

“Linguistic View of the World” and “Linguistic Evaluated View of the Word”: Correlation of Concepts

Olga N. Prokhorova, Igor V. Chekulaj, Jerome Baghana and Irina A. Kuprieva
The National Research University “Belgorod State University” (BelSU),
Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

Abstract: The study deals with the actual problems of the linguistic axiology. A special attention is drawn to the mechanisms of forming the value and evaluation components of the linguistic view of the world. A clear-cut differentiation of the value and evaluation as fundamental structures of the qualifying language thinking is put an emphasis on. In conclusion, an attempt is made to show the necessity of further investigation of the axiological substructure within the linguistic view of the world.

Key words: Linguistic view of the world, value, evaluation, correlation, concept, axiology

INTRODUCTION

The problem of studying the Linguistic View of the World (the LVW) is one of the most promising areas of research of the phenomena of language and speech from the point of view of an anthropocentric approach to the study. As we know, the concept of the LVW is complex and ambiguous to draw a clear enough structural model to describe the acceptable LVW of different languages and cultures (Hillsdale, 1978; Berlin, 1999; Baumgartner, 1966; Evans and Green, 2006; Chekulaj, 2014).

Kornilov (2003) one of the most recognized experts in the field of research of the LVW notes: “Any interpretation of the concept of the LVW in our opinion, can not claim to be absolutely true, since it is not an objectively existing reality but is used by its creators solving any theoretical or practical problems. This is a kind of a linguistic tool”.

Thus, the most correct interpretation of the concept of the LVW would be his understanding of both the individual one, existing in the mind of a particular individual’s creative consciousness and as a result of the complex action of objective and subjective factors of perception, processing and storing incoming information about such external reality.

Such understanding of the LVW seemingly leads to agnosticism in the further scientific interpretation of the concept. Indeed, the peculiarities of individual rethinking of information about the outside world explain why the fact that often one and the same phenomenon of objective reality is often taken from diametrically opposite points of view. For example, different people have different attitudes to such things as wedding, marriage, army etc.

This statement clearly indicates that an important component of the LVW is its axiological component. The fact is that axiology is a philosophical theory of ontology, origin and operation of value.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The ongoing research is mainly based on the cognitive methodology. The latter is seen as the most important method to reveal the true nature of the studied concepts in general and in different lingvo cultures in particular. The main part of this linguistic method is aimed at the lexical level of the ongoing research while interpreting the terms under study and their correlation.

Main part: Comparative and semiotic research data reflect concepts in different languages and show that even quite specific entity united in certain conceptual categories in the form of linguistic signs (i.e. that part of the so-called scientific view of the world) in different language cultures may have significant differences (for example, the known facts of linguistic categorization of various spectral colors, classification of flora and fauna, etc.) not to mention the abstract and interpretive concepts.

Thus, the diversity that the LVW of different languages shows within the world culture and the LVW of certain groups and individuals within a single linguistic culture, is explained by subjective interpretation of reality, including axiological (value-estimated) and psychologically (sensory-emotional) rethinking of reality. Generally, discrete understanding of evaluation and emotions as the main manifestations of the subjective

attitude of the individual to reality is impossible as well as understanding of the LVW as of a clearly defined structure. However, existing works in semantics and functional characteristics of emotions (e.g., V.I. Shahovskiy and others) and in evaluation (N.D. Arutyunova, E.M. Volf, M.E. Retunskaya and others) allow to make an assumption that there are axiological and psychological factors separate from each other that serve the formation of the LVW of collective and individual scale.

Obviously, it would be appropriate to ask a question actually if there is a subordinate hierarchically of the LVW and separate Evaluation Linguistic View of the World (ELVW) or whether there are only certain factors of axiological order, creating axiological specificity of the certain LVW not standing out in a separate structural fragment of the total LVW?

Here I would like to turn to another important lingvo cognitive concept which at the first sight is indirectly related to the values and evaluation in their relation to the LVW. This concept is the basic concept of a quantum structuring knowledge about the outside world and social relations.

In the description of the structure and concept Popova (2002). Sternin name the following basic components: “a core a prototypical unit (it may belong to the consciousness of all people as well as to a group and an individual); basic layers overlying the core, beginning from less to more and more abstract; an interpretative field of the concept, containing the evaluation and interpretation of the core content of the concept of national, group and individual consciousness”.

In general, this hypothesis of internal structuring of the concept should be recognized as a valid one but one needs to make the necessary remarks.

If we consider a concept the referents of which are sufficiently concrete objects, this scheme works completely correctly. For example if we analyze the concept of amphibians in its structure, we can clearly identify the nuclear part/core (animal type of the chord, the class of amphibians (amphibians)), base layers (for example, the possible submission of frogs and toads like something united in opposition to triton more like reptiles) and finally, interpretative layer, the existence of which emotions and assessments are explicated for example.

“And how to sit?” A tall and strict girl asked. “The boys alone or at the same desk with the girls? If at the same, then I disagree.”

“The guys will pull our hair,” a stout girl said with a deep voice “or start kissing”. Our deputation mimed a strong resentment. I indignantly performed “The storm on

the Volga” and Stepan spited even and said: “Pooh. Kissing... I would rather put a frog into my mouth!” (Kassil', 2015).

Continuing the theme of amphibians in the Russian language and Russian culture, one can develop an interesting sequel. If you pay attention to such a derivative of the word (a frog) as (“liagushatnik”), it is easy to notice that this word has at least two fixed vocabulary of meanings:

- A place in either a swimming pool or open water body fitted for swimming which is shallow enough to allow children to play or other people to learn swimming there (a paddling pool)
- A scornful nickname of a Frenchman (similar to such nominations as “katsap” (the Russian), “khokhol” (the Ukrainian), “negritos” (black Africans), “kitaez” (the Chinese), etc.) (a frog-eater)

It is easy to note that both meanings belong to the said low register (Morohovskij, 1991) but if you try to define their connotative and assessment characteristics, in this regard, there are certain difficulties. We can say that in the systemic meaning, both lexical and semantic variants have common semantics of neglect but the use in certain contexts shows that in terms of lingvo axiology not all is clear, even in relation to the the particular lexico-semantic variant. For example, the object of evaluation may vary in particular: It's not a river. It's a paddling pool! It's just for kids while I am a first-class sportsman and have nothing to do but swim here. That is why the lexeme 1 in the LVW is connected with the negative attitude to the person or object of reality but in terms of axiology it has differential characteristics.

Such facts of different of characteristics of the LVW and semantic and axiological categorical framework in different languages are not isolated. Thus, having no axiological characteristics in the English language the LVW produced by conversion of the verb to coach can have a neutral meaning (to train somebody) and an axiologically marked meaning as well. The latter is very close to the meaning (to preach), (suggest), (to make someone jump through a hoop) (very close to the Russian slang word (to weigh somebody down) but more colloquial, than slang) for example: “What do you want me to say?” “Whatever you will, boy”, Denton said, his voice broken. “I do not plan to coach you. Say what you think of me...” (Shaw, 1989).

It is already possible to make a preliminary conclusion that the LVW and the sphere of values and estimates are not related to general cognitive entity. In principle, they are alike due to the fact that there are no

absolute mental system designs but there are different kind of “tools” of transmission and storage of certain information of verbal nature.

In connection with the last question, one can be interested in the question if the LVW and linguoaxiological sphere intersect. In a number of works researching lingvo axiology the scientists reveal close relationship of these concepts (for example in her monograph Med (2007) speaks about the evaluation aspect of the LVW). But, the answer to seemingly simple enough question is not so easy to give immediately. To do this, you must turn to an analysis of the facts of language and thought.

Obviously, this analysis should begin with the study of the main axiological categories. These categories are the value and evaluation. The value is the main focus of the study, since the evaluation is only an expression of values, “representation, concept, judgments about the value” (Anisimov, 2001). The statement that the value and evaluation are different things but at the same time, things which are interconnected and interdependent are usually ignored in lingvo semantic research and often reduced to the analysis of categories such as “value” and “evaluation”. But rarely, it comes to the analysis of values as the core content and subject matter in axiology.

In the last decade, however, there has been a positive trend in studies related to lingvo axiology to speak of values as primary in relation to the evaluation categories. However, most researchers in the field of lingvo semantics continue to speak only of the category of evaluation. In our opinion, this is due to quite understandable reasons: because the assessment as an expression of values is visible while the value is a quite hidden and ambiguous category, it is difficult to speak of it in terms of objective analysis and because of the value, we can judge only by its expression in the form of assessment.

Broadly defined the value is “the importance (utility) of a set of objects for a variety of living beings”. But, synonymous “relevance” and “utility” are not the only ones in the row. Axiological categories such as “normal”, “stability”, “prospects” and others should be also added here.

Are these axiological categories the essence of the phenomena understanding? From an ontological point of view, they are not. Values are things, events, events, etc., i.e., objective and subjective denotative and significative events. Real, substantive values are for example, our relatives, our house or apartment, a car, a favorite suit, a higher education diploma or a relevant academic degree, certificate of professor or associate professor an album with family photographs and at specific times or periods

of life things that we would never associate with values (for example, a cruch for a person who has broken a leg).

If you try to compile a common list of constantly associated and potential values, this activity would be lifelong and very individual. Thus, the values are represented in the language practically by all meaningful signs, transmitting concepts about the totality of objects and phenomena or to put it simply by all the lexical and phraseological means of the language, including the terminology phrases like “greenhouse effect”, “X-rays”, etc.

But what is the totality of objects and phenomena of the physical and social world in correlation with the categories of relevance, usefulness, importance, rule and others? This is the attitude of some categorical iconic entities to another through the general category of value; the most important thing for writing is a pen or pencil, etc.

Thus, the categorical nominations are marks of the attitude of value. Since, relations of evaluation are also social and sometimes universal ones, they are merged together in the category of value from the standpoint of the ordinary understanding of reality. And for the purpose that this value would realize in any way and serve the needs of society or the individual, it must be actualized in a speech evaluation.

Interpretation of values as the evaluation is technically easy. Generally speaking, this very interpretation is a certain indicator of the formation of the so to say value-valuation relations in a language and consciousness of its speakers, it shows how the values are represented in the form of verbal and non-verbal evaluation.

In an effort to realize a certain evaluation attitude in a certain situation of communication the communicator selects, firstly, pragmatic tactics and strategy needed for this situation, speech acts in order to maximize the illocutionary and perlocutionary effects; secondly, the speaker selects the necessary means of communication and objective evaluation of content, i.e., lexical and phraseological means of language; thirdly, colours his statement with the necessary dynamic-acoustic and prosodic parameters (pitch, placement of pauses in the utterance, certain, appropriate types of pragmatic parameters of the given situation, intonation patterns, etc.). Thus, the evaluation relation associated with certain denotations is translated into the reference situation and turns to the relations of evaluation.

Finally, the processed evaluated content is verbalized in the form of evaluative statements. The attitude turns into a ready unit of speech, the essence of which is the actual assessment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It may be accompanied by further extralinguistic means appropriate to the valuation situation (facial expressions, gestures, body movements) and could be a synthesized explication of values and estimated relationship. These considerations allow us to conclude that the actual assessment in the strict sense of the term is a result of a complex axiologically based verbal and cogitative mechanism.

Thus, it is easy to notice that the lexical and phraseological resources of the language system, the transmission of values and relation of evaluation, refer to the language as a system; the relation of evaluation is formed in the course of the speech evaluation mechanisms and evaluation is implemented in certain speech units and structures, i.e., it refers to the prepared speech.

This leads to the need of appropriate changes in *lingvo axiological* terminology. If there is a view of the world in the mind, its content is recognized directly in terms of language and speech evaluation, we can not speak about evaluated linguistic view of the world as of the correct term. It is more tempting to suggest the term *value linguistic view of the world* but the legitimacy of the term needs to be scrutinized.

First of all, it should be noted that from linguistic point of view values are implemented in almost all units of language nomination and this is understandable because if the thing is referred to, it is the value in itself. But what to do with predicative units (adjectives, verbs, adverbs) which transmit the properties and relations? Can these be considered as the reference to the values? Sure but they are not so much values as they are meta-values, serving to update the content of values in typical situations of interaction between the man and the outside world.

So, the verb to ask introduces a situation in which there is a thing, regarded from the point of view of the speaker as a value for the kind of one, several or all of the communicants, for example.

Mava is the value for Willow Ivan asks Masha to marry him (Masha is the value for Ivan). Book is the value. Ivan asks Masha for a book (a book is the value for Ivan). Silence is the value for Willow. Ivan asks Masha to stop talking (silence is the value for Ivan).

Therefore to select a unit, created exclusively for the transmission of values in the language, is quite difficult. The only thing that can be differentiated in terms of concept are different structural parameters of values and value concepts. Thus for example, the core of extremely valuable concepts as good and evil can hardly be clearly defined. Paradoxically but the most important component of these concepts seems to be an interpretive field, i.e.,

the most peripheral portion of the concept in the above mentioned opinion of Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin.

But, the different structure of subject and value concepts has no importance when we relate some to the view of the world and the others to a linguistic evaluated view of the world because subject entities often act as associated in the thinking process with the values.

On the other hand, the term *view of the world* is a kind of metaphor to describe the presentation of the collective or the individual view of the world and can not be an objective entity, otherwise people would have long compared the individual view of the world and were able to find a compromise not only in solving global problems and small household troubles (Rosch, 1975; Schalley, 2004). Therefore, the presence of units of language that transmit valuable content in the composition should be LVW also metaphorically.

In our view, the following metaphor is appropriate. Concepts like values are important parts of any view as colours or other material of which this picture is made of. And they are different colours, different combinations of which produce almost all of the colors of the spectrum. But, the ratio of the actual informative and valuable in the picture (view) depends on the specific technique of applying paint, allowing to obtain darker or lighter areas, and details of the picture, a thick or thin layer of paint, etc.

On the other hand, one could assume the existence of the general evaluated view of the world view of the world, and on this basis the existence of general evaluated view of the world related to LVW). But at the moment, it would be extremely difficult to determine their essential characteristics. That is because ELVW has not received quite adequate scientific description, excluding any possible doubt due to its reliability and scientific validity. Speaking of ELVW, we can say that this area is untouched area for research because value concepts like mental structures have received only a general description. Therefore for a more adequate description of ELVW's further research of value-conceptual sphere of linguistic phenomena is needed.

The ongoing linguistic research in the sphere of terminology shows that the terms *linguistic view of the world* and *evaluated linguistic view of the world* are difficult to define and need to be studied further. This opens a vast area for a further linguistic analysis.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the term "evaluated linguistic view of the world" needs to be further investigated. While, it is difficult to speak clearly about its relative independence from the general linguistic view of the world. On the other

hand, one should not forget that the view of the world of values is a more orderly system than a general linguistic view of the world. Undoubtedly, the paradigm of the speech content of the assessment exists by itself but it is clear that it is due to the value content of the objective and subjective entity with respect to the human world. In connection, with the latter correlation of value and evaluation in the general linguistic view of the world is one of the most important if not a prior, problems of modern linguo axiology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study is prepared with the financial support of the project being realized as a part of the state program for high schools for purpose of research work (project code 2014/420-776).

REFERENCES

- Anisimov, S.F., 2001. Vvedenie v aksiologiju [uchebnoe posobie]. Moskva: Sovremennye Tetradi, pp: 128.
- Berlin, N.Y., 1999. Cognitive linguistics: Foundations, Scope and Methodology. Mouton der Gruyter. pp: 270.
- Baumgartner, K., 1966. Die Struktur des Bedeutungsfeldes. Satz und Wort im heutigen Deutsch. Dusseldorf, pp: 220.
- Chekulaj, I.V., 2014. Princip ocenocnoj aktualizacii v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke. M.: INFRA-M., pp: 159.
- Evans, V. and M. Green, 2006. Cognitive linguistics: An introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ., pp: 830.
- Hillsdale, 1978. Cognition and categorization, pp: 115.
- Kornilov, O.A., 2003. Jazykovye kartiny mirov kak proizvodnye nacional'nyh mentalitetov [monografija]. Moskva: CheRo, pp: 349.
- Kassil', L., 2015. Konduit i Shvambranija. URL: <http://www.vse-knigi.su/lev-kassil/konduit-i-shvambrania>.
- Morohovskij, A.N., 1991. Stilistika anglijskogo jazyka [učebnik]. K.: Vishha Shkola, pp: 272.
- Med, N.G., 2007. Ocenocnaja kartina mira v ispanskoj leksike i frazeologii [monografija]. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo S.-Peterburgskogo Universiteta, pp: 235.
- Popova, Z.D., 2002. Očerki po kognitivnoj lingvistike. Voronezh: Istoki, pp: 191.
- Rosch, A.H., 1975. Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories. Journal of Experimental Psychology, pp: 192-233.
- Schalley, A.C., 2004. Cognitive modeling and verbal semantics: A representational Framework based on UML. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp: 446 n.
- Shaw, I., 1989. Rich Man, Poor Man. L.: New English Library, pp: 477.