The correlation between linguistic and conceptual worldviews: the role of metaphor

Aida Sadykova, Diana Kayumova

Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kremliovskaya str., 18, 420008, Kazan, Russian Federation

Abstract. The present work considers correlation between linguistic and conceptual worldviews, the role of metaphor in forming conceptual worldview, the development of semantic and cognitive trend in the framework of cognitive linguistics, interpretation of notions 'concept' and 'sphere of concepts' as basic categories of cognitive linguistics, basics of the cognitive approach to the analysis of conceptual metaphor. Metaphor allows structuring and comparing segments of national conceptual worldviews. It establishes association correspondence between spheres of concepts of cognitive consciousness of native speakers, plays the role of a tool to implement categorization and organized classification of human experience set in the language and represented by the linguistic units.
[Sadykova A., Kayumova D. **The correlation between linguistic and conceptual worldviews: the role of metaphor.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(6):552-555] (ISSN:1097-8135). http://www.lifesciencesite.com. 82

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, semantic and cognitive approach, categorization of reality, sphere of concepts, linguistic view of the world, conceptual worldview, semantics.

Introduction

One of the methods of forming the sphere of concepts of native speakers is conceptual metaphor. Conceptual metaphors, representing the universal human capability to structure new realms of knowledge while relying on the experience of human interaction with the world, are 'phenomena', providing understanding [1].

Metaphor exists in the language as a semantic phenomenon and is at the same time viewed as a tool of cognition, comprehension, categorization, representation, and interpretation of reality. Metaphor as a semantic and cognitive phenomenon allows to structure and compare segments of national conceptual worldviews represented by metaphorically redefined vocabulary. Fundamental features of conceptual metaphors are categorization as a way of division of the world regulating the observed reality, and systematization allowing to distinguish a range of basic conceptual metaphors, by which the ordinary conceptual system of the human cognitive consciousness operates. Metaphorical reconsideration of vocabulary is a 'cognitive process, in which with the help of mental operations on the basis of old knowledge we see the categorization of new knowledge and new units in speech, language, and the mental lexicon' [2].

The main part

At the present stage of research, cognitive linguistics is presented in the world by several trends, each of them having their own purposes, their realms of research and analysis procedures: the theory of prototypes and categorial semantics of E. Rosch [3], the theory of conceptual metaphor and structuring of non-object world of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [4], the theory of ethno-cultural semantics of key cultural concepts of A.Wierzbicka [5], the theory of structuring space and phonic formation of L.Talmy [6], the 'role' cognitive grammar of R. Langacker [7].

The study of worldview became one of the main trends of anthropological science in the second half of the 20th century. Cognitive anthropology and, consequently, anthropological paradigm in linguistics have eventually developed out of this trend.

In the common philosophical sense, worldview is a combination of world outlook of human knowledge, an integral image of reality of historically determined character.

As worldview is a necessary component of human activity, it determines the specific way of perception of reality. This idea of the existence of specific nationally determined worldviews was originated in late 18th-early 19th centuries in the works of the German philologists.

The notion 'linguistic view of the world' goes back to the ideas of W. von Humboldt about the existence of the language as 'intermediate realm' between thinking and reality. In the opinion of W. von Humboldt, the language reflects not merely substantial features of the extralinguistic world, but the human attitude to this world [8].

It is accepted to consider linguistic, or naïve, worldview as reflection of everyday, common conceptions about the world. Linguistic view of the world is one of the ways of structuring the knowledge of an individual about the objective reality. All human knowledge about the world acquired in the course of a person's life and existing in their consciousness in the form of worldview, determines the attitude of a person to reality, influence the formation of the axiological system, mastery of socially determined rules and regulations, and subconscious choice of the strategy of activity.

A.B. Mikhalyov in his work 'Layers of linguistic worldview' regards linguistic view of the world as layered formation which includes lexical (nominative), phonetic (onomatopoeic), phraseological (paremic), grammatical (categorial) and discursive (situational) layers [9].

At the present stage of the development of the national linguistics, the term 'linguistic view of the world' has no common interpretation, since it is interchangeable with the terms 'cognitive model', 'cognitive base', 'system', 'paradigm', 'integral knowledge', 'matrix', 'group mentality', 'national mentality', 'sphere of concepts', 'semantic space of the language', etc.

In the opinion of S.G. Shafikov, the term 'worldview' remains at the present stage of the research 'due to the informative function of the model which does not explain, but only describes the design of the world around' [10].

S.V. Ivanova in her monograph 'Culturological aspect of linguistic units' suggests to distinguish between the notions 'view' of the world and 'model' of the world. From the researcher's point of view, '...linguistic model of the world presents linguistic means of implementing the worldview categories of culture. Linguistic view of the world presents objects and reality phenomena in their interconnections, coherence and variety expressed in language forms' [11].

Due to the fact that linguistic view of the world is consolidated and expressed in lexical and grammatical categories of a language, the method of its study is conceptual and semantic analysis of lexical and grammatical meanings of a certain semantic field of a given language. As a result of comparative conceptual and semantic analysis, we see that different languages manifest a universal semantic component, which is determined by the common view of the world shared by native speakers of different languages. It is accounted for by universal forms of human perception of objective reality, commonness of physiology and mentality of people, same cognitive processes of the mind, regardless of individual psychological features, ethnic identity or race.

As noted by S.G. Shafikov, the logical and conceptual system rests on the fundamental universality of human experience determined by the integral world structure and the uniform of human nature, while multiple physiological mechanisms embedded into the human genetic system ensure psychological unity of the humankind [12].

As worldview is created and perceived by people, the subject of cognition is always a historically finite person who subconsciously transfers their own features to the reality around

them. This is the manifestation of the principle of anthropomorphism of worldview which is found in natural languages and reaffirms intercultural uniformity of human perception of reality.

The representatives of the semantic and cognitive approach in the national linguistics regard linguistic view of the world as a synonym to the notion 'semantic space of the language'. From the standpoint of this approach, a linguistic view of the world is formed by:

- nominative linguistic means are lexemes, substantial nominations, idioms specifying certain division and classification of objects of the national reality, as well as significant absence of nominative units;

- functional linguistic means are the selection of vocabulary and phraseology for communication, with the composition of the most frequent, that is, communicatively relevant linguistic means of the people on the background of the whole corpus of linguistic units of the language system;

- imaginative linguistic means are nationally specific figurativeness, methaphorics, the course of development of figurative meanings, inner form of linguistic units;

- phonosemantics of the language [13].

V.I. Karasik distinguishes a number of ontological characteristics of linguistic view of the world which can be detected at different segments of the lexical and phraseological systems of the language and which make it possible to compare the similarly named segments of the linguistic view of the world in different languages:

- the presence of concept names;

- the inhomogeneous conceptualization of the similarly named segments of lexical systems;

- the specific combinatorial set of associative criteria of concepts;

- the specific character of classification of certain subject areas;

- the special focus of subject areas on certain spheres of communication [14].

In this way, the study of linguistic view of the world is important as it helps to understand, systematize knowledge of the world and the place of a man in it. When describing linguistic view of the world, the semantic and cognitive approach implies:

- the description of 'division of reality' reflected in language paradigms (lexical and semantic, lexico-phraseological and structurally syntactic groups and fields);

- the description of the nationally specific meanings of linguistic units (which semantic differences are detected in similar meanings in different languages);

- the detection of the absent units (lexical gaps) in the language system;

- the detection of endemic (detected only in one of the compared languages) units [15].

The contemporary researchers, besides linguistic view of the world, also distinguish conceptual worldview or cognitive worldview, because a thought takes not only the language form.

As noted by R.I. Pavilenis, conceptual worldview is understood as a global, coherent, continuously constituted system of information (opinions and knowledge) about the universum at the disposal of an individual [16].

We share the point of view of Y.S. Kubryakova that the linguistic view of the world, or internal lexicon, presents the verbalized part of conceptual worldview. In the framework of this approach, conceptual worldview is regarded as representation of the functional distinctiveness of the mental level in the mind or intellect of a person, level of their thinking activity. Thus, conceptual worldview contains a lot more information, as all kinds of thinking take part in its formation. The content of conceptual worldview unfolds the language, correspondingly, linguistic view of the world is subdued to the conceptual one [17].

The representatives of the semantic and cognitive approach in linguistics distinguish between linguistic view of the world and conceptual worldview, which from the standpoint of this approach is interpreted as cognitive worldview. Cognitive worldview is a combination of the sphere of concepts and the stereotypes of consciousness determined by culture, while linguistic view of the world is a combination of the consolidated in linguistic units perception of reality by the people at a certain stage of the development of the people, the perception about the reality reflected in the meanings of the language signs – the linguistic division of the world, linguistic ordering of objects and phenomena, information about the world inherent in the systemic meanings of words [18].

Conclusions

Thus, linguistic (indirect, secondary) view of the world regarded as indirect, secondary, is defined as the result of objectivization of conceptual worldview in the language. Conceptual worldview is represented by a combination of concepts, while linguistic view of the world exists in the form of meanings of linguistic units making 'semantic space of the language' [19].

The linguistic view of the world is only a part of conceptual worldview due to the fact that not all its content is expressed by language means, but only those concepts which bear communicative significance and cultural value for the given people.

We should note the thesis formulated by G.N. Sklyarevskaya that 'implementing the function of idealization and representation of reality, language in fact represents organized classification of human experience' [20]. The view of the world offered by the language reflects the naïve worldview of native speakers, formed on the basis of stereotypes, models, conventions, standards, patterns, rooted in the experience of dozens of generations during many centuries.

Based on this thesis, it becomes evident that linguistic view of the world cannot bear an imprint of a person of this language community, and even deeper difference is detected when comparing worldviews in different languages. However, despite the discrepancies in the view of the world by different native speakers of the same language or different languages, there is some dominant idea in linguistic view of the world which allows to single out its kernel, and presence of common semantic features in different languages allows to speak about the above-mentioned universal semantic component and universal processes occurring in the word structure, including those due to transfer of meaning.

Metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon belongs to conceptual worldview and is a method of cognition, vision, and understanding of unattainable or understudied phenomena of reality, that is, metaphorical expressions reflect and reveal metaphorical perception of reality. For this reason, the study of regularity and consistency of metaphorical transfer in the framework of various aspects of existence and human activity allows a glimpse into the intelligence structure.

The comparative study of conceptual metaphor from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics, to our mind, leaves open the opportunity of the analysis of the semantics of metaphorically redefined lexemes of the semantic field under study, since it is the language material, or the semantic space of the sphere of concepts that gives access to conceptual metaphors structuring human perception, thinking, and activity, forming the sphere of concepts of a native speaker. In this connection, we consider that metaphor should be viewed more from the standpoint of the semantic and cognitive approach. Metaphor can be viewed not separately, but as a semantic phenomenon whose existence is determined by the semantic structure of the word, and as a cognitive phenomenon taking part in the process of cognition, categorization and systematization of reality.

Corresponding Author:
Dr.Sadykova Aida
Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University
Kremliovskaya str., 18, 420008, Kazan, Russian
Federation.

References
1. Lakoff, G., Johnson M., 2004. Metaphors we live by: Transl. from English. Moscow: Editorial URSS, pp: 206.
2. Davletbaeva D., Sadykova A., Smirnova E., 2013. The aspects of Modern Phraseology Modeling. World Applied Sciences Journal. 27, pp: 58-62.
3. Rosch, E. 1973. Natural categories. Cognitive Psychology. Elsevier. V.7. pp: 328-350.
4. Lakoff, G., Johnson M., 2004. Metaphors we live by: Transl. from English. Moscow: Editorial URSS, pp: 196.
5. Wierzbicka, A., 2001. Comparing cultures through vocabulary and grammar. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture, pp: 193.
6. Talmy, L., 2000. Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge (Mass), Leningrad: Bradford Book, The MIT Press, pp: 565.
7. Langacker, R. W., 2000. Grammar and Conceptualization: Berlin, GmbH&Co.KG, pp: 427.
8. Humboldt, W., 2000. Selected works in linguistics: Moscow: Progress, pp: 400.
9. Mikhalyov, A.B., 2001. Layers of linguistic worldview. In the Proceeding of 2001 Moscow Conference 'Language and Culture', pp: 108.
10. Shafikov, S.G., 2004. Typology of lexical systems and lexical and semantic universals: Bashkir Un-ty Publishers, pp: 225.
11. Ivanova, S.V., 2002. Culturological aspect of linguistic units: Bashkir Un-ty Publishers, pp: 116.
12. Shafikov, S.G., 2004. Typology of lexical systems and lexical and semantic universals: Bashkir Un-ty Publishers, pp: 225.
13. Popova, Z.D., Sternin, I.A., 2007. Cognitive linguistics. Moscow: AST; Vostok-Zapad, pp: 320.
14. Karasik, V.I., 2004. Language circle: person, concepts, discourse. Moscow: Gnozis, pp: 390.
15. Popova, Z.D., Sternin, I.A., 2007. Cognitive linguistics. Moscow: AST; Vostok-Zapad, pp: 320.
16. Pavilenis, R.I., 1983. Problems of sense: Contemporary logical and philosophical analysis of language: Moscow: Mysl, pp: 312.
17. Kubryakova, Y.S., 2004. Ensuring speech activity and problems of internal lexicon. Issues of cognitive linguistics, pp: 6-17.
18. Popova, Z.D., Sternin, I.A., 2007. Cognitive linguistics. Moscow: AST; Vostok-Zapad, pp: 320.
19. Popova, Z.D., Sternin, I.A., 2002. Language and national worldview. Voronezh: Istoki, pp: 192.
20. Sklyarevskaya, G.N., 1993. Metaphor in the system of language. Nauka, pp: 166.

5/15/2014