

**КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО СВІТОГЛЯДУ
В КОНТЕКСТІ ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ КОНЦЕПТУ «ДОБРА»****Богдана МАНЧУЛ,**Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича,
ВДНЗ України «Буковинський державний медичний університет»,
Чернівці (Україна)
danam@ukr.net**CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW
IN TERMS OF THE VERBALIZATION OF CONCEPT “GOOD”****Bohdana MANCHUL,**Yuri Fed'kovych Chernivtsi National University,
Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine «Bukovinian State
Medical University», Chernivtsi (Ukraine),
ORCID ID 0000-0002-6937-1403; RESEARCH ID D-5867-2016

Манчул Богдана. Концептуалізація лінгвістичного мировоззрення в контексті вербалізації концепта «добра». Автор аналізує семантичну структуру номінативних одиниць, що спонукає установленню глибоких закономірностей взаємодії між структурами свідомості та мовними формами людини. Іменительні можливості лінгвістичного мировоззрення реалізуються через лексическі та фразеологіческі одиниці. Вони можуть бути підвергнуті концептуальному аналізу з метою дослідження та моделювання змісту поняття «добра».

Ключевые слова: вербалізація, лінгвістический кругозор, семантическа структура, поняття «добро».

Introduction. Cognitive linguistics proclaims language as not only a means of formation, preservation and transmission of thoughts or experience¹, but also a means of cognition, receiving, storing and generalization of information as well as objectivation of the surrounding world. Language does not reflect the world directly, it reflects the conceptualization and categorization of the world performed by an individual provides the access to the concepts serving as the basis for the formation of a category. The reality that surrounds us is filtered through the human consciousness and is shaped by means of language signs "Language is a dress of thought". Accordingly, language allows structuring culturally and socially relevant mental models and using them in communication.

Communication is understood in cognitive linguistics as a mental process, a specific way of processing the information, which is accumulated during the perception and cognition of the world and is transmitted in conversation with the help of language. Thus, **the purpose of our article** is to investigate the concept recognized by the content of the linguistic sign. That is, in addition to its subjective correlation, it includes communicatively meaningful information.

Historiography. Scholars designated concept using different terms, describing various manifestations of its essence, e.g. Plato's "idea", Aristotle's "category", Descartes' "innate ideas", Humboldt's "inner forms". Modern linguistics still cannot offer a satisfactory and unequivocal definition of "concept". The research in Lakoff, Radden and Kovecses, Panther and Radden, Langacker, Barcelona, and Panther and Thornburg has shown that discourse is better understood as a "reference point" (a vehicle or source) that triggers a target meaning. As a practice of structural linguistics, componential analysis goes back to Prague School linguists such as Hjelmslev and Jakobson, who used Trubetzkoy's principles of phonology to devise a method for this

kind of analysis. D. Lyons describes some cognitive and structuralist systems of componential analysis, beginning with the structuralist Coseriu, who divided components of meaning into "semes" and "classemes."

Main part. Recent studies of categories are based on the principle of anthropocentrism, according to which phenomena should be classified taking into consideration the peculiarities of human perception. The essence of categorization lies in the creation and singling out the classes of objects perceived and comprehended by a person. Thus, a category is one of the cognitive forms of human mental activity that allows generalizing and classifying a person's experience. As a result of categorization there appears an integral system of categories, the ultimate units of which are concepts. A person "imposes" a conceptual network onto the real world in order to single out the concepts of the reality, which helps him/ her to segment the world according to his/her individual view of reality and associative – objective relations. However, categorization of experience does not reveal the mechanism of its perception and processing. The nature of cognitive processes can be disclosed appealing to the notion of conceptualization.

Conceptualization is the process of cognitive activity of a person that involves the apprehension, organization and structuring of the information, received by a person through various channels. It differs from categorization in its ultimate result and the aim of cognitive activity. The essence of conceptualization is distinguishing between certain minimal units of human experience in their ideal content expression. Categorization, on the other hand, lies in the combination of these units into larger groups. In its narrow understanding, categorization refers an object, phenomenon or process to a certain realm of experience, category.

The ultimate result of conceptualization is the emergence of a concept, which is considered a simple cognitive

¹Fauconnier Gilles "Turner Mark. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities", 2002, P. 98.

structure of the representation of knowledge².

There exists a considerable number of interpretations of the term “concept” from mystic, theological, dialectical, logical, methodological, semasiological, and linguistic points of view. Scholars designated concept using different terms, describing various manifestations of its essence, e.g. Plato’s “idea”³, Aristotle’s “category”, Decart’s “innate ideas”, Humboldt’s “inner forms”. Modern linguistics still cannot offer a satisfactory and unequivocal definition of “concept”.

While interpreting the notion of concept, scientists operate the following key words: abstract, generalizing conception; subjective – objective essence that presents the surrounding world and the person himself/herself, the essence embodied in word in content forms – image, symbol, idea; operative mental unit (of memory, *lingua mentalis*, conceptual system, language of mind); a container, a quantum of knowledge; a condensed sense, which a person uses in the process of thinking, and which comprise cognitive basic subsystems of thought and knowledge; present a communicative and mental aspects; generalized mental, perceptive – cognitive- affective formation with a field structure; a complex cognitive lingual- social construct.

The existence of such a great number of approaches to the definition of the above mentioned phenomenon is determined by the fact that the term “concept” serves the explanation of the units of human mental and psychic recourses and the information structure, which reflects human knowledge and experience.

In our investigation we stick to the definition of “concept” considering it to be the most appropriate one running as follows: a concept is an operative content unit of memory, *lingua mentalis*, conceptual system and language of mind, the whole world view reflected in human consciousness.

A concept is connected with other elements of the conceptual system and enters a national conceptsphere – the totality of categorized, processed, standardized concepts in a nationality’s consciousness. People acquire concepts learning them from the experience of preceding generations rather than looking up the corresponding dictionary definitions. Therefore, cultural concepts represent the units of knowledge that manifest national, social and individual pre-determination.

A thorough analysis of the semantic structure of nominative units favours the establishment of profound regularities of the interactions between the structures of human consciousness and language forms. The nominative possibilities of the linguistic world view are realized by lexical and phraseological units that can be subjected to conceptual analysis in order to accomplish the aim of the research – to model the content of the concept GOOD.

In the process of verbalization, only the limited amount of information is activated (or “lit up”) at a time, thus a considerable amount of it remains in the block of memory the content of which is not active (or not lit up). The knowledge is extracted from this storage when there emerges the necessity to transmit it to other people. Taking out experience from the memory is connected with the transferring it into the verbal (lingual) form of something

that initially had (wholly or partially) a preverbal status. The mental process, as many modern scientists point out, uses not an ordinary language being at the disposal of a certain ethnic group, but a special code – “language” of mind, or *lingua mentalis*.

Thus, the verbalization represents the re-coding of the results of the mental process by means of a particular ethnic language. Information is preserved in the memory in the form of separate “pieces” or episodes. They may vary in size as well as in the quantity of memorized details. Thus, for example, the blocks “My school years” and “My last school examination” are different in spacious-time volume and the number of “lit up” details while recalling.

Extracting from the memory his/her experience, a speaker first of all fractures a large episode into a number of smaller pieces, bringing the process of segmentation to micro- episodes, which can be correspondingly substituted by mental structures – suppositions or (as they are more often nowadays called) - propositions. Each proposition reflects a set of participants of a given episode, their roles and the general character of an event. If we take for instance an event of passing an object to somebody, we presuppose the presence of three participants in this event: the one who performs the act of passing (agent), the one who is a receiver (addressee) and the thing which is being passed (object, patient).

To render the ideas about an object and a situation in general a speaker selects appropriate words and constructs the sentence. However, the sentence is not an exact imprint of thought. The content to be informed is subjected to modification, in the process of which the following aspects are taken into account: a certain communicative intention (illocution) of a speaker, an addressee’s state, his/her preliminary awareness about the objects to be mentioned, and the possibility of his/her comprehension of the utterance and his/her adequate reaction.

Scientists distinguish between three main approaches in the understanding of the linguistic nature of a concept. Firstly, the realization of concepts is prescribed to lexemes, the meanings of which are the content of the national linguistic consciousness and which form the world view of particular language bearers⁴. Within the bounds of this approach, a concept gains a rather broad interpretation. The main means of the investigation here is a conceptual model that helps to single out basic semantic components of a concept and to reveal stable relations between them.

Secondly, semantic formations with the lingual – cultural peculiarities characterizing the bearers of a particular ethnic culture are considered concepts. The interpretation of a concept within this approach is rather narrow and limited by certain parameters.

Lastly, some linguists refer to a concept a confined number of semantic formations that serve as key notions for the understanding of the national mentality as a specific attitude to the world of its bearers. All the above mentioned approaches to interpreting a concept choose a word as the principal form of embodiment of a concept⁵.

A word functions as the name of a concept – a language sign that fully and adequately renders its content. However, a word as a representative of a lexico-semantic

² Gauker Ch. “*Words Without Meaning*”. *Massachusetts: The MIT Press*, 2003, P.108.

³ Gee J. P. “*An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*”. London: Routledge, 2001, P. 200.

⁴ Lakoff George, Johnson Mark. “*Metaphors We Live by*”, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980, P. 175.

⁵ Panther Klaus-Uwe, Thornburg Linda L. “*A Cognitive Approach to Inferencing in Conversation*”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30. Cuyckens H. (edd): *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* [Chapter 10]. Oxford, OUP, 1999, P. 755-769.

system, is realized only in a set of a certain lexical paradigm, thus, it may be interpreted as:

1) an invariant of a lexical paradigm, formed by lexical – semantic variants of this word;

2) the name of a semantic chain, formed by the synonyms of this word.

In addition, a concept correlates with more than one lexical unit, thus, the form of its expression correlates with the plane of expression of the totality of various synonymic (lexical, phraseological and aphoristic) means representing the concept in language. In other words, a concept correlates with the plane of expression of the lexico-semantic paradigm⁶.

In modern linguistics a concept is acknowledged to be the content of a linguistic sign, i.e. in addition to its subjective correlation it includes communicatively significant information. Primarily, it is the determination of the place occupied by a sign in the lexical system of language – its paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations reflecting the linguistic value of an extralinguistic object.

In addition to the primary means of verbalization concepts may be also realized with the help of secondary means including metaphor and metonymy.

Traditionally, metaphors were the exclusive domain of rhetoric, analysed alongside other tropes as imaginative, poetic, ornamental devices. They were often considered as something that belongs in poetry that is more concerned with novel or interesting uses of words than with accepted, everyday practice. Typically, the term metaphor was thus used to refer to the unexpected use of language in literature (e.g. Shakespeare's *Life's but a walking shadow*), whereas conventional, familiarised metaphors (e.g. a dull sound) were defined as "dead", because the original semantic contradictions of such metaphors are not recognised as such by speakers. In more recent years, however, cognitive linguists have shown that these conventionalised metaphors play a large role in language.

As has been advanced most extensively by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, metaphor may, in fact, be far more central to human language, indeed to our very thought. Lakoff and Johnson show how metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, and how it is more than just a matter of language; it may structure our entire conceptual system. As such, Lakoff also provides a new theory of mental concept formation, both linguistic and pre-linguistic: Idealized cognitive models (ICMs). The theory of cognitive models provides a possible mechanism for the operation of metaphor in language, but more than that it can account for our entire understanding of the world, from concrete physical concepts to the most abstract scientific concepts and language. Metaphor, of course, is the beginning of the theory of ICM's. Metaphor may indeed be conceptual and hence pre-linguistic, but it is examined most readily when it is expressed in language.

Thus, Lakoff and Johnson have used conventional metaphors to argue that much of our everyday talk (and, hence, as they claim, much of our thought, and much of our reality) is structured metaphorically. This means that most

of our abstract categories are organised cognitively by structures borrowed from more concrete categories. In cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphors are thus defined as "a mapping of the structure of a source model onto a target model"⁷. These mappings are realised linguistically. For instance, the conceptual metaphor *TIME IS MONEY* is reflected in the linguistic expressions *You're wasting my time, This gadget will save you hours, Is that worth your while, He's living on borrowed time* etc. According to Lakoff / Johnson, there are three different types of conceptual metaphors: 1). structural metaphors refer to the organisation of one concept in terms of another (e.g. *TIME IS MONEY*), 2). orientational metaphors are concerned with the (mostly spatial) organisation of a whole range of concepts (e.g. *HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN*), 3). ontological metaphors relate to "ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances" (e.g. *INFLATION IS AN ENTITY*) and 4). conduit metaphors which represent the process of communication as the movement of senses "filling" language means ("containers") through the channel connecting a speaker and a listener. The claim that it is not only language but our thought/reality that is structured metaphorically is a disputable one and relates to the much-discussed Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativism. The notion of conceptual metaphor hence comprises both types of metaphor (the imaginative and the "dead" type), because both can express the same structural metaphor. It appears that most research on conceptual metaphors focuses on finding out more about the existence of particular conceptual metaphors (i.e. typical target and source models and their linguistic realisations) as well as their influence on human thought. This kind of research examines the metaphorical conceptualisation of cognition⁸.

Other linguistic research is interested in using conceptual metaphors in TESL, the problem of metaphors in translation, and corpus evidence for conceptual metaphors

As metaphors are especially useful means in articulating new ideas and concepts, facilitating learning and making things particularly memorable⁹, they considerably influence popular folk knowledge of abstract concepts.

Conceptual metonymy is a cognitive process that is pervasive in grammar, the lexicon, conceptual structure, and language use. Metonymies provide what we call natural inference schemas that guide much of pragmatic reasoning in the construction of meaning, especially in the determination of explicit meaning, i.e. explicature, and implicit meaning, i.e. generalized and particularized conversational implicature.

Metonymy is often characterized as a 'stand for' relation, a reflection of which is that metonymies are usually represented by the schema *X FOR Y*, where *X* represents the source meaning (also called 'vehicle') and *Y* symbolizes the target meaning of the metonymic operation. This "substitution" view of metonymy leads easily to the (erroneous) assumption that metonymy and pragmatic implicature are very different phenomena. An implicature is usually regarded as content that is added to what is said/ explicitly conveyed.

⁶ 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, P. 205-219.

⁷ Lakoff George, Johnson Mark. "Metaphors We Live by". Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980, P. 175.

⁸ Panther Klaus-Uwe, Thornburg Linda L. "A Cognitive Approach to Inferencing in Conversation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 30. Cuyckens H. (edd): *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics [Chapter 10]*. Oxford, OUP, 1999, P. 755-769.

⁹ Lakoff George, Johnson Mark. "Metaphors We Live by". Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980, P. 123.

Conclusions. In recent work it has been claimed that metonymy should not be viewed as a mere substitution relation. The research in Lakoff, Radden and Kovecses, Panther and Radden, Langacker, Barcelona, and Panther and Thornburg has shown that metonymy is better understood as a “reference point” (a vehicle or source) that triggers a target meaning. Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza and his colleagues at the University of La Rioja regard metonymy as a process of meaning elaboration that involves either expansion or reduction of a cognitive domain (matrix). This work emphasizes the conceptual nature of metonymy and is indeed an important step forward from the simplistic view of metonymy as a mere rhetorical trope to the insight that metonymy is a ubiquitous mental operation.

In a linguistically manifest metonymic relation, a source meaning is related to a target meaning by means of a linguistic form (e.g. morpheme, word, phrase, sentence) that we call the linguistic vehicle. Indeed, the target meaning can be just a nonce sense, created on the spot, but it can also, through frequency of use, become a conventionalized meaning, stored separately in the mental lexicon.

Манчул Богдана. Концептуалізація лінгвістичного світогляду в контексті вербалізації концепту «добра». Автор аналізує семантичну структуру номінативних одиниць, що сприяє встановленню глибоких закономірностей взаємодії між структурами свідомості і мовними формами людини. Називні можливості лінгвістичного світогляду реалізуються через лексичні і фразеологічні одиниці. Вони можуть бути піддані концептуальному аналізу з метою дослідження і моделювання змісту поняття «добра». Поняття пов'язане з іншими елементами концептуальної системи і входить в національну концептосферу, тобто сукупність класифікованих, оброблених стандартизованих понять у свідомості національності. Тому культурні концепції є одиницями знань, які проявляються на національному, соціальному й індивідуальному рівнях.

Когнітивна лінгвістика проголошує мову не тільки засо-

бом формування, збереження і передачі думок і досвіду, але й засобом пізнання, отримання, зберігання і узагальнення інформації, а також об'єктивації навколишнього світу. Мова не відображає світ безпосередньо, вона відображає концептуалізацію та категоризацію світу, що виконується індивідом, забезпечує доступ до концепцій, які виступають в якості основами для формування категорій. Реальність, яка нас оточує, фільтрується через людську свідомість і формується за допомогою мовних знаків. Відповідно, мова дозволяє структурувати культурно і соціально значущі ментальні моделі і їх використання в спілкуванні.

У сучасній лінгвістиці поняття визнається змістом мовного знака, тобто на додаток до його суб'єктивної кореляції він включає в себе комунікативно значиму інформацію. У першу чергу, це визначення місця, займаного знаком в лексичній системі мови – його парадигматичні і синтагматичні відносини, що відображають мовну цінність в позамовних об'єктах.

Ключові слова: вербалізація, лінгвістичний світогляд, семантична структура, метафора, поняття «добро».

Богдана Манчул – кандидат філософських наук, асистент кафедри філософії Чернівецького національного університету ім. Ю. Федьковича, викладач Буковинського державного медичного університету. Автор понад 20 наукових публікацій. Коло наукових інтересів: філософія науки, соціальна філософія, когнітивні науки, міждисциплінарні дослідження.

Bogdana Manchul – PhD, Assistant of the Department of Philosophy Chernivtsi National University named after Yuri Fedkovych, a lecturer of Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine «Bukovinian State Medical University». The author of over 20 scientific publications. Research interests: Philosophy of science, social philosophy, cognitive sciences, interdisciplinary research.

Received: 15.05.2017

Advance Access Published: June, 2017

© B. Manchul, 2017