

## ФІЛОСОФІЯ

УДК 811.161.1

© Bohdana Manchul  
(Chernivtsi)CONCEPTUAL AND LINGUISTIC WORLD VIEW IN TERMS  
OF COGNITIVE SCIENCE

*The article considers interconnection of linguistic and conceptual outlooks that are closely related and interdependent in terms of cognitive science. However, they are not equal. Most linguists believe that the conceptual world view is much broader than linguistic which is believed to cover only part of the conceptual paintings. It vocalize only part of what we perceive, as there are many other ways of expression such as art, music, architecture, etiquette, which are non-verbal means of implementing the concept of ideology.*

**Keywords:** linguistic-conceptual world view, cognitive science, conceptual world picture, language.

The totality of ideas about the world reflecting a person's worldview is the result of coordinated work of all human cognitive mechanisms. It is adopted in linguistic as well as in philosophic scientific studies to designate this knowledge the world view.

In defining and differentiating between the phenomena of the linguistic and conceptual world views scientists usually proceed from the notions "the image of the world" and "the world view". The image of the world is interpreted in modern psychology and psycholinguistics as "the reflection in the human psychics of an objective world mediated by objective meanings and corresponding cognitive schemes, and thus subjected to the conscious reflection" [1, p.99]. The world view is a certain vision of the world, its sense construction according to the logics of world comprehension and world imagination. The world view of an individual – a representative of a certain culture- includes not only cognitive but also evaluative (axiological) components. It constitutes the core of a person's worldview.

As a child, as a person grows and experiences the world, he/she sees relationships, categorizes, discriminates and generalizes about what his/her senses reveal. A person replaces the sensory experiences and memories with abstract generalized ideas and understanding in forming concepts. He/she fits many concepts together into schemes, and structures his/her conceptual schemes into a framework.

The conceptual framework can change as new experiences provide new insights. In this way, human comprehensive conception of the world as a whole, that is, the worldview develops. It is something that continually evolves – indeed, a person spends the rest of his/her life testing and refining it, based on feedback he/she gets. In short, the worldview is a conceptual framework and a set of beliefs used to make sense out of a complex, seemingly chaotic reality.

A worldview is a coherent collection of concepts and theorems that must allow us to construct a global image of the world, and in this way to understand as many elements of our experience as possible.

Societies, as well as individuals, have always contemplated deep questions relating to their being and becoming, and to the being and becoming of the world. The configuration of answers to these questions forms their worldview. Research on worldviews, although we are convinced of its practical value and necessity, will always be primarily an expression of a theoretical interest [3, p.88].

Hence, a worldview is a system of co-ordinates or a frame of reference in which everything presented to us by our diverse experiences can be placed. It is a symbolic system of representation that allows us to integrate everything we know about the world and ourselves into a global picture, one that illuminates reality as it is presented to us within a certain culture.

World-view construction consists of the attempt to develop worldviews that take into account as much as possible all aspects of our experience. Although this construction expresses itself in a language that includes intrinsic limitations – languages are not closed formations and symbolic systems can be combined - these inherent constraints need not condemn our enterprise. World-view construction is always connected to a culture in which "meanings" are circulated, types of behaviour are passed from

generation to generation, socio-political problems are produced, and styles of art confront us [2, p.23]. The material used to construct a worldview comes from our inner experience and our practical dealings with things, as well as from the interpretation of history and of scientific knowledge about our world. All these aspects are necessarily related to particular cultures, which are not monolithic entities, but which are always in a process of change. In this sense world views are not fixed images or copies of the world, but will somehow try to capture, as much as is possible, all the aspects of this world.

The main properties of a worldview are "coherence" and "fidelity to experience". Because of the rational demand for coherence, a worldview should be a consistent whole of concepts, axioms, theorems, and metaphors which do not exclude each other but which can be thought together.

Our experience also includes our different systems of values. Even if these systems are often ambivalent and contradictory, we want our worldview to be faithful to them. Since evaluation is seen to be more subjective, and hence connected to a particular person inside a particular culture, it will be difficult to achieve one global worldview, satisfying the needs for coherent evaluation of the world for everyone. Not only scientific experience, but also aesthetic and ethical sensitivity will have a deep influence on our attempts at worldview construction. It does not follow from this, however, that world views will be simply a question of taste and feeling. Arts, styles, customs and moral codes can be very diverse, but even then they are all interconnected within their culture, and on a larger scale within the whole world in which they interact.

Every experience leads towards action of the one having the experience. It is by means of these actions that we can influence the world, and strive for certain ends. A worldview should contain an organized concept of our real and possible actions in this world. But conversely, these different types of experiences will in turn be influenced by the global world view into which they are incorporated. One of the essential functions of worldview construction is to generate this interaction consciously and in a controlled way. As a consequence, a world view can relate the different domains of experience, so that they are liberated from their isolation and become parts of the whole. The goal is to make the communication between the different layers of our experience explicit. Otherwise, if extensive elements remain unconscious, there is a danger that one aspect will emerge as the view of the whole [6, p.90].

Each human is part of a whole larger than one self. Both philosophy and religion have reflected on this awareness, and on the final nature of reality as a whole. Such ultimate questions cannot be avoided in the process of worldview construction. Indeed, they form the driving force behind the religious, philosophical, ethical, aesthetic and political quest of humanity. But unique solutions are not possible in this domain. Religions, differentiated internally and externally, generally emphasise the necessity of personal conversion or inner transformation, and usually rely on the experiences of a founder. In this respect, faithfulness to tradition is important for most religions. Here world-view construction differs from religion in that it shows a fundamental openness towards different interpretative models of reality, allowing agnosticism and a higher degree of uncertainty.

The term "the worldview" was first introduced in the works of L.Wittgenstein, devoted to the research in the sphere of philosophy and logics [4].

If the world is considered a picture, than the place of a person in it is his/her worldview that embraces the system of a person's viewpoints and beliefs, determining his/her attitude to the surrounding world. The worldview is the lens through which we view the world, a set of beliefs, attitudes, and biases shaping how we think about events in the world: multifaceted, malleable, and usually not fully or clearly articulated.

The world view is a global image of the world, the result of spiritual activity of a person and his/her contacts with this world [2, p.145].

The process of the human cognition of the world is realized gradually. It begins with the sensation of the world which presupposes the reflection of the world and the attitude to it in sensual – emotional forms; then goes the perception of the world as the knowledge and spacious and time notion of it. As the result of the synthesis of this knowledge, there emerges the image of the world. The process is completed by the comprehension of the world that contains its explanation or general world view [2, p.11].

Modern linguists consider the world view to be an ideal formation consisting of structurally organized elements, has certain properties, performs its intrinsic functions and develops [3, p.24].

The world view as a quintessence of the worldview is cosmologically oriented (it presents a global image of the world), anthropomorphic (it is marked by the specific method of human comprehension of the world), is of obligatory nature (the categories of culture, reflected in language and other sign systems, are acquired subconsciously and gain the imperative character for all members belonging to a certain community).

The plurality of world views that embody various worldviews of people is not a whim of history but its objective necessity. Some scientists believe that there exist as many world views as there are observers that contact with the world. Each person perceives the reality in his/her unique and peculiar way depending on his/her natural abilities, the character of the connection with the culture of his/her epoch. Hence, the world view is the result of the formation by an individual of the world image that meets three criteria: the agent of the world view (the one who describes), the subject of the world view (that is described) and the result of the activity (the very image).

The agent of the world view that accumulates the information about the world and reproduces one's view on it may be: 1) an individual (empirical agent), 2) a separate group of people (community), 3) a separate people (peoples), 4) humanity on the whole [3, p.9]. Modern scientists distinguish between several qualitatively different types among the agents of the world view: adults and children; psychically normal individuals and those with psychical impairments; people of a modern civilization and those of archaic world comprehension. Accordingly, three principally different types of entire world views have been singled out:

- 1) adult world view and children's world view;
- 2) the world view of a psychically normal person and the one of a psychically impaired person;
- 3) "civilized" world view and archaic world view [3, p.32].

Every independent sphere of social consciousness – mythology, religion, philosophy, science – has its own special methods of world perception, its own lenses through which a person looks at the world. The result of this perception is the creation of corresponding local or special world views – mythological, religious, philosophic, scientific (physical, chemical, biologic, etc.) [3, p.67].

Many scientists stick to the viewpoint that the process of the reproduction of the world view in human consciousness, though being an indivisible unity, is represented by the conceptual and linguistic models.

Investigating the problem of the world view researches, as a rule, proceed from a simple triad: the surrounding reality (real world), the reflection of this reality in human mind (conceptual world view) and the expression of the results of this reflection in language (linguistic world view) [2, p.39].

The real picture of the world is an objective essence independent of an individual. A person, a language bearer, is a mediator between the world and the language. Perceiving and cognizing the world, he/she forms his/her system of conceptions about it. Having processed them in his/her mind and having contemplated the results of this world perception, a person transmits them to other members of his/her language community by means of language. In other words, between the reality and the language there exists cognition.

The linguistic world view which may be also denoted by the terms "linguistic intermediate world", "linguistic world representation", "linguistic world model" emerges in the process of cognition owing to an active participation of language. It is the result of the fixation of conceptsphere with the help of secondary sign systems which materialize the cognitive world view available in human consciousness. The world view formed and reflected in human consciousness is its secondary existence fixed in a special material form which is language.

Objective reality is expressed in various languages in different ways thus, divergent linguistic world views are formed. The linguistic world view is the result of the reflection of a unique social and historic experience of a certain nation [3, p.9]. Language does not create a formation different from the objective world view but only its specific colouring, conditioned by the way of life and national culture of a people. Here we deal with the notion of the ethnic world view which is based on "the national – cultural peculiarity of perceiving the world, i.e. on the view of the world characteristic of a particular people" [3, p.10].

Linguistic relativity formulated by Benjamin Lee Whorf in the 1930s claims that the structures of language influence the way we think about reality. In brief, the claim relies on the fact that languages are

classificatory systems, in the sense that languages classify experience and the outer world at large, and further, that languages do so in differing manners.

Ultimately, linguistic relativists conclude that the picture of the world that is depicted by our languages becomes different according to our linguistic input. It is the same world, but viewed differently, with aspects of it being highlighted more than others and being given differential salience. What Whorf and other relativists state is that language has come so far as to manipulate the human mind, in that humans would tend to take the linguistic picture to be the true picture of the universe. In other words, human thinking is claimed to be relative to our linguistic perspective onto the world.

What is meant by thinking is 'conceptualising' – and not neurological processes of thought, or the actual content of thought itself. Relativists do not claim that language determines what we think about, but rather it claims that language influences and guides, or channels, the way we think about the world, and the way we conceptualise this world.

The conceptual world view is the biggest conceptual unit [2, p.19], that variety of the world view, which is the result of a direct cognition of the surrounding reality. It may be defined as cognitive, since it represents "the result of the cognition of the reality and functions as the totality of organized units of knowledge – conceptosphere" [3, p.4-5].

The conceptual and linguistic world views are closely connected and interdependent. However, they are not equal. The majority of linguists believe that the conceptual world view is far broader than the linguistic one [1, 3; 4, 87]. The latter is believed to cover only a part of the conceptual picture. Language verbalizes only a part of that we perceive, since there exist many other ways of expression, such as art, music, architecture, etiquette which are nonverbal means of the realization of the conceptual world view [4, p.87].

As the process of the world cognition by a person is continuing, the conceptual world view is constantly enriching and changing while the linguistic world view is more conservative and retains the traces of the obsolete beliefs about the world for a long time.

The connection between the conceptual and linguistic world views is realized in two ways: "Language designates separate elements of the conceptual world view. This designation is embodied in the formation of words and means of connection between words and sentences. Language explains the content of the conceptual world view linking words in speech" [4, p.107]. Hence, characteristic of each language "words, formatives and means of connecting sentences as well as syntactic constructions participate in the explanation of the conceptual world view.

The interconnection of the two world views is also conditioned by the similarity of their inner structure: the conceptual structure can be organized in the form of concepts, and linguistic one – in the form of thesaurus separate blocks of which can correspond to semantic, associative or thematic fields.

We cannot but agree with the viewpoint that the concept of the linguistic world view is reasonable only when it is considered to be an ideal entity [4, p.57], which is interpreted as the knowledge of an individual about the world embodied in language form [5, p.23] and is exhibited in the process of the analysis of language units. The latter serve as the instrument of the linguistic world view for the explication of the conceptual world view. Words, as main nominative units, also have the role of the link between the linguistic world view and the conceptual world view [4, p.54], however, linguistic world view is not merely reduced to a real or a virtual language system. With the help of language means, it designates the elements of the conceptual world view at the same time reflecting the general world view [2, p.76].

Thus, the linguistic world view is a constituent part of the general world view, representing its in – depth layer, i.e. a subsystem of the conceptual world view, including those its elements which are expressed by corresponding language signs [4, p.18].

In the light of the above mentioned facts we believe that the conceptual and linguistic world views should be treated as equally significant for human comprehension of the world. An individual lives in a language community, enriching his/her conceptual system owing not only to his/her own experience but also to social – historic one as well as to language, since general human and national experience is preserved by language.

## Bibliography

1. Lakoff George. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. – 653 p.
2. Renkema J. Introduction to Discourse Studies. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004. – 289 p.
3. Talmy Leonard. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring. – Cambridge, MA and London, 2000. – 153 p.
4. Thornburg Linda, Panther Klaus – Uwe. Speech Act Metonymies. // Liebert W.-A., Redeker G., Waugh L. (edd): Discourse and Perspectives in Cognitive Linguistics. – Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, 1997. – Pp. 205-219.
5. Gee J. P. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. – London: Routledge, 2001. – 267 p.

Богдана Манчул

## Лінгвістично-поняттєвий світогляд в контексті когнітивних наук

*У статті розглядається взаємозв'язок лінгвістичного та поняттєвого світоглядів, які тісно пов'язані і взаємозалежні. Проте, вони не рівні. Більшість лінгвістів вважають, що концептуальний погляд на світ набагато ширше, ніж лінгвістичний. Останній, як вважають, охоплює тільки частину концептуальної картини. Мова озвучує тільки частину того, що ми сприймаємо, так як існує багато інших способів вираження, такі як мистецтво, музика, архітектура, етикет, які є невербальними засобами реалізації концептуального світогляду.*

*У міру того як процес пізнання світу людиною триває, концептуальний погляд на світ постійно збагачується і змінюється, в той час як лінгвістичний погляд на світ більш консервативний і зберігає сліди застарілих уявлень про світ протягом тривалого часу.*

*Відтак, концептуальні та лінгвістичні погляди слід розглядати як однаково значущі для людського розуміння світу. Індивідум живе в мовній спільності, збагачуючи його концептуальну систему завдяки не тільки його власного досвіду, а й соціально-історичним подіям, а також і мові, так як загальний людський і національний досвід зберігається зокрема і мовно.*

**Ключові слова:** лінгвістично-поняттєвий світогляд, когнітивні науки, концептуальна картина світу, мова.

*Надійшла до редакції 12.04.2016 р.*

УДК: [316.32/.316.752]:321.01

© Олександр Полішук  
(Хмельницький)

**Ключові цінності у громадянському суспільстві,  
що визначають напрям розвитку держави**

*Розглянуто ціннісні аспекти сучасного громадянського суспільства. З'ясовано їх функцію у сприянні діяльності громадянського суспільства, що визначають його колективну дію та вектор розвитку держави і суспільства в цілому. Встановлено, що громадянське суспільство виступає універсальним зразком подальшого розвитку суспільства, а його цінності поділяють на загальнолюдські (первинні), суспільно-політичні (вторинні) та інші, що переплітаються у просторі цього соціально-політичного інституту й забезпечують вектор розвитку у межах держави. При цьому звернуто увагу на громадську спільноту та її цінності, які у порівнянні з цінностями громадянського суспільства мають спільні риси. Розкрито консолідуючу роль цінностей у процесі формування колективності громадянського суспільства. Відзначено значення цінностей громадянського суспільства в українських революціях та протистоянні між Україною і Росією.*

**Ключові слова:** цінності, громадянське суспільство, держава, громадянська спільнота.