

LINGUISTIC CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORLD : FROM CULTURAL, COGNITIVE, AND ETHNOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES

It is no empty play upon words if we speak of language as arising in autonomy solely from itself and divinely free, but of languages as bound and dependent on the nations to which they belong.

Back in the 1960s, people started to realize that those who speak two, even unrelated languages can actually balance the different ways of seeing the world that come with each language. Then, in the 1970s and 1980s, when people became more interested in how our minds work and the creative side of languages, linguists began to think about ideas similar to "worldview." These included things like metaphors, how we commonly use symbols to represent ideas, how we interact through talking, how we organize our thoughts, and how we use our imagination.

Language is a product of collective inspiration. The internal prototype of language inherent in the soul of each person, as an internal action, turns into external behavior as a result of the joint action of the mental forces of individual people, which (forces) were supported by everyone's confidence that they would understand. This act of creative power is performed by the whole mass of the people, in which an individual is drowning [6, p.11–12].

Language shows a community's inner thoughts and feelings, it's a type of awareness. A community shapes its language and can be identified by it. But language doesn't just show how we think, it also influences it. Our native language, with its unique way of seeing things, comes between our active mind and the outside world. So, how we see the world depends on our language. However, it's not a fixed thing. Even though our first language strongly affects how we think, every time we speak creatively, we try to go beyond those limits, similar to learning a new language with its own way of understanding things. According to German philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt, we can't fully grasp objective reality, but that's okay. Instead, this basic limitation actually allows our thinking and understanding to constantly grow and expand through language [4, p.41–59].

Bartmiński defines the linguistic worldview as “the interpretation of reality encoded in a given language, which can be captured in the form of judgements about the world. The judgements can be either entrenched in the language, its grammatical forms, lexicon and ‘frozen’ texts (e.g. proverbs) or implied by them”. [2, p.76]. The linguistic worldview is mostly social and cultural, and therefore visible chiefly in entrenched linguistic forms, such as proverbs or folk songs; it designates the portion of language that is shared by a community of speakers. However, “[t]he definition of linguistic worldview is not fully agreed on” [1, p.24].

For many years, we've seen more and more proof that each language interprets the world, rather than simply mirroring it directly. When talking about the language used in literature, the idea of a literary artwork based on experience was very important. Roman Ingarden argued that all the non-language parts of a work that matter artistically come from the language used and its features. Some qualities that are important for how we appreciate the work directly depend on how the language is formed or come from how complex and expressive the sentence structure is. So, the language in a piece of writing plays a double role: first, it shapes everything else in the work, and second, it is itself part of the work.

Berger highlights that language is key to building our shared reality. It focuses our experiences, creates patterns, and makes them real. Language is the main way we learn to live in the world with others and how we make sense of that world together through talking. On this base of language, we build our ways of understanding, rules for right and wrong, values, and overall worldviews, which together form a society's shared understanding of things.

Professor Joseph points out that while the expression of self and the emotions is one of the principal functions of language, linguists have mostly ignored it, seeing it as a matter of aesthetics. This old idea separates emotions from the mind and doesn't see them as something to study scientifically. Joseph argues that identity studies often focus on the individual, but to understand language in society, we need to also look at how others create and assign identities based on their culture.

Identity, with its appropriate attachments of social reality, is always identity within a specific socially constructed world. Or, as seen from the viewpoint of the individual, one identifies oneself, as one is identified by others, by being located in a common world [3, p.378]. Identity always exists within a shared, socially created world. We identify ourselves and are identified by others. The common world relies on shared knowledge, culture, and language so we can understand each other's viewpoints. Our social identity is defined within a larger understanding of reality. If we can't share perspectives, we can be misidentified. For example, Columbus called people "Indians" as a result of a miscommunication [5, p.8–20].

You can't have a society without communication, and people become social beings through society. Language, made up of words, is what sets humans apart from animals. Words are essential for all knowledge and learning, helping us create, save, and share what we know with future generations. Trying to understand how people communicate, what makes it hard, and what makes it easier is important because communication is fundamental to human life. It's especially important now that people, languages, and cultures are mixing more than ever before. We urgently need to teach tolerance, build interest and respect for different cultures, and overcome negative feelings about cultural differences. This is why intercultural and international communication is getting so much attention [8, p.127–136].

REFERENCES

1. Bartmiński, Jerzy. (2009/2012). *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*, p.24. Ed. Jörg Zinken. Sheffield and Oakville, CT: Equinox.
2. Bartmiński, Jerzy. (2009/2012). *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*, p.76. Ed. Jörg Zinken. Sheffield and Oakville, CT: Equinox.
3. Curtis, J. E., & Petras, J. W. (1970). *The Sociology of knowledge: A Reader*, p.378. Bloomsbury Academic.
4. Głaz, A., Danaher, D., Łozowski, P., Chlebda, W., Pajdzińska, A., Cavanagh, C., & Gicala, A. (2013). *The Linguistic Worldview Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*, p.41–59. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.2478/9788376560748>
5. Riley, P. (2007). *Language, culture and identity: An Ethnolinguistic Perspective*, p.8–20. A&C Black. Retrieved from: <https://short-link.me/ZifC>
6. Salim, S., & Purwaningtyas, I. (2023). *Analysis of language styles: Rhetoric and Figurative Language in Makeup Advertisement on Instagram. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Language, Literature, Education, and Culture, ICOLLEC 2022*, p.11–12.
7. Von Humboldt, W. (1999). *Humboldt: "On language": On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and Its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*, p.24. Cambridge University Press.
8. Yergeshov, Y., & Bissenbayeva, Z. (2024). *Philosophical analysis of the interaction of language and culture. The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences (EPESS)*, 36, p.127–136.