

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2023 Issue: 06 Volume: 122

Published: 16.06.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Javohirkhon Ravshankhonovich Nasrullaev
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
independent researcher
Uzbekistan


THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW AS AN INTEGRAL COMPONENT OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Abstract: This paper examines the concept of the linguistic picture of the world, focusing on its cognitive nature and the factors that contribute to its formation. It explores how individuals perceive and interpret the surrounding world based on their background knowledge, experiences, and expectations. The role of nature, culture, and cognition in shaping the linguistic worldview is discussed, highlighting the influence of external living conditions, cultural norms, values, rituals, and cognitive processes. The paper emphasizes that language is not a direct reflection of the world but rather an individual's subjective interpretation, capturing meaningful and conscious aspects of their experience. It also addresses the variations in the linguistic picture of the world across different languages, emphasizing the importance of distinguishing between scientific and linguistic perspectives. The study contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the linguistic models of the world within the broader context of human sciences.

Key words: linguistic picture of the world, cognitive nature, perception, interpretation, nature, culture, cognition, subjective interpretation, language variation, scientific perspective, linguistic perspective, human sciences.

Language: English

Citation: Nasrullaev, J. R. (2023). The significance of the linguistic worldview as an integral component of the conceptual framework. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (122), 218-221.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-122-34> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.06.122.34>
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

An individual, functioning as a cognitive entity, embodies a distinct system of knowledge, ideas, and opinions concerning the objective reality. This system, referred to as the “picture of the world” (or conceptual system of the world, model of the world, or image of the world) within various scientific domains, is examined from different perspectives.

The linguistic picture of the world represents the reflection of reality through language, serving as a cognitive image of consciousness. It encompasses a comprehensive model that encapsulates knowledge within a conceptual system as expressed through language. It is customary to distinguish the linguistic picture of the world from the conceptual or cognitive model of the world, which forms the basis for the linguistic embodiment and verbal conceptualization of human understanding about the world [5; 46].

Furthermore, the linguistic or naive picture of the world is often interpreted as a reflection of everyday,

common-sense notions about the world. The concept of a naive model of the world posits that each natural language reflects a specific way of perceiving the world, which is assumed to be universally applicable to all native speakers. Yu.D. Apresyan characterizes the linguistic picture of the world as naive in the sense that scientific definitions and linguistic interpretations do not always align in scope and content [1; 357]. While the conceptual picture of the world, or the “model” of the world, is subject to continuous evolution, reflecting cognitive and social activities, certain elements of the linguistic picture of the world retain remnants of long-standing ideas held by individuals about the universe.

Amidst a diverse range of viewpoints regarding the nature of the linguistic picture of the world, it is widely acknowledged that the linguistic categorization of reality varies across different societies. As individuals engage in their activities, a subjective representation of the external world

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

emerges within their consciousness. Language acquisition occurs parallel to the acquisition of knowledge about the surrounding reality. Consequently, alongside the logical or conceptual picture of the world, a linguistic picture also takes shape. Although the linguistic picture of the world does not contradict the logical one, it is not identical to it.

R.I. Pavlenis introduced the term “conceptual system” to refer to the conceptual picture of the world, which develops during an individual's process of comprehending the world. It serves as a reflection of the national spiritual activity of a particular community. Language acts as a tool for capturing the specific knowledge that characterizes a given community, thus revealing the content of the conceptual system.

An integral component of the conceptual system, reflecting its national peculiarities, is the concept or meaning, which represents a cognitive structure resulting from the reflection of a particular aspect of reality. The concept encompasses various forms of content, such as conceptual, verbal, associative, and cultural elements. Consequently, cross-linguistic comparison of concepts facilitates the identification of both national and universal components within the content of speakers' conceptual systems across different languages. The distinction in thought patterns is influenced by the presence of distinct national concepts embedded within the culture [7; 286].

S.I. Dracheva delves into an examination of the distinctive national characteristics present within the conceptual picture of the world. Given the universal nature of cognitive processes involved in perceiving the surrounding world, the content of the conceptual component among speakers of different languages exhibits notable similarities. Furthermore, the core components of multicultural concepts tend to align to a greater extent, while national specificity becomes evident in peripheral aspects and the cultural dimension of the concept [3; 60-64].

Therefore, when exploring the peculiarities of knowledge representation among individuals who speak different languages or are bilingual, the concept assumes a fundamental role. Analyzing specific concepts serves as a basis for identifying the national characteristics within fragments of the conceptual system, which are contingent upon factors such as the activities of individuals and cultural or geographical considerations.

The national identity of the conceptual system is also reflected through the presence of particular concepts embedded within a culture. The collection of such concepts determines the distinctiveness of the collective mindset, making their identification crucial not only for understanding the nuances of speech generation but also for discerning the intricacies of meaning formation. Consequently, the data derived

from this analysis can find applications in fields such as sociology, political science (specifically ethnic conflict studies) [3; 60-64].

The comparative analysis of concepts across different languages reveals a consistent correlation between universal and idioethnic components. The conceptual aspect of a concept, which is shared by speakers of various languages in reference to the same aspect of reality, is considered universal, while national and cultural specificities manifest in other components.

When examining R.I.Pavlenis' theory of the conceptual system, V.A.Pishchalnikova highlights that a concept encompasses both psychological and personal meanings [9; 15]. At its core, a concept represents a generalization of objects belonging to a specific class based on their distinctive characteristics. The presence of an intersubjective element within each component of the concept enables communication between individuals with different conceptual systems.

According to [8; 380], the meanings of words and other meaningful units acquired by an individual become integral components of the corresponding concept, capable of representing the concept as a whole alongside other components such as visual and auditory elements. Consequently, the perception of a linguistic sign activates the subjective figurative, conceptual, and emotional information contained within the concept, and vice versa, any form of such information can be associated with the sign [9; 12]. Meaning is understood as the process of shaping consciousness, combining various sensory characteristics (visual, tactile, auditory, gustatory, verbal) associated with the object.

Hence, the conceptual picture of the world can be viewed as an information system encompassing knowledge about objects that is actively and potentially represented in an individual's cognitive and practical activities. The concept serves as the unit of information within this system, serving to capture and actualize the conceptual, emotional, associative, verbal, cultural, and other content related to the objects of reality embedded in the structure of the conceptual picture of the world.

The issue of understanding must primarily be approached as the challenge of comprehending the world from the perspective of the subject's conceptual framework, which is externalized and manifested through their activities.

The process of conceptualizing the world through language, specifically through the use of words, holds significant importance. R. Lado, one of the pioneers of contrastive linguistics, once remarked: “There is an illusion, sometimes even among educated individuals, that meanings are universally the same, and that languages only differ in the way they express these meanings. In reality, the values through which we classify our experiences are culturally determined,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

resulting in substantial variations from one culture to another” [4; 34-35]. Not only do meanings vary, but the composition of vocabulary as well. The particularities of such variations constitute an integral part of linguistic worldviews.

As mentioned earlier, the perception of the surrounding world is influenced to some extent by the cultural and national characteristics of native speakers of a given language. Consequently, from the standpoint of ethnology, linguoculturology, and other related fields, the most intriguing aspect lies in understanding the reasons behind discrepancies in linguistic worldviews, which indeed exist. Addressing such a question requires transcending the boundaries of linguistics and delving into the intricacies of other peoples' knowledge about the world. Various factors contribute to these discrepancies, although only a select few appear discernible and thus hold primary significance. Three principal factors or causes of linguistic differences can be identified: nature, culture, and cognition. Let us examine these factors.

The first determinant is nature, which primarily encompasses the external living conditions of individuals, influencing language variations. Naming animals, localities, and plants that one is familiar with, as well as describing the natural state, are all shaped by personal experiences. Linguistic consciousness is influenced by natural circumstances, even extending to phenomena like color perception. The categorization of color shades often stems from semantic cues linked to the visual perception of objects in the surrounding natural environment. Specific colors become associated with particular natural entities. While there are some shared associations across linguistic cultures, there are also variations [1; 351].

The nature in which individuals exist initially shapes their realm of associative representations in language, evident through metaphorical shifts in meaning, comparisons, and connotations.

The second factor is culture. “Culture is something that individuals did not inherit from the natural world, but rather something they brought forth, created themselves” [5; 51]. The outcomes of material and intellectual activities, socio-historical developments, aesthetic, moral norms, and values that distinguish different generations and social communities manifest in diverse conceptual and linguistic representations of the world. Language captures the distinct features of cultural domains. Furthermore, language discrepancies can be attributed to national rituals, customs, folklore, mythological conceptions, and symbols. Cultural models embodied in specific terms propagate beyond borders, becoming known even to those unfamiliar with the culture in question. Recent research has focused extensively on this topic.

Regarding the third factor, cognition, it is crucial to acknowledge that individuals possess distinct

rational, sensory, and spiritual approaches to perceiving the world. The ways in which people understand the world differ among individuals and communities. Such disparities become apparent in the outcomes of cognitive processes, which manifest in the specific linguistic representations and distinctive linguistic consciousness of various groups. V. von Humboldt referred to this influence of cognition on language differences as “different ways of seeing objects” [2; 156-158].

It is crucial to consider that the perception of a situation or object is directly influenced by the perceiving subject's background knowledge, experiences, expectations, and physical location. This dependence allows for the description of the same situation from various perspectives, thereby enhancing its understanding. Although the process of “constructing the world” is subjective, it still involves the consideration of diverse objective aspects and the actual state of affairs, resulting in the creation of a “subjective image of the objective world”.

When investigating the cognitive foundations of language usage, E.S.Kubryakova appropriately highlights the linguistic picture of the world as a structure of knowledge about the world, emphasizing its cognitive nature. By studying derivational processes from a cognitive perspective, we can elucidate not only the specifics of mapping the world in a particular language but also contribute to general principles concerning human comprehension of fundamental categories of existence, the characteristics of the universe, and the laws governing the world's structure in both the physical aspect of human existence and their social organization, as well as the entire system of their values and moral and ethical assessments [3; 336-337].

When evaluating the picture of the world, it is essential to recognize that it is not a mere reflection or window into the world, but rather an individual's interpretation of the surrounding world and a means of understanding it. Language does not merely mirror the world but captures not only what is perceptible but also what is meaningful, conscious, and interpreted by individuals [3; 95]. Consequently, a person's understanding of the world is not limited to sensory perception alone. Rather, a significant portion of their world comprises the subjective results of their interpretation of the perceived information. Hence, it is appropriate to view language as a “mirror of the world”, albeit an imperfect one that represents the world indirectly through the subjective cognitive refraction of a community of individuals.

As evident, there are multiple interpretations of the concept of the “linguistic picture of the world”. This divergence arises due to variations in the pictures of the world across different languages, as the perception of the surrounding world is influenced by the cultural and national characteristics of native speakers. Each linguistic picture of the world presents

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

its own perspective, highlighting the importance of distinguishing between the concepts of the “scientific (conceptual) picture of the world” and the “linguistic (naive) picture of the world”.

Thus, at the current stage of linguistic development, linguistic models of the world are

subjected to description and interpretation within the broader domain of human sciences. The picture of the world in any language is explored not only in the context of folklore, mythology, culture, history, customs, and psychology of a particular community but also within the realm of linguistics.

References:

1. Apresyan, Y.D. (1995). *Selected Works in 2 Volumes. Vol. II: Integral Description of Language and Systemic Lexicography*. (pp. 348-385, 628-631, 460-481). Moscow: School "Languages of Russian Culture",
2. Humboldt, W.O. (1984). *On the Difference in Structure of Human Languages and Its Influence on the Spiritual Development of Mankind*. In: Humboldt, W. *Selected Works on Linguistics*. (pp. 156-180). Moscow.
3. Dracheva, S.I. (1997). *Experimental Study of Verbal Content in Ethnic Conceptual Systems*. In: *Text: Structure and Functioning. Vol. 2*. (pp. 60-64). Barnaul: Altai University Press.
4. Kubryakova, E.S. (2003). *Linguistic Picture of the World as a Specific Representation of the World Image in Human Consciousness*. In: *Bulletin of I.Ya. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University*, No. 4 (38), pp. 2-12.
5. Lado, R. (1989). *Linguistics Beyond Cultural Borders*. In: *New in Foreign Linguistics. Vol. XXV: Contrastive Linguistics*. Moscow, pp. 34-35.
6. Manakin, V.N. (2004). *Comparative Lexicology*. Kiev: Znannya.
7. Pavilenis, R.I. (1983). *The Problem of Meaning: Modern Logical-Functional Analysis of Language*. Moscow.
8. Pavilenis, R.I. (1986). *Speech Understanding and Philosophy of Language*. In: *New in Foreign Linguistics. Vol. XVII: Moscow*, pp. 380-388.
9. Pishchalnikova, V.A. (1992). *The Problem of Meaning in Literary Texts*. Novosibirsk.
10. Pishchalnikova, V.A., & Sorokin, Yu.A. (1993). *Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. Barnaul.
11. Yusupov, O. Y., & Nasrullaev, J. R. (2020). *Linguo-social and cultural features of learning English. Theoretical & Applied Science*, (2), 408-412.