in contrast to the text, is open, unfinished, cyclic, indiscrete, processual, dynamic, i.e. such

socio- and linguo-cultural phenomenon in which there is verbal communication in a specific subject-content area (Приходько 2013, 196). Therefore, some linguists realizing the redundancy of the term cognitive-discursive concerning cognitive-communicative, abandoned the first term over time (e.g. Приходько 2013, 6). It is clear that this concerns primarily paradigmatic status of the proclaimed cognitive-discursive paradigm. That is why I believe that it should not be defined as a paradigm but as one of the promising areas of cognitive-communicative paradigm.

Furthermore, cognitive-communicative paradigm in linguistics has been already more established terminologically and methodologically covering such linguistic areas as linguo-semiotics, linguo-philosophy, linguo-pragmatics, linguo-culturology, linguo-conceptology, linguo-synergetics and others. However, none of these linguistic disciplines can be completely autonomous because they are interdisciplinary, i.e. they use methodological developments of allied research areas. This resulted in the beginning of XXI century intensive dissemination of interdisciplinary studies both in Ukraine and the post-Soviet space. The commonality of these philological works is a complex linguistic analysis of the object of study and systematization and generalization of data from different sciences.

5. Methodological symbiosis of linguo-pragmatics and linguo-conceptology in Ukraine: concept in discourse vs. discourse in concept

In the post-Soviet space within cognitive linguistics, which covers too broad research field, a new linguistic discipline emerged – linguo-conceptology. It was the latter's expansion into the realm of linguo-pragmatics that contributed greatly to today's dominant linguistic studies in Ukraine. They are being performed within the cognitive-communicative (cognitive-discursive) approach. One could even point to the formation of linguistic research schools in Kyiv (e.g. Потапенко 2009; Славова 2010), Kharkiv (Морозова 2008; Фролова 2009; Шевченко 2004, 2015), Odessa (e.g. Петлюченко 2009), Lviv (e.g. Кусько 2001) and Zaporizhia (e.g. Приходько 2013) where the central issue is the interaction between concept and discourse.

The relevance of this approach to the study of concepts is determined by the nature of discourse, its linguo-social and dynamic characteristics because discourse is both an environment of localization of concepts, and the speech and mental construct that affects their change and development. The essential framework for the analysis of concepts, in the light of the relationship between cognition and communication, is data verification through studying discursive manifestations of the means that verbalize a concept based on the discourse analysis technique. This allows researchers to examine both basic semantic peculiarities and associative images reflecting all the stereotype knowledge, ideas, beliefs, images, estimates, assumptions, prejudices, expectations and the like which are associated with the phenomenon represented by a concept.

Therefore, it is logical that in terms of cognitive-communicative (cognitive-discursive) linguistic approach the most urgent and the most controversial issue in modern Ukrainian linguistics is to define concept's ontological essence, linguo-

cultural significance, system organization and socio-cultural actualization which is a basic unit not only in linguo-conceptology but also in linguo-cognitology. This makes researchers focus on potential properties that are objectified in language (system) and subjectified in speech (discourse). This is due to the fact that the establishment and functioning of various types of concept systems is accompanied by the formation and operation of the specific discourses. These two cognitive and communicative processes enable native speakers to overcome difficulties related to iso- and polymorphism, contradiction and inconsistency of the concepts and discourses that already exist in their socioculture and those that are appearing. These processes also identify the logics of transitions from one concept to another, removing some concepts with the help of others and building new concept systems based on those that already exist.

Thus, linguists in Ukraine do not doubt the fact that concepts are a specific cognitive standard in discourse, texts and genres organization, i.e. they are the basis of cognitive modeling of socio-discursive spaces. Discourse is usually interpreted within three levels of representation: speech (form), sociocultural (content) and communicative-pragmatic (function) (Приходько 2013, 196–200). Sociocultural level directly correlates with the environment of communication, outlining communicative-pragmatic discourse organization which is interacted with the mode and style of communication. However, socio-cultural and communicative-pragmatic levels are projected in the language level which "provides building blocks" for verbal discourse.

In other words, the discourse is a complex cognitive-communicative construct which embraces three basic factors (registers) of communication: environment, modus (mode) and communication style. These factors mainly determine a taxonomy of discourses in a particular language culture (subculture). In modern Ukrainian linguistics the most important aspect is the study of discourses of professional strata (politics, economics, law, sport etc.), corporate and subcultural strata (bank, religion, terrorism, crimes, etc.), common discourses (family, youth, children etc.), discourses of virtual communication (fairy tales, computers etc.) and some specific discourses (advertisement, elections, leisure, celebrations and others).

It should be emphasized that the concept analysis in the framework of cognitive-discursive approach is not only semantic analysis of a concept and other nominative units that represent it (definitional, etymological, parts of speech, synonymic and antonymous analysis etc.) but also data verification through studying discursive manifestations of the means that verbalize a concept. The reason for this is the fact that the results that the researcher can obtain after performing traditional methods of lexical units analysis that represent the concept in lexicographical sources is not sufficient enough to examine a concept's structure within that approach. Therefore, the data should be verified through studying means that verbalize a concept in a variety of discursive contexts. It includes different discursive techniques, particularly a method of cognitive interpretation of meaning that engages explicature, implicature, and presupposition of discourse which allows predicting an interpreter's inferences. In discourse a unit of language which objectifies a concept is not only a form that fixes knowledge about the world but also knowledge about a man's inner world, values, intentions, and goals, related to consciousness,

i.e. discursive approach allows examining a subject of discourse's individual concept system.

It is noteworthy that communication codes of human language underlie cognitive principles of communication, which is a phenomenon of the neuro-cognitive level. However, the use of coding systems (grammatical, phonetic, prosodic, etc.) depends on the context. It is the context of discourse that defines what a pragmatic focus is directed toward, how speech acts are realized (directly or indirectly), schemes and scenarios of their implementation, as well as a sequence of the speech acts (steps) in the discourse. This way, the study of specific characteristics of the cognitive concept GOD in the world view of British people in different historical periods (Полина 2003) made it possible to detect the dependency between cognitive characteristics of the concept and a potential set of speech acts which might have it. The analysis of a large amount of English material has confirmed the presence of historical changes in this concept affecting its frame structures in general and the frequency of individual slots of the concept and their content. Ukrainian linguists have also found out that certain types of discourse can be studied as a result of the interaction between cognitive and communicative components. For example, deliberate conflict speech interaction comes about as the result of violations of socio-cultural norms and cognitive scheme that enhances the integration of social and cognitive levels of analysis of such interaction. Here, at the cognitive level it is important to take into account the sender's and recipient's cognitive dissonance of the discourse (Фролова 2009).

In this regard it should be emphasized that discourse units – speech acts – are interpreted not in isolation but along with cognitive (mental) processes which precede their utterance. Consequently, the use of concept analysis is promising for the classification of speech acts for two reasons (Шевченко 2004, 203–204):

1. this helps to determine such important indicators of a speech act as performative verbs. For example, Ukrainian researchers, who explored the concepts WILL / DESIRE, ANGER, FEAR and others, have described a group of performative verbs for directives, expressives and the like;

2. identifying a dominant type of information in the statement (cognitive or social-regulatory) is one of the criteria that allows distinguishing metacommunication from other types of communication, to designate phatic metadiscourse and its unit, namely an appropriate speech act.

A close methodological connection between the notions "concept" and "discourse" within cognitive-discursive area of linguistics allows to distinguish two types of concept relevant discourses (closed and open) and two discourse relevant types of concepts (mono- and polydiscursive) (Приходько 2013, 203):

1. closed and open discourses are differentiated according to their ability to borrow concepts which are inherent to a particular discourse, and their ability to "lend" their concepts to another discourse. The most open discourses are, for instance, political advertising, family, and the least open are official, scientific, religious;

2. monodiscursive and polydiscursive concepts are distinguished according to their abilities to be used preferably their indifferently in this or that discourse. Accordingly, the first ones are called discourse preferable concepts and the second ones – discourse indifferent.

This division of discourses into closed and open, and concepts into mono- and polydiscursive is characterized by a quantitative asymmetry, i.e. by a small number of closed discourses in the linguo-culture compared to the large number of open ones and, therefore, a small number of monodiscursive concepts compared to the prevailing majority of polydiscursive ones. Most obviously, this fact can be explained by non-rigid contours of sociocultural communication space in which a creative speaker wants to go beyond norms and conventions in his speech by using different strategies and tactics of cognitive verbal information. However, the cognitive-communicative asymmetry can prevent a concept from functioning in one type of discourse of a specific communi-cation. This causes the concept to transit another discourse (e.g., the transition of monodiscursive concepts in polydiscursive ones and vice versa). Hence, outer extrapolation of concepts is not only a symmetrical relation to the communication environment under the principle "a specific concept – an appropriate discourse" because the same concept can be a part of the information field of several discourses, and the same discourse normally appeals to several concepts.

Ukrainian researchers argue (e.g. Приходько 2013, 205–206) that consideration of two basic categories of cognitive-communicative paradigm in linguistics – concept and discourse – in the light of their methodological tandem enables to study them at least from two research perspectives:

1. analysis of a discourse based on the appeal to different concepts;

2. study of a concept through appealing to different discourses (this perspective is not always seen in studies of Ukrainian scholars; they often analyze one concept in one discourse).

Taking into account the above mentioned ideas of a strictly fixed correspondence between the discourse and concept, linguists argue for dualism in the conceptual organization of discourse which, in fact, defines two vectors of cognitive-discursive research:

1. discourse-centered (from discourse to concept);

2. concept-centered (from concept to discourse).

Thus, the vector "from concept to discourse" is methodologically based on the fact that both the concept and the conceptual field in which it is realized, is characterized by cognitive-semantic selectivity regarding possibilities of its actualization in a particular discourse. That means the ability or inability of a concept to be combined with a similar concept in the process of speech production. This makes the same concept dominate in a discourse and be indifferent compared with the other. However, a vast majority of concepts do not belong to one discourse only, they can function in two, three or more discourses.

It is the preferable use of certain concepts in a particular discourse that forms the latter's cognitive map, i.e. every discourse can form its own conceptual system which consists of configurations of various concepts. The selection and combination of these concepts depend on a lot of factors: speech intentions, a structure of relationships "addresser – addressee", agents' coding techniques and customers' decoding competence in discourse. Such conceptual configurations create specific, often a unique mental-informational portrait of a discourse which depends on the type of logical-semantic parallels between a discourse and a concept. In this sense, discourse is a set of appeals to different concepts which determines their selection and their actualization according to its typological identity as a sociocultural marked product of communication. Segments of conceptual fields serve as a cognitive-semantic resource for discursive and conceptual selection.

An influence that a particular discourse has on a concept, i.e. a discursive subjectivation of a concept, no matter whether it is represented by the whole social community or an individual representative (speaker), demonstrates its diverse and vast associative potential, which is caused by two synergistic factors:

1. a concept's features and peculiarities are always richer than those represented by the subject that appeals to it;

2. a concept is exposed to constant reflection of discourse agents. That is why it gains new properties, characteristics and qualities and undergoes regular modifications in consequence of permanent mental-verbal activity of discourse agents and clients.

The existence of a typology of concepts which directly correlates with the criterion of "objectivity–subjectivity" (i.e. social, personal, national and universal concepts), methodologically enables recognition of the fact that these mental constructs function in the context of different types of consciousness – common, scientific, official, art and others. Therefore, analysis of discourses (contexts) is a prerequisite for exploring peculiarities of a word. It is almost impossible to examine this specificity of all kinds of discourses, genres, texts and contexts, but it can be modeled on the appropriate methodological grounds.

Realization of a concept in discourse is usually based on its two inherent options:

1. paradigmatic (a set of features which are formed naturally, i.e. without any deliberate influence of a social institution);

2. syntagmatic (a result of intentional actions aimed at the creation of a new profile). The main methods of syntagmatic modification of a concept is stereotyping through constant repetitions, manipulation of meaning and regulation of usage.

It is important to emphasize that the establishment of situational specificity of discursive configurations of concepts within the regime, environment and communication style is methodologically valid for synchronic research. But discourse is a "live" communicative phenomenon, so in its progressive dynamics it develops according to objective laws of nature, society and thinking. These constantly specify, modify and alter both concept, and their discursive dispositions.

This understanding of concept and discourse on the background of their methodological synergies within cognitive-communicative (cognitive-discursive) approach makes it possible for today's Ukrainian linguists to solve a wide range of current linguistic issues. Thus, Olena Morozova (Морозова 2005) proposes an integrative approach to the study of lingual aspects of lie (concept LYING) in the English language. Its methodological basis is a cognitive-discursive perspective of the linguistic knowledge. The researcher considers lie as cognitive-communicative entity that exists in both lingual and discursive spaces. This approach made it possible to find out that the concept LYING connects existential spaces of lie. The concept here is understood as an event in which the language sign acquires its meaning. It is a unity of static (classification and structural) and dynamic (identification) modus. This understanding of the concept LYING was used as methodological basis that allowed the researcher to determine a unit that realizes lie in the discourse (a discourse seme of lie), to model the concept as frame and prototype structures, to show principles that underlie conceptual categories of lie, to create a phase model of the situation of lie and a configuration model of false statement. The last model illustrates an internal shape, cognitive and communicative content of false statements.

A somewhat different methodological way was performed by Laryssa Kompantseva (Компанцева 2008) where the author has attempted to combine cognitive-pragmatic approach and linguo-cultural. This polyparadigmatic study aims to explore constitutive components of the Internet communication, i.e. to determine the principles of formation of genre system, to reveal verbal representation of important concepts, to identify the basis for the formation of new signs of a lingual individual, language picture of the world and to describe terminology of the Internet communication. The researcher defines the phenomenon of the Internet communication as an interactive interpersonal communication two main aspects of which need to be examined – cognitive-pragmatic and linguo-cultural, as these research areas allow exploring the Internet communication simultaneously in different paradigms of linguistics.

6. Conclusion

This article provides the methodological basis for cognitive-communicative (linguo-didactics), cognitive-communicative (linguistics) and cognitive-discursive research areas. First two areas have the same name but they belong to different fields of knowledge. That is why this study does not focus on cognitive-communicative approach in linguo-didactics. The last two areas, which emerged at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries due to the dissemination of ideas from linguo-pragmatics and cognitive linguistics, are of great concern to us because they are the most topical in Ukraine. Moreover, they are referred to a separate paradigm by some Ukrainian linguists that appears to be especially pretentious. It is the last fact that makes the author argue against paradigmatic status of the cognitive-discursive paradigm and consider it to be a part of the cognitive-communicative paradigm. The theoretical and methodological framework for cognitive-communicative (cognitive-discursive) area in linguistics is the under-

standing of cognition based on human experience and the acceptance of conceptual sphere's system nature, lingual consciousness and speech. Therefore, this area focuses on an integrated study of mental and communicative processes and it involves a wide range of methods and techniques of cognitive linguistics and pragmatics as well as allied research areas.

The study shows that in modern Ukrainian philology the methodological symbiosis of linguo-pragmatics and linguo-conceptology is of great importance because discourse is an environment where concepts are located, a means of their realization and the factor that effects their changes and development. The essential framework for the analysis of concepts, in the light of this approach, is the verification of the data through studying the discursive manifestations of the means, which verbalize the concept. This involves discourse analysis techniques.

References

CARSTON, Robin (2002): Linguistic Meaning, Communicated Meaning and Cognitive Pragmatics. *Mind and Language*, Vol. 17, No. 1–2, pp. 127–148.

CHAMOT, Anna and O'MALLEY, Michael (1987): The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A Bridge to the Mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 227–249.

KOROSTENSKI, Jiří (2014): Rusko-české konceptualizační strategie (na příkladu konceptu „kontejneru"). *Acta Fakulty filozofické Západočeské univerzity v Plzni*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 51–64.

RASKIN, Jonathan (2006): Constructivist Theories. In: *Comprehensive Handbook of Personality and Psychopathology, Vol. 1: Personality and Everyday Functioning.* New York: John Wiley, pp. 212–229.

SPERBER, Dan and WILSON, Deirdre (2002): Pragmatics? Modularity and Mindreading. *Mind and Language*, Vol. 17, No. 1–2, pp. 3–23.

БАРАБАНОВА, Галина (2007): *Методика навчання професійно-орієнтованого читання в немовному ВНЗ.* Київ: „Інкос".

БАЦЕВИЧ, Флорій (2004): *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики.* Київ: Академія.

ЗОНТОВА, Світлана (2005): Когнітивний підхід до навчання іншомовної лексики. *Проблеми сучасної педагогічної освіти*, Вип. 8, Ч. 2, с. 89–93.

КАРАСИК, Владимир (2007): *Языковые ключи.* Волгоград: Парадигма.

КОВРИГО, Світлана (2010): Комунікативно-когнітивний підхід у навчанні англійської мови. *Англійська мова та література*, № 36, с. 17–23.

КОМПАНЦЕВА, Лариса (2008): *Интернет-лингвистика: когнитивно-прагматический и лингвокултурологический подходы.* Луганск: Знание.

КУБРЯКОВА, Елена (1995): Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX века. В: *Язык и наука конца XX века.* Москва: РАН, с. 144–238.

КУСЬКО, Катерина (2001): Дискурс іноземномовної комунікації: концептуальні питання теорії і практики. У: *Дискурс іноземномовної комунікації.* Львів: Вид-во Львівського нац. ун-ту, с. 25–48.

МАНАЕНКО, Геннадий (2008): Значение „мира текста" и смыслы „мира дискурса". В: *Язык. Текст. Дискурс.* Ставрополь & Краснодар: АПСН, с. 9–23.

МІЗІН, Костянтин (2012): Нові напрями в українському мовознавстві: зіставна лінгвокултурологія. *Мовознавство*, № 6 (268), с. 38–52.

МІЗІН, Костянтин (2015): Методологічна валідність лінгвокультурології vs зіставної лінгвокультурології: аргументи та контраргументи. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету імені Альфреда Нобеля*, № 2 (10), с. 104–110.

МОРОЗОВА, Елена (2005): *Ложь как дискурсивное образование: лингвокогнитивный аспект.* Харьков: Экограф.

ПЕТЛЮЧЕНКО, Наталія (2009): *Харизматика: мовна особистість і дискурс.* Одеса: Астропринт.

ПОЛИНА, Анна (2003): Историческое варьирование семантического прототипа концепта БОГ. *Вісник Харківського нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна*, № 609, с. 169–172.

ПОТАПЕНКО, Сергій (2009): *Сучасний англомовний медіа-дискурс: лінгвокогнітивний і мотиваційний аспекти.* Ніжин: Вид-во Ніжин. держ. ун-ту ім. М. Гоголя.

ПРИХОДЬКО, Анатолий (2013): *Концепты и концептосистемы.* Днепропетровск: Белая Е. А.

СЕРАЖИМ, Катерина (2002): *Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність.* Київ: КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка.

СЛАВОВА, Людмила (2010): *Мовна особистість політика: когнітивно-дискурсивний аспект.* Житомир: Выд-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка.

ФРОЛОВА, Ірина (2009): *Стратегія конфронтації в англомовному дискурсі.* Харків: ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна.

ЧЕРНЯВСКАЯ, Валерия (2011): Дискурс как фантомный объект: от текста к дискурсу и обратно? В: *Когниция, коммуникация, дискурс, Вып. 3.* Харьков: ХНУ им. В. Н. Каразина, с. 86–95.

ШАТИЛОВ, Сергей і ХРУЛЕВА, Нина (1992): Об организации и содержании экспериментально-опытного обучения немецкому языку в 5 классе на коммуникативно-когнитивной основе. *Иностранный язык в школе*, № 2, с. 9–13.

ШЕВЧЕНКО, Ирина (2004): Становление когнитивно-коммуникативной парадигмы в лингвистике. *Вісник Харківського нац. ун-ту*, № 635, с. 202–205.

ШЕВЧЕНКО, Ирина (2015): дискурс как когнитивно-коммуникативный феномен: единицы и категории. В: *Лингвистические исследования.* Ереван: Лимуш, с. 146–159.

ЮСУПОВА, Татьяна (2010): Сущность и составляющие когнитивно-коммуникативного подхода к обучению иностранному языку. *Вестник Московского государственного областного университета,* № 3, с. 103–106.

Резюме

В этой статье рассмотрена методологическая база трех научных направлений – когнитивно-коммуникативного (лингводидактика), когнитивно-коммуникативного (лингвистика) и когнитивно-дискурсивного, которые возникли в результате необходимости изучения взаимодействия когнитивных механизмов человека в его речевой практике. Эта необходимость стала актуальной в Украине на рубеже XX и XXI веков в связи с распространением идей лингвопрагматики и когнитивной лингвистики. В пределах когнитивной лингвистики, которая охватывает слишком широкое исследовательское поле, выделилась со временем на постсоветском пространстве новая языковедческая дисциплина – лингвоконцептология. Именно методологический симбиоз лингвоконцептологии и лингвопрагматики способствовал тому, что в настоящее время в Украине доминируют языковедческие студии, выполненные в русле когнитивно-коммуникативного (когнитивно-дискурсивного) подхода.

В данном исследовании установлено, что ценность когнитивно-дискурсивного подхода в исследовании концептов определяется самой природой пребывания концептов, средством их реализации, и тем фактором, который влияет на их изменение и развитие.

Обязательной предпосылкой анализа концептов сквозь призму этого подхода является верификация полученных данных изучением особенностей дискурсивных реализаций средств вербализации концепта с опорой на методики дискурс-анализа, что позволяет установить как его базовые семантические признаки, так и ассоциативно образные, которые отображают все стереотипизированные знания, представления, верования, образы, оттенки, предположения, предубеждения, ожидания и т. п., ассоциируемые с феноменом, представленным концептом.

Выявлено, что с точки зрения когнитивно-коммуникативного (когнитивно-дискурсивного) лингвистического подхода самой актуальной и наиболее дискуссионной проблемой современного украинского языкознания является установление онтологической сущности, лингвокультурной значимости, системной организации и социодискурсивной актуализации базовой единицы не только лингвоконцептологии, но также лингвокогнитологии и лингвокультурологии – концепта, что предусматривает акцентирование внимания на потенциальных и реализационных свойствах, которые объективируются в языке (системе) и субъективируются в речи (дискурсе). Это связано с тем, что образование и функционирование концептосистем разного типа происходит параллельно с образованием и функционированием соответствующего дискурса. Это два когнитивно-коммуникативные процесса дают возможность носителю языка преодолевать трудности, связанные с изо- и полиморфизмом, противоречием и непоследовательностью тех концептов и дискурсов, которые уже существуют в социокультуре, и тех, что только появляются. Эти же процессы определяют также логику переходов от одного концепта к другому, выведение одних концептов с помощью других и построение новых концептосистем на основе тех, которые уже существуют.

Доказано, что особенностью концептного анализа в русле когнитивно-дискурсивного подхода есть не только семантический анализ имени исследуемого концепта и других номинативных единиц, которые его представляют (дефиниционный и этимологический анализы, установление синонимического и антонимического рядов и т. п.), но и верификация полученных данных путем изучения специфики дискурсивных реализаций средств вербализации концепта. Это связано с тем, что результаты, которые исследователь может получить с помощью традиционных методик анализа значения лексем, которые представляют концепт в лексикографических источниках, при этом подходе являются недостаточными для изучения структуры концепта. Поэтому эти данные должны верифицироваться исследованием актуализации средств вербализации концепта в разнообразных дискурсивных контекстах с использованием дискурсивних методик, в частности методики когнитивной интерпретации значения, с помощью которой можно идентифицировать экспликатуры, импликатуры, пресупозиции дискурса, что дает возможность прогнозировать инференции интерпретатора. Единица языка, которая объективирует концепт, функционирует в дискурсе не только как форма фиксации знаний о внешнем мире, но и знаний о внутреннем мире человека, его оценки, установки, цели, которые связанны с деятельностью сознания, то есть дискурсивный подход делает возможным выход на индивидуальную концептную систему субъекта дискурса.