



ANDRIANNA MILO

Užhorodo nacionalinis universitetas, Ukraina
Uzhhorod National University, Ukraine

LINGVOKULTŪROS SĄVOKA ŠIUOLAIKINIAME MOKSLE: FORMAVIMASIS IR POTENCIALAS

The Concept of *Linguoculture* in Modern Science:
Formation and Potential

SUMMARY

The article considers the concept of *linguoculture* in scientific discourse. As an object and one of the basic units of linguocultural studies, this concept focuses on the comprehension of the “language – culture – consciousness” triad, and is embodied in the ideas of the conceptual picture of the world. Civilizational identity indicates belonging to a distinctive linguo-cultural community as a carrier of the discursive practices created by it (religions, ideologies, social practices, cultural traditions, styles, and values), which together constitute a special image of humanity. In Ukraine, the formation of the linguoculturological paradigm is determined by the specifics of identification processes caused by the struggle for the civilizational identity of Ukrainianness. Despite its active use in the modern social and humanitarian paradigm, the concept of *linguoculture* remains lacunar. Based on general scientific and purely linguistic approaches, the article defines the standardization of the terminological system of the concept of *linguoculture* in the conceptual apparatus of the modern theory of language philosophy, formulates its definition and characterizes the types of *linguoculture* within civilization.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama moksliniame diskurse vartojama *lingvokultūros* sąvoka. Ši sąvoka, kaip objektas ir vienas iš pagrindinių lingvokultūros tyrimų vienetų, susijusi su triados „kalba–kultūra–sąmonė“ suvokimu, ji yra perteikiama per konceptualaus pasaulio paveikslo idėjas. Civilizacinė tapatybė rodo priklausymą savitai kalbinei-kultūrinei bendruomenei, perteikiamos tos bendruomenės sukurtos diskursyvinės praktikos (religijos, ideologijos, socialinės praktikos, kultūrinės tradicijos, stiliai ir vertybės) sudaro tam tikrą žmoni-

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: konceptualus pasaulio vaizdas, kultūra, *lingvokultūra*, kalba, civilizacinė tapatybė.

KEY WORDS: conceptual picture of the world, culture, *linguoculture*, language, civilizational identity.

jos įvaizdį. Ukrainoje lingvokultūrinės paradigmos formavimasi lemia identifikacijos procesų ypatumai, besireiškiantys per kovą už civilizacinį ukrainietiško identitetą. Nors *lingvokultūros* sąvoka aktyviai vartojama šiuolaikinėje socialinėje bei humanitarinėje paradigmoje, vis dėlto ji tebėra nepakankamai išplėtotą. Straipsnyje, remiantis bendramoksliniu ir lingvistiniu požiūriais, apibūdinama, kaip šios sąvokos terminologinė sistema standartizuojama šiuolaikinės kalbos filosofijos teorijos sąvokų sistemoje, kaip formuojamas jos apibrėžimas ir apibūdinami civilizaciniai *lingvokultūros* tipai.

INTRODUCTION

In the international scientific discourse, the focus remains on the study of the interdependence and relationship between language and culture. Linguocultural studies is a relatively new linguistic direction which was formed in the 90s of the twentieth century and is related to many sciences – both general scientific (philosophy, anthropology, ontology, psychology) and purely linguistic (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, country studies, etc.). The concept of *linguoculture* as an object of linguocultural studies is one of the most commonly used in modern linguistic studies and is often found in the titles of scientific papers and keywords, but the definition of the term in scientific linguistic discourse is virtually absent and is at the stage of forming.

In the Ukrainian scientific space, the concept of *linguoculture* is defined in the totality of its components: concepts of a certain culture, system of values, linguistic personality, stereotypes, etc. Among the wide range of linguocultural studies presented in the Ukrainian scientific discourse, the following definitions of *linguoculture* have been recorded: (1) “Linguoculture (Latin: *lingua* – language and *cultura* – education, development) is the expression, reflection and fixation of culture in language and discourse” (Zahn-

itko 2012: 156). The definition of a linguocultural community as “unity of an ethnic group, united by language and culture; community of an ethnic group, its language and culture, which are manifested in the peculiarities of communication; a large group of people, whose members may belong to the same or different ethnic groups, have a common linguistic and cultural consciousness; linguistic and cultural unity of people” is also important to comprehend this concept (ibid); (2) “a synergistic combination of language and culture, recorded and mastered by a certain ethnolinguistic consciousness” (Matuzkova 2022: 48); (3) “a complex of linguistic units that fill the value-semantic space of the language in the process of cognition of reality by a certain linguocultural community” (Ibid., p. 204).

Cultural identity consists of a complex of interactions between language, culture and personality, which manifests itself at different levels and in various forms. This concept encompasses the collective memory of a family, community, nation, country, ancestral history, etc., and refers to customs, traditions, beliefs, values which form a person’s sense of belonging. Influenced by globalization, migration processes, and technological progress, languages are also undergoing changes (Darginavičienė 2023: 169). Since languages and cultures are not

static, in the process of fundamental changes in the political, economic, social and cultural life of individuals, reorientation and adaptation to new conditions of life occurs, including transformation of national identity (*ibid.*, p. 172).

In the spectrum of research in Ukraine, a special place is given to the specifics of identification processes, since at the current stage the struggle for Ukrainian civilizational identity continues, the role and formation of its components (ethnic, religious, national, civic and Euro-identity) in the European integration progress is activated. In the process of mastering a language, a person acquires a thorough knowledge of the

world, creating discursive practices, which leads to the formation of their cultural self-consciousness, as well as national and cultural identity.

The multidimensional nature of these processes poses a significant problem of comprehension of the phenomenon of *linguoculture*. The paradigm shift in science, due to transformations and modern challenges in a globalized world, demonstrates the development and formation of new approaches to language research, strengthening interdisciplinary ties, and identifying new trends. Scientific research on the study of the phenomenon of *linguoculture* produces new theoretical and applied directions.

PHILOSOPHICAL COMPREHENSION OF THE CONCEPT OF *LINGUOCULTURE*

The principle of anthropocentrism in linguocultural studies is based on the concepts of language, culture and human consciousness; its prerequisites were laid in the nineteenth and late twentieth centuries by W. von Humboldt (the Humboldtian way through the languages of mankind). The concepts of the such American scientists as F. Boas, E. Sapir, B. Whorf, and others are based on the development of the “language – thinking – ethnos” triad. The hypothesis of linguistic relativity by E. Sapir and B. Whorf is associated with the study of the linguistic picture of the world, the inseparability of language from cognitive processes. These ideas about language as a historical form of the national spirit were continued in the works of our compatriot O. Potebnia.

M. Heidegger, one of the most influential German philosophers of the twentieth century, noted that the essence of man lies in living in the world. Semantic relations in any world are reflected in language: “Being lives in the house of language, most likely, language is the house of Being. In its home man dwells. It is this primary form of relation to the world that characterizes man as man” (Heidegger 1949: 24).

In modern scientific discourse, linguoculturological research is carried out within the synergetic paradigm, including the cognitive-discursive one, which assumes the principle of anthropocentrism and is based on the study of a person as a subject of cognition, that is, the existence of a person in language and language in a person. In this sense,

linguoculturology studies language as a cultural phenomenon and as discursive practices (religions, ideologies, so-

cial practices, cultural traditions, styles, and values) created by carriers of a certain culture.

CONCEPTUAL DEMARCATION OF CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE

Continuous historical movement is closely related to ethnic groups, culture, science, and religion, so human relations in society are the subject of history. The study of internal and external aspects of life of society became the object of the conception of the English philosopher Arnold Toynbee, who tried to rethink the historical development of society through the prism of the theory of the cycle of local civilizations passing through cyclical stages – origin, rise, decline, and fall of civilization (Toynbee 1995). The philosopher attempted to explain the peculiarities of the development of all cultures of mankind at the same time, applying the concept of “civilization” to the specifics of the development of peoples and cultures in different regions and countries. As a result, the world history looked like a mosaic panel made up of the multilinear development of sovereign cultures which are located side by side and coexist. However, in his “Study of History”, A. Toynbee proved that despite all the differences and dissimilarities of the cultures of different peoples, they all belong to a single civilization and in their development sooner or later go through identical stages, which are characterized by the same ideas; although they have essential features, their essence is the same (see Rafalskyi 2018: 41). According to A. Toynbee, spiritual factors of personal-

ity and self-determination play a decisive role in the progressive development of civilizations, during which an original culture is born, and the unique experience of each civilization is unrepeatable.

The concept of a high “community of culture” was set forth by Oswald Spengler in his resonant work “The Decline of the West”, in which he substantiated the conceptual postulates of an equivalent cyclical development of cultures. In his opinion, each culture is a “living organism with its own history”, and the existence of universal culture is only a “lulling chimera”, because world history is nothing more than a mechanical set of autonomous historical processes of individual cultures closed in their development. According to O. Spengler, each culture has its own destiny (“has its own life cross to bear”) and has been functioning for about 1000–1500 years. Dying in the sense of spirit, vitality, intentionality, heuristics, and creativity, it leaves a corpse in the form of formalized regulations and functional automatisms. This quasi-living, mummified phase is, in fact, civilization (ibid., pp. 13–14). Thus, according to O. Spengler, civilization is the completion of culture. There is a loss of the “soul of culture” by the people, the “massification” of all spheres of life, their mummification and mortification (ibid., pp. 40–41). Culture is an image of a person’s soul, it is based on a world-

view. Culture is functionally spontaneous; it represents a certain choice, self-determination. If culture, according to Spengler, is created by the soul, then civilization is created by reason, for a very specific applied purpose (ibid., p. 73). O. Spengler absolutized the distinction between civilization and culture, defining civilization as “a natural stage in the development of culture at the stage of its extinction, exhaustion of vital resources...” and proved that “civilization is the end of culture” (ibid.). This degenerative phase of genesis is characterized by a high level of science and technology, which is achieved through degradation of morality and art. There is a latent disintegration of the “soul of culture”, the massification of all spheres of life, when quality gives way to quantity, and content to form (ibid.).

Such conceptual provisions of A. Toynbee and O. Spengler may become the basis for the analysis of cultural and

civilizational interaction, but at the same time, given their socio-historical paradigm, a dialogue between them is impossible (ibid., p. 84). In this sense, taking into account the conceptual demarcation of culture and civilization as substantive and essential aspects of *linguo-culture*, civilization is considered as general and external, and culture – as specific and internal:

- (1) culture is the inner property of a person, which reveals their peculiarity, uniqueness and originality; civilization is a world external to a person, it is a sphere of unification and standardization;
- (2) culture presupposes the presence of outlook idealism and religious worldview in one form or another, in the absence of which any spirituality as a driving force of culture is impossible; civilization is generally non-religious (or at least indifferent to religion);
- (3) culture is closely related to racial and national specifics of human groups, and unifying and global factors prevail at the level of civilization (ibid.).

CIVILIZATIONAL IDENTITY

The concept of “civilization” according to A. Toynbee or “high culture” according to O. Spengler is referred to by the authors of the monograph “Civilizational Identity of Ukrainians”, compiled by the team of Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Rafalskyi, 2022). The key concept of this study is civilizational identity: “a complex, multifaceted and multi-level structure that includes three components: mentality, locality and globality. Mentality is based on the value and semantic

uniqueness of civilization, locality is based on the ability of a community to represent world culture in its context by its own means (ethnic, social, religious, artistic and aesthetic), and globality indicates the contribution of local civilization to the general culture and their interaction” (Rafalskyi 2022: 464). At the same time, civilizational identity synthesizes the achievements of basic collective identities: ethnic, national, social, civic, cultural, religious, as well as regional and local, which are transformed under the influence of civiliza-

tional values (ibid). Civilizational identity points to:

affiliation of an individual, ethnic group or state with a particular civilization... that is, a community of specific geographical areas that act as carriers of religions, ideologies, social practices, cultural traditions, styles and values created by them, which together constitute a special image of humanity and claim worldwide significance. In the system of these civilizations, there are regional and

local civilizations, including the Ukrainian one (ibid).

The civilizational identity of Ukrainians is understood as “a set of symbols, ideas and feelings of a person (people) regarding their belonging to the Ukrainian cultural and civilizational community, which is based on universal and national values within the European civilizational space and interacts with other civilizations” (ibid).

CONCEPTUAL PICTURE OF THE WORLD / LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD FROM A LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

The term “picture of the world” was introduced into linguistic use by Leo Weisgerber. Clarification of the peculiarities of assimilation and processing of information reflected in the conceptual picture of the world with the help of linguistic signs shows that language not only represents the concepts of the culture of the people, but also influences the formation of national concepts as units of the conceptual sphere that are verbalized and objectified in the lingual system. The conceptual sphere of the national language informs about the culture of the nation, its moral and ethical traditions, the attitude towards other peoples, material and spiritual values, etc. (Slukhai 2011: 192).

Among the various classifications of pictures of the world, we will focus attention and highlight the real, cultural (conceptual), linguistic picture of the world. “The real picture of the world is an objective reality, the world that surrounds a person. The cultural one is a reflection of the real picture through the

prism of concepts formed on the basis of human knowledge, which were received by the senses and passed through consciousness (collective and individual). The linguistic picture of the world is a reflection of reality through the cultural picture of the world” (ibid., pp. 18–19).

According to the means of reflecting the world, a distinction is made between the cognitive and linguistic picture of the world. The means of reflection of the cognitive picture of the world are concepts, while linguistic signs which are produced by thinking and language reflect the linguistic picture of the world. The picture of the world is characterized by the following semantic features: it explicates the features of human subjectivity; it reflects the main features of a person’s worldview; it is cosmological and anthropomorphic at the same time; it directs a person’s actions, although it may not be conscious; it is absolutely certain for its subject; it constitutes the unity of statics and dynamics, stability and instability, the finite and the infinite.

It is also characterized by the following formal features: it is a broad-spectrum regulation; it always has lacunae; it is plastic, mobile, multivariant; it is limited in its complexity and detail; it is visual and figurative; it is systemic in nature; it is particular and holistic (Ibid., p. 20).

The dialectics of interdependence between the linguistic picture of the world and the conceptual picture of the world points to the following peculiarities: the language would not play the role of the most important means of communication if it were not connected with the conceptual picture of the world. After all, the communicative function of the language is based on the definition and expression of certain conceptual semantic values, the verbalization of conceptual meanings (ibid., p. 26). "The study of the linguistic picture of the world provides the identification of the features not only of the language system, but also of the specifics of the perception of the world by the corresponding ethnic group, that is, the specifics of the national conceptual picture of the world" (ibid., p. 31).

The concepts of mentality and national character are semiotic regulators of the communication process of representatives of different linguistic cultures, in particular national communicative behavior, and are considered through the prism of cognitive semiotics (Korolyov 2020: 354). National communicative behavior reflects the centuries-old traditions of a certain ethnic group, as well as etiquette and ritual norms due to knowledge and stereotypical representations of the cognitive base:

The observance of traditions and etiquette and ritual norms in national communicative behavior causes the formation of national values of communication participants as representatives of a certain linguaculture, reflecting the cognitive-semiotic specificity of the mentality and national character of the individual people. These provisions make it possible to clarify the definition of the concept of national communicative behavior as adherence to a set of traditions and norms in the communication of representatives of a specific linguaculture, who have common national-value orientations in achieving the goal of communication (ibid, p. 362).

The conceptual picture of the world is "a set of meanings, knowledge, and ideas about the world, organized into a certain conceptual system. The substrates of the conceptual picture of the world are concepts, representations, certain action schemes, behavior scenarios, that is, mental entities that are not always associated with the verbal code" (Slukhai 2011: 36–37).

Each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and organizing (i.e., conceptualizing) the world. The meanings expressed in its units form a single system of views, the so-called collective philosophy, which is imposed as mandatory on all native speakers. Thus, the conceptual picture of the world is objectified in language, so one also speaks of a linguistic picture of the world – a set of ideas about the world, a certain way of linguistic conceptualization of reality historically formed in the everyday consciousness of the relevant language group and objectified in lan-

guage. The elements of the linguistic picture of the world are words, formatives, means of grammatical communication, as well as syntactic constructions (ibid). As a product of historical development, the linguistic picture of the world correlates with the conceptual picture of the world, but is not identified with it.

The results of a global cross-linguistic study led by Asifa Majid, Professor of Language, Communication, and Cultural Cognition at the Department of Psychology, University of York, of the way of perceiving the world (visual, acoustic, gustatory, tactile or olfactory) indicate that perception and linguistic description in different languages of the world are fundamentally different. Differentiation lies in which sensory domains are encoded linguistically and in what way this happens in language. The researchers attribute the trend towards better coding in some languages in part to cultural peculiarities. Indeed, some societies are more focused on smells or sounds. For example, the Jahai language, spoken by the hunter-gatherer community in the Malay Peninsula, has shown the same rich vocabulary for describing smells as English has for colors. At the same time, speakers of Lao or Persian were more accurate at distinguishing tastes and described the bittersweet water with a single word, “tokh”, while English-speaking recipients responded to this stimulus in a more complex way, characterizing water with

a number of concepts, since their language lacked words to describe this name. Speakers of the endangered Umpila language found it easier to describe smells, and they have a serious advantage over English. Cultural factors in the differential coding of perception are art and architecture: bearers of communities engaged in the production of decorative ceramics were better at describing shapes, and members of communities with developed musical traditions were better at distinguishing sounds, even if they were not musicians themselves (Majid 2018: 11369–11376). Therefore, a number of substrates of the conceptual picture of the world of speakers of different languages can be supplemented by such sensory domains as gustatory, tactile or olfactory.

Thus, the linguistic and conceptual pictures of the world are two separate phenomena that stand out within the framework of the general construct “picture of the world”:

The linguistic picture of the world serves for designating the main elements of the conceptual picture of the world. At the same time, close relationship between them makes it possible to unite them in a linguistic-conceptual picture of the world, which, like the linguistic picture of the world and the conceptual picture of the world integrated by it, is national, that is, one that is able to express the conception of the world and worldview of the people, its bearer, by means of a certain language (Slukhai 2011: 36).

DEFINITION AND TYPOLOGY OF THE CONCEPT OF *LINGUOCULTURE*

Thematization of the essence of the concept of *linguoculture* in modern sci-

ence, which is based on general scientific (anthropological, ontological, civili-

zational and cultural-historical) and purely linguistic (cognitive-pragmatic and linguo-cultural) approaches, allows us to make an attempt to define the concept of *linguoculture* and characterize the types of linguocultures.

DEFINITION. *Linguoculture* is an “externalized” in verbal and non-verbal codes conceptual picture of the world of a particular community as a carrier of discursive practices (religions, ideologies, social practices, cultural traditions, styles and values) created by it, which together constitute a specific image of humanity.

TYPOLOGIZATION. The hierarchical model represents a system of complementary types of linguoculture:

- regional (civilizational) linguoculture (states within recognized borders);
- national (civilizational) linguoculture (ethnos);
- local (civilizational) linguoculture (within the state: language areas, minority peoples and ethnic groups, according to the territorial-administrative division within one state); borderline (diaspora) in correlation / identification of oneself with the national / local;
- linguoculture of ethos.

Ethos (from Ancient Greek *ἔθoς* – place of stay, common dwelling), later – habit, custom, place of residence of a person, disposition, character, way of thinking. Gradually, the figurative meaning of the

word is established, so that it begins to refer to such changes in man (influenced by customs, traditions, and appropriate behavior) which become a practical norm and an internal law, forming a specific human nature, as stable and inevitable as natural laws... M. Heidegger returns to the original meaning of *ethos* as a place of human residence, their ontological world. In philosophical hermeneutics, the question of “metanorms” necessarily includes the “living ethos” – traditions, customs, established moral codes, and appropriate behavior. In sociology and social psychology, the concept of *ethos* is also used to delineate the most stable part of social behavior, which is conditioned by the most functionally important norms and values (Filosofskyi 2002: 210).

In our study, the *linguoculture of ethos* is understood as discursive practices (religion, ideology, social practices, cultural traditions, styles, and values) of the relevant linguocultural community (e.g., social groups (LGBT, age, gender, profession, etc.)) explicated in the language at the appropriate locus and tempus.

Each language is based on its own special picture of the world, and each language has its own specific way of conceptualizing the world, so the relevant linguocultural community has its own *linguocultural picture of the world*. Linguocultural concepts are the units of modeling the linguocultural picture of the world; their study is based on the immanent analysis of the linguistic and conceptual picture of the world.

CONCLUSIONS

The *linguocultural* landscape of the world is constantly affected by internal and external transformations. These

changes in today’s globalized society lead to a change in the scientific paradigm. The development of a clear the-

ory and methodology in research activities contributes to the qualitative achievement of the set goals and objectives. In perspective, standardization of the terminological system of the concept of *linguoculture* in the conceptual apparatus of modern linguistics by formulating its definition and typologization will allow to expand the possibilities of linguistic research in the field of *linguocultural* studies, in particular their practical and applied functionality. Transition to a fundamentally new level of scientific comprehension of the concept of *linguoculture*, based on the symbiosis of the content and structural components of

this scientific direction, will expand the potential of its scientific productivity. Active formation of the theoretical and methodological plane of the concept of *linguoculture* in modern scientific discourse testifies to the correlation between requests and responses to modern globalization challenges: political and economic transformations, migration crises, and military conflicts. In Ukraine, the development of the *linguocultural* direction is determined by the specifics of identification processes, the formation of which is caused by the struggle for the civilizational identity of Ukraine.

References

- Heidegger Martin. 1949. *Über den Humanismus*. Frankfurt am Main : Vittorio Klostermann.
- Darginavičienė Irena. 2023. The Multilingualism: Language and Cultural Identity, *Logos-Vilnius* 116: 167–174. Available: <https://doi.org/10.24101/Logos.2023.61> (Visited on October 20, 2023).
- Filosofskiy entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk. 2002. [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary], Київ : Абрис.
- Korolyov Igor, Domylivska Liudmyla. 2020. Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior, *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 9(1): 354–364. Available: <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i1.2355> (Visited on October 20, 2023).
- Majid Asifa (eds.). 2018. Differential coding of perception in the world's languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(45): 11369–11376. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1720419115> (Visited on October 20, 2023).
- Matuzkova Olena – Матузкова Олена. 2022. *Лінгвокультура та переклад : монографія*. [Linguoculture and Translation]. Одеса : Видавець Букаєв Вадим Вікторович.
- Rafalskyi Oleh, Samchuk Zoreslav – Рафальський Олег, Самчук Зореслав. 2018. *Цивілізаційні перехрестя сучасного суспільства* [Civilizational Crossroads of Modern Society]. Київ : ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України.
- Rafalskyi Oleh (eds.). 2022. *Цивілізаційна ідентичність українства: історія і сучасність* [Civilization Identity of Ukraine: History and Modernity]. Київ: ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України.
- Slukhai Nataliia, Snytko Olena, Vilchynska Tetiana – Слухай Наталія, Снитко Олена, Вільчинська Тетяна. 2011. *Когнітологія та концептологія в лінгвістичному висвітленні : навч. посіб.* [Cognitology and Conceptual Studies in Linguistic Aspect: Textbook]. Київ: Видавничо-поліграфічний центр «Київський університет».
- Тоунбее Арнолд – Тойнбі Арнольд. 1995. *Дослідження історії* [A Study of History]. Київ: Основи, Т. 2.
- Zahnitko Anatolij – Загнітко Анатолій. 2012. *Словник сучасної лінгвістики : поняття і терміни*. [Dictionary of Modern Linguistics: Concepts and Terms]. Донецьк : ДонНУ, Т. 2.