

Cognitive Metaphor as an Idiom in Shaping the Cognitive and Pragmatic Architectonics of Linguistic World Picture

Nikolay F. Alefirenko^{1,2*}, Olga V. Dekhnich³

¹*Department of Russian Language and Literature, Pedagogical Institute, Belgorod National Research University, Russia*

²*Department of Russian Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Hradec Králové University, Czech Republic*

³*Department of English Philology and Cross-Cultural Communication, Institute for Cross-Cultural Communication and International Relations, Belgorod National Research University, Russia*

**Corresponding Author*

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, linguistic world picture/world view, cognitive metaphor, archetype, linguistic consciousness, linguistic identity.

Abstract. The paper deals with controversial issues of cognitive metaphors functioning as idioms in shaping the cognitive and pragmatic architectonics of linguistic world picture. The conceptual basis of the paper is made up of cognitive metaphor, world view (or world picture), linguistic world picture, as well as of linguistic thinking which contributes to idioms emergence. Though the phenomena of “world view” and “linguistic world picture” have a similar origin, they are described differently by scholars. “World view” is a process known as conceptualization of reality, while linguistic world picture is a sustainable architectonics of a people’s ethno-cultural mentality. A polemic interpretation of linguistic world picture is suggested. Priority is attached to LWP concepts which form the theoretical basis of contemporary linguistic anthropology. Though the idea of LWP may be traced back to Humboldtian concept of language, it should not be treated as the only possible point of view. If Humboldt’s ideas of language and thought inseparability are taken as a basis, linguistic world picture and the conceptual one will have to be considered identical. In this case LWP will become an excessive concept. An analysis of differences between these similar categories is possible due to the interpretation of LWP in terms of coherent relations between language and thought. This approach enables LWP to be considered a mundane consciousness product.

1. Introduction

World picture as a collection of concepts and views typical of a community or an individual has repeatedly become an object for scientific examination. Theories of the world considered from various perspectives constitute different types of world views, one of them being linguistic world picture. Linguistic world picture which expresses mentality of an ethnic group has been a symbolic centre of the humanities since early XXI century. It is connected with axiological development strategies of linguistics,

philosophy, psychology, culture studies and literature studies. Among the authors who address this issue are M. Heidegger [1], W. von Humboldt [2], B. Whorf [3], Russian scholars N.D. Arutyunova [4], Yu.D. Aspesyan [5], V.A. Chudinov [6] and many others.

Despite the impressive research volume, cognitive linguistics does not provide any definite concept of LWP, which is quite paradoxical. LWP is frequently mentioned in humanities research, and it becomes a cornerstone of an avant-garde doctrine, but its concept remains blurry. It may result from the fact that the very term “linguistic world picture” originates from a cognitive metaphor. Thus, its needs to be examined in terms of philosophy and anthropology, on the one hand, and in terms of cognitive linguistics, on the other. Works by G. Lakoff [7], N.F. Alefirenko [8], O.V. Dekhnich [9] and other scholars have been used as the theoretical basis for the study of cognitive metaphor.

Having a metaphorical origin, the term “*world picture*” does not provide any scientifically accurate description of the concept it denotes. In his reflections on the meaning of “world picture”, Martin Heidegger wrote that “with the word “-picture-” we think first of all of a copy of something”, but in fact, “world picture, when understood essentially, does not mean a picture of the world, but the world conceived and grasped as a picture” [1].

The term “*linguistic world picture*” is as relative as the above one. In the strict sense, language does not reflect the world directly. It reflects the way native speakers see the world and conceptualize it. The world image reproduced from linguistic data looks like a caricature or a sketch, as it is made of characteristic features of real-world objects. These objects may be perceived by an individual upon world categorization, and they become subjects of linguistic nomination [8]. Even though linguistic world picture has limited possibilities of reflecting reality, it is compensated with empirical world knowledge shared by native speakers of a specific language.

There are several synonymic terms used by scholars to denote the idea of an individual shaping his/her subjective concepts of objective world. These include “*world picture*”, “*world view*” and “*world image*”. Besides, some researchers speak of the “world model”, where model means a simplified description of the object.

2. World picture as a means of conceptualizing reality

B.A. Serebrennikov described world picture as “an integral and global world image resulting from an individual’s spiritual activity as a whole, not just from a singular aspect” [10]. The postulated integrity of the objective world’s subjective image does not prevent scholars from studying this phenomenon from different perspectives. Hence, the attributes taken into consideration in describing world picture include, first of all, the subject creating world picture; second, the object (the world or its fragment), its image to be reconstructed in the course of the subject’s creative activity; and third, the object presentation form. Depending on the subject’s characteristics, there can be various world pictures: an individual one (the world picture inherent for a person, for example, for a writer, a scientist, a child et cetera) and a collective one (the world picture of a nation or of a professional community, or one based on gender, age, residence etc). World picture can be studied wholly or partially. In the latter case attention is paid to separate images constituting the entire world picture, such as images of a human, nature, or any other object. Finally, depending on the object representation form, which is determined by the field the subject is engaged in, there is biological, physical, religious, political world picture, among others. World picture may be considered from the temporal perspective, taking into account its historic and cultural components (for example, medieval world picture, mechanistic world picture, contemporary world picture).

A controversial issue which remains important for the contemporary science is the place of linguistic world picture (LWP) in the hierarchy described above. The question is, whether is it an independent world image within an individual’s system of world images or is it only responsible for reflecting conceptual world picture. It is of primary importance both to contemporary anthropological linguistics and anthropocentric semantics to distinguish the notions of “linguistic world picture” and “conceptual world

picture”, as it determines the object of study.

Conceptualization of reality means an individual’s apprehension of information about the world and mental construction of objects and phenomena of objective reality, resulting in specific ideas of the world represented by concepts, that is, by meanings recorded in an individual’s consciousness. Cognition of the world enables people to build general notions which are integrated into a world knowledge system known as conceptual world picture. The main part of this knowledge is recorded in language with the meanings of specific linguistic units. It implies that linguistic conceptualization of reality takes place simultaneously with mental conceptualization, and results of the former, are referred to as linguistic world picture.

3. Polemic interpretations of linguistic world picture (LWP)

Let us address the concepts of linguistic world picture which form the theoretical foundation of contemporary linguistic anthropology.

The notion of linguistic world picture traces its origin to Wilhelm von Humboldt’s concept of language. This linguist and philosopher prove that language is not a denotation of an idea formed independently. Instead, it is the organ which builds the thought: “language is the formative organ of thought”, while “thought and language are therefore one and inseparable from each other” [2]. In Humboldt’s view, language is an intermediary between an individual world and external reality, and “the whole mode of perceiving things subjectively necessarily passes over into cultivation and the use of language” [2]. The scholar stresses that “since all objective perception is inevitably tinged with subjectivity, we may consider every human individual, even apart from language, as a unique aspect of the world-view” [2].

Humboldt’s ideas are supported by a number of Russian and European linguists. Alexander Potebnya [11] agreed with Humboldt’s idea that “the word arises from this very perceiving; it is a copy, not of the object in itself, but of the image thereof produced in consciousness” [2]. Humboldt’s followers emphasize his idea that “there resides in every language a characteristic world-view” [2]. John Leavitt, revising the works by Neohumboldtian scholars - Leo Weisberger and Jost Trier – referred to their perception of language as “representing a world picture ... characterized by an inner form” [12]. Thus, the language of a specific society is a “conceptual construction of a lived field” [12], a spiritual content and body of knowledge, which is referred to as the world picture of a respective language.

Though Wilhelm von Humboldt never actually uses the term of “*linguistic world picture*”, he may well be considered the founder of the concept which interprets linguistic world picture as incarnation of thought built with the help of language. A notion becomes objective remaining inherent to the subject at the same time. It is language that enables this process to happen. In other words, the psychological conceptualization of reality is inseparable from the linguistic conceptualization [2]. Using Humboldtian idea of the link between language and thought, we can conclude that LWP is to some extent identical to conceptual world view.

Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf offer an unusual vision of LWP in terms of ethnolinguistics. In their understanding, borders between language and thought do not coincide in a strict sense. Apart from being a means of expressing ideas, a specific language actually builds these ideas. That is, the content of cognition is not common for all. Instead, it depends on language. Language determines the mentality of a respective nation and the way people cognize the world. According to B. Whorf, “we dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscope flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds—and this means largely by the linguistic systems of our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way—an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is of course, an implicit and unstated one, but its terms are absolutely obligatory; we

cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data that the agreement decrees” [3].

Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is based on the idea that people see the world differently, from the perspective of their native languages, and each language reflects reality in its unique manner. Hence, languages differ in what concerns their linguistic world pictures. This hypothesis has been developed and completed by other scholars, including L. Weisgerber, D. Alford, G. Carrol, D. Hymes and others. Although the concept described above does not allow us to equate language and world view, it still acts as a force which can transform the latter. It means that linguistic world picture serves as a “mould” for “casting” thinking stereotypes.

Thus, developing Humboldt’s idea of language as an activity, scholars begin to acknowledge linguistic world picture as an independent phenomenon. Major controversies in the interpretation of LWP concern the extent to which language influences human activity. It has given rise to various concepts of “linguistic determinism” and “linguistic relativity”.

Not questioning the existence of LWP, Russian linguistic anthropologists, including B.A. Serebrennikov, G. V. Kolshansky, R. M. Frumkina and other ones, remain critical towards Humboldt’s ideas and Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Having profoundly revised Humboldt’s notion of the world-building function of language, they prove that language is not identical to intellectual activity. Far from building the world, language only reflects it by means of thought. In other words, thought is an intermediary between the world and language.

According to G. V. Kolshansky, language does not cognize objective reality and does not create a world of its own. It is used only as a means of expressing mental content resulting from the reflection of reality in one’s consciousness. No stage of language development implies its functioning as an independent creative force, or as one creating its own world picture. It only records conceptual world whose primary source is objective reality [13].

While language is so “attentive” to objective reality, it is often “indifferent” to the changes in people’s world outlook and world view. M. P. Odintsova stressed that linguistic world picture and world view are two different interacting entities, one is linguistic and semantic, and the other one is philosophical and gnoseological. The latter is incarnated with the help of language, though it is not part of it [14]. Linguistic world picture, being nothing else but an inner natural semiotic form of explicating knowledge, and in a broader sense - a form of explicating all information rendered in speech, does not prevent us from distracting the non-verbal subject content from this form and expressing it in a different way: by means of the same language or of another one, or by means of a non-verbal language system (music, painting, ballet or cinema). Linguistic world picture is adapted to an individual’s subjective status of consciousness, and it reacts to various intents, motives and states of a person, without imposing on the speech/thought subject any linguistic means of interpretation (conceptualization) of reality as the only possible one.

B. A. Serebrennikov, being intensely critical of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, stressed that any language is the result of objective reality reflected by an individual. It is not a self-contained force creating the world. Language is largely adapted to the specifics of human physiology, but these specifics have emerged due to a prolonged adaptation of the organism to the environment [10]. An uneven division of the linguistic continuum accompanies primary nomination and may be explained with differences in associations and in linguistic material remaining from previous epochs. Language is a means to consolidate the reflective capacity of human thinking. Reflection is closely connected with a person’s practical experience.

Though Russian linguistic anthropology considers LWP and conceptual world picture to be two independent phenomena, borders separating them are quite flexible. G. V. Kolshansky doubted that these borders can be established, as it would be wrong to divide the integral and ideal content of linguistic units into linguistic world picture and conceptual world picture [13].

Conceptual world picture is constituted by all the knowledge and perceptions of reality acquired by an individual as a result of his/her psychological activity. Language is a storage system for this knowledge and these perceptions. Elements of objective reality are stored in linguistic units in the form of gnoseological images. At the same time, language is a means of obtaining new knowledge about the world, because thought structure and dynamics are incarnated in linguistic units and their properties. In other words, according to A.Ye. Kibrik, linguistic units are adapted both for nomination of objective reality components (and subsequent storage of knowledge) and for meeting the mental process requirements [15].

4. LWP in terms of language and thought

As language reflects the results of practical, artistic, technical and scientific cognition of the world, that is, the results of the world conceptualization in an individual's consciousness, linguistic world picture is closely connected with the conceptual one. Without it, language would not be able to serve as a means of communication. However, as any other world picture, the linguistic one has its own conceptual content. It results from the fact that language builds its own conceptual system dependent on physical and cultural experience and connected with this experience directly. At the same time, conceptual world picture (including the scientific one, in particular) is constantly being "redrawn", as cognition is accompanied with fallacies and errors. Unlike conceptual world picture, the linguistic one can store these errors and fallacies in its conceptual "bank" for a long time without any correction, despite all conceptual changes and scientifically grounded ideas which take place.

Language usually reflects a thought which has already been shaped (a thought being a result of thinking). The process of thinking and linguistic activity seldom coincide (an example of such coincidence may be thinking aloud on order to produce a specific effect on the listeners). Thought as a thinking result which has already been reflected in language via verbal characters and structures, it can exist for an infinitely long time, even if it is refuted by a better intellectual activity also reflected in language. To be more precise, it is not a thought that exists in language steadily, but its linguistic reflection, an "echo", which has become an integral "particle" of language.

In spite of its relative stability, linguistic world picture is a dynamic one. As V.I. Postovalova puts in, it is not "a dead entity" [16]. It undergoes certain changes resulting from reinterpretation of various phenomena of objective reality. It means that linguistic world picture can also be "redrawn", though the process is slower than in the case with conceptual world picture. A clear evidence of LWP's dynamic character is an active metaphorization of reality, whereby metaphors enable us to consider newly perceived objects or phenomena through the prism of what has been already cognized, thus enhancing the scope of interpreting the denotatum by means of enriching linguistic units with new meanings [4-7]. Thus, we can say that LWP has a specific status: it is connected with all kinds of world pictures (for example, physical, political, medieval world pictures, world images of specific individuals or of a community etc.) due to the fact that all world pictures are expressed in language to some extent.

As seen above, LWP is an aggregate of an individual's knowledge and perceptions of the outside world imprinted in his/her consciousness and reflected in language. Contemporary Russian linguistic anthropology relies on this interpretation of LWP. It means that on the one hand, linguistic world picture is not identical to the conceptual one, and consequently, it cannot be considered on a par with other types of world pictures. On the other hand, we acknowledge that it has conceptual content, as it is language that incarnates (or, more precisely, reflects) the specifics of individual world view and those of a national and cultural community, including views of life on the whole and of each object separately. Some scholars (for example, T. V. Bulygina and A. D. Shmelev) describe LWP as a constituent of an integral conceptual world picture which includes components associated with linguistic meanings [17]. In this interpretation we can see LWP as a specific system of world division and a form of its categorization.

Let us turn our attention to major features of linguistic conceptualization of reality, that is, of linguistic world picture.

5. Linguistic world picture as a mundane consciousness product

The most characteristic feature of LWP is its non-concordance with scientific knowledge of reality. The difference between LWP and scientific world view becomes most notable when scholars try to analyze words of natural language used as scientific terms. Here is the classic example by L.V. Shcherba: “A *straight line* is described in geometry as the shortest distance between two points”. But in standard language is it evidently not so... In everyday situations we say that the line is *straight* when it does not deviate to the right or to the left (as well as up or down)” [18]. According to Yu.N. Karaulov, “vocabulary has gone many thousand years of development, together with scientific perceptions of various epochs it has also reflected and accumulated layers of fallacies and superstitions, and the pre-logical stage of human thinking and language formation has been partially imprinted in it as well” [19].

Knowledge and perceptions of the world reflected in language are of various nature, they do not always have a scientific ground, they are often controversial, incomplete and sometimes even erroneous. Emphasizing the pre-scientific character of linguistic world picture, scholars describe it as a natural one. It is natural, *na ĭve* perceptions that shape the meanings and use of linguistic units. Yu.D. Apresyan wrote that “the semantic meaning of a linguistic unit reflects a naive notion of an object, property, action, process event and the like” [5]. Sapir-Whorf linguistic relativity hypothesis is also based on the suggestion that LWP reflects everyday perceptions of the world. According to E. Sapir and B. Whorf, we unconsciously transfer norms dictated by language into our experience [3]. For example, the *soul* in Russian LWP is a concept which always exists. Yu.S. Stepanov described it as a constant of Russian culture [20]. At the bottom of this concept is a notion of an object belonging to the ideal world: the soul is the most important part of inner human which is responsible for moral and emotional expressions. There is an idiom in the Russian language denoting an emotional uplift: “*воспарить душой*” (“*to uplift the soul*”). It contains archaic ideas of a soul existing inside a human body. Mythological world picture describes this life-creating substance as vapour which can leave the body and raise up in heaven. From the historical perspective, we must stress that natural, or *na ĭve* (linguistic) world picture emerged much earlier than the scientific one: homo sapiens began to develop visions of the world and of themselves and to incarnate them in language, in myths, poems and religious texts long before the initiation of science. The formation and development of scientific world view and its description by means of natural language were two simultaneous processes.

There is an undoubted inter-connection and inter-penetration between LWP and scientific world view which is a system of world images and knowledge. These world pictures cannot but overlap, as language is a universal means of reflecting and storing human knowledge and perceptions of any kind, both scientifically grounded ones and erroneous or distorted. For example, the following phrases taken from colloquial speech and academic literature prove that LWP and scientific world view do not contradict each other: *Look, there's a flash of lightning, it's going to rain... How sultry it is! There is hardly a breath of air* (colloq.) - *Lightning (an abrupt discharge of atmospheric electricity accumulated in the air which entails thunder as an atmospheric phenomenon) takes place in hot weather accompanied with a strong condensation of water vapour over an overheated landmass* (from academic literature); *It is warm today – the snow is melting* (colloq.) – *Heat melts snow into liquid state* (from academic literature). In other words, trivial knowledge is not devoid of realism and adequacy to the real world; scientific knowledge is formed out of realistic perceptions; *na ĭve* (linguistic) world picture does not exclude realistic perceptions of the environment, while science which is usually based on experience and observations also contains components of everyday consciousness. Compare the Russian expressions: “*в голове кипят мысли*” (“my brain is bursting with ideas”, or, word for word: “thoughts are boiling in my head”), “*сердце ушло в пятки*” (“my heart sank”, or, word for word: “my heart has gone down into the heels”), “*душа рвется наружу*” (“I am in desperate need of some spiritual freedom”, or, word for word: “my soul is yearning to get outside the body”). These expressions show that LWP contradicts to scientific (realistic) perceptions of human and of body parts.

Thus, we can speak of a contradictory linguistic conceptualization of reality: LWP reflects both *na ĭve*

and subjective perceptions and realistic ones having scientific grounds. We cannot claim that linguistic world picture reflects reality to full extent. A.A. Zalevskaya said that world image functions on different awareness levels with a compulsory combination of “knowledge” and “experience” and can only partially be described by verbal means; LWP is not so rich as world image and only describes part of it [21]. We would like to add that the above part of world image consists of conceptual world picture components which are reflected in meanings of linguistic units; and beyond there is a system of psychological and emotional entities. They are not explicated in language but form an extralinguistic background which can spotlight LWP specifics. In other words, conceptual world picture is richer than the linguistic one, as different types of thinking are involved in its formation.

Conceptual world picture variability (its non-stop “redrawing” resulting from the advancement of the thinking process and obtaining new knowledge about the world) implies the existence of the author’s element: every particular person (or a community) conceptualizes reality based on the database formed within a specific time period and containing information about the world. They comprehend reality according to their personal intellectual abilities and the cognitive experience accumulated by many generations. The author’s element in LWP is relative: there is no doubt that linguistic world picture is created by a human (a community), but due to its longevity, sustainability and stereotypic character it does not have any specific author. Many generations have contributed to the formation of linguistic world picture and brought in their world views.

Though LWP and world view are not identical things, they are closely connected, as LWP reflects a specific way of perceiving and conceptualizing the world which is typical of certain cultures. Besides, an individual’s attitude to the world and behavioral standards are often determined by LWP. According to N.D. Arutyunova, “The world is dual for a contemporary person. It falls in two: The Universum, or Alien world (like “It” in M. Buber’s works, or “Autre” in French existentialism), and human world, “available existence” (comparable with Heidegger’s “Dasein” concept). The former is infinite and boundless, but theoretically countable. Everything in the Universum complies with the laws which are binding for all. In the human world everything is governed by rule of chance: an individual’s life perception is nation-specific. Natural language reflects human world in nation-specific variants” [4].

National LWPs may have similar interpretations of the world images based on common value systems and benchmarks (for example, the languages of Christian states have similar interpretations of *good* and *evil*, *clever* and *stupid* etc.) E.A. Pimenov believes that every nation’s LWP explicates a much bigger share of common experience than of unique culture-specific one. “A common world picture is an intermediary and a foundation of mutual understanding between both individuals and cultures. It is the common part of the world picture that enables a system of sustainable (constant and variable) linguistic equivalents to exist” [22]. At the same time, speaking on the common and nation-specific features of LWPs in different languages, we must admit that the world picture which is common for a national language is variable, as the subjects who actually shape it (including social or professional communities, age groups, or their representatives) have different cultural, ethnic, speech and behavioral attitudes.

Based on the above reasoning, we suggest the following definition of the basic notion within anthropocentric semantics: *LWP consists of the processes and results of reality conceptualization as a manifestation of an individual’s creative mental and linguistic/speech performance, which are not identical to processes and results of scientific conceptualization of the world in terms of quantity and quality.*

Major features of linguistic conceptualization of reality include incongruity with scientific knowledge, contradictory and incomplete reflection of reality, multiple author’s elements in LWP, a combination of the panhuman, nation-specific and personal elements in interpreting the world.

The concept of LWP overlaps with the concept of “language semantic system” to some extent: both are linguistic entities characterizing people’s world views; speaking of LWP as an aggregate of knowledge and perceptions about the world reflected in language, we mean their reflection in the semantic system of

language, for semantic meaning is the content of the above knowledge and perceptions rendered with lexemes and grammar. At the same time, the semantic system is an autonomous and self-organizing system developing on its own, with a proviso that it is made according to human “measurements”. What concerns its ability to reflect an individual’s world view, that is, its ability to objectivize and to represent a person’s “measurement”, language semantic system serves as a simulator: LWP is a linguistic model of the world objectivized by a semantic system. Thus, the concept of LWP incorporates the concept of “language semantic system” extrapolating it into a study of linguistic conceptualization of reality.

6. LWP research prospects in terms of cognitive linguistics

The study of world picture, or world view, continues to arouse an intense interest among researchers. On the one hand, it proves that post-modern philosophy resources are inexhaustible, on the other hand, it exposes the interest of reflexive thinking toward motives and myths archetypic for each ethnic group in mapping the cognitive and pragmatic architectonics of the world [1]. As we have already mentioned, despite numerous works in the field, there is no solid concept of LWP in linguistics. Among the reasons of its indefinite status is probably its origin, as the notion of LWP is derived from a cognitive metaphor: “world picture”, or “world view”.

Authors of the cognitive metaphor theory claim that such metaphors enjoy a big advantage, as they provide an opportunity to penetrate into the unknown space of physical world view which is still beyond logical. This idea makes sense for us if we consider cognitive metaphor through the prism of a verbal one. Idioms as figures of speech are often made by means of cognitive metaphors. The creative function of the latter is to detect latent characteristics of an event or state even when their real characteristics are not explicated via phrasemes. A phraseme-building metaphor is a name transfer based on similarities, failing any real links between the direct and indirect meanings. Emotions are almost never expressed directly. Instead, they are compared with something.

Let us consider various types of concepts incorporated in cognitive structures functioning as metaphors.

The first group of concepts represents cognitive structures of the perceived objects in LWP. Such structures have two apexes, where both semantic centres (the naïve concept and the emotional seme) are dominant. These concepts are of rational and evaluative nature. For example, the Russian expression “цены нет” (“*somebody of something is priceless*”) is used to describe an object of high value, or to render the highest praise. Let us illustrate it in contexts: 1) “Желаете окружить владения? — ласково спросил Трощенко. — Этому лесу **цены нету**. Слышите? — Трощенко ударил обухом топора по сосне. — Поет древесина!” (“*Would you like the estate to be surrounded [with trees]? — Troshchenko asked kindly. — This forest is **priceless**. Can you hear? — Troshchenko struck a pine with an axe back. — The timber sings!*”) [23]; 2) “сколько душе угодно” (“*to your heart’s content*”, or word for word: “*as much as your soul likes*”) – you can walk, paint, sing, dance, eat or take something without any limits, to your heart’s desire. Here is an abstract from a critical review of Turgenev’s novel: “На людей, подобных Базарову, можно негодовать, **сколько душе угодно**, но признавать их искренность – решительно необходимо” (“*You can be indignant with people like Bazarov **as much as your heart desires**, but you must admit their sincerity*”) [24]; 3) “час от часу не легче!” (“*going from bad to worse*”) - the further, the worse, the more incidents and difficulties. We can see this expression in the following context: “Объяснения Лопатина [журналиста] не смягчили его. — **Час от часу не легче!** — воскликнул он, когда Лопатин назвал себя...—Теперь только и радости, что в газетах про нас писать!” (*Explanations given by Lopatin [the journalist] did not make him any kinder. — Things are **going from bad to worse!** – he said when Lopatin introduced himself... - The only joy now is that they will write about us in newspapers!*”) [25].

The second type of concepts is mainly used to objectivize the emotive structure of the perceived in LWP. The semantic structure nucleus is made up of sensitive and empirical perceptions focused by

consciousness alongside with peripheral implications of naïve concepts. For example, the expression “*своя голова на плечах*” (word for word: “to have *one’s own head on one’s shoulders*”) means that a person is able to solve problems on his/her own; “*без году неделя*” (word for word: “*a week wanting a year*”) means “*quite recently, not long*”; “*сидеть на шее*” (word for word: “*to sit on someone’s neck*”) describes living at somebody’s expense. Such concepts owe their existence to the mechanism of metonymy which uses contiguous associations and is therefore based on associated and metonymical perception of a communicative event. At the same time, they often contain rudimentary concepts of autochthonic Slavic culture.

The third type of concepts is represented by cognitive structures of rational and sensitive nature, for example: “*связывать по рукам и ногам*” (*colloq.*) (close to the English expression “*to have someone bound hand and foot*”), meaning “to deprive someone of the opportunity to act freely”; “*бить баклуши*” – word for word, (“*to beat wooden workpieces*”) meaning “to idle around”, “to play the fool”.

All types of linguistic nomination are constituent parts of LWP, including direct and indirect ones, among which there are secondary types (metaphoric words and phraseological combinations) where LWP is poeticized only by the lexical component with a phraseologically bound meaning; the generalized combination is motivated by meanings of the word forms constituting it: a) “*сгорать от стыда, от срама, от позора*” (“*to burn with shame*”); b) “*сгорать от любви*” (“*to burn with love*”); c) “*сгорать от нетерпения, зависти*” (“*to burn with impatience or envy*”). However, such idioms do not allow for any combinations with other words (we cannot say in Russian “*сгорать от радости*” – “to burn with joy”) and phraseological units which are indirect derivatives (for example, “*пускать козла в огород*” (word for word, “*to let the goat into the vegetable garden*”) comparable with the English expression “*to give the sheep in care of the wolf*”). The latter Russian phraseological unit is idiomatic, as cognitive metaphors have a capacity for re-interpretation. Units formed with indirect derivation may acquire idiomatic character in two ways: either by means of re-interpretation, that is, using a phraseme generating mechanism, or with the help of an implicit meaning, which complicates idiom understanding. It takes a significant effort to reveal the semantic content of extra-linguistic sources: a) of speech situation and b) of a respective communicative event simulated in a discourse. A mixed (linguo-cognitive) type of LWP representation via a semantic field is the adjunction of the revealed discourse-dependent information and the linguistic meanings of units included into respective semantic field.

So, linguistic world picture is the result of an individual’s multifaceted spiritual activity (at the primary stage it includes senses, perceptions, ideas, while at the final one it is represented by its supreme mechanisms: thinking and self-consciousness). This interpretation of LWP enables us to describe it as an image of the world, the latter meaning an integral and global one. As world image is of psychic nature, it can only be referred to as a subjective world picture. It may be explained with the fact that an image is usually reflexive, situational and fragmentary, which may make it remote from the real communicative event.

In global perception of reality, world image does not depend on the situation. Still, even in this case it cannot be considered identical to LWP. The integral and global character of world image transforms it into a “layout” of the Universe, which serves as the foundation for LWP. LWP is void of sketchiness; it gives birth to ethno-linguistic consciousness. Having axiological content, it is “tied” to a specific culture or civilization, and generalization is typical of it. Unlike LWP, world image is personal, subjective, indigenous and unique. For a linguistic identity creating LWP, image is the main cognitive category. This category is not formed on a semantic basis, but is rather based on a knowledge system. As a result, various ways of non-verbal imagery become cognitive units.

At the foreground of the linguistic identity’s cognitive level there are human knowledge quanta having an abstract structure. This knowledge is formed in linguistic consciousness. Based on the naïve generalization of visual and sensory images (Gestalts), significative features emerge which enable meanings of idioms or words to be detected. Such meanings can contain specific features of LWP. Due to the above significative features, semantic and thematic unities of linguistic units (words and

phraseological units) are formed, which are also known as semantic fields.

First of all, we need to understand how words and phraseological units are integrated in semantic fields. We have noticed that at the bottom of discursive and pragmatic semantic field there are concepts, and their significative and axiological characteristics are used to correlate LWP with reality and human experience.

Cognizing objective reality, human consciousness registers specific and common features and records semantic characteristics of words and idioms. Their similarities enable us to conclude that these characteristics reflect discursive and pragmatic features of nominative units combining them in uniform significative and semantic unities which are integrated into sememes. These unities serve as constructive elements of idiom and word meanings without differentiating traditional and conceptual perception from sensory perception.

Such amalgamation of the traditional, conceptual and sensory perception is subjected to cognitive and pragmatic interpretations which serve as building blocks for LWP. A linguistic identity's cognitive level is a thesaurus of ideas, images and concepts. Their axiological content makes the foundation of LWP on the whole and builds a gravitational force for its connotative and pragmatic centrifugal character. Thesaurus units form hierarchy and coordination, they arrange phraseological and lexical concept representatives into semantic fields. An aggregate of these semantic fields builds LWP.

A semantic field is a mode of representing linguistic world picture [26, p. 231]. It goes without saying, a semantic field can be modified in its own way in order to implement the cognitive and pragmatic register of LWP. At this level of LWP, the semantic field is formed by an aggregate of phraseological and lexical units representing various parts of speech and sharing the function of representing a common discursive and pragmatic concept based on a cognitive metaphor. It is cognitive metaphor that emits "ionizing" phantomic radiation of semantic connotations via a discursive and pragmatic concept, thus combining phrasemics and metaphorical lexis into lexico-phraseological semantic groups and fields of cognitive and pragmatic nature.

We understand phantomic radiation of semantic connotations as proliferation of spiritual energy around the whole semantic field. It is generated by a discursive and pragmatic concept. The semantic field which objectivizes the cognitive and pragmatic register of LWP has an ideal and material structure: (a) the ideal component is represented by the discursive and pragmatic concept which is basic for such semantic fields, and (b) the material component is made up of idioms and metaphoric words integrated in this semantic field and bound by associative and imaginative relationship.

The expression "ionizing phantomic radiation" is somewhat of a cognitive metaphor which induces implicit meanings to be explicated with words and imagery by constituents of the semantic field.

The pragmatic level, structurizing a linguistic identity's world picture, "binds" it to a specific communicative situation. It confers a dynamic character to an individual's LWP, which is necessary for verbal thinking, thus forming goals, motives, interests, creative potentials, endeavors, attitudes and opinions in the linguistic consciousness. Wilhelm von Humboldt describes this layer of language as inner language form (*innere Sprachform*) which reflects its identity together with mental processes. This symbiosis enables the components at this level of a linguistic identity to transform a person's LWP from an abstract and sustainable structure into an activity-based and communicative one, which evokes situationally bound associative and imaginative perceptions in a linguistic consciousness. The above perceptions are of significance to linguistic world picture.

7. Conclusion

The analysis of Russian and European research into world view issues enables us to conclude that LWP is an aggregate of perceptions about the world historically developed in mundane consciousness and reflected in language. This is why, in the long-term perspective, it is reasonable to study the cognitive and

pragmatic mechanisms which record the unique way of world perception typical of a specific nation. Each natural language is considered to have a unique LWP associated with a system of phraseo-semantic fields. The latter, in combination with lexico-semantic fields, represent the way a respective nation or linguistic identity perceives the world. A linguistic identity may be characterized by a specific correlation of human consciousness and linguistic world picture.

The conjugation between the scientific and linguistic world in our linguistic consciousness is of especial interest. On the one hand, a systemic semantic arrangement of vocabulary enables us to simulate an integral system of perceptions reflected in language, irrespective of whether it is science-specific or if it represents a “naïve” world view. On the other hand, the inter-penetration of scientific and naïve world pictures also arouses interest, as it is connected with the influence of scientific language on phrasemics development and neologization. It also enables us to trace how phrasemics penetrates into the discursive and pragmatic strata of linguistic consciousness which used to reject them. One way or another, science penetrates into our contemporary lives and thus changes the cognitive and pragmatic architectonics of LWP which becomes less and less “naïve”.

References

- [1] Heidegger M. *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*. Translated and with an introduction by William Lovitt. New York (US): HarperCollins Publishers; 2013.
- [2] Humboldt W. *On Language, On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Edited by Michael Losonsky, CUP: 1999, p. 25-64. [Cited 2019 June 1]. Available from: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/vhumboldt-wilhelm.htm>
- [3] Whorf B. *Science and linguistics*. In: MIT Technology Review. Massachusetts (US): Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 1940, Vol 42. p. 229-31.
- [4] Arutyunova N.D. *Issues of morphology and world building: on the material of the Spanish language*. Moscow (RU): Languages of Slavic cultures; 2007.
- [5] Apresyan Yu.D., editor. *Linguistic world picture and systemic lexicography*. Moscow (RU): “Languages of Russian culture” school, “Vostochnaya literatura RAN” Publishing; 2006.
- [6] Chudinov V.A. *Civilization: mentality, archetype, nature*. In: Proceedings of IVth International Kondratyev conference of May 15-16, 2001. Moscow (RU): International Kondratyev fund; 2002, p. 209-210.
- [7] Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. London (UK): The University of Chicago press; 2003.
- [8] Alefirenko N.F. *Cognitive and pragmatic sources of phrasemo-semiosis*. Moscow (RU): Flinta: Nauka; 2018.
- [9] Dekhnich O.V. “People are trees” conceptual metaphor in contemporary English. PhD thesis: 10.02.04. Belgorod (RU): Belgorod State University; 2004.
- [10] Serebrennikov B.A. *How is world view reflected in language? In: The role of human factor in language: language and world picture*. Moscow (RU): Nauka; 1988.
- [11] Potebnya A.A. *Mysl i yazyk. /Potebnya A.A. Thought and language*. Kyiv (UA): Sinto; 1993.
- [12] Leavitt J. *Linguistic relativities. Language diversity and modern thought*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press; 2011.
- [13] Kolshansky G.V. *The objective world view in cognition and language*. Moscow (RU): Nauka; 1990.
- [14] Odintsova M.P. *Linguo-anthropological studies by Omsk specialists in Russian philology*. Omsk (RU): Omsk University Bulletin; 2002, Issue 2. p. 5-13.
- [15] Kibrik A.E. *Essays on general and applied linguistic issues*. Moscow (RU): Moscow State University; 1992.
- [16] Postovalova V.I. *World view in human life. In: The role of human factor in language: language and world view*. Moscow (RU): Nauka; 1988.

- [17] Bulygina T.V., Shmelev A.D. Linguistic conceptualization of the world (based on the Russian Grammar). Moscow (RU): "Languages of Russian culture" school; 1997.
- [18] Shcherba L.V. The experience of general lexicography theory. In: Language system and activity. Moscow (RU): Editorial URSS; 2004, p. 265–312.
- [19] Karaulov Yu.N. General and Russian Ideography. Moscow (RU): Nauka; 1976.
- [20] Stepanov Yu.S. Constants: a dictionary of Russian culture. Moscow (RU): Languages of Russian culture; 1997.
- [21] Zalevskaya A.A. National and cultural world view and approaches to its study. In: Yazykovoe soznanie i obraz mira: collected papers. / N.V. Ufimtseva, editor. Moscow (RU): Nauka; 2006, p. 39-54.
- [22] Pimenov E.A. Study of the TRAUER (grief) concept by means of a synonymical row. In: Etnogermenevtika i antropologiya. Kemerovo (RU): Kemerovo State University; 2004, p. 89-94.
- [23] Paustovsky K.G. A story of forests. In: Paustovsky, K. G. Povesti. Perm (RU); 1986.
- [24] D.I. Pisarev. Bazarov. "Fathers and sons", novel by I.S. Turgenev. In: D.I. Pisarev. Literary critics in three volumes. Vol.1. Articles of 1859-1864. Leningrad (RU): Kjudozhestvennaya literatura; 1981.
- [25] Simonov K.S. The so-called private life (from Lopatin's notes). Moscow (RU): AST; 2012.
- [26] Rubtsov I.N. Semantic fields as a means to implement linguistic world pictures. St.Petersburg (RU): Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University bulletin; 2008, Issue 60. [Cited 30 May, 2019]. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/semanticheskie-polya-kak-sposob-realizatsii-yazykovyh-kartin-mira>