

IRSTI 16.01.11

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp83-94](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp83-94)

B. Nygmetova¹, Sh. Adilova², Zh. Ospanova³, Zh. Ospanova¹

¹Margulan University, Pavlodar, 140000, Kazakhstan

²Tashkent State Technical University named after Islam Karimov, Tashkent, 100095, Uzbekistan

³Astana IT University, Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

ON THE ROLE OF THE LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD IN THE ETHNO-LINGUISTIC CONCEPTUALIZATION OF REALITY

This article attempts to concretize the concept of “picture of the world” within the framework of cognitive linguistics, giving it an additional characteristic – “linguistic”. By the language structure, the authors understand the specific syntactic or morphological features of a particular language, thereby asserting the information contained in them, the specifics of both national mentality and national character, which are the most important components of the entire national culture. The authors analyze using the method of cognitive-oriented and conceptual description of language from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, while highlighting verbal ways of representing the processes of perception of the world, reflecting the signs of a picture of the world, rethinking reality, as well as the actualization of already known concepts.

In the comparative aspect, examples are given on the material of unrelated languages (German, Kazakh, Uzbek and Russian), as a result of the analysis, national-specific features of vision, modeling and contemplation of the world, including conceptualization and further representation, are revealed, which indicates the national imagery of perception of the surrounding reality. As a result of the analysis, conclusions are drawn that the basis of conceptual universals are different prototypes from each other, which is explained by the following: representatives of different cultures attribute certain national-specific characteristics to the concept. The results of the study confirm the idea that the formation of a linguistic picture of the world as a derivative of the national mentality is influenced by certain cognitive dominants.

Key words: language picture of the world, concept, national world dimension, cognitive linguistic, conceptualization, prototype.

MAIN PROVISIONS

The current state of linguistics is characterized by the development of various directions related to the desire of scholars to study language in its specific realization [1], [2]. The shift in focus toward a communicative approach to language as a means of communication is associated with the need to consider both knowledge of the language and its application – whether active or passive.

The concept of the “picture of the world” is actively applied in various scientific fields, yet it does not always receive a clear and unambiguous interpretation, even among representatives of the same discipline. This concept is considered within the framework of cognitive linguistics, highlighting the characteristic of “linguistic”. For the purpose of this article, the abbreviations “PW” (Picture of the World) and “LPW” (Linguistic Picture of the World) will be used.

Behind the diversity of cultures lies a universal set of basic concepts, i.e., all that goes beyond the universal conceptual basis and constitutes the idioethnic way of perceiving and understanding the world. If the linguistic structure is understood as the specific syntactic-morphological features of a particular language, then it concerns the information contained within them about the specifics of national mentality and national character – all of which, together, form national culture. The verbal reflection of objective conditions and images of the real world is based on national-specific, or idioethnic, features of categorization, conceptualization, and rethinking of existing realities, which directly influence both PW and LPW.

INTRODUCTION

According to the ideas of Humboldtianism, and later, modern European Neo-Humboldtianism, ethnolinguistics, and hermeneutics, the understanding of language and its nature is based on the study of different perspectives, interpretations, and comparisons of language through the prism of distinct worldviews.

Each worldview, as a fragment of the surrounding reality, typically represents language as a phenomenon, defining specific principles of its functioning. For example, linguistic activity is considered in the context of human life and work. Scholars' interest in the Linguistic Picture of the World (LPW) is driven by various factors that emphasize the idioethnic component in the methods of representing and verbalizing the surrounding reality in a particular language, confirming the relevance of this publication's topic. The object of research is the processes of ethnolinguistic conceptualization of reality, while the subject includes linguistic representations, including lexical, grammatical, and phraseological components.

The aim of the article is to highlight the ethnocultural component in the process of conceptualizing reality and its linguistic interpretation as a reflection of the idioethnic aspect of the LPW. It is evident that in any case, the Picture of the World (PW) in relation to linguistics should represent a certain systematization of the content plan of the language, as all knowledge and ideas of a given people about the world are recorded and preserved in the national language, especially in the lexical and phraseological composition of the language.

In scientific literature, the concept of "Picture of the World" has various interpretations and definitions. For example, V.I. Postovalova considers PW from an anthropological perspective as a holistic set of images existing in the world, created by a particular collective (ethnolinguistic) consciousness. These images can represent oppositions of categories such as "being-consciousness", "activity-knowledge", "personal consciousness-social consciousness", and so on. PW, as the foundation of knowledge, serves as a tool for the successful integration of people in society, helping them understand each other and interact with other ethnic groups, thereby promoting uniform unification and organization of certain elements of human activity. All of this leads to unity in understanding the world [3, 87-91].

V.I. Postovalova further provides a series of reflections on LPW as a linguistic image of the surrounding reality, indicating that, like PW, it possesses an anthropocentric image of the world, whose features are highlighted by a particular linguistic consciousness. Moreover, LPW facilitates orientation in the world, the formation of stereotypical behavior, and various forms of communication, thereby regulating human activity [3, 180].

The well-known linguoculturologist V.I. Karasik, defining PW as a conceptual category of linguoculturology, describes it as a complex system of images formed in a certain collective consciousness or in individual understanding (in the case of authorial models of the world). The system of images, verbalized based on their semantics and representing the centuries-old experience of an ethnic group, is referred to by the author as the "Linguistic Picture of the World", which is part of the Mental Picture of the World. In LPW, which contains collective representations, objective-subjective moments of reality reflection, the scholar highlights value and emotive (humorous) aspects. Being part of LPW, the value picture of the world expresses ethnocultural specificity, modeled in the form of interrelated evaluative judgments within the frameworks of moral, legal, and religious codes, as well as in the form of commonly accepted opinions and typical folklore-literary plots. The study of LPW is accompanied by the identification of matching, partially matching, and non-matching concepts within a particular linguoculture, which is associated with uneven processes of conceptualizing certain fragments of the surrounding ethnic world (depending on the place of residence, lifestyle, and interest of the ethnic group) and with specific combinations of associative features of concepts highlighted by the ethnic group [4].

Hence, linguistic reflection of the worldview has an idioethnic coloring, as each linguoculture, along with universal characteristics, also has its unique structure. Linguistic signs possess varying

degrees of semiotic depth according to the cultural-historical background, as evidenced by recent works in domestic publications [5], [6], [7].

Metaphorically, LPW is similar to a human portrait: some people have very large eyes with a deep penetrating gaze, others have thick eyebrows or small lips, which adds individuality. At the same time, the perception of a person and their face occurs holistically; not only specific features are remembered. The same is observed in LPW, and therefore, to distinguish between the concepts of “specific” and “nonspecific” in language semantics, it is necessary to include all linguistic content.

Based on the idea that the basic concepts of one ethnic group’s worldview model may differ or be absent in another, it is necessary to determine the degree of mutual penetration of languages and cultures. In all the world’s languages, the lexicalization of basic concepts and categories takes place, while culturally specific ones are fixed separately in each language, which allows us to assert the differences between linguistic and cultural systems.

At the same time, lexical-semantic universals are also noted, having a common foundation on which human language, thought, and culture are based. There is a need to define a universal set of concepts based on psychological unity of all humanity [8, 321-322], as different cultures apply different concepts, leading to entirely unique mentalities.

We are inclined to agree with N.F. Alefirenko’s statement that LPW is the reproduction or “depiction” of the world through linguistic means, which helps create a visual representation of the phenomena and objects of the real world. LPW represents a system of naïve knowledge about the surrounding world, verbalized at the lexical, phraseological, and grammatical levels of the linguistic system in view of ethnolinguistic conceptualization of reality. It is at this stage that the reflection of the unity and diversity of the world takes place, with the identification of its elements, states, positions, and interrelationships [9]. This assertion is confirmed by the analysis conducted further in the subsection “Results”.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The conducted research relies on methods of cognitive-oriented and conceptual description of language according to the principles of cognitive linguistics, with an emphasis on identifying the verbal representation of processes involved in the perception of the surrounding world, which reflect the characteristics of the picture of the world, as well as focusing on the determination of the peculiarities of reinterpreting objective reality and actualizing previously known concepts. Based on V.I. Karasik’s methodology for describing cultural concepts, we assume that when studying the Linguistic Picture of the World (LPW), one should take into account such features as the presence of names (titles) of concepts; the uneven nature of conceptualization depending on the significance/non-significance for a particular ethnic group; various associative features concerning a specific phenomenon and subsequently the concept [4, 226].

Conceptual description of language involves referring to the prototypical approach, the origins of which trace back to the teachings of E. Rosch and H. Putnam. The prototype is viewed as an integral part of the national image of the surrounding reality [4, 225] and as a categorical concept that contains representations of a typical category and highlights something typical based on life experience [2, 140-145]. In addition, the interpretative method proposed by A. Wierzbicka [8] is used in the analysis, which involves explaining a particular phenomenon in the language through the lens of national-cultural differences in the conceptualization of the world. This also facilitates the use of semantic differentiation method, where a specific set of characteristics properties describing representations of an ethnic type is compiled.

The analysis is conducted on examples drawn from lexicographic sources of the German, Kazakh, and Russian languages: Goetz 1997 [10], Wahrig 2011 [11], Ozhegov’s Explanatory Dictionary (online version), the Kazakh Language Explanatory Dictionary [12], and Uzbek language (www.izoh.uz). The choice of these languages is determined by the scientific interests of the authors of this article. Kazakhstan is a unique country where, alongside the official language - Kazakh - other languages are also in use. The second most widely spoken language among the population is

Russian. The state language is used for official work and administrative affairs in government bodies, organizations, and local self-government authorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Along with Kazakh, Russian is officially used as well. Often, we can observe **code-mixing** among speakers of Kazakh and Russian.

The popularization of the German language in Kazakhstan and in Uzbekistan is an important and relevant process driven by a number of interconnected factors. Clearly, knowledge of German significantly facilitates business communication and strengthens partnerships between companies and entrepreneurs from these countries. The promotion of German along with English in Kazakhstan's and Uzbekistan's education system can open additional opportunities and contribute to a broader cultural exchange.

It is worth noting that Kazakh and Uzbek languages belong to the Turkic language group, Russian to the East Slavic group, and German to the Germanic group. Thus, our research is supported by an analysis of four unrelated languages, making the comparative analysis more compelling. Being limited within the framework of one article, the authors decided to limit the results based on these different languages.

RESULTS

In linguistic pictures of the world, grammatical and lexical specificity can be distinguished, with the former relating to significant grammatical categories and relying on the latter, which also includes precedent texts and the phraseological fund of the language [4, 227]. This is explained by the socio-historical events in the life of the ethnic group, which influence the unique approach to fixing a fragment of the world and its selective linguistic representation, reflected in the socio-historical consciousness and behavior of the speakers of the linguistic culture, as well as in the specifics of the national worldview.

To begin with, to consider how this specificity is reflected outside the lexical space in language facts, let us turn to examples from morphology, namely to the category of grammatical gender, which is present or entirely absent in languages. It is noted that in languages containing the category of gender, there is a low degree of semantic motivation for gender correlation despite the fact that this motivation initially existed, the reasons for which cannot be determined within the framework of this article. The unique way of perceiving the world and national imagery influenced the attribution of masculine or feminine gender to objects and phenomena during the formation of languages; later, everything was constructed by analogy.

It is quite clear that the following coincidence is not accidental: in the German language, the names of all seasons are of masculine gender: *der Winter*, *der Frühling*, *der Sommer*, *der Herbst*, while in Russian, *zima* (winter), *vesna* (spring), *osen'* (autumn) are feminine gender words, and *leto* (summer) is a neuter gender word, while in Kazakh and in Uzbek, there is no category of gender: *kys/qish* (winter), *koktem/ bahor* (spring), *zhaz/ yoz* (summer), *kuz/ kuz* (autumn). In view of this feature in the Turkic languages, we will further provide examples in German and Russian more clearly demonstrate the idioethnic features of worldview. For instance, the following words are of masculine grammatical gender: *der Wind* (wind), *der Orkan* (hurricane), *der Schneefall* (snowfall), *der Regen* (rain), *der Hagel* (hail), *der Schauer* (shower). However, it is worth noting the gender mismatches in different languages for the same concepts: *pogoda* (weather - feminine) - *das Wetter* (weather - neuter), *nebo* (sky - neuter) - *der Himmel* (sky - masculine), *klimat* (climate - masculine) - *das Klima* (climate - neuter), *groza* (thunderstorm - feminine) - *das Gewitter* (thunderstorm - neuter), *oblako* (cloud - neuter) - *die Wolke* (cloud - feminine) [10], [11].

Perhaps, for those learning a foreign language with the gender category, this fact somewhat complicates the learning process. However, for native speakers of a language with this category, gender is not something inexplicable or meaningless; it represents an invaluable spiritual heritage reflecting the unique specificity of thinking, an essential part of the entire figurative structure of the language. It is a source of national-specific and cultural realities familiar and understandable for one people, which, however, may only cause bewilderment among speakers of another linguistic culture

or linguistic consciousness. For example, in Russian consciousness, expressions like “*Matyushka zima*” (*Mother Winter*) and “*Moroz krasny nos*” (*Frost with red nose*) are quite common. These images are mostly symmetrical in gender correlation, and when this correlation is broken, their naturalness and compatibility are lost. If we translate these expressions into German: *Mutterwinter* (*die Mutter* (feminine), *der Winter* (masculine)), *Frost Roter Nase* (*der Frost* (masculine), *die rote Nase* (feminine)), we find that along with the gender agreement, the naturalness of these expressions, which are so familiar and understandable to a Russian native speaker from early childhood, is lost. For instance, in poetry, authors most often rely on LPW of their native language because they know it better than another language they might speak. If we turn to the features of color designation in the language, for example, in Kazakh, the lexeme “*kok*” (“*blue*”) is a homonym and has such a word-formation potential that, upon detailed study, around three hundred derived words are observed in five semantic fields.

Let us consider the agglutinative method of forming new words in the Kazakh language by grammatically changing the form of the word by adding morpheme-affixes to the base, which is quite natural for Kazakhs: *ana* (mother) → *ana+m* (my mother) → *ana+m+a* (to my mother) or *ana* → *ana+lar* (mothers) → *ana+lar+ym* (my mothers) → *ana+lar+ym+yz* (our mothers) → *ana+lar+ym+yz+da* (in our mothers) → *ana+lar+ym+yz+da+gi* (who is in our mothers) and so on [12]. However, for those studying Kazakh as a foreign language, this may cause difficulties at the initial stage, or, on the contrary, seem like a very universal method of word formation, excluding interference from the native language. The same is in Uzbek language, but it is different in Russian and in German (see the Table 1.).

Table 1 - Comparative analysis of the method of education using the example of the lexeme "mother"

Meaning	Kazakh	Uzbek	Russian	German
mother	ана	она	мать	Mutter
my mother	анам	онам	моя мать	meine Mutter
our mothers	аналарымыз	оналаримиз	наши матери	unsere Mütter
at our mothers'	аналарымызда	оналаримизда	у наших матерей	bei unseren Müttern
maternal	анамның	онамнинг	материнский	mütterlich

The examples presented allow us to note different types of languages (agglutinative – Kazakh and Uzbek, and inflectional – Russian and German) and ways of expressing grammatical meanings. Similarly to the Kazakh language, Uzbek uses a chain of affixes attached to the base, while the order of affixes is strictly regulated by grammar. When learning a language, this makes it easier to remember and understand, since the system is predictable and logical, despite the fact that it causes difficulties at the initial stage (pronunciation features, the order of affixes and sound changes - vowel harmony). At the same time, the lack of inflection characteristic of Indo-European languages can be perceived by students as an advantage: in Uzbek and Kazakh there is no case declension through changing the ending of the root, and all grammatical meanings are expressed by external elements (affixes) that do not change the base.

A characteristic trend in the German language is the method of compounding. We are talking about compounds (Kompositum) - these are complex words formed by combining several bases based on lexical-semantic variations, morphological and semantic-syntactic principles, for example: *Zimmerpflanze* (*Zimmer+Pflanze* - room plant), *dunkelrot* (*dunkel+rot* - dark red), *stillstehen* (*still+stehen* - stand still), *Graukopf* (*grau+Kopf* - gray head), *Arbeitsfähigkeitsbescheinigung* (*Arbeit+s+Fähigkeit+s+Bescheinigung* - certificate of work ability), *Sommerschlussverkauf* (*Sommer+Schluss+Verkauf* - summer sale), which the Germans explain by their tendency towards language economy and reducing the gaps between words. Sometimes such words contain more than 50-60 characters

Grundstück | *s* | *verkehr* | *s* | *genehmigung* | *s* | *zuständigkeit* | *s* | *übertragung* | *s* | *verordnung* (67 characters, 6 word bases) [10], [11].

On one hand, the importance of such sections of the language as syntax, morphology, and phonetics, which serve as a source of information about the idioethnic way of thinking and contain enough material for necessary observations and research, is undeniable; on the other hand, under LPW, the lexical-phraseological system of the language is understood, beyond which all other sections are consciously excluded. Here we come close to the concept of a “prototypical world”, representing a set of prototypes of material world objects. This is possible thanks to our ability to form a prototype – a concrete or abstract mental image of objects of a certain category; a tool that allows us to cope with the infinite number of stimuli from the surrounding world.

When switching to a foreign language, one has to rely on the knowledge of a huge mass of realities related to the whole context of life in a particular cultural and informational environment. Knowledge of these realities is also called a **cognitive base**, which, in turn, is always reflected in his/her national language. Knowledge of any national language by a representative of another culture at an elementary level, not supplemented by the possession of the cognitive base of this people, often leads to communicative problems, when a foreigner does not understand the meaning of phrases composed even of words known to him, or understands them superficially, not realising the true meaning included in the connotations of native speakers of a given language. As practice shows, a person masters a foreign language at the level of an instrument of communication, but not at the level of “the house of being of the people's spirit”.

It follows from the above that it is possible to consider a national language as a national LPW only taking into account the cultural-philosophical approach to language as a ‘house of being of the spirit’ of a given nation. “*The perfection of the world is always adequate to the perfection of the spirit contemplating it*”, wrote G. Heine. It follows that the brighter and more diverse, more original the world captured in the language, the more perfect is the spiritual-collective ethnic linguistic consciousness contemplating it. From the cultural-philosophical point of view, we have tried to present language not as a sign system and an instrument of communication and recognition, but as a “house of the spirit” of the people, which reflects the national character, national worldview in a broad sense, and specific facts of history and culture of the people.

DISCUSSION

Conceptual universals can have entirely different prototypes, meaning that in each language, a corresponding national-specific image of this concept aligns with the universal concept, which may be unknown to speakers of another language. Representatives of different languages and cultures may seemingly speak about the same thing, but they may mentally picture entirely different objects.

For instance, A. Wierzbicka provides examples showing that although there are seas, oceans, mountains, and forests in the world, each ethnic group has different experiences: some are more familiar with the sea and its characteristics, while others have more experience with snow or mountains. Even soil is not uniformly brown everywhere: it can be red, yellow, or black, and, correspondingly, the greenery of grass may depend on various factors such as moisture content, the amount of sunlight it receives, or its location - whether in open air, in the shade, in dense thickets, or in the desert [8].

In Kazakhstan, nature differs regionally: in the western part of the country, sandy-shell soil prevails, which is connected to ancient climatic changes and tectonic shifts; in the northern part, there are forested areas and vast steppes, while in the south, there are mountain peaks. Depending on this, the perception and conceptualization of the surrounding reality by the inhabitants of our country can differ not only culturally but also regionally, which is also reflected in the language. For example, in Kazakh folklore, poetry, and literature, the beauty of the steppe expanses is often described in detail. Most likely, the best way to become familiar with the national prototypes of conceptual universals, which are the foundation of the national worldview, is to immerse oneself in this environment to fully experience it and understand the concept correctly. The ethnically specific sphere of the national

Linguistic Picture of the World (LPW) is of the greatest interest to a researcher of a particular culture, as understanding the national LPW of another language through the lens of one's own linguistic consciousness is almost impossible or very difficult. In such an "immersion" into the sphere of another's LPW, everything unusual and incomprehensible is adjusted to the familiar forms of one's own national linguistic consciousness.

Anna Vezhbetskaya in her works, discussing the problem of the connection between language and national character, suggested identifying them from the national specific in the respective languages [8]. Thus, information about the national character can be obtained as a result of linguistic analysis. Probably, the choice of one approach or another is determined by the specific object of research, its goals. But the second approach seems more interesting to us because of the existing opportunity to gain new knowledge with greater objectivity.

For culturology, LPW is a necessary concept, as it reflects the national way of worldview, which forms and predetermines the national character. Without knowledge of the content of national consciousness it is difficult to comprehend what constitutes national culture, in particular: ethical, moral and value priorities, way of thinking, etc. Knowledge of the LPW of another language is the basis for any cultural studies. Without knowing the alphabet of a foreign language, we cannot read words and sentences - the same will happen if we immerse ourselves in the study of a foreign cultural context without knowledge of the specificity of the national worldview captured in the LPW of the respective language.

In any kind of intercultural contacts, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of national symbols. It is very closely related to the connotative zone of language, which contains information about associations caused in the collective consciousness by various objects of the surrounding world. If, for example, in any culture certain types of animals are symbols of strength, diligence, wisdom, submission, cowardice, meanness, etc., then in relation to linguistics, this means that the lexical meanings of words naming these animals include this information (specific to each language). This component of the meaning is called the connotative (associative) component of the meaning of the word. The connotative zone of any language presents difficulties for assimilation by representatives of other cultures. A person who is far from linguistics or ethnography may simply not realize its existence and limit himself to knowing only the basic meanings of words, or "manage" to introduce into a foreign language the familiar connotations of his native language, considering them universal or self-evident. The problem of cross-cultural misunderstandings in the process of communication between representatives of different cultures lies precisely in the actual lack of awareness of the great importance of this part of the LPW. For example, one can imagine the degree of misunderstanding and displeasure of a Russian-speaking person who hears a comparison with a rat from a native German speaker. But this misunderstanding will disappear immediately after the association of the name of this animal with an enthusiastically working man, typical for the German language, is explained. In Russian, the same idea is reflected as connotational elements of meaning in the names of other representatives of the animal world – bee, ant [13].

The famous philosopher Martin Heidegger is the author of the famous metaphor: "Language is the house of being." Modern philosophers have reinterpreted this definition: "Language is the house of the spirit," as it most vividly expresses the essence of the cultural and philosophical approach to language. Thus, language is understood as a sign, a system, a code, and a tool of communication and cognition, and a collective creation – the "house of being of the spirit of the people", which should reflect and preserve for future generations the national LPW. In the context of the cultural and philosophical approach, attention can be focused on the aesthetic significance of language. You can enjoy the language: its melody, rhythm, and the indescribability of certain meanings, which are primarily indicators of the language's identity.

Any national language can have functionality, expediency, etc., but also be a source of beauty, grace, and wisdom. In this sense, language can be compared with many other categories of the objective world, which over time have acquired many additional functions unrelated to the original ones. For example, clothing has long since failed to fulfill its main purpose – to keep warm, protect from the weather and cover nakedness. Concepts of fashion and style are emerging, which often have

more value for people than simple functionality. So, language is like fashion in clothes. Language is one of the “clothes” of his thoughts, feelings, and sensations that allow him to serve the widest range of thoughts and feelings.

Surely, everyone has noticed that their self-perception and behavior are somewhat dependent on how they are dressed at the moment. Changing casual clothes for a strict evening suit and shoes, a person involuntarily changes his behavior somewhat: gait, gestures, manner of speaking – all this is adjusted. That is, just as clothing changes fragments of a person's self-perception and behavior, so the national language changes the self-perception of its native speaker.

There is a search for equivalents in the native LPW, but as a rule, these equivalents are only apparent. From the above, we come to the following conclusions: a) the specificity of the verbal reflection of the world is determined by the differences in the objective realities of the world concerning a particular ethnic group; b) the specificity of the vocabulary is determined by the characteristics of the collective consciousness, which manifest in various ways of reinterpreting the same external realities and the processes of the emotional-evaluative, moral-value components of human consciousness; c) the naive picture of the world in everyday consciousness, where the object-oriented way of perception predominates, has an interpretative character, i.e., collective stereotypical and model representations are fixed in the language in a form accessible to the majority; d) each specific language represents a unique system, which in turn imprints on the consciousness of its speakers and shapes their picture of the world.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the analysis confirm the idea that the main function of the LPW is to fix in the national linguistic consciousness the idioethnic way of perceiving the world and to transmit it from generation to generation, leading us to the model “language - culture – society”. To understand and more accurately describe the role of LPW in the formation of national worldview, it is necessary not only to consider idiomatic and invariant linguistic manifestations and interpretations of reality but also to conduct interdisciplinary research, taking into account collective representations of the world, which are a fundamental part of the linguistic picture of the world.

In conclusion, the linguistic picture of the world is shaped by both grammatical and lexical features deeply rooted in the socio-historical and cultural influences of a particular language. The presence or absence of grammatical categories such as gender significantly affects the ways in which reality is conceptualised in different language communities. This is evident when comparing gender attributions in German, Russian and Kazakh languages, where different grammatical structures reflect unique national worldviews, giving a special flavour to the linguocultures considered in this paper. In addition, differences in word formation processes, such as the agglutinative nature of Kazakh and the tendency to complex word formation in German, emphasise different cognitive approaches to language structuring. These features not only affect communication, but also determine how speakers of different languages perceive and categorise their environment. Phraseological and lexical systems of languages serve as essential tools for preserving cultural heritage and national identity, making them an indispensable part of linguistic and cognitive research.

Ultimately, language serves as both a mirror and a basis for the worldview of its speakers, reflecting deep historical, social and cultural experiences. While structural differences in languages can pose challenges for language learners, they also provide valuable insights into the complex relationship between language, thought and cultural perception.

As a research perspective, it can be assumed that the importance of choosing methods for substantiating linguistic statements at the interdisciplinary level is crucial, which, in turn, determines the prospects for cognitive research in linguistic disciplines. One of the most promising areas of further research is a detailed study and description of the widest possible range of metaphorical models used to describe meteorological phenomena in various national discourses of the languages being compared and at different stages of social development, as well as the results of quantitative

analysis with the expansion of empirical data, which will serve as convincing evidence for further conclusions of the study.

REFERENCES

- 1 Nurgaliyeva, S., Zhumasheva, A., Yelikpaev, S., Kapassova, B., Nygmetova, B., Kairova, M. (2024). Challenges and Approaches to Audiovisual Translation of Disney Cartoons into the Kazakh Language: An Analysis of Cultural Adaptation. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 69-79. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10307>
- 2 Kubrjakova, E.S., Dem'jankov, V.Z., Pankrac, Ju.G., Luzina, L.G. (1996), *Kratkij slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov* [A brief dictionary of linguistic terms], Moscow, Russia.
- 3 Postovalova, V.I. (2017), *Jazyk i miroponimanie: Opyt lingvofilosovskoj interpretacii*. [Language and worldview: Experience of linguo-philosophical interpretation], Lenand, Moscow, Russia.
- 4 Karasik V. I. Lingvokul'turnye harakteristiki rechevogo zhanra «pozhelanie» // *Zhanry rechi*. 2024. T. 19, vyp. 3 (43). S. 225-232. DOI: 10.18500/2311-0740-2024-19-3-43-225-232
- 5 Ospanova Zh., Tolybayeva K., Nurkenova S., Duisekova K., Baltabayeva G. *Lingua and culture study research on indirect communication cognitive metaphor. XLinguae*. 2020. Vol. 2. – P. 157-165. DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.13.
- 6 Ganikyzy, A.G., Kortabaeva, G.K. (2023), “Semantics of colors in anthroponymy based on kazakh and english languages”, *Bulletin of Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University. Philological Series*, vol. 1, pp. 18-24.
- 7 Salikzhanova, Sh.B., Sarekenova, K.K. (2023), “Simvolicheskoe znachenie zhenskoj odezhdy i ukrashenij” *Vestnik Kokshetauskogo universiteta imeni SH.Ualihanova* [Bulletin of Sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau University], vol. 1, pp. 53-63.
- 8 Wierzbicka, A. (2025). Semantics and Religion: Christian Themes, the nsm Approach. *Cognitive Semantics*, 10(3), 289-295. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/23526416-bja10071>
- 9 Alefirenko N.F., Chumak-Zhun I.I. Axiological connotations of Slavic ethnonyms. *Rusin*. 2023. № 72. pp. 178–195. DOI: 10.17223/18572685/72/8
- 10 Goetz, D., Haensch, G., Wellmann, H. (1996), *Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch. Deutsch als Fremdsprache* [Langenscheidt's large dictionary. German as a foreign language], Berlin; München, Germany.
- 11 Wahrig, G. (2011). *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Renate Wahrig-Burfeind* [German Dictionary by Renate Wahrig-Burfeind], München, Germany.
- 12 Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі [Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh language] (Almaty, 2008).
- 13 Sabitowa M. *Nationalkulturelle Elemente in der Semantik der Phraseologismen des Deutschen und Kasachischen* // *Das Wort*. Moskau – Berlin, 1987, S. 296-300.

Received: 17.02.2025

Қоршаған ортаның этнолингвистикалық тұжырымдамалаудағы әлемнің тілдік бейнесінің рөлі туралы

Б.Д. Ныгметова¹, Ш.Р. Адилова², Ж.Т.Оспанова³, Ж.З.Оспанова¹

¹Өлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті, Павлодар, 140000, Қазақстан

²И. Кәрімов атындағы Ташкент мемлекеттік техникалық университеті, Ташкент, 100095, Өзбекстан

³Astana IT University, Астана, 010000, Қазақстан

Бұл мақалада когнитивті лингвистика шеңберіндегі «әлем бейнесі» ұғымын нақтылауға тырысып, оған қосымша сипаттама – «тілдік» береді. Тілдік құрылым бойынша авторлар белгілі бір тілдің нақты синтаксистік немесе морфологиялық ерекшеліктерін түсінеді, осылайша олардағы ақпарат туралы, ұлттық менталитеттің де, бүкіл ұлттық

мәдениеттің маңызды құрамдас бөлігі болып табылатын ұлттық сипаттағы ерекшеліктер туралы айтады. Авторлар когнитивті лингвистика тұрғысынан тілді когнитивті-бағдарланған және тұжырымдамалық сипаттау әдісін қолдана отырып талдау жүргізеді, сонымен бірге әлем бейнесінің белгілерін көрсететін әлемді қабылдау процестерін бейнелеудің ауызша әдістері, шындықты қайта қарау, сондай-ақ бұрыннан белгілі ұғымдарды өзектендіру ерекшеленеді.

Салыстырмалы аспектіде бір-бірімен байланысты емес тілдердің (неміс, қазақ, өзбек және орыс) материалына мысалдар келтіріледі, талдау нәтижесінде әлемді көрудің, модельдеудің және ойлаудың, оның ішінде тұжырымдамалаудың және одан әрі бейнелеудің ұлттық ерекшеліктері анықталады, бұл қоршаған шындықты қабылдаудың ұлттық бейнесін көрсетеді.

Талдау нәтижесінде тұжырымдамалық әмбебаптардың негізінде бір-бірінен ерекшеленетін прототиптер жатыр деген тұжырымдар жасалады, бұл келесідей түсіндіріледі: әртүрлі мәдениеттердің өкілдері тұжырымдамаға белгілі бір ұлттық ерекшеліктерді жатқызады. Зерттеу нәтижелері ұлттық менталитеттің туындысы ретінде дүниенің тілдік бейнесінің қалыптасуына белгілі бір когнитивті доминанттар әсер етеді деген пікірді растайды.

Кілт сөздер: тілдік әлем бейнесі, концепт, ұлттық дүниетаным, когнитивтік лингвистика, концептуализация, прототип.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Nurgaliyeva, S., Zhumasheva, A., Yelikpaev, S., Kapassova, B., Nygmetova, B., Kairova, M. (2024). Challenges and Approaches to Audiovisual Translation of Disney Cartoons into the Kazakh Language: An Analysis of Cultural Adaptation. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 69-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10307>
- 2 Кубрякова Е.С., В.З. Демьянков, Ю.Г. Панкрац, Л.Г. Лузина. Лингвистикалық терминдердің қысқаша сөздігі. Мәскеу: М.В.Ломоносов атындағы ММУ, 1996. – 245 б.
- 3 Постовалова В.И. Тіл және дүниетаным: тілдік философиялық интерпретация тәжірибесі. М.: Ленанд, 2017. – 312 б.
- 4 Karasik V. I. Lingvokul'turnye harakteristiki rechevogo zhanra «pozhelanie» // *Zhanry rechi*. 2024. T. 19, vyp. 3 (43). S. 225-232.
- 5 Ospanova Zh., Tolybayeva K., Nurkenova S., Duisekova K., Baltabayeva G. Lingua and culture study research on indirect communication cognitive metaphor. *XLinguae*. 2020. Vol. 2. – P. 157-165. DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.13
- 6 Ganikyzy A.G., Kortabaeva G.K. (2023). “Semantics of colors in anthroponomy based on kazakh and english languages”, *Bulletin of Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University. Philological Series*, vol. 1, pp. 18-24.
- 7 Саликжанова Ш.Б., Сарекенова К.К.. Әйелдер киімдері мен зергерлік бұйымдарының символдық мәні // Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Көкшетау университетінің хабаршысы. Фил. сер. – 2023. – № 1. – Б. 53-63.
- 8 Wierzbicka, A. (2025). Semantics and Religion: Christian Themes, the nsm Approach. *Cognitive Semantics*, 10(3), 289-295. <https://doi.org/10.1163/23526416-bja10071>
- 9 Alefirenko N.F., Chumak-Zhun I.I. Axiological connotations of Slavic ethnonyms. *Rusin*. 2023. № 72. pp. 178–195. DOI: 10.17223/18572685/72/8
- 10 Goetz D., Haensch G., Wellmann H. Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Berlin; München, 1997. – 1182 p.
- 11 Wahrig G. Deutsches Wörterbuch von Renate Wahrig-Burfeind. München, 2011. – 1730 p.
- 12 Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. Ред. Т. Жанұзақов. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. – 968 б.
- 13 Sabitowa M. Nationalkulturelle Elemente in der Semantik der Phraseologismen des Deutschen und Kasachischen // *Das Wort*. Moskau – Berlin, 1987, S. 296-300.

Материал 17.02.2025 баспаға түсті

О роли языковой картины мира в этноязыковой концептуализации действительности

Б.Д. Ныгметова¹, Ш.Р. Адилова², Ж.Т.Оспанова³, Ж.З.Оспанова¹

¹Павлодарский педагогический университет имени Әлкей Марғұлан, Павлодар, 140000, Казахстан

²Ташкентский государственный технический университет им. И. Каримова, Ташкент, 100095, Узбекистан

³Astana IT University, Астана, 010000, Казахстан

В данной статье предпринята попытка конкретизировать понятие «картина мира» в рамках когнитивной лингвистики, придавая ему дополнительное определение – «языковая». Под языковой структурой авторы понимают конкретные синтаксические или морфологические особенности определенного языка, тем самым утверждая о содержащейся в них информации, о специфике как национальной ментальности, так и национального характера, которые являются важнейшими составляющими всей национальной культуры.

Авторами проводится анализ с применением метода когнитивно-ориентированного и концептуального описания языка в ракурсе когнитивной лингвистики, при этом выделяются вербальные способы репрезентации процессов мировосприятия, отражающие признаки картины мира, переосмысления действительности, а также актуализации уже известных понятий. В сравнительном аспекте приводятся примеры на материале неродственных языков (немецкого, казахского, узбекского и русского), в результате анализа выявляются национально-специфические особенности видения, моделирования и созерцания мира, в том числе концептуализации и дальнейшей репрезентации, что указывает на национальную образность восприятия окружающей действительности.

В основе концептуальных универсалий лежат отличные друг от друга прототипы, что объясняется следующим: представители разных культур приписывают концепту определенным национально-специфическим характеристикам. Результаты проведенного исследования подтверждают идею о том, что формирование языковой картины мира как производной национального менталитета находится под влиянием определенных когнитивных доминант.

Ключевые слова: языковая картина мира, концепт, национальное мироизмерение, когнитивная лингвистика, концептуализация, прототип.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- 1 Nurgaliyeva, S., Zhumasheva, A., Yelikpaev, S., Kapassova, B., Nygmetova, B., Kairova, M. (2024). Challenges and Approaches to Audiovisual Translation of Disney Cartoons into the Kazakh Language: An Analysis of Cultural Adaptation. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 69-79. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10307>
- 2 Краткий словарь лингвистических терминов / Кубрякова Е.С., В.З. Демьянков, Ю.Г. Панкрац, Л.Г. Лузина. Москва: МГУ им. М.В.Ломоносова, 1996. – 245 с.
- 3 Постовалова В.И. Язык и миропонимание: Опыт лингвофилософской интерпретации. М.: Ленанд, 2017. – 312 с.
- 4 Карасик В. И. Лингвокультурные характеристики речевого жанра «пожелание» // Жанры речи. 2024. Т. 19, вып. 3 (43). С. 225-232. DOI: 10.18500/2311-0740-2024-19-3-43-225-232
- 5 Ospanova Zh., Tolybayeva K., Nurkenova S., Duisekova K., Baltabayeva G. Lingua and culture study research on indirect communication cognitive metaphor. *XLinguae*. 2020. Vol. 2. – P. 157-165. DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.13.
- 6 Ganikyzy A.G., Kortabaeva G.K. (2023). “Semantics of colors in anthroponomy based on kazakh and english languages”, *Bulletin of Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University. Philological Series*, vol. 1, pp. 18-24.

- 7 Саликжанова Ш.Б., Сарекенова К.К.. Символическое значение женской одежды и украшений // Вестн. КУ. Сер.фил. – 2023. – № 1. – С. 53-63.
- 8 Wierzbicka, A. (2025). Semantics and Religion: Christian Themes, the nsm Approach. *Cognitive Semantics*, 10(3), 289-295. <https://doi.org/10.1163/23526416-bja10071>
- 9 Alefirenko N.F., Chumak-Zhun I.I. Axiological connotations of Slavic ethnonyms. *Rusin*. 2023. № 72. pp. 178–195. DOI: 10.17223/18572685/72/8
- 10 Goetz D., Haensch G., Wellmann H. Langenscheidts Großwörterbuch. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Berlin; München, 1997. – 1182 p.
- 11 Wahrig G. Deutsches Wörterbuch von Renate Wahrig-Burfeind. München, 2011. – 1730 s.
- 12 Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. Ред. Т. Жанұзақов. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. – 968 б.
- 13 Sabitowa M. Nationalkulturelle Elemente in der Semantik der Phraseologismen des Deutschen und Kasachischen // Das Wort. Moskau – Berlin, 1987, S. 296-300.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 17.02.2025

МҒТАР 16.31.21

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp94-108](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss3pp94-108)

Қ.Б. Слямбеков¹, А.А. Солтанбекова¹, Б.С.Шалабай², Т. Қалибекұлы³

¹А.Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты, Алматы, 050040, Қазақстан

²Ш.Уәлиханов атындағы Көкшетау университеті, Көкшетау, 020000, Қазақстан,

³Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, 050022, Қазақстан

ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНДЕГІ КҮРДЕЛІ ЕТІСТІКТЕРДІ ЖАСАНДЫ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТІГЕ ҮЙРЕТУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ: ТЕГТЕУ МЕН МОРФОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ МОДЕЛЬДЕУ ҮЛГІЛЕРІ

Мақалада қазақ тіліндегі күрделі етістіктерді автоматты тану мен корпуста белгіленім жұмыстарын жүргізу арқылы генеративті ЖИ модельдерін тұрғызуға арналған аннотациялау, тегтеу кезеңдерін жүзеге асырудың тәжірибесі баяндалған. Құранды етістіктер, құрама етістіктер, аналитикалық формалы етістіктерді тегтеудегі қиындықтар, ғылыми мәселелер, оларды шешудің жолдары, сондай-ақ белгіленім жұмыстарының ерекшеліктері жайлы айтылады. Үлкен тіл модельдерінің архитектурасында сол тілдің грамматикасы, ал оның трансформациясында сол тілдің грамматикалық модельдері жататыны сөзсіз. Заманауи лингвистиканың даму бағыты да осындай модельдерді әзірлеп, оны жетілдірумен байланысты болмақ. Сондықтан қазақ тіліндегі күрделі грамматикалық компоненттердің бірі – күрделі құрамды етістіктерді модельдеу, оның морфологиялық белгіленім үлгісін ұсыну – қазақ тілін автоматтандыру жұмыстарындағы ең өзекті мәселелердің бірі болып отыр. Аталмыш мақала осы бағытта жүзеге асырылып жатқан тәжірибелерді бөлісу мақсатында жазылып отыр.

Кілт сөздер: етістік, күрделі етістіктер, құранды етістік, аналитикалық формант, құрама етістік, тұрақты күрделі етістік, жасанды интеллекті, автоматтандыру, белгіленім

НЕГІЗГІ ЕРЕЖЕЛЕР

Генеративті жасанды интеллектінің Үлкен тіл модельдерін (LLM – Large Language Model) әзірлеудің трансформациясында сол тілдің күрделі грамматикалық жүйесі жататыны, ал мұндай ауқымды машинаны үйрету жұмыстары жиналған мол деректерді (big data) аннотациялау жұмыстары арқылы оқытылатыны белгілі.