

## Linguistic worldview: of the world: linguistic and national particularities

Aizhan Saburtanovna Dalabayeva

Ablaikhan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Muratbayeva Street, 200, Almaty, 050022, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Abstract.** Language is integral and most important part of any national culture, material base which must be studied along with historical, geographic, economic and other determinant before familiarization with this culture but the key point is penetration into the way of thinking of the nation, an attempt to look at the world with the eyes of bearers of this culture. It is not by coincidence that the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev believes that "National language forms national consciousness". The article showed the essence of language picture of the world (LPW), the notion of national language picture is analyzed, the relationship between national culture and language is considered and necessity to study LPW in order to understand culture of other nation is explained. Particularities of LPW of the Kazakh and Russians are considered as exemplified by equivalent-free, background and connotative lexis, and words-concepts.

[Dalabayeva A.S. **Linguistic worldview: of the world: linguistic and national particularities.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(5s):149-152]. (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 28

**Keywords:** LPW, national LPW, equivalent-free lexis, background lexis, connotation lexis, connotative lexis, connotative language zone, words-concepts.

### Introduction

Theoretic base of the concept which defines the language as the key determinant of world outlook of ethnos is the theory of linguistic relativity, related to the names of prominent linguists: Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir and Benjamin Worf. They shared the same opinion that all people see the world in different way - in particular, they see it through the prism of their language. Basing their approach on observation of languages which are quite different from Indo-European languages these scientists in different times arrived at the same conclusion that languages are not just different material "shells" of one single panhuman knowledge but different visions of the world [1].

Yu. Apresyan interprets the essence of LPW in the following way: in his opinion every natural language reproduces some way of reception and conceptualization of the world. All language meanings form a kind of common for all language-speakers system of views, some collective philosophy which becomes an attribute of all language speakers. The way of reality conceptualization which is characteristic of one language is partially universal, partially nationally specific: that is why speakers of different languages see the world in different way through the prism of their own languages [2].

Here LPW can be considered "naïve" in terms of its difference from so called "scientific picture" of the world. For example, R. Hallig and V. von Wartburg argued that world picture of ordinary language speaker consists of pre-science notions fixed by language, and the language-speaker himself

perceives surrounding world in terms of so called naive realism (such vision does not correspond to scientific knowledge of the world) [3]. In this case, any ethnic language can be considered as representation of ordinary taxonomy of reality existing in collective language consciousness of some ethnos: the representation of LPW in specific national language [4].

In the same time O. Kornilov believes that LPW on its own is abstraction which have not really existed. LPW of specific national languages are real - national language picture of the world because LPW out of some specific language does not exist. Thus, in author's opinion, national language picture of the world is objectively existing realities, ideographic structures lexical systems of any national language. O. Kornilov believes that national language picture of the world is the result of representation of objective world by ordinary (everyday) consciousness of specific language community, of **specific ethnos**. Every national language picture of the world fixes **unique** perception of given language community; this is a category which fixes the experience of the whole language community, to the full extent it is developed in minds of people - language-speakers [5].

There is interesting point of view that LPW is one of 2 plans of 2-coded, 1-plan representation of the world both by 1 man and by the whole nation. Theory of 2-code representation of knowledge about the world was described in detail in the well-known book by V. Paivio *Mental representations* (Poivio, 1986). For long time all scientists were convinced

that the processes in human mind are of language nature, Paivio suggests “mental processes in human mind can be intermediated not by language (verbal forms) but imagination and therefore by images. He writes that representation is often defined in the dictionaries as something which is characteristic of mind: a portrait, image, picture and even masterpiece ...- all this can be understood as representation of something” [6].

In accordance with this theory the representation of fragments of the world can be picture-like (images) and language-like (words and some other formal systems). LPW is a system of representation of the second type to which images also can correspond. Availability or absence of such correspondence depends on the character of represented object or idea. Images which correspond to lexical units are so called prototypes of denoted objects (this term gave the name to the new semantic area - prototypic semantics). Prototypes are collective images of denoted objects which have all necessary and significant (as language speaker thinks) attributes and characteristics which are attributes of the whole class of these objects, most (or all) of its representatives. In this sense meaning of the world can be considered as description of generalized visual image of an object, i.e. the prototype.

Analysis of national particularities of LPW is possible if we focus on relationship between culture and the language which was fully described and postulated in the work of E. Sepir *Language, Introduction into study of speech*. [7].

The President described the relationship between culture and language very shortly and precisely: “I am absolutely confident that if the issue of free development of Kazakhstan language and culture is not solved the realization of efficient national policy in our country will not be possible”.

LPW can be used in 2 ways in cognition of other people’s culture:

-on the one hand, as collection of *illustrative linguistic material*, necessary for proving different features of national character which can be a-priori attributed to given nation or considered as well-known. It is important that in this case LPW is not regarded as source of knowledge about national particularities, with its own value. This approach to LPW is secondary in regard to declared particularities of national character but must just prove them.

-on the other hand, as *a source of knowledge* about national character and mentality. This approach to LPW is a database which must be analyzed and only after that the conclusions about national vision of the world can be made. In this case LPW is gnoseologically valuable.

So, familiarization with LPW of the nation is *necessary* condition for getting familiar with national culture, national mentality but this condition is *not enough*. It must be accompanied by the study of the whole complex of national culture elements: history, folklore, poetry, painting and many others, including physical geography of the country. This is integral complex.

So, national LPW is not a comprehensive source of information about national world view but it is its key element.

In this connection we should emphasize **pragmatic aspect** of cognition of other nations, their culture, national character and mentality through cognition of national LPW.

It is worth mentioning that this pragmatic direction can be different: it can be oriented to the other culture and getting knowledge about it, but can also have opposite direction - to propaganda of national culture, one's own national world vision in order to make it clear for representatives of other cultures.

National particularities of LPW are manifested in the ways of nomination of the given language, because the word is used as a sign and image of out-of-language realities. National-cultural specifics of lexical structure of the language, for example Russian and Turk, can be considered through examples of equivalent-free, background and connotative lexis.

In every language there are sufficient number of words which cannot be translated into other languages exactly. They are so called equivalent-free lexis which is identified in comparison of Russian and Turk cultures. Mainly equivalent-free lexis denotes specific phenomena of the given national culture.

In case of borrowing such words are called egotisms: they do not only describes and interpret foreign culture but symbolize it: for example, realities of Russian culture: *maslenitsa, gusli, balalaika, chastushka, pirog (cake), karavai (big round loaf of white bread, a sign of friendship and hospitality), kalach*; realities of Turk culture: *kumys, tybeteika, kamzol, kurban-bairam, sabantui, kazan* etc.

National-cultural specifics has background-lexis: these are words which coincide by their lexical meaning but different by their lexical background. they have additional stylistic and semantic connotations in Russian and Turk language and cultures.

National colouring of connotative lexis is manifested not in subject-logical part of their semantic meaning but in additional, usually emotionally expressive information which in combination form connotative zone of the language -

that part of national LPW which contains information about stable in given national tradition associations, produced in collective language consciousness by different objects of surrounding world.

For example, if in some culture some animals are symbols of strength, diligence, wisdom, obedience, chicken-heartedness, meanness etc, then in regard to linguistics it means that lexical meaning of the words denoting these animals include this information also (unique for every language). This element of the meaning is called connotative (associative) element of word meaning.

Let us consider some examples. A. Myrzashova points out that sheep is positive symbol in LPW of the Kazakhs - it is a stereotype image of obedient, meek, modest man (analogous to Russian expression: "can't say bo to a goose"). The sheep image is used for positive characteristic of people, animals, life (man's existence) and, in particular, in description of 1) man's appearance: *koi moiyn* a neck is beautiful like sheep's one; *koi kez* - beautiful big brown eyes; *koi mic* - attractive small teeth; 2) obedience of a horse: *koi tori* - friendly idling horse; 3) peaceful existence: *koi ustine boztorgai*- peaceful time, happy life.

On the contrary, in Russian LPW a he-sheep is stupid, obedient, fully controlled by its destiny, and in the same time stupidly persistent animal which is associated with image of very stupid but persistent person (stupid like a sheep): it is quite different from the vision of Kazakh people. Besides that in Russian LPW there is steady expression "to look at the new gates like a sheep" (to be surprised to a full extent, do not understand what is going on). Besides that Russians use image of a sheep to denote a person who does not try to struggle against his destiny (too much obedient) and in description of man's appearance - a man with very curly hair.

There are also other examples. In Kazakh LPW image of a dog is usually used for characteristic of a bastard, and not very clever person. In Russian vision a dog (side by side with negative connotation) is associated with faithfulness, devotion, being happy with little food: dog's faithfulness, devotion.

In Russian LPW a horse is a concept which has both positive and negative connotation which is manifested in Russian proverbs and sayings: *Bridegrooms are like horses - vague things, Things go worse than the slowest horse, It was my horse - but it has finished*. For a Kazakh a horse is a noble animal, the personification of beauty, strength, freedom, quickness and nobleness, the symbol of the light and pure: that is why in Kazakh language there cannot be such associations. This is proved by proverbs: *The name of a young man can be glorious because of his wife or because of his horse. Quick-*

*legged horse is sometimes a horse and sometimes - wings. Where a horse is, there can not be devil.*

In general, connotative zone of any language is very difficult to understand by representatives of other cultures. A man which has never studied linguistics or ethnography can just not realize its existence and will learn just main words meaning, or, much worse, will introduce their own connotations into foreign language believing them to be universal or evident. This is the reason for many culture-communicative failures.

Special place in LPW is occupied by key words or words-concepts expressing significant elements of national culture. Different definitions of the concept allow to identify the following invariant attributes: 1) minimal unit of man's experience in its ideal representation, verbalizing with the aid of a word and having field structure; 2) these are key units of processing, storage and transfer of the knowledge; 3) the concept has mobile boundaries and specific functions; 4) the concept is social, its associative field determines its pragmatics; 5) this is key cell of culture [9].

In regard to Russian and Kazakh languages there are studies devoted to description of different concepts reflecting material and internal world of a man. For example, one key concept in LPW of different nations is attitude to home, analysis of which in Russian and Kazakh language was made by M. Shingareva [10]. The author showed that in Kazakh LPW the concept 'home' has the following lexemes: *ui, yurta, shanyrak*. National home - *yurta* - was the aim of the whole life of a Kazakh; that is why *yurta* had special meaning in everyday life of the Kazakhs. The key element was *shanyrak* - round piece at the top. *Shanyrak* was considered the symbol of happiness in the family, peaceful life. It was family relic (talisman) and was passed from generation to generation. *Kara shanyrak* (literally "black carcass") of father's *yurta* was respected by the sons as a divine thing. In especially important cases the Kazakhs swore looking at *shanyrak*. The importance of this concept for the Kazakhs was represented by steady word combinations: *shanyrak byi bolsyn* - keep the *shanyrak* of our *yurta* very high!" - (good lick!) after erection of new home, marriage; if a man established *shanyrak* it meant that a man has become independent, created a family. Russian word "dom" (home) has more meanings. Home fire-place and place of living, building, dynasty (for example, the house of the Romanovs). It shows that concept formed by Russian word "dom" and "yurta", "ui", "shanyrak" are different things determined by different cultures.

**Inference.**

Given above examples and our conclusions show that LPW reproduces everyday empirical (naive), cultural and historical experience of specific language community most distinctly expressed by those language units which directly represent out-of language reality, denote subjects and phenomena of the world around us. Language semantics is a product of historical development of a nation which includes, among other things, the past of its culture.

Summarizing all said above we would like to repeat N. Nazarbayev's words: "Ultimate power of the Kazakh language, its gnoseological, communicative and expressive wealth puts it on decent and legal position in world linguistic space. By the extent of its development Kazakh language like Ukrainian, Uzbek and Russian languages is a component of panhuman thesaurus of language forms and meanings. It has a lot of unique words and expressions which has no external equivalents and can not be found in any dictionary of the world, and that is why specific phenomena, notions and concepts of LPW of the Kazakhs can be clarified and interpreted only on the base of resources o Kazakh language".

**Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Dalabayeva, Ablaihan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Muratbayeva Street, 200, Almaty, 050022, Republic of Kazakhstan

**References**

1. Samovar L.A. and R.E. Porter, 1995. *Communication between Cultures*. - Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
2. Apresyan, Yu., 1998. *Selected works, Volume 1. Lexical semantics. Synonymic means of the language*. Moscoe: School Language of Russian culture.
3. Hallig, R. und Wartburg W., von, 1963. *Semantic system as foundation for lexicography, 2 Aufl., B.*
4. Goddard, C. and A. Wierzbicka. 1996. *Semantic and Lexical Universals. Theory and Empirical Findings*: Amsterdam.
5. Kornilov, O., 2003. *LPWs as derivatives of national mentalities*. Moscow: CheRo.
6. Kubryakova, E. and V. Demyankov, 2007. *Regarding the problem of mental representations. Issues of cognitive linguistics*. Moscow: Institute of Language studies; Tambov: State university named after G. Derzhavin, 4: 8–16.
7. Sepir, E., 2007. *Language. Introduction into speech study*. Moscow: Direct-Media.
8. Myrzashova, A., 2010. *Zoomorphic signs of intellectual concept-sphere of the Kazakhs and Russians*. Vestnik of KarSU, 2.
9. Maslova, V., 2005. *Cognitive linguistics: Textbook*. Mn: TetraSystem.
10. Shingareva, M., *Key notions of LPWs of Russian, Kazakh and English ethnoses*. Date Views 26.02.14 [www.rusnauka.com/19\\_NNM\\_2007/Philologia/22431.doc.htm](http://www.rusnauka.com/19_NNM_2007/Philologia/22431.doc.htm).

3/23/2014