

THE LEADING LINGUISTS RESEARCH REVIEW CONCERNING THE NATIONAL PECULIARITY OF LINGUISTIC AND CONCEPTUAL WORLD PICTURES REFLECTION

Nelli Hayduk

Senior Lecturer, Mariupol State University,

e-mail: gaiduk_nelli@mail.ru, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6292-6376>, Ukraine

Abstract. The article analyzes and summarizes the views of Ukrainian and foreign linguists concerning the language structure and conceptual world pictures peculiarities. The paper focuses on the existence of general and specific in language. The role of culture in the formation and evolution of national world pictures and the influence of the national language on the formation of the speakers' worldview are reviewed. The problem of national specificity of the language is analyzed not only in terms of the language and thinking, language and reality relation, but also in terms of the correlation of language and culture, their interaction and interplay. Culture is presented in the study as a complex phenomenon, in the framework of which the peculiarities of knowledge of reality are fixed by one or another lingua-cultural community. The language world picture is considered as one of the main components of culture and as a means of transferring lingua-cultural peculiarities.

Keywords: concept, culture, conceptual world picture, thinking, linguistic world picture, language model, national language peculiarity.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/3108>

Introduction

The concept of "world picture" refers to fundamental scientific concepts, the research of which leads to the study of the specificity of individual languages as components of national cultures.

Such linguists as Ya. Anusevych, N. Arutyunova, Ye. Bartminskyy, I. Boduen de Kurtene, R. Budahov, H. Brutyan, L. Vaysherber, A. Vezhbytska, Ye. Vereshchahin, R. Hzhhehorchikova, W.von Humboldt, V. Zvehyntsev, Yu. Karaulov, H. Kardela, A. Kozhybskyy, V. Kostomarov, O. Kubryakova, D. Lykhachov, P. Lozovskyy, M.Lyuter, M. Mazurkevych- Bzhovzovska, V. Maslova, I.Machkevych, L. Mikeshyna, Ch. Oshud, R. Pavilonis, H. Palmer, Z. Popova, V. Postovalova, T. Radziyevska, E. Rosh, E. Sepir, I. Sreznevskyy, Y. Sternin, V. Teliya, M. Tolstoy, B. Uorf, R. Frumkina, T. Tsyvyan, N. Shvedova and others were engaged in problems of theoretical substantiation of the world pictures in different aspects.

The existence of different views concerning the peculiarities of the structure of world pictures, the presence / absence of the interrelation of language, culture and national language specifics in the concepts of language and conceptual world pictures, the absence of a clear interpretation of the concept of "world picture " show the complexity of the investigated phenomenon, the need for a thorough study of the question of the correlation of general and specific in the language determine the actuality of the study.

The aim of the study is to analyze the views of leading linguists on the peculiarities of the structure of language and conceptual world pictures.

The main tasks are to consider the correlation of general and specific in language, the research of the role of culture in the peculiarity of national world pictures, analysis of the influence of the national language on the separate speaker outlook formation.

Linguistic hypothesis of W. von Humboldt

The basic theoretical positions about the specific features in naming the world, which largely determined the further development of linguistics, were proposed by W. von Humboldt. The researcher paid considerable attention to finding solutions to the problem of ensuring the people unity as intellectual creatures and the causes of the enormous national languages variety. For W. von Humboldt the human language is the integral factor.

In order to explain the fact that, despite the commonality of the foundations of human consciousness, each nation expresses its thoughts in a specific way, W. von Humboldt suggests a hypothesis about the influence on the language of the "spirit of the nation": "The language has a completely national character ... Different languages are for the nations their original thinking organs" (*Gumboldt, 1984:303-304*). Consequently, the language is formed under the influence of the national spiritual culture, and therefore each language is unique. And, according to W. von Humboldt, the language affects the speakers thinking, because of "absolutely spiritual intellectual activity... with the help of sound materializes in speech and becomes accessible to sensory perception" (*Gumboldt, 1984:75*).

The scientist connects the problem of the national language with the problem of the language and thinking correlation, emphasizing that the leading role belongs to the language. Thinking, according to W. von Humboldt, is nationally determined. According to the scientist, a person, learning a language, simultaneously assimilates a national world view.

Cultural world views in American linguistics

In the United States, regardless of W. von Humboldt, there are similar concepts. Thus, E. Sapir remarked on the dependence of the process of human knowledge on the language: "People live not only in the objective world of things, and not only in the world of social activity, as is usually believed; they are largely influenced by that particular language, which is a communication means for this society" (*Sepir, 1993:114*). Reality, according to E. Sapir, is largely unknowingly built on the basis of linguistic norms. He believes that we see, hear and perceive one way or another of one or another phenomenon, mainly because the linguistic norms of our society assume this form of expression. According to E. Sapir, thinking is also inseparable from the verbal form and depends on it, the language is a certain system of categories, according to which we perceive the surrounding world. According to the scientist's conviction, only at the time of its occurrence language and its forms were determined by experience, the results of the interaction of man with the surrounding reality. Subsequently, the system of language determines the process of our perception of reality (*Sepir, 1993*). E. Sapir, like W. von Humboldt, also speaks of the dependence of national consciousness on the system of language. The researcher argues that language creates its own special reality, it compares the language with the "coordinate system", which provides orientation in the surrounding world (*Zvegyntsev, 1960:134*).

The idea that the world appears to us as a kaleidoscopic stream of impressions that should be organized by our consciousness, which means - the language system maintained in our consciousness, is being developed by American researcher B. Whorf, who points out that we are dismembering the world, organizing it is in the concept and we distribute the meaning of it, and not otherwise, mainly because we are participants in a particular transaction, concluded by such a system. This opinion B. Whorf later lays the principle of linguistic relativity foundation of: "We faced a new principle of relativity, which shows that similar physical phenomena, allow

us to create a similar picture of the universe only for similarity or, at least, for the language systems correlation" (*Whorf, 1960:174-175*).

In American linguistics, on the basis of the linguistic relativity principle, a theory of primitive languages was created, according to which languages with a more elementary structure correspond to lower levels of the native speakers of such languages thinking. The leading idea of the linguistic relativity principle is the inability to accurately translate from one language to another and even the impossibility of mutual understanding between people of different nationalities. In addition, we note that if the system of language affects the process of human thinking, then it would not be possible to develop science and culture.

Modern comparative studies

A Polish researcher, the founder of the philosophy of general semantics, another direction that developed the views of W. von Humboldt, A. Kozhybsky wrote that each language, having a structure, by its very nature, reflects in this structure the world as it was understood by those who developed language (*Brutyan, 1959:271*).

At present in western linguistics the position of general foundations of human thought existence has become universally accepted. On the basis of experimental data, Charles Osgood affirm: "Modern comparative studies on psycholinguistics show that although languages have a clear uniqueness in phonology, grammar, and semantics, which makes them incomprehensible to other language carriers, they demonstrate the presence of universals that make it possible at a profound level translation from one language to another" (*Osgood, May, Miron, 1975:4*).

A. Vezhbyskaya, one of the prominent Polish researchers of semantics and questions about the universal categories of consciousness existence, author of the semantic primitives theory, shares the view of the language universals existence: "Languages and cultural systems differ significantly from one another, but there are semantic and lexical universals that point to the general conceptual basis on which the human language, thinking and culture are based ... and the language-specific configuration of these primitives reflects the cultural diversity" (*Vezhbyska, 1996:297*).

In our opinion, the semantic primitives theory as an integration approach has a great importance, because it allows us to determine the essence of the languages national specificity, which exists because of the human thinking General laws. The semantic primitives theory corrects the principle of Whorf's linguistic relativity, because it gives a fundamental theoretical justification for the possibility of translation from one language to another.

A rather common direction in the American linguistics is a cultural linguistics. The theoretical basis of this direction formed the views of E. Sapir and B. Whorf. The main postulate of this direction is the idea of the existence between the human consciousness and the intermediate world reality, which is a special real world model. Immitating B. Whorf, this special world in the American tradition, is called the look of the world (according to the modern terminology - the linguistic world picture).

H. Palmer emphasizes the internal complexity of this concept, and, unlike the senior representatives of American anthropology, dont absolve the role of language in these interrelations. According to H. Palmer, language could completely determine the world view in such a culture, where there would be no other expression and communication means. However, according to the scientist, culture like that doesn't exist (*Palmer, 1999:291*).

In the native linguistic of the second half of the XX century in connection of the theory of linguistic relativity criticism developed by the American researcher B. Whorf, the problem of the national and cultural language specificity has received a new impetus to the development.

V. Zvegintsev in the the article "Theoretical and linguistic background of the Sepir-Whorf's hypothesis" points to the fundamental mistakes of this theory. He writes that language has derived from the consciousness and from the thinking, language doesn't have a determining influence on the process of thinking. Differences in the languages, according to the researcher, firstly are explained by the concrete material and these languages social existence conditions; secondly, human consciousness and thinking peculiarities; thirdly, the constructive features and languages themselves functioning laws. The commonality of the main categories of human thinking provides the universal human consciousness features: "in different forms people think about the same thing" (*Zvegintsev, 1960:129*).

G. Brutian, criticizing the linguistic relativity theory of, proposed, in turn, the theory of linguistic complementarity. This theory is based on the postulate that the basis of knowledge is a common logical model for all mankind, and "through verbal images and language models there is an additional vision of the world. Linguistic world modeling is combined with its logical reflection, creating the perception preconditions of a more complete and comprehensive surrounding reality picture" (*Brutyan, 1968:57*). Thus, native linguists substantiated the existence in the universal foundations thinking, which can't be due to the language system.

The national specificity language problem is connected not only with questions of the language and thought and language and reality relation, but also with the problem of the language and culture relation, their interaction and mutual influence.

Thoughts about the role of culture and people outlook in the process of language development were reflected in the works of many linguists of different epochs. I. Sreznevsky wrote that it was impossible to imagine a nation and a language without one another (*Sreznevsky, 1959:16-17*). R. Budagov explained the language national specificity by social existence conditions of the nation and noted that any national language is not only a certain designations system, but also the result of a reflection kind of all the people that speak this national language activity (*Budagov, 1978:49*).

One of the domestic ethnolinguistics founders M. Tolstoy said that language can be considered as a tool of culture and can be described through the signs common to all cultural phenomena, and on the other hand, language and culture are independent, autonomous semantic systems (*Tolstoy, 1995:36*). V. Telia also thinks that the language and the traditional culture are connected and that the role of culture is dominant (*Telia, 1996*).

After the most of researchers, we acknowledge a presence in thinking of universal common to all mankind bases, consider national languages originality conditioned by concretely-historical language and culture terms and connection, and mark the qualifying role of culture in national originality formation.

The Language World Picture

One of basic concepts in the modern researches devoted intercommunication of language and culture and national specific of language, the concept of language and conceptual world pictures comes forward. The Language World Picture (LWP) interprets the reality faced by a person and regulates human behavior in relation to this reality. Man's thought of person is indissolubly related to the categorizing process. R. Frumkina determines this process as act of taking of word (object) to the group.

One distinguishes the primary categorizing – grouping of separate copies in classes, and summarizing categorizing – grouping of classes, in upper classes. I. Machkevich specifies a considerable role which is played by categorizing in the cognition process: "The main purpose of categorization is reducing the fragmentation of the world ... Categorization represents the human world as a simplified and immobilized, adjusted to the cognitive abilities of man"

(Mackiewicz, 1999:52-53). One distinguishes two models of categorizing: logical and natural. The logical model of categorizing is based on objectively existent surrounding reality efficiency confession. Therefore, it is assumed that logical categories only reflect the world order.

Each logical category consists of objects (phenomena) that have a certain set of essential properties. This set is obligatory for all representatives of this category. It distinguishes one category from another. Each object can either belong uniquely to a particular category, or just as unconditionally belong to it. Therefore categories have clear limits that are fundamentally not subject to the change. The defects of this model appeared when it was confirmed that there are such concepts for which we can not find the defining properties that are characteristic of all designates. Therefore there appeared a model of the natural categorizing, the founder of which is the French psychologist E. Rosh. Members of the natural category are not equal in rights. They feature special objects - psychological centers of the category (prototypes) (Tolstoy, 1995). The existence of a natural category is due to a set of properties characteristic of its prototype – for the most representative. Less representative to one degree or another are similar to the prototype, therefore they have one or more properties in common with it. Natural categories are inwardly heterogeneous, their limits are opened, and categories can constantly broaden. The advantage of the model of natural categorization is that human consciousness does not lose its activity and affects the categorization process. This theory has a significant methodological significance. G. Kardel notes that due to the distinction of natural categories based on the theory of prototypes, researchers receive a perfect tool for studying problems associated with "speech inaccuracy" (Kardela, 1999:37).

There is no doubt that the fact that language is a complex, controversial phenomenon, and therefore its categories can not be considered as something unchanged. The model of natural categorization, thus, provides an opportunity to discover the hidden system that is the basis of language knowledge. Appearance of concept of «natural category» gave the linguists the possibility to find out basic units which WP consists of. These units are the natural language classes represented by semantic fields. Not just single words but the principles of concepts grouping and classification find a formal expression in the language give possibility to determine the world picture. It is necessary to draw attention to another problem related to the distinction between the scientific and non-scientific conceptual world pictures (CWP).

L. Mikeshina defines the scientific WP as a knowledge subject consisting of various forms: facts, principles, laws, hypotheses and theories (Mykeshyna, 1983:62). Under the naive WP the real ideas about the world and the man, peculiar to the members of this cultural and historical group on the certain stage of her development, which are the necessary cognitive basis of the world adaptation are most often understood. It is obvious that the naive WP is the basis of the CP. In philosophical works, the concept of scientific WP is elaborated in detail in the connection with the worldview problem.

At the same time, most researchers consider the scientific world picture as a part of culture, a special form of the conceptual world picture, because the scientific world picture is nothing more than a scientific aspect of the general cultural and historical world picture. Consequently, the scientific world picture, as well as the naive world picture, is part of the CP. The categories of the scientific world picture are often verbal embodiments. The naive world picture sets before itself the specific goals of orientation and successful activity in the world. It's center is a person, its abilities and needs, its perception of the world. The scientific world picture is aimed at the knowledge of objective reality, the world as they are without a regard to a person. At the heart of the scientific world picture lies the process of logical categorization, and the basis of the naive world picture - the process of natural categorization.

Conclusions and suggestions

In modern linguistics the connection of thinking, language and culture is recognized by the majority of researchers. Culture is a complex phenomenon, in the framework in which traditional, mass and elitist components are distinguished. In the aspect of the study of national specificity, the most interest is the traditional culture, in material and spiritual works of which the knowledge of reality features are fixed by any linguistic and cultural community. The linguistic world picture, as one of the main cultural components, is one of the transferring these peculiarities' means.

Despite the considerable amount of scientific researches, the question of the relationship between language and culture and the role of national language peculiarity remain relevant, open and controversial and require further research.

References

- Brutyán, G. A. (1959). *The Theory of General Semantics*. Yerevan: The Publishing House of Armenia SSR's Academy of Sciences. [in Russian].
- Brutyán, G. A. (1968). *The Hypothesis of Sepir -Worf*. Yerevan: Luys. [in Russian].
- Budagov, R. A. (1978). *The Struggle of Ideas and Directions in Linguistics of the Present-Time*. Moscow: Science. [in Russian].
- Gumboldt, Fon V. (1984). *Selected Works on Linguistics*. Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
- Kardela, H. (1999). *Ogdena i Richardsa trojkąt uzupełniony, czyli co bada gramatyka kognitywna*, in: J. Bartminkiego (Ed.). *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 15-37. [in Poland].
- Kasevych, V. B. (1996). *Buddhism. The Picture of the World. Language*. Saint Petersburg: Petropolis. [in Russian].
- Mackiewicz, J. (1999). *Kategoryzacja a językowy obraz świata*, in: J. Bartminkiego (Ed.). *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 47-55. [in Poland].
- Mykeshyna, L. A. (1983). *The Scientific Picture of the World as the World Outlook Form of Knowledge. Scientific Picture of the World. Logical-Epistemological Aspect: Collection of Scientific Works*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka. [in Russian].
- Osgood, Ch. E., May, W. H., Miron, M. S. (1975). *Cross-cultural Universals of Affective Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. [in English].
- Palmer, G. B. (1999). *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press. [in English].
- Sepir, Ye. (1993). *Selected Works on Linguistics and Science of Culture*. Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
- Sreznevsky, I. I. (1959). *Thoughts on the History of Russian Language*. Saint Petersburg: Uchpedgiz. [in Russian].
- Telia, V. N. (1996). *Russian Phraseology: Semantic-Pragmatic and Linguistic-Cultural Aspects. Languages of Russian Culture*. Moscow: Shkola. [in Russian].
- Tolstoy, N. I. (1995). *Language and National Culture. Essays on the Slavonic Mythology and Ethnical Linguistics. Languages of Russian Culture*. Moscow: Shkola. [in Russian].
- Vezhbytska, A. (1996). *Language, Culture. Cognition*. Moscow: Russian Dictionaries. [in Russian].
- Vezhbytska, A. (1999). *Semantic Universals and Description of Languages*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture. [in Russian].

- Whorf, B. (1960). Science and Linguistics. New in Linguistics. Moscow: Foreign Literature Publishing House. [in Russian].*
- Zvegynstsev, V. A. (1960). Theoretic-Linguistic Preconditions of the Sepir-Worf Hypothesis. New in Linguistics. Moscow: Foreign Literature Publishing House. [in Russian].*