

ПЕДАГОГІКА

UDC 378.147:811.111'233'243:37.026

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.4/29.209665>

Viktoriiia SLABOUZ,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1810-4054

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages

of Donbas State Pedagogical University

(Sloviansk, Donetsk region, Ukraine) queen_viktoiya28@ukr.net

Nataliia NIKITINA,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0653-7453

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,

Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages

of Donbas State Pedagogical University

(Sloviansk, Donetsk region, Ukraine) nikitina_sdpu@ukr.net

FORMING LANGUAGE PERSONALITY'S FOREIGN-LANGUAGE LINGUOCOGNITIVE ACTIVITY (ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH)

The article deals with the analysis of the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistic thought and the methodical approaches to form the language personality's linguocognitive (subjective) activity in the process of teaching the foreign language. The scholars return man to the center of the universe. The principle of anthropocentrism, or "man in language", changes the methods and means of teaching students in all directions of education, especially when teaching them foreign languages. It is proved by the intensification of contacts between people, the growth of acts of communication, so the problem of establishing mutual understanding is becoming very acute. Possessing language in general and the linguocognitive competency, in particular, is considered as the most important component of a language personality. The relevance of the study is since the socio-economic and political situations in society form a social demand concerning preparing its citizens in a foreign language, namely concerning developing and forming the foreign-language linguocognitive activities. The purpose of the article is to analyze the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistic thought and methodological approaches to the formation of the linguocognitive (subjective) activity of the language personality in the process of teaching a foreign language from the position of the anthropocentric approach. The investigation presented is devoted to training the Ukrainian-speaking future English teacher from analyzing his/her speech behavior in the educational process to identify the linguistic-pragmatic characteristics of the secondary language personality, which is understood as a communicatively active subject, capable of cognizing, describing, evaluating, transforming the surrounding reality and participating in communication with other people using a foreign language in the foreign language activity. The success of the process of educational foreign-language communication depends on the similarity of the images of the sender of the message and its recipient. The basis of this similarity is determined by the commonness of knowledge of the speaker and the listener, the writer, and the reader, the knowledge that precedes and determines the meaning of the language sign.

Key words: *anthropocentric paradigm, communicative-cognitive learning, foreign-language competency, language personality, linguocognitive activity, systemic-structural paradigm.*

Вікторія СЛАБОУЗ,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1810-4054

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри іноземних мов

Донбаського державного педагогічного університету

(Слов'янськ, Донецька область, Україна) queen_viktoiya28@ukr.net

Наталія НІКІТІНА,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0653-7453

кандидат педагогічних наук,

доцент кафедри іноземних мов

Донбаського державного педагогічного університету

(Слов'янськ, Донецька область, Україна) nikitina_sdpu@ukr.net

ФОРМУВАННЯ ІНШОМОВНОЇ ЛІНГВОКОГНІТИВНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ МОВНОЇ ОСОБИСТОСТІ (АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ)

У статті представлено аналіз антропоцентричної парадигми лінгвістичної думки та методичних підходів до формування лінгвокогнітивної (суб'єктивної) діяльності мовної особистості у процесі навчання іноземної мови. Вчені повертають людину до центру Всесвіту. Принцип антропоцентризму, або «людина в мові», змінює методи та засоби навчання учнів/студентів у всіх ланках освіти, особливо під час навчання іноземних мов. Цей факт доведено активізацією контактів між людьми, зростанням спілкування, тому проблема встановлення взаєморозуміння стає дуже гострою. Володіння мовою загалом і лінгвокогнітивною компетенцією зокрема вважаються найважливішим компонентом мовної особистості. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена тим, що соціально-економічні та політичні ситуації в суспільстві формують соціальний попит стосовно підготовки своїх громадян до іноземної мови, а саме до розвитку та формування іноземномовної лінгвокогнітивної діяльності. Мета статті – проаналізувати антропоцентричну парадигму мовної думки та методологічні підходи до формування лінгвокогнітивної (суб'єктивної) діяльності мовної особистості у процесі навчання іноземної мови з позиції антропоцентричного підходу. Представлене дослідження присвячене навчанню україномовного майбутнього вчителя англійської мови з точки зору аналізу його мовленнєвої поведінки в навчальному процесі з метою виявлення мовно-прагматичних характеристик вторинної мовної особистості, яка розуміється як комунікативно активний суб'єкт, здатна пізнавати, описувати, оцінювати, трансформувати навколишню реальність та брати участь у спілкуванні з іншими людьми за допомогою іноземної мови в іноземній діяльності. Успіх процесу навчального іноземномовного спілкування залежить від подібності образів відправника повідомлення та його одержувача. В основі цієї подібності визначається спільність знань мовця і слухача, письменника і читача, знання, що передує і визначає значення мовного знака.

Ключові слова: антропоцентрична парадигма, комунікативно-когнітивне навчання, іноземна компетенція, мовна особистість, лінгвокогнітивна діяльність, системно-структурна парадигма.

The problem setting. The global problems that the mankind has been facing in the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century raise a new question about the place of the educational system in modern culture, about the formation of a new personality, who can solve complex issues of intercultural interaction with linguistic-cognitive skills in the era of globalization. It is about the formation of a linguocognitive activity of a linguistic personality.

In connection with the evolution of the science of language, the refinement of its new principles, borderline concepts studied previously by related sciences are increasingly becoming the subject of linguistics, and this leads to the emergence of new directions in linguistics. In linguistics of the second half of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century, the dominant systemic-structural paradigm is replaced by the anthropocentric paradigm, which returns the status of “measure of all things” to man and returns man to the center of the universe (Vorkachev, 2001: 64). Although the very concept of anthropocentrism is not new to linguistic thought, it was at the end of the 20th century that anthropocentrism, on a higher basis, served to develop a completely new paradigm in linguistics. The principle of anthropocentrism, or “man in language”, has been affirmed in domestic linguistics for quite some time. As early as at the end of the 19th century, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay in his work “Phonology” (1899) singled out anthropophysics as a science that deals “only with essentially human sounds, that is, the sounds of human speech” (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963: 354). Lately, the

mentioned principle has been studied in the works of V. Alpatov, Iu. Apresian, N. Arutiunova, A. Vezhbitckaia, etc. Following the canons of anthropocentrism has gained particular importance in humanitarian semantics, which, in contrast to the formal, or logical-mathematical, studies semiotic systems (language, cultural phenomena, customs and rituals, art, etc.) transmitting information and human society canons. That is, a person cannot develop, realize his/her abilities and skills, self-assert and self-improve beyond society, without interconnections and interaction with other people, nature, and the world as a whole. Modern society is characterized by the intensification of contacts between people, the growth of acts of communication, so the problem of establishing mutual understanding is becoming very acute. Hence the role of language as a means of communication, mastery of the world is growing. Possessing language in general and the linguocognitive competency, in particular, is considered as the most important component of a language personality. Through the word, man determines the way of personal interaction with the outside world, embodies a clear position by language towards him. Increasing attention to the given interaction leads to the formation of the language personality's foreign-language linguocognitive activity.

Education is impossible without appeal to the individual, to the development of his/her cognitive skills. One of the functions of the personality is a continuous search, substantiation, and revision of the sense of his/her activity. Failure to fulfill this function, its insufficient representation in the individual's life is

a sign of his/her insufficient personal development. **The relevance of the study** is since the socio-economic and political situations in society form a social demand concerning preparing its citizens in a foreign language, namely concerning developing and forming the foreign-language linguocognitive activities. The higher the social need for knowledge of the language and specialists who speak one or several foreign languages, the more significant the pragmatic aspects of learning become.

The analysis of recent studies and publications.

Linguistics, psychologists, and linguodidactians have studies the language personality. L. Veisgerber (Veisgerber, 1993) and V. Vinogradov (Vinogradov, 1980: 124) study this phenomenon in a narrow aspect – as the linguistic personality of the author of the artwork and the linguistic personality of the character of the work. A. Leontev (Leontev, 2003) regards the speaker as the linguistic personality, the creator of the image of the world. G. Bogin (Bogin, 1984: 19) analyzes the phenomenon of the language personality (the model of the language personality as man who is ready to produce speech actions, creates language products); S. Vorkachev (Vorkachev, 1986: 20) studies the ethnosemantic personality; V. Neroznak (Neroznak, 1998: 80–85) considers the personality as a polylectic/general human and ideological/specific to a particular community; T. Snitko (Snitko, 1999: 40) compares language personalities of the western and eastern cultures; V. Karasik (Karasik, 2003) investigates the dictionary language personality; O. Biliaiev (Biliaiev, 2005) focuses the reader's attention on the national-language personality; L. Matsko (Matsko, 2006) analyzes the nationally-conscious Ukrainian speaking personality; L. Skurativskiyi (Skurativskiyi, 1998) studies the spiritual language personality, etc. As follows from the presented analysis of the publications and studies, insufficient attention has been paid to the anthropocentric aspect concerning the development of the linguocognitive activity of the language personality.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to analyze the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistic thought and methodological approaches to the formation of the linguocognitive (subjective) activity of the language personality in the process of teaching a foreign language from the position of the anthropocentric approach.

The presentation of the material. The anthropocentric approach to language, presented in many linguistic traditions, is historically primary, but over time it has lost universality, and only in recent decades, it has regained leading positions in science in general and in linguistics in particular. The anthro-

pocentric approach to language becomes the basis for natural linguistic expansion; it brings linguistics closer to psychology, sociology, philosophy, and cultural studies.

Modern linguistic investigations are dedicated to continuing the study of language from the perspective of systemocentrism and anthropocentrism simultaneously, which provides the most profound and comprehensive insight into the subject, “for just as there is no doubt that language is anthropocentric and anthropomorphic in nature, there is no doubt that it continues to be a system” (Kravchenko, 2001). According to E. Popova, “a voluminous approach to the facts of language (structural, semantic, functional) serves a distinctive sign of linguistics of the 20th century” (Popova, 2002: 74). E. Kubryakova, defending “the ideas of polyparadigmality, or polyparadigmatism of modern linguistics”, considers “it is it that is the indicator of the maturity of humanistic science” when there is “such progress of knowledge which is provided by the analysis of an object immediately in different directions, in different paradigms of knowledge” (Kubryakova, 1995: 4).

Some scholars are very skeptical of the anthropocentric approach, noting that new lines of linguistic investigations of this kind are being developed in the framework of traditional structural linguistics and only open up its new possibilities. So, V. Pishchalnikova explains the changes, taking place, by changing the angle, formulating “a new object of study – the language ability, which is carried out in speech activity, and by the desire to understand the essence of cognitive processes. Systemocentric linguistics, according to the author's opinion, is only beginning to turn to a more or less systematic study of this new scientific object for it, emphasizing the cognitive aspect of research” (Pishchalnikova, 2002: 123).

According to many linguists, modern linguistics has not yet come to a clear definition of a new object of research, the goals, and values that dominate at this stage of the development of science, methods, and principles of description (Frumkina, 1999), explaining that the new paradigm is at the formation stage. The scientists who uphold the ideas of this position point to terminological inconsistencies and vaguely defined concepts, which are used in many in various new areas of linguistics, borrowed them from other sciences. The logical and natural rapprochement of linguistics with other sciences is quite obvious as a process caused by the general tendency of modern social life to integrate and globalize the results of all manifestations of human activity.

The inevitability of rapprochement between linguistics and other sciences was already noted in

the first half of the 20th century by such linguists as E. Sapir, R. Jakobson, E. Benveniste. For instance, R. Jakobson wrote, “Now we are faced with the urgent need for thorough joint work of scientists of various specialties. The relationships between linguistics and related sciences require particularly close attention” (Jakobson, 1985: 369). Summarizing the results of the interdisciplinary meeting of representatives of various nomothetic sciences about man, R. Jakobson pointed out that “the problems of the interconnections of human sciences are concentrated around linguistics. This fact is explained, first of all, by the extremely regular and closed structuredness of language and the important role that it plays in culture; on the other hand, both anthropologists and psychologists recognize that linguistics is the most advanced and accurate science of man and, therefore, is a methodological model for other related sciences” (Jakobson, 1985: 370). R. Jakobson distinguished such directions of linguistics as sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, anthropological linguistics.

The significance of linguistics for other sciences is also emphasized by E. Sapir, “The significance of linguistic data for anthropology and the history of culture has long become a universally recognized fact. In the process of developing linguistic research, language proves its usefulness as an instrument of knowledge in the human sciences and, in turn, needs these sciences. It becomes difficult for a modern linguist to confine himself/herself only to his traditional subject. If he/she is not completely without imagination, then he/she cannot but share the mutual interests that connect linguistics with anthropology and the history of culture, with sociology, psychology, philosophy, and – in the longer perspective – with physiology and physics” (Sapir, 1993: 260–261).

According to A. Cienki, the connection of linguistics with cognitive science, psychology, neuroscience, anthropology, and philosophy is explained by the fact that “language reflects the interaction between psychological, communicative, functional and cultural factors” and that its structure “is a product of two important factors: one internal (that is, the individual speaker’s mind), the other is external (namely, the culture that is common with other speakers of the same language)” (Cienki, 1997: 340).

E. Kubryakova, characterizing along with functionalism and explanatoriness anthropocentrism as the main paradigmatic feature of modern linguistics, distinguishes the so-called expansionism, which is expressed in the expansion of objects of study of linguistic science, in attracting it to the analysis of linguistic facts, means and methods of other sciences (Kubryakova, 1995: 207–211).

So, the analysis of special literature confirms the concentration of attention of various sciences around man. In this regard, increasing the attention of linguists to the problem of the relationship between language and man and attracting other sciences to solve it seems logical and reasonable. Anthropocentrism is recognized by most modern scholars as one of the leading principles in the development of modern linguistics for considering language phenomena in the dyad “language and man” (Kubryakova, 1995: 212). Now, “instead of the requirement to study the system (or structure) of language, a requirement is being put forward to study the language ability of the ideal speaker/listener, his/her language knowledge, his/her competency, the speaker’s internal state, the language mechanisms of the brain, the structure of the representation of knowledge of language in it, etc.” (Kubryakova, 1995: 12).

However, the principle of anthropocentrism is understood by scientists ambiguously. In linguistic science, different approaches to the implementation of the anthropological principle have been determined, depending on the underlying hypothesis. The first approach involves the inclusion of a “language personality” in the object of the science of language (from the content of science to its history) (Karaulov, 1986: 43). The second approach is reflected in modern linguistic philosophy and is associated with the recognition of language as part of a person (Albrecht, 1977: 80–81). According to the third approach, the subject of linguistics is recognized man as a user of language (Kharitonova, 2004: 11), as “...the center through which the coordinates determining the subject, tasks, methods, and value orientations of modern linguistics go” (Popova, 2002: 69). The last, fourth approach to the implementation of the anthropological principle, developed by W. von Humboldt, who believed that language learning is subordinate to the “goal of man’s knowledge of himself/herself and his/her attitude to everything visible and hidden around him/her” (Humboldt, 1985: 383), is based on the recognition of language as the component that makes man be man. Considering the relationship of man and language, W. von Humboldt, argued that “language is the organ of the inner being of man” (Humboldt, 2000: 47); “language is not just an external means of communication between people, maintaining social relations, it is embedded in the very nature of man and is necessary for the development of his/her spiritual forces and the formation of a world outlook” (Humboldt, 2000: 51); “it is the language which is a close and lively interaction with the character” (Humboldt, 2000: 55), “spiritual development is possible only through language” (Humboldt, 2000: 63); “languages

are inextricably fused with the inner nature of man" (Humboldt, 2000: 65).

The existing different approaches and interpretations of the principles of anthropocentrism quite clearly confirm that in recent decades, domestic and foreign linguistics has changed the development paradigm, has announced a new approach – anthropocentric – to the study of language, determining the focus of attention of man who creates language and is created by language since “one cannot understand language in itself without going beyond its borders, without contacting its creator, carrier, user – to man, to a specific language personality” (Karaulov, 1987: 7).

The scholars call this turn the “anthropocentric shift” in the philology of the 20th century (Vorozhbitova, 2003: 43). The linguists are unanimous in their opinion that the characteristic feature of the science of language at the end of the 20th century is “orientation to the transition from positive to deep knowledge along the paths of a holistic synthetic comprehension of language as an anthropocentric phenomenon” (Postovalova, 1999: 25). According to V. Postovalova, “turning to the topic of the human factor in language indicates a transition from “immanent” linguistics with its intention to consider language “in itself and for itself” to anthropological linguistics, which suggests studying language in close connection with man, his/her consciousness, thinking, spiritual and practical activity” (Postovalova, 1988: 8). That is why the universal concept man is announced, and describing this “most important superconcept” (Eroshenko, 2003: 18) is the task of anthropocentric linguistics.

V. Alpatov in his article “On the Anthropocentric and Systemocentric Approaches to Language” notes that it is the anthropocentric approach that is historically primary and that the researcher studies language as its carrier and relies on “understanding and describing the native speaker’s ideas, often referred to as linguistic intuition” (Alpatov, 1993: 15). Anthropocentrism as a “special principle of research”, according to E. Kubryakova, consists in the fact that scientific objects are studied, first of all, by their role for man, by their purpose in his/her life, by their functions for the development of the human personality and his/her improvement. It is revealed that man becomes a reference point in the analysis of certain phenomena, that he/she is involved in this analysis, determining his/her perspective and ultimate goals.

The foregoing allows concluding that the anthropocentric approach today occupies a central place in linguistic research and is understood as one of the fundamental characteristics of the new linguistic paradigm that is being formed at this stage. All

phenomena of language are considered inextricably linked with the phenomenon of man as a “*language personality*”.

The fundamental position of anthropological linguistics is quite clearly expressed in the works of Yu. Karaulov, and it is formulated as follows, “a language personality expressed in language (texts) and through language is a personality reconstructed in his/her main features based on language means” (Karaulov, 1987: 38). “As a language personality, we understand the totality of man’s abilities and characteristics that determine the creation and perception of speech works (texts), which differ a) by the degree of structural-language complexity, b) by the depth and accuracy of reflection of reality, c) by a certain target orientation” (Karaulov, Krasilnikova, 1989: 3). The language personality is understood by Yu. Karaulov “...as a kind of full-fledged representation of the personality, containing psychological, social, ethical, and other components, but refracted through his/her language, and discourse” (Karaulov, Krasilnikova, 1989: 7).

There are some other viewpoints on the concept of “language personality”. G. Bogin, for example, from the standpoint of linguodidactics defines a linguistic personality as follows, “a linguistic personality is one who assigns language, i.e. one for whom language is speech” (Bogin, 1984). According to T. Vinokur’s idea, a language personality should be differentiated “not as a social-psychological universality but communicative-activity unit being at the same time a binomial “speaking/listening” (Vinokur, 1993). V. Karasik understands a language personality as “a basic national-cultural prototype of the native speaker of a certain language, mainly fixed in the lexical system, as a kind of “semantic photo robot” compiled based on worldviews, value priorities and behavioral reactions” (Karasik, 1994).

The investigation presented is devoted to training the Ukrainian-speaking future English teacher from analyzing his/her speech behavior in the educational process to identify the linguistic-pragmatic characteristics of the secondary language personality, which is understood as a communicatively active subject, capable of cognizing, describing, evaluating, transforming the surrounding reality and participating in communication with other people using a foreign language in foreign language activity.

In the framework of the theory of the language personality, the structure of a language personality (Karaulov) is considered, represented by three levels: 1) *the verbal-semantic level* which presupposes normal knowledge of the natural language for the carrier, and for the researcher – the traditional description of

the formal means of expressing certain meanings; 2) *the cognitive level* the units of which are notions, ideas, concepts developing and forming in each language individuality into a more or less ordered, more or less systematized “picture of the world” reflecting the hierarchy of values. The cognitive level of the arrangement of the language personality and his/her analysis involves the expansion of the meaning and the transition to knowledge, thereby covering the intellectual sphere of the personality, giving the researcher an outlet through language, through the processes of speaking and understanding – to knowledge, consciousness, processes of cognition of man; 3) *the pragmatic level* (goals, motives, interests, attitudes, and intentions). This level provides in the analysis of a logical and conditional transition from assessments of his/her speech activity to the understanding of real activities in the world of the language personality (Karaulov, 1989).

The anthropological approach is considered appropriate to be chosen as the main one when analyzing the methods and techniques of psycholinguistics, communicative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and other modern areas of the science of language. The analysis of language means on the interdisciplinary basis allows recreating a holistic image of a person, reconstructing a language model of his/her behavior, all components of which are interconnected and interdependent. The main directions of linguodidactic research are such that the learner as a person, as a subject, and as an individual invariably occupies a central place in it. The educational-upbringing process, deeply social, active, informative and communicative in nature, is designed to “produce a person” for society, so that, in turn, he/she (a person) produces society “in his/her productive activities and in his/her communication” (Leontev, 1973: 98). This kind of creative, formative goal cannot be achieved without knowledge and consideration of the learner’s desires, interests, and aspirations in the educational-communicative activity, because any human action, as one knows, is causally determined and motivated by the need to satisfy the need that caused it. This circumstance allows considering the didactic process as a methodological basis for further systematic and consistent action to develop methods for developing the necessary skills and abilities ... using the system of appropriate exercises (Khaleeva, 1995), setting the training, education, and development of the learner’s personality using a foreign language and culture in the process of linguocognitive, intellectual-emotional communicative activity as the goal. The linguocognitive (subjective) activity of a language personality should be correlated, first of all, with the concept of

his/her language competency, which is identified with “language proficiency” by Yu. Apresian (Apresian, 2006), and which is defined by S. Vinogradov as a “set of skills and abilities”, including the ability to paraphrase, the possession of synonymy and distinguishing homonymy, the orthological ability, i.e. the ability to distinguish correct language sentences from incorrect ones and, finally, the selective ability that is realized in the selection of figuratively expressive language means that are most effective for giving communication conditions (Vinogradov, 1996: 148). In general, the linguocognitive activity of a language personality involves taking into account his/her picture of the world, or “reconstruction of the language model of the world, or the thesaurus of this personality (based on the texts produced by him/her or based on special testing)” (Karaulov, 1987: 43). Understanding a language personality as a personality manifesting himself/herself in language (texts) is based on the notion that he/she is capable of producing his/her own ones and perceiving (understanding) other people’s texts in the process of his/her subject-cognitive activity, as well as making a free transition in discourse from knowledge to meanings and vice versa. Although the word and knowledge, the word and the image (concept), the objective and the subjective, language and speech are inextricably linked, “the word exists as the core of multidimensional connections and associations,” according to E. Kubryakova, “moreover, functioning not only in roles reflecting language ties proper, but also the structures of knowledge behind them” (Kubryakova, 1988: 21) in the human head as such phenomena as the word or verbal memory, the internal (mental) vocabulary, the mechanism of generation, perception, and understanding of speech.

The compositional structure of the cognitive-creative activity of the language personality is considered in the structure of the generation of the speech utterance, according to A. Leontev, which includes the link of motivation and the formation of speech intention; the orientation link; the link of planning; the link for the implementation of the plan (the executive link); the control link (Leontev, 2008: 64).

A. Zalevskaya’s position most fully meets the socio-psychological, and therefore the national, both in the intra- and intersubjective concept of the subject of activity, the author emphasizes that a person’s word “is a means of “output” of the individual on the subjective picture of the objective world, outside of which neither the word itself nor its use has any meaning” (Zalevskaya, 1992: 52).

The anthropocentric approach to language learning is also embodied in the activity approach in the

text theory, which brings us to understand the nature of the thesaurus level of organization of a language personality, when notions, ideas, perceptual images, concepts, frames, schemes, etc. "... are built into an ordered, fairly strict hierarchical system, to some (indirect) extent reflecting the structure of the world, and an ordinary thesaurus can serve as a well-known (albeit distant) analog of this system" (Karaulov, 1987: 52).

As foreign languages are mastered, the cognitive sphere of the language personality is enriched and expanded mainly, firstly, in the process of "blurring the signedness" of the lexicon and the formation of "asemiomatic" imagery, where the image is understood as "a way to quantize the cognitive space and read the information in it" (Karaulov, 1987: 177); secondly, due to the ability of a person in the cognitive space to semantize the image, to reveal its content in the signs of language. According to Yu. Karaulov, every image can be transferred to the semantic level, can be verbalized, its essence, its cognitive and emotional content can be revealed, constructing the appropriate text (Karaulov, 1987), choosing it from the following typology: the text with the explicit/implicit activity in the text; the text with one activity/with several activities; the text with the cumulative/non-cumulative activity (cumulative activity is characterized by goal-setting); the text with one/several agents (Belousov, 2002: 7).

Conclusions. When teaching a foreign language, taking into account the interaction of language structures with other cognitive and conceptual structures, it seems methodologically important in the process of the communicative-cognitive teaching of foreign language communication to create the conditions for a) enriching, "bloating" the sign side of the ideological network of the subject of educational activity, b)

forming the mechanism of "erosion of the signedness" and foreign-context imagery. Such a methodical solution to the problem will allow the learner to avoid replacing images of the foreign cultural reality with the images and ideas formed based on his/her native language, and will also ensure the formation of the person's true representations about the studied foreign language culture, corresponding to the reality, which will inevitably result in the correct choice of the meaning by language means of fragments of foreign-context culture in acts of intercultural communication (interference).

The success of the process of the educational foreign-language communication depends on the similarity of the images of the sender of the message and its recipient. The basis of this similarity is determined by the commonness of knowledge of the speaker and the listener, the writer, and the reader, the knowledge that precedes and determines the meaning of the language sign. Therefore, the methods of communicative-cognitive teaching foreign language communication are faced with the following tasks: a) to activate students to penetrate the mechanisms of the meaning formation by analyzing the speech activity, taking them beyond the boundaries of a static language system to the linguocognitive level of assimilation of the studied language units; b) to form in the students' minds the basics of the linguocognitive fund in the process of solving educational and cognitive tasks, problem situations, didactic games, linguocognitive text analyses, etc., i.e., to maximize their speech-cognitive activity; c) to form the students' ability to penetrate the "spirit" of the language they are studying, into the "flesh" of the culture of the people with whom intercultural communication can be carried out (Khaleeva, 1989), that is, to direct efforts towards the formation of a "secondary language personality".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алпатов В. М. Об антропоцентричном и системоцентричном подходе к языку. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1993. № 3. С. 15–26.
2. Альбрехт Э. Критика современной лингвистической философии. / Пер. с нем. А. Г. Шестакова. Москва, 1977. 160 с.
3. Апресян Ю. Д., Апресян В. Ю., Бабаева Е. Э., Богуславская О. Ю. и др. Языковая картина мира и системная лексикография. Москва : Школа «Языки славянских культур», 2006. 910 с.
4. Белоусов К. И. Форма текста в деятельности освещения : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.01 : 10.02.19. Кемерово, 2002. 179 с.
5. Біляев О. М. Лінгводидактика рідної мови : навчально-методичний посібник. Київ : Генеза, 2005. 180 с.
6. Богин Г. И. Модель языковой личности в ее отношении к разновидностям текстов : дис. ... докт. филолог. наук. Ленинград, 1984. 354 с.
7. Воркачев С. Г. Языковая личность: культурные концепты. Волгоград, Архангельск, 1986. С. 16–25.
8. Бодуэн де Куртенэ И. А. Фонология. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. Москва, 1963. Т. 1. С. 353–361.
9. Вайсбергер Л. Родной язык и формирование духа. Москва, 1993. 232 с.
10. Виноградов В. В. Опыт риторического анализа монографии «О художественной прозе». Москва, 1980. С. 120–146.
11. Виноградов С. И. Нормативный и коммуникативно-прагматический аспекты культуры речи. Культура русской речи и эффективность общения. Москва : Наука, 1996. 441 с.

12. Винокур Т. Г. Говорящий и слушающий : Варианты речевого поведения. Москва : Наука, 1993. 172 с.
13. Воркачев С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Филологические науки*. 2001. № 1. С. 64–72.
14. Ворожбитова А. А. Актуализация философско-лингвистического наследия как отражения «антропоцентрического сдвига» в филологии конца XX века. Антропоцентрическая парадигма в филологии. Ставрополь, 2003. Ч. 2 : *Филология*. С. 43–48.
15. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры. Москва : Наука, 1985. 452 с.
16. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. / Пер. с нем. Общ. ред. Г. В. Рамишвили, послесл. А. В. Гулыги и В. А. Звегинцева. Москва : ОАО ИГ «Прогресс», 2000. 400 с.
17. Залевская А. А. Индивидуальное знание. Специфика и принципы функционирования. Тверь : Изд-во Твер. гос. ун-та, 1992. 135 с.
18. Ерошенко А. Р. Концепт «Человек» в антропологической лингвистике : особенности интерпретации. Антропологическая парадигма в философии. Ставрополь, 2003. Ч. 2: *Филология*. С. 18–20.
19. Карасик В. И. Оценочная мотивировка, статус лица и словарная личность. *Филология*. Краснодар, 1994. С. 2–7.
20. Карасик В. И. Языковая личность : аспекты изучения. II Междунар. науч. конф. «Язык и культура». Москва, 2003. С. 362–363.
21. Караулов Ю. Н. «Четыре кита» современной лингвистики, или о предпосылках включения «языковой личности» в объект науки о языке (от содержания науки к ее истории). *Соотношения частнонаучных методов и методологии в филологической науке*. Москва, 1986. С. 33–52.
22. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. Москва : Наука, 1987. 261 с.
23. Караулов Ю. Н. Русская языковая личность и задачи ее изучения. Язык и личность. Москва : Наука, 1989. С. 3–8.
24. Караулов Ю. Н., Красильникова Е. В. Русская языковая личность и задачи ее изучения. Предисловие. Язык и личность. Москва : Наука, 1989. С. 3–11.
25. Кравченко А. В. Знак, значение, знание. Очерк когнитивной философии языка. Иркутск, 2001. 260 с.
26. Кубрякова Е. С. Роль словообразования в формировании языковой картины мира. Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 141–172.
27. Кубрякова Е. С. Парадигмы научного знания в лингвистике и ее современный статус. *Известия Академии наук СССР. Серия литературы и языка*. Москва : Наука, 1994. Т. 53. № 2. С. 3–16.
28. Кубрякова Е. С. Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX века. *Язык и наука конца XX века*. Москва, 1995. С. 144–238.
29. Леонтьев А. А. Искусство как форма общения. В кн.: Психологические исследования. Тбилиси : Мецниереба, 1973. С. 213–222.
30. Леонтьев А. А. Язык и речевая деятельность в общей педагогической психологии. Москва : Издательство Московского психолого-социального института ; Воронеж : Издательство РПО «Модек», 2003. 536 с.
31. Леонтьев А. А. Основы психолингвистики : учебник для студентов высших учебных заведений. 5-е изд., стер. Москва : Смысл; Академия, 2008. 288 с.
32. Мацько Л. Аспекти мовної особистості у проєкції педагогічного дискурсу. *Дивослово*. № 7. 2006. С. 2–5.
33. Нерознак В. П. От концепта к слову : к проблеме филологического концептуализма. *Вопросы филологии и методики преподавания иностранных языков*. Омск, 1998. С. 80–85.
34. Пищальникова В. А. Вместо предисловия : Основания динамической теории значения : когнитивный аспект. / Ред. Лукашевич Е. В. *Когнитивная семантика: эволюционно-прогностический аспект*. Москва ; Барнаул, 2002. С. 3–20.
35. Попова Е. А. Коммуникативные аспекты литературного нарратива : дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.01. Липецк, 2002. 669 с.
36. Поставалова В. И. Картина мира в жизнедеятельности человека. Человеческий фактор в языке. Язык и картина мира. / Отв. ред. Б. А. Серебренников. Москва, 1988. С. 8–69.
37. Поставалова В. И. Лингвокультурология в свете антропологической парадигмы (к проблеме оснований и границ современной фразеологии). Фразеология в контексте культуры. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1999. С. 25–37.
38. Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии. Москва : Прогресс, 1993. 656 с.
39. Скурагівський Л. Світоглядні засади навчання словесності. *Українська мова і література в школі*. № 1. 1998. С. 6–11.
40. Снитко Т. Н. Предельные понятия в западной и восточной культурах. Пятигорск, 1999. С. 46.
41. Фрумкина Р. М. Самосознание лингвистики вчера и завтра. *Изв. АН. Сер. лит. и яз.* 1999. Т. 58. № 4. С. 28–38.
42. Халеева И. И. Основы теории обучения пониманию иноязычной речи (подготовка переводчиков). Москва : Высшая школа, 1989. 237 с.
43. Халеева И. И. Вторичная языковая личность как реципиент инофонного текста. Язык – система. Язык – текст. Язык – способность. Москва, 1995. С. 27–43.
44. Харитоновна И. В. Системное исследование языка: философско-методологический аспект : автореф. дисс. д-ра филос. наук. Москва, 2004. 32 с.
45. Ченки А. Семантика в когнитивной лингвистике. Фундаментальные направления в современной американской лингвистике. Москва, 1997. С. 340–369.
46. Якобсон Р. О. Работы по поэтике. Москва : Прогресс, 1985. 464 с.

REFERENCES

1. Alpatov, V. M. (1993). Ob antropotcentrichnom i sistemotcentrichnom podkhode k iazyku [On the anthropocentric and systemocentric approach to language]. *Voprosy iazykoznanii – Issues of Linguistics*, 3, 15–26 [in Russian].
2. Albrekht, E. (1977). *Kritika sovremennoi lingvisticheskoi filosofii [Criticism of modern linguistic philosophy]*. A. G. Shestakova (Tr.). Moskva [in Russian].
3. Apresian, Iu. D., Apresian, V. Iu., Babaeva, E. E., Boguslavskaia, O. Iu. et al. (2006) *Iazykovaia kartina mira i sistemaia leksikografiia [Language picture of the world and systemic lexicography]*. Moskva: Shkola “Iazyki slavianskikh kultur” [in Russian].
4. Belousov, K. I. (2002). Forma teksta v deiatel'nostnom osveshchenii [The form of the text in activity coverage]. *Candidate's thesis*. Kemerovo [in Russian].
5. Biliaiev, O. M. (2005). *Linhvodydaktyka ridnoi movy: navchalno-metodychnyi posibnyk [Linguodidactics of the native language: teaching-methodic guide]*. Kyiv: Heneza [in Ukrainian].
6. Bogin, G. I. (1984). Model iazykovoii lichnosti v yeye otnoshenii k raznovidnostiam tekstov [Model of language personality and its attitude to varieties of texts]. *Doctor's thesis*. Leningrad [in Russian].
7. Vorkachev, S. G. (1986). Iazykovaia lichnost: kulturnye kontsepty [Language personality: cultural concepts]. (Pp. 16–25). Volgograd, Arkhangel'sk [in Russian].
8. Baudouin de Courtenay, I. A. (1963). *Fonologiya. Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu [Phonology. Selected works on General Linguistics]*. Vol. 1. (Pp. 353–361). Moskva [in Russian].
9. Vaisberger, L. (1993). *Rodnoi iazyk i formirovanie dukha [Native language and spiritual formation]*. Moskva [in Russian].
10. Vinogradov, V. V. (1980). *Opyty ritoricheskogo analiza monografii “O khudozhestvennoi proze” [Experience of the rhetoric analysis of the monograph “On Fiction Prose”]*. (Pp. 120–146). Moskva [in Russian].
11. Vinogradov, S. I. (1996). *Normativnyi i kommunikativno-pragmaticheskii aspekty kultury rechi. [Normative and communicative-pragmatic aspects of culture of speech. Culture of Russian speech and efficiency of communication]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
12. Vinokur, T. G. (1993). *Govoriashchii i slushaiushchii: Varianty rechevogo povedeniia [The speaker and the listener: Variants of speech behavior]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
13. Vorkachev, S. G. (2001). Lingvokulturologiya, iazykovaia lichnost, kontsept: stanovlenie antropotcentricheskoi paradigmy v iazykoznanii [Linguoculturology, language personality, concept: developing the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics]. *Filologicheskie nauki – Philological Sciences*, 1, 64–72 [in Russian].
14. Vorozhbitova, A. A. (2003). Aktualizatsiia filosofsko-lingvisticheskogo naslediia kak otrazheniia “antropotcentricheskogo sdviga” v filologii kontsa XX veka. Antropotcentricheskaiia paradigma v filologii [Actualization of philosophical-linguistic heritage as reflection of the “anthropocentric shift” in philology of the end of the 20th century. Anthropocentric paradigm in philology]. *Filologiya – Philology*, ch. 2, 43–48. Stavropol [in Russian].
15. Humboldt, von W. (1985). *Iazyk i filosofiiia kultury [Language and philosophy of culture]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
16. Humboldt, von W. (2000). *Izbrannye trudy po iazykoznaniiu [Selected works of linguistics]*. G. V. Ramishvili (Tr.). Moskva: OAO IG “Progress” [in Russian].
17. Zalevskaia, A. A. (1992). *Individualnoe znanie. Spetsifika i printsiipy funkcionirovaniia [Individual knowledge. Specifics and principles of functioning]*. Tver: Izd-vo Tver. gos. un-ta [in Russian].
18. Eroshenko, A. R. (2003). Kontsept “Chelovek” v antropologicheskoi lingvistike: osobennosti interpretatsii. Antropologicheskaiia paradigma v filosofii [Concept “Man” in anthropological linguistics: peculiarities of interpretation. Anthropological paradigm on philosophy]. *Filologiya – Philology*, ch. 2, 18–20. Stavropol [in Russian].
19. Karasik, V. I. (1994). Otsenochnaia motivirovka, status litca i slovarnaia lichnost [Evaluation motivation, face status and vocabulary personality]. *Filologiya – Philology*, 2–7. Krasnodar [in Russian].
20. Karasik, V. I. (2003). Iazykovaia lichnost: aspekty izucheniia [Language personality: aspects of study]. *II Mezhdunar. nauch. konf. “Iazyk i kultura” – The 2nd International Conference “Language and Culture”*, 362–363. Moskva [in Russian].
21. Karaulov, Iu. N. (1986). “Chetyre kita” sovremennoi lingvistiki, ili o predposylkakh vklucheniia “iazykovoii lichnosti” v obekt nauki o iazyke (ot sodержaniia nauki k yeye istorii) [The “Four Whales” of modern linguistics, or the prerequisites for the inclusion of a “linguistic personality” in the object of the science of language (from the content of science to its history)]. *Sootnosheniia chastnionauchnykh metodov i metodologii v filologicheskoi nauke [Correlation of Private Scientific Methods and Methodology in Philological Science]*. (Pp. 33–52). Moskva [in Russian].
22. Karaulov, Iu. N. (1987). *Russkii iazyk i iazykovaia lichnost [Russian language and language personality]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
23. Karaulov, Iu. N. (1989). *Russkaia iazykovaia lichnost i zadachi yeye izucheniia. Iazyk i lichnost [Russian language personality and tasks of studying]*. (Pp. 3–8). Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
24. Karaulov, Iu. N., & Krasilnikova, E. V. (1989). *Russkaia iazykovaia lichnost i zadachi yeye izucheniia: Predislovie. Iazyk i lichnost [Russian language personality: Preface. Language and personality]*. (Pp. 3–11). Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
25. Kravchenko, A. V. (2001). *Znak, znachenie, znanie. Ocherk kognitivnoi filosofii iazyka [Sign, meaning, knowledge. Essay of cognitive philosophy of language]*. Irkutsk [in Russian].
26. Kubriakova, E. S. (1988). *Rol slovoobrazovaniia v formirovanii iazykovoii kartiny mira. Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v iazyke. Iazyk i kartina mira [Role of word-formation in forming language picture of the world. Language and picture of the world]*. (Pp. 141–172). Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].

27. Kubriakova, E. S. (1994). Paradigmy nauchnogo znaniia v lingvistike i yeye sovremennyi status [Paradigms of scientific knowledge in linguistics and its modern status]. *Izvestiia Akademii nauk SSSR. Seriiia literatury i iazyk – News of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Series of Literature and Language*, vol. 52, 2, 3–16. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].
28. Kubriakova, E. S. (1995). Evoliutiia lingvisticheskikh idei vo vtoroi polovine XX veka [Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the 20th century]. *Iazyk i nauka kontca XX veka [Language and Science of the End of the 20th Century]*. (Pp. 144–238). Moskva [in Russian].
29. Leontev, A. A. (1973). Iskusstvo kak forma obshcheniia [Art as a form of discourse]. *Psikhologicheskie issledovaniia [Psychological Studies]*. (Pp. 213–222). Tbilisi: Metcniereba [in Russian].
30. Leontev, A. A. (2003). *Iazyk i rechevaia deiatel'nost' v obshchei pedagogicheskoi psikhologii [Language and speech activity in general pedagogical psychology]*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo psikhologo-sotsial'nogo instituta; Voronezh : Izdatel'stvo RPO “Modek” [in Russian].
31. Leontev, A. A. (2008). *Osnovy psikholingvistiki: ucheb'nik dlia stud. vyssh. ucheb. zavedenii [Fundamentals of psycholinguistics: textbook for higher educational institutions]*. Moskva: Smysl; Akademiia [in Russian].
32. Matsko, L. (2006). Aspekty movnoi osobystosti u proektsii pedahohichnoho dyskursu [Aspects of language personality in the projection of pedagogical discourse]. *Dyvoslovo – Magic World*, 7, 2–5 [in Ukrainian].
33. Neroznak, V. P. (1998). Ot kontcepta k slovu: k probleme filologicheskogo kontseptualizma [From the concept to the word: on the problem of philological conceptualism]. *Voprosy filologii i metodiki prepodavaniia inostrannykh iazykov [Issues of Philology and Teaching Methods of Foreign Languages]*. (Pp. 80–85). Omsk [in Russian].
34. Pishchalnikova, V. A. (2002). Vmesto predisloviia: Osnovaniia dinamicheskoi teorii znachenii: kognitivnyi aspekt [Instead of preface: Bases of dynamic theory of meaning: the cognitive aspect]. Lukashovich E. V. (Ed.). *Kognitivnaia semantika: evoliucionno-prognosticheskii aspekt [Cognitive semantics: evolutionary-prognostic aspect]*. (Pp. 3–20). Moskva; Barnaul [in Russian].
35. Popova, E. A. (2002). Kommunikativnye aspekty literaturnogo narrative [Communicative aspects of literary narration]. *Doctor's thesis*. Lipetck [in Russian].
36. Postovalova, V. I. (1988). Kartina mira v zhiznedeiatel'nosti cheloveka [Picture of the world in the human activity]. *Chelovecheskii faktor v iazyke. Iazyk i kartina mira [Human factor in language. Language and picture of the world]*. B. A. Serebrennikov (Ed.). (Pp. 8–69). Moskva [in Russian].
37. Postovalova, V. I. (1999). Lingvokulturologiia v svete antropologicheskoi paradigmy (k probleme osnovanii i granitc sovremennoi frazeologii) [Linguoculturology in the light of anthropological paradigm (on the problem of the foundations and boundaries of modern phraseology)]. *Frazeologii v kontekste kultury [Phraseology in the context of culture]*. (Pp. 25–37). Moskva: Iazyki russkoi kultury [in Russian].
38. Sapir, E. (1993). *Izbrannye trudy po iazykoznaniiu i kulturologii [Selected works on linguistics]*. Moskva: Progress [in Russian].
39. Skurativskiy, L. (1998). Svitohliadni zasady navchannia slovesnosti [Worldview principles of teaching literature]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, 1, 6–11 [in Ukrainian].
40. Snitko, T. N. (1999). *Predelnye poniatii v zapadnoi i vostochnoi kulturakh [Limit concepts in Western and Eastern cultures]*. Piatigorsk [in Russian].
41. Frumkina, R. M. (1999). Samosoznanie lingvistiki vchera i zavtra [Self-consciousness of linguistics yesterday and tomorrow]. *Izv. AN. Ser. lit. i iaz. – News of the Academy of Sciences. Series of Literature and Language*, vol. 58, 4, 28–38 [in Russian].
42. Khaleeva, I. I. (1989). *Osnovy teorii obuchenii ponimaniiu inoiazychnoi rechi (podgotovka perevodchikov) [Fundamentals of theory of understanding of foreign-language speech (training of interpreters)]*. Moskva: Vysshiaia shkola [in Russian].
43. Khaleeva, I. I. (1995). *Vtorichnaia iazykovaia lichnost' kak retsipient inofonnogo teksta. Iazyk – sistema. Iazyk – tekst. Iazyk – sposobnost' [Secondary language personality as a recipient of foreign-context text. Language – system. Language – text. Language – ability]*. (Pp. 27–43) Moskva [in Russian].
44. Kharitonova, I. V. (2004). Sistemnoe issledovanie iazyka: filosofsko-metodologicheskii aspekt [Systematic research of language: philosophical-methodological aspect]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Moskva [in Russian].
45. Cienki, A. (1997). *Semantika v kognitivnoi lingvistike. Fundamentalnye napravleniia v sovremennoi amerikanskoi lingvistike [Semantics in cognitive linguistics Fundamental directions in modern American linguistics]*. (Pp. 340–369). Moskva [in Russian].
46. Jakobson, P. O. (1985). *Raboty po poetike [Works on Poetics]*. Moskva: Progress [in Russian].