



Journal Website:  
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

## THE LINGUISTIC WORLD PICTURE AS ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

Submission Date: February 01, 2024, Accepted Date: February 06, 2024,

Published Date: February 11, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue02-03>

Alikhasanova Zulfiya

Lecturer, Gulistan State Pedagogical institute, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

This article explores the concept of the linguistic world picture as one of the fundamental concepts of modern linguistics. The essence of linguistic world pictures, the sources of their formation, functions and classification are investigated. The concepts of conceptual and linguistic world pictures are presented, taking into account their native speakers. The necessity of distinguishing the linguistic world picture from others is substantiated. The linguistic consciousness of a person and the meaning in the linguistic world picture and its mental formations are investigated.

### KEYWORDS

World picture, cognitive linguistics, term, the concept, linguistic community, worldview, mind, human factor, linguistic personality, conceptual world picture.

### INTRODUCTION

The term "world picture" is one of the basic concepts of cognitive linguistics. From the point of view of V. I. Postovalova, this term is used in linguistics to express the specifics of a person, his relationship with the world, the conditions of his existence in this world [20].

V. V. Morkovkin defines the world picture from the point of view of mental education, although he explains that "the picture exists not only in the plane of consciousness, but also in the plane of language, since thinking outside of language is impossible" [18].

The ways of forming a world picture, namely its composition, are determined differently by linguists. G. V. Kolshansky considers the world picture to be an ideal representation of a person about all objective processes and objects of reality, the main ways of realizing the world picture are individual consciousness and public consciousness in one time period or another. Consequently, the world picture is "the totality of knowledge of mankind in a certain historical period".

### **The main results and findings**

V. V. Morkovkin identifies the following sources of the formation of the world picture: innate knowledge, knowledge acquired through practical and professional activities, knowledge obtained from studied materials, knowledge obtained through thinking, and knowledge from the native language.

It is accepted that each natural language corresponds to a unique linguistic world picture – a set of representations about the world that has developed in the consciousness of a linguistic community, a specific way of perceiving and organizing the world. The term "linguistic world picture" was introduced into the scientific terminological system by L. Weisgerber in the early 1930s, although during this period there were other terms considered synonymous: "linguistic intermediate world," "linguistic representation of the world," "linguistic model of the world" [6].

L. Weisgerber noted that the world picture of a particular language is its transforming force which shapes the understanding of the surrounding world through language as an "intermediate world" for its speakers, and the linguistic world picture of a specific linguistic community is its common cultural heritage.

Perception of the world is carried out through thinking but with the involvement of the means of the native language. The way reality is reflected in it has a specific ethnic character and corresponds to the static form of the language. Essentially, the scientist emphasizes the ability of humans to establish a correlation between several points of view - their own and others', that is, to consider, compare, contrast, and apply different perspectives on objects and events: "There is no doubt that many of our deep-rooted views, ways of behavior, and attitudes turn out to be 'learned', that is, socially conditioned, as soon as we trace the sphere of their manifestation throughout the world" [23].

A thorough contribution to the differentiation of the concepts of the world picture and the linguistic world picture was made by E. Sepir and B. Whorf, who argued that "the idea that a person navigates the outside world, essentially, without the help of language and that language is just an accidental means of solving specific problems of thinking and communication is just an illusion". In fact, "the real world is largely unconsciously built on the basis of the linguistic habits of a particular social group."

By using the combination "the real world", E. Sepir means the "intermediate world", which includes language with all its connections with thinking, psyche, culture, social and professional phenomena. That is why E. Sepir argues that "it becomes difficult for a modern linguist to limit themselves only to his traditional subject ... they cannot but share mutual interests that connect linguistics with anthropology and cultural history, with sociology, psychology, philosophy and – in the longer term – with physiology and physics" [21].

According to the historical approach in language, the linguistic world picture is the end product of research by early linguists. V. von Humboldt's ideas about the internal form of language represent the first step in compiling a modern understanding of the term linguistic world picture; the same role is played by the hypothesis of linguistic relativity of Whorf and Sepir [5]. Its main ideas are as follows:

- 1) the typology of social life and social production, as the typology of behavior, is determined by all cultural institutions, including language;
- 2) language, among other cultural institutions, takes the place of an intermediary between thinking and social life and social production, and therefore the type of language determines the type of thinking and the type of behavior of the language collective. Nowadays the term "linguistic world picture" is used by many

scientists of different fields of knowledge, including philosophers, ethnographers, sociologists and linguists.

In modern linguistic research, the "human factor" in language is inseparable from the concept of "world picture". An individual linguistic world picture is the perception and assessment of the world by an individual linguistic personality. As in any world picture, the prevailing ideas are those that correspond to the value concepts and meaning of an individual's life. The study of the linguistic world picture of any nation in our time is an important point in linguoculturology and linguopragmatics. Thanks to this, we learn and study not only his language, but also his history, culture, and way of life. At the same time, language is understood as the cultural code of the nation, and not just a means of communication. The research also draws attention to the fact of the diversity of world pictures. The conceptual world picture may be different for different people, for example, representatives of different eras, different social, age groups, different fields of scientific knowledge, and there are also gender varieties, etc.

The interrelation of conceptual and linguistic world picture is expressed by the fact that the reality existing around consists in the inner spiritual space of a person, and the results of this reflection, i.e. the complex of knowledge and perceptions of a person about the world, are represented by linguistic means. Distinctive features of culture and history of the people, acquiring

meaning in the form of knowledge structures, are a component of their conceptosphere, and then receive linguistic embodiment. Scientists emphasize that "language could not perform the role of a means of communication if it was not connected with the conceptual world picture" [22].

Thanks to the works of I. G. Herder and V. Humboldt, the concept of a linguistic world picture was prepared by the development of linguistics, which realized the inextricable link between language and culture. In Russia, the tradition of studying the interaction and correlation of language, thinking and culture has been formed since M. V. Lomonosov, the works of F. I. Buslaev and his school, A. A. Potebni, M. M. Bakhtin, L. P. Yakubinsky, V. V. Vinogradov and others.

O. A. Kornilov, in order to distinguish the concept of a linguistic world picture from the category of figurative expressions in the category of terms, it offers the introduction into scientific use of two concepts of this concept: cultural and linguistic. "The culturological approach is aimed at identifying the features of the national mentality of a linguistic community. The linguistic direction is associated with the interpretation of the results of practical work on the external structuring of semantic fields, the establishment and systematization of relations between them, and the practice of compiling ideographic dictionaries" [10].

The linguistic world picture is characterized by its multifaceted and coherent nature: it encompasses the results of all human activities and reflects information from all spheres of human knowledge. This statement stems from the understanding of language as a universal means of transmitting and storing information. Thus, the linguistic world picture represents a universal system of knowledge about the world, embodied in linguistic form and inherent to all language speakers.

In the formation of the conceptual world picture, both verbalized elements participate (in this case, "language plays the role of a means of communication precisely because it explains the content of the conceptual picture of the world and signifies it by creating words and means of connection between words and sentences") [12].

The basis of the categorical apparatus of linguoculturology consists of such concepts as a conceptual world picture, a linguistic world picture, a concept, a linguistic personality, as well as cultural connotation. The conceptual apparatus of this science also includes such terms as mentality, mentality, ritual, custom, sphere of culture, type of culture, civilization, paganism and some others.

The most important concepts for this work are those with which cultural information can be presented in linguistic units: cultural semes, cultural background,



cultural concepts and cultural connotations. Cultural semes are smaller and more universal than the word, semantic units, semantic features.

For example, the following cultural semes can be distinguished from the words "oak", "birch" in Russian and "isiriq", "paxta" in Uzbek: oak is a large tree with the associative meaning of "strong, healthy"; birch is one of the most common trees in Russia, considered its unofficial symbol; isiriq (*harmala vulgaris*) is a perennial plant with, in addition to medicinal properties, also so-called apotropaic properties; paxta (cotton) is a plant considered the national pride and the "white gold" of Uzbekistan. Pomegranate (*nar* in Azerbaijani) is the hallmark of Azerbaijan, is considered a symbol of good luck, prosperity and abundance, has cultural and pragmatic features in the national world picture [2]. The plant world is an important layer of the linguistic world picture. Floral vocabulary reflects the economic and cultural activities of the people, the value system of the national linguistic and cultural community, its worldview and understanding, and floral ornament, having a semantic load, acts as one of the types of non-verbal communication [3].

The linguistic world picture is multifaceted and integral: it enshrines the results of all human activity and reflects information from all spheres of human knowledge. This judgment comes from the very understanding of language as a universal means of transmitting and storing information. Thus, the

linguistic world picture is a universal system of knowledge about the world, fixed in the linguistic form and peculiar to all native speakers.

The formation of the conceptual world picture involves both verbalized (in this case, "language plays the role of a means of communication due to the fact that it explains the content of the conceptual world picture and signifies it through the creation of words and means of communication between words and sentences") and non-verbalized concepts, as "not everything perceived and cognized by man, not everything that has passed and passes through different sense organs and comes from outside through different channels into man's head, has or acquires a verbal form. Not everything is reflected by means of language and not all information coming from outside has to be passed through linguistic forms" [12].

An indicator of the conceptual significance of a certain unit is the frequency of its use. Therefore, not all concepts are reflected in the conceptsphere, but only those of cultural value. E. C. Kubryakova believes that the more significant a concept is for the representatives of society, the more complex and ramified system of means it is represented in the language [4].

The concept of the "conceptual sphere of language" was introduced into scientific circulation by D. S.

Likhachev, who presented it as a special field, the aura of language. He associates this term with cognitive abilities, stock of knowledge and skills, cultural experience of both an individual and an ethnic group as a whole. "The more concepts of the national language, the richer the entire culture of the nation, its literature, folklore, science, fine arts, it is correlated with all the historical experience of the nation and religion especially" [16].

V. Humboldt wrote about the national identity of the conceptual sphere. The definition of the linguistic world picture is connected with his postulates about the internal form of language. V. Humboldt noted that "all languages necessarily show unity in their fundamental properties, differing at the same time not only externally, but also in the internal form or the spirit that generates language" [7]. The main source of the concepts is the cognitive activity of a person, including through her communicative activity. "A set of concepts, from which, as from mosaic pieces, the canvas of a native speaker's worldview is formed, forms a conceptual sphere" [19].

The national linguistic world picture is an existing form of being and embodiment of the linguistic world picture through a particular language in the existence and communication of a certain cultural society. In any national language the world picture takes a national form of expression. National differences in differentiation of the world, specificity of expression of

reality in certain languages lead to the emergence of their own nationally peculiar world pictures.

O. A. Kornilov emphasizes that "the national linguistic world picture is the result of the reflection of the objective world by the everyday consciousness of a particular linguistic community, a particular ethnos" [11]. According to N. F. Alefirenko and N. N. Semenko, the national linguistic picture of the world is "a specific intralinguistic reality functioning in both individual and mass consciousness, thus expressing the worldview not only as an individual, but also as a mass phenomenon" [1].

Linguists argue that all linguistic pictures of the world contain certain common elements that allow us to relate and understand them. E. A. Levina emphasizes that the universality of national linguistic pictures of the world is determined, "firstly, by the unity of the objectively existing world, secondly, by the universality of man himself as a living organism, thirdly, by a certain commonality of human experience, fourthly, by the presence of linguistic universals in each language" [14].

The individual national world picture is a product of the expression of the objective world by the perception of an individual. The national linguistic picture of the world is opposed to those linguistic pictures of the world which are limited to the public sphere, territorially (dialects, colloquialisms) and professionally (sub-languages of sciences and crafts).

The conceptosphere of any ethnos is wider than the lexical sphere, which is represented by the meanings of language words. The conceptosphere of a language is replenished thanks to the culture of a nation, its oral folk art, literature, science, art, historical experience, religion. Current scientific data allow us to assert that the conceptosphere is an organized system, which is quite orderly: "the concepts forming the conceptosphere, according to their separate attributes enter into systemic relations of similarity, difference and hierarchy with other concepts.... The conceptosphere is an ordered set of people's concepts, an information base of thinking" [15].

Linguistics of the late XX century was marked by the introduction of the term "world picture" into the scientific community in the conceptual and meta-linguistic apparatus, referring to the basic concepts that describe the uniqueness of man, his spirituality, and the conditions of interaction with the objective world. Consequently, it is necessary to distinguish the concept of a "linguistic world picture" from the concept of "worldview", although some linguists consider them interchangeable. Worldview is interpreted as an individual and purposeful attitude of an individual to reality, which regulates his behavior and determines his activity.

V. G. Kolshansky called the world picture displayed in the consciousness of a person the secondary existence of the surrounding world. Language plays an important

role in the formation of the picture of the world. Linguists distinguish two features of language materialization: "Language directly participates in two processes related to the world picture. First, in its depths, the linguistic picture of the world, one of the deepest layers of the human world picture, is formed. Secondly, language itself expresses and explicates other pictures of the human world, which through the mediation of special vocabulary enter the language, bringing into it the features of the person, their culture" [9].

The linguistic world picture is not on a par with scientific pictures of the world (chemical, physical, etc.), poetic, philosophical, religious, folklore, etc. It precedes them and shapes them, because a person is able to understand the world and himself thanks to the language in which socio-historical experience is consolidated – both universal and national. Due to the specifics of the language, a certain linguistic picture of the world arises in the minds of its speakers, through the prism of which a person sees the world. Consequently, all these pictures of the world are in some sense "linguistic". But at the same time, almost each of these worldviews has a significant "supplement" that goes beyond the linguistic picture of the world, which forms the type of human attitude to the world (nature, animals, oneself as an element of the world). It sets the norms of human behavior in the world, determines his attitude to the world. Each

natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and organizing ("conceptualizing") the world [17].

Our understanding of the world is largely held captive by the linguistic world picture. Consequently, each specific language contains a national, distinctive system that defines the worldview of native speakers of a given language and forms their world picture. In fairness, it must be said that not all linguists agree with this position. Thus, G. V. Kolshansky wrote that there is no reason to raise the question of a special division of the world through language [8].

"If the linguistic and conceptual frameworks of the world are fundamentally universal, and their creators are the entire people, then the poetic framework is individual, created in the texts of one person, a representative of that nation. Therefore, the linguistic world picture and the world picture reconstructed based on poetic texts of one author are comparable but not identical."

The individualization of the idea of the meaning of a word quite often comes into contact and even comes from the linguistic world in which a person lives, in other words, from his native language, where this idea is fixed and used. And in another language, there may not be such a representation, because here it is different, its own idea of it, its own, different linguistic world picture. Each nation has its own vision of the world, its own mentality, which is unique and different

from others. And in this sense, Uzbeks and other nations have enough differences in the linguistic world, which indicates their vivid and peculiar linguistic pictures of the world, their connection with the mentality (national identity) of a particular community and its mentality (verbal and non-verbal manifestation of mentality).

In this sense, as an example, we point out that the psycho-emotional life of a Russian person is concentrated around the word сердце (heart): доброе сердце, холодное сердце, добросердечный, бессердечный, чувствовать сердцем, сердечный друг, хранить в сердце, сердечно рад, сердцем мил, сердцем добр, сердце отдам за тебя etc. For an Uzbek, this word is also important spiritually, but it is secondary to him and is covered with another word, namely jigar (liver) (which causes Russian at least perplexity: jigarim, jigarim mening, jigar do'stim, bolam – jigarim, toychoq – jigarim, jigarimni ol, jigari toza, jigari pokiza, jigari xushro'y etc.

In the Azerbaijani language, the word can (soul) has a high frequency of use in the meaning of "the inner mental (psychological) world of a person". In the national system of values, spirituality, the "soul", the main thing, is the core concept that dominates the mind, common sense. In the Azerbaijani language, this concept is not so much abstract as "human", that is, it is associated with the psychological processes taking place inside the person himself: mənim canım (my



soul), can deyib, can eşitmək (to live soul to soul), canla və başla (işləmək) – with pleasure, with the soul (to work), canım qurban (I will sacrifice my soul/life for you – willingness to give /do everything for someone), can bala (dear child) an expression often used in the meaning of "poor thing" when expressing sympathy; also, in addition to the positive connotation, the lexeme can is used in a negative sense, in the context of swearing: canın çıxsın, canına azzar etc.

It should be noted that the can – jon component is a morphological means of expressing endearment in the Azerbaijani and Uzbek languages, being used as a special suffix for the addressee: (-can) anacan, atacan, nənəcan and in the Uzbek language, in addition, they express endearment by adding to male names (Ilhomjon, Rahimjon, Mansurjon).

There are no extrahuman and all-human world pictures, so each individual picture of the world contains at least a piece of truth, understood by everyone in their own way. V. I. Postovalova writes: "In the strict sense of the word, there are as many pictures of the world as there are observers in contact with the world" [19].

## CONCLUSION

Thus, the linguistic world picture in general and in the main coincides with the logical reflection of the world in people's minds (the conceptual picture of the world). At the same time, separate sections in the

linguistic world picture are preserved, which, in our opinion, include phraseology, paremiology, semantics of some words, they store archaic knowledge about the world and man, it is this part of the linguistic world picture that varies from language to language. Consequently, at the present stage of the development of linguistics, one of the main concepts is the linguistic world picture, which is in the focus of linguoculturology, linguopragmatics and linguists.

## REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N.F., Semenenko N.N. Phraseology and paremiology. - M.: Flint: Nauka, 2009. - 344 p.
2. Alixasanova Z.F. Comparative linguoculturology and its conceptual framework // Bulletin of Gulistan State University. Humanities-Social Sciences series, 2023. No. 3. –pp. 229-232.
3. Alixasanova Z.F. Floronyms in the Russian and Uzbek linguistic world pictures / Materials of the international scientific practical conference "quality education and interdisciplinary approach: problems, solutions and cooperation". – Gulistan. 2023. – pp. 609-614.
4. Bazarbayeva A.M. The linguistic world picture as a national and cultural image of reality. // Novainfo, 2021. – No. 122. – pp. 74-75.
5. Brutyan G.A. Towards a philosophical assessment of the theory of linguistic relativity (On the Sepir-Whorf-Korzybsky hypothesis) / G.A. Brutyan // Questions of philosophy. 1961. No. 1. – pp. 169-183.

6. Chizhova M.E. The linguistic world picture as one of the basic concepts in modern cognitive linguistics // Izvestiya Saratov University. A new series. Philology series. Journalism. - 2011. -No. 4. - vol. 11. - pp. 3-6.
7. Humboldt V. von. On the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind // Humboldt V. von. Selected works on linguistics. - M., 1984. - pp. 37-297.
8. Kolshansky G.V. Communicative function and structure of language / Edited by T. V. Bulygina. 2nd edition stereotypical. – M.: KomKniga, 2005. – p. 176.
9. Kolshansky G.V. The objective world picture in cognition and language. – M.: Nauka, 1990. – 108 p.
10. Kornilov O. A. Linguistic world picture as derivatives of national mentalities. – Moscow: Nauka, 2003. – 348 p.
11. Kornilov O.A. Linguistic world picture as derivatives of national mentalities. - 2nd ed., ispr. and add. - M.: Chero, 2003. - 349 p.
12. Kubryakova E. S. A concise dictionary of cognitive terms / Kubryakova E. S., Demyankov V.Z., Pankrats Yu. G., Luzina L. G. / Under the general editorship of E.S. Kubryakova. -M.: Moscow State University, 1996.-242 p.
13. Kubryakova E. S. Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world. - M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. – 560s.
14. Levina E.A. The national linguistic world picture as a unity of universal and national-specific content // Bulletin of PGLU. – 2005. – No. 1. – pp. 70-75.
15. Likhachev D.S. Conceptosphere of the Russian language // IAN SL. 1993. Vol. 52, No. 1. pp. 3-9.
16. Maslova V. A. Linguoculturology. A textbook for higher education. studies. institutions / V. A. Maslova. – M.: Publishing center: "ACADEMIA", 2001. – 208 p.
17. Maslova V.A. Introduction to cognitive linguistics: textbook / V.A. Maslova. – M.: Flint: Nauka, 2004. – 296 p.
18. Morkovkin V.V., Morkovkina A.V. Russian agnonyms. – Moscow: Astra seven, 1996. – 415 p.
19. Popova Z.D. Cognitive linguistics / Z.D. Popova, I.A. Sternin. - M.: ACT: East-West, 2007. - 314 p. - (Linguistics and intercultural communication. The Golden Series).
20. Postovalova V.I. The world picture in human life // The role of the human factor in language: Language and the world picture / ed. by B. A. Serebrennikov. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – p. 32.
21. Sepir E. Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies. M. Publishing group "Progress – Universe", 1993. 123 p.
22. Serebrennikov, B. A. The role of the human factor in language: language and the world picture / B. A.

Serebrennikov, E.S. Kubryakova, V.I. Postovalova. -

M.: Nauka, 1988. - 216c.

23. Weisgerber J.L. Language and philosophy//  
Questions of Linguistics, 1993. No.2

24. Rakhimov, B. K., Jabborova, D. D., Khudayberdieva,  
D. B., Omonboev, B. I., Kurbanov, E. E., & Khayitov,  
S. T. (2023). Psychological Fundamentals of  
Formation of Creative Thinking of Future Teachers.  
Journal of Law and Sustainable Development,  
11(12), e2704-e2704.



OSCAR  
PUBLISHING SERVICES