

INTRODUCTION

When we speak or write, we use the lexicon (in the sense of wordstock) and grammar (in the sense of grammatical system) of a particular language, and through verbal patterns we project an image of ourselves. Such projection is, however, also shaped by external conditions, by extralinguistic reality. For Sapir (2007, p. 13), language is not an inherent (biological) function, “that is due entirely to the circumstance that he [language user] is born not entirely in nature, but in the lap of a society that is certain, reasonably certain, to lead him to its traditions.” The interdependence between language and culture was tackled by Sapir and Whorf as early as in the 1920s; their theory has allowed for two stances: that language reflects culture and delineates our mindset and that language cannot be decontextualized since culture is expressed through language (Chang 2004). Twentieth-century cultural phenomena (globalization, detraditionalization, and individualization) have resulted in a tendency to contemplate a human being as “the language animal” (Taylor 1985). “The language animal” is a philosophical term implying that a personal identity represents a structure created in line with how people interpret their contact with reality. In other words, socialization and individualization, i.e. processes necessitating customized verbal behavior, permanently shape the personal identity.

A language becomes a means of describing the personal identity, and language practice is used for creating the meaning of self and of others. The personal identity, i.e. the “narrative structure” of “I”, is formed by and/or in linguistic practice (often idiosyncratic) in the mother tongue or in a foreign language. Holliday, Hyde, Kullman’s (2004, p. 66) approach is that “the term ‘identity’ defies precise definition and crosses traditional boundaries between disciplines in the social sciences. Increasingly in recent years there has been an emphasis on the interrelationship of culture and identity, as well as the longer-established emphasis on the interrelationship between culture and behavior.” People express their presence through the use of language within a particular cultural context. The processes of socialization and individualization are necessarily followed by the stage that is beyond the conventional nature of a sign, i.e. the individuation stage. In Jungian psychology, it represents post-conventional stage of an individual’s development. An individual is fully aware of the society’s codes and

conventions, yet s/he can approach them in a critical way, which results in a unique structure of a human identity.

Our verbal performance in different social events mirrors different sides of our personality and the different social roles that we undertake. Depending on the activity in which the speaker is engaged, they produce different discourses, and these help the listener recognize the speaker's identity. Most populations in the world become engaged, for different reasons, in interactions involving a language that is not their native. By virtue of their regular exposure to social encounters in native settings or with native speakers, they become bilingual from a socio-pragmatic perspective. We are aware that the term 'bilingual'/'multilingual' has varying interpretations, like a parent being a native speaker, exposure to a language in a natural environment, etc. (Körtvélyessy 2008). Hereinafter, whenever we refer to a language user as a bi-/multilingual, we have in mind socio-pragmatic reading of the term, according to Kecskes's approach (personal communication 2015). In this view, monolinguals represent a minority and most foreign language users are to a certain degree bilingual or multilingual.

When a person becomes bilingual or multilingual, their identity is subjected to a great change. For treating the identity of a multilingual speaker, the notion of individuation is a useful concept; however, it should be adapted to the needs of the cross-field perspective applied. In our discussion, we put it on a par with

... acting-interacting-thinking-valuing talking (sometimes writing-reading) in the *appropriate* way with the *appropriate* props at the *appropriate* times in the *appropriate* places ...; [this implies] socially accepted associations among ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting, in the *right* places and at the *right* times with the *right* objects (associations that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or 'social network').
Gee (1985 qt. in Holliday, Hyde, Kullman 2004, p. 76; [emphasis added])

Moreover, it encompasses looking into the issue of identity as an individual and as a social being since a multilingual's identity is not only a matter of personal identity but is greatly influenced by the sociocultural context. The justification has to be sought in (social) psychology, anthropology, philosophy, or discourse-related studies. We claim that in the course of change from a monolingual/monocultural to multilingual/multicultural mind, the configuration of language-culture-identity element is altered,

and this alteration culminates with the stage of individuation, which as a matter of fact can be seen as a unique quality attributable to multicompetence and the essence of which is conceptualization.

What differentiates the mind of a monolingual from that of a multilingual is the nature of the common underlying conceptual base (on the term, see Kecskes, Papp 2000). Kecskes and Papp (2000, p. 42) argue that “the full acquisition and proper use of a concept requires the learner to know not only its lexical-semantic counterpart and associated declarative knowledge but also the multimodal mental representation and culturally based behavioral scripts and schemas that are acquired through genuine communication.” Lakoff and Johnson (qt. in Kecskes, Papp 2000, p. 42) claim, “[o]ur ordinary conceptual system in terms of which we both think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature”; in other words, it is culture-dependent. This view is also supported by Dilkina, McClelland, Boroditsky (2007, p. 215) who uphold a view that “cross-linguistic differences arise as a result of differences in experience,” as “speakers of various languages are exposed to distinct patterns of linguistic input.” Thus, we agree that multicompetence “is not the sum of two or more well-developed systems but is a system on its own right” (Kecskes, Papp 2000, p. 38), and we add that hermeneutic understanding is a necessary part of its establishment.

For an individual, to adequately treat the differences between two languages, the conceptualizing process needs to take place; as it were, we can attribute it to hermeneutic understanding. Hermeneutic understanding represents the fusion of learning and experiencing, and it derives from the assumed varying interpretation of an expression both on an individual level (in terms of an individual person) and a collective level (in terms of a community). This results in a differing signification of extralinguistic reality in the system of language signs in particular languages. During the process of hermeneutic understanding, a person can understand a foreign language expression by conceptualizing its relative equivalent in the mother tongue. The resultant conceptualization mirrors the awareness of the content correspondence of the two expressions. ‘Conceptualizing’ and ‘conceptualization’ are key terms in the present book. In our treatment, they stand for a process and a product, respectively. Our endeavor is to arrive at the conceptualization of certain lexemes in a particular language,

which is to say at the interpretation accounting for the lingua-culture traditions or conventionalization. For that to happen, the process of conceptualizing needs to happen. The question is what this process includes, what types of sub-processes can guarantee that conceptualization can be identified.

As a primer, we establish the necessary theoretical background through defining a language speaker's identity from a multidisciplinary perspective (psychological, anthropological, and philosophical) and the role of lingua-culture in identity formation (Ch 1). In order to describe what conceptualizing and conceptualization involve, we conducted two experiments. The two experiments were conducted on the material of English and Slovak linguistics terminology necessary to be mastered by prospective professional users of English and Slovak, our respondents in one of the experiments (Ch 2 and 3). Based on the conducted experiments, we propose the building blocks of a bi-/multilingual identity, and conclusively specify what actually has to happen if successful conceptualizing is to take place (Ch 4). The validity of the proposed conceptualizing scheme is attested to through applying it to the selected linguistics terminology (Ch 5).

It can serve as a methodological framework for exploring the nature and compatibility of different kind of lexemes in different language pairs. The present book presents the search for what the conceptualizing process encompasses and what makes a confident language expert (here, a confident language expert in linguistics terminology, in compliance with the selected material and subjects). The compiled corpus of the studied terminology represents, to our knowledge, the core of the following language levels: phonetic and phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical, and stylistic; the stylistic level is also represented by terms that occur on the borderline with related linguistic disciplines (pragmalinguistics, sociolinguistics).