

Introduction

In the course of the ideas of Humboldtianism⁽¹⁾ the languages are the different interpretations of the world by the man. Representing the indirect reflection of the world (mediated by human consciousness) the languages give different visions of the reality. According to Humboldt, any language creates a certain model of the world for those, who use it, as though leading round them a magic circle of determined representations and images.

Exceeding the bounds of this circle is possible only by study of another language, “by entering into other circle”, i.e. through penetration into the system of world outlook embodied by other language. Thus, distinctions among languages seem to be somewhat greater, than just language distinctions: various languages by their nature, by their influence on cognition and on feelings appear to be different outlooks (Humboldt W., 1985, p.370).

Being captured by the language, a person handles the things in a way they are presented to him by his language, behaves in society like this is prescribed by the language. So, the language turns out to be in the closest contact to spiritual activity of the person, with cultural life of the ethnic community, whose communicative needs it serves. In the words of the prominent Russian scientist D. Likhachiev, “the language of a nation is in itself compressed or even algebraic expression of all culture of a nation” (Likhachiev, 1993, p.9).

The connection between language and culture is rather exactly formulated in such Sapir's statement: the culture is what this or that society makes and thinks, the language is how this society thinks. It means that the language (to be more exact, its content) gives keys to the understanding of ways of thinking of a nation, discloses the peculiar features of mentality of language bearers, gives a chance to look on the world by the eyes of other people, to comprehend how the bearers of another language and culture feel and think.

Thus, the concept of “**language world model**” is becoming the main concept of linguistic and cultural analysis.

Language World Model (LWM) and Scientific World Model (SWM). Concepts' Determination

This notion has been founding different interpretations in the works of Humboldt, Weisgerber, Whorf, Coseriu, Trir and other scientists. Having generalized all available approaches to the definition of the given concept, it seems possible to accept as “a working definition” the following one: “Language world model is the certain sight on the reality conveyed by the means of the certain language. It is a verbalized interpretation of the environment by the language community”. Language world model (LWM) shouldn't be identified with scientific world model (SWM). The last is common for all language collectives. It reflects a modern level of development of a scientific international thought that finds fixing in classifications and terminology of the concrete sciences. If the scientific world model is generated by the scientific consciousness, the language world model is produced by the ordinary, naive consciousness, which being refracted in specific language promotes the formation of special for each language substance - LWM.

However, there is no impenetrable wall between these two forms of reflection of the reality. The scientific world model interacts with the language world model in any national language. In fact this global problem can be reduced to a more concrete one - problem of interaction between the concept as a logical category and the meaning as a language category.

Correlation between Logical and Language Categories

In the history of the linguistics one can find very different, sometimes even diametrically opposite approaches to this question. Within the framework of a logical trend in linguistics (Aristotle, logicians of Port-Royal, A. Vostokov, F. Buslayev) categories of language were considered to play secondary roles in comparison with categories of thought. The last were qualified as primary and universal ones, only using language categories as the form of their expression. Then psychological approach came to take the place of the logical trend. Within the limits of the psychological approach any direct connection between the forms of language and the forms of thinking was denied. In

opinion of G. Shteintal, the outstanding representative of the psychological trend in linguistics, the categories of grammar and logic are as little correlated with one another as concepts of a circle and a red color.

Mental categories were announced a direct correlates of language categories, and the psychology was proclaimed to be a methodological basis of linguistics. Thus, the linguistic thought of the 19-th century has passed a way from a complete identification to a complete delimitation of language and logical categories.

In the thirties of the 20-th century the theory of a linguistic relativity (the hypothesis of Sapir-Whorf) was developed. Within its framework the main role was given to language. The logic of thinking and the character of cognition were predetermined by language, which certain society uses for communication. The unconditional primacy of language over logic of thinking was declared.

The problem of correlation between language and logical categories should be, apparently, solved by means of determining the nature of their connection. That will clear their common and peculiar features. As the most essential common moment it is possible to note the following: logical categories and logical rules underlie all language categories and relationship between them. In their turn logical categories appear in every concrete language in certain grammatical and lexical arrangement. The idea which is not submitted by the properly arranged sentence simply does not exist, is dead in fact. At the same time the national languages' peculiarities result in discrepancy of language and logical categories. The laws and the forms of logic thinking are unconditionally identical to all peoples, irrespective of language they use for the purposes of communication. However, language semantic systems that embody the results of the human cognitive activities divide the objective world quite differently. Moreover, any language performs not only as the mean of expression of human thinking, but it conveys human consciousness as a whole: all affective aspects of the intellectual activity of the person, connected with his emotional, volitional and sensual spheres. That's why a lot of language categories, e.g. interjections, modality, mood find no correspondence in logic.

Thus, it is possible to speak about the existence of two forms of a world reflection in human's consciousness - by means of concept and by means of significance (meaning). Both concept and meaning generalize reflecting constant and stable in the phenomena of the

objective world: these are their common grounds. The distinction between them depends on international character of concepts and national peculiarity of lexical meanings. Reflecting by the semantic side of its units the objective reality language simulates not only the material universe, but also the human consciousness and thinking, which play the role of mediators in language reflection of the world.

Humboldt's Notion of the "Language Form"

So what are these language forms which manifest the substratum of the national specific features of the language? Generally speaking, it is the language as a whole, to be more precise, "the form of the language", as W. Humboldt called it. Being unique for every language, conveying the spirituality of the nation, "the form of the language", after W. Humboldt, is the combination of separate language elements in an integral whole. The German scientist distinguished two kinds of language form: the internal and the external ones. The paramount importance is given to the internal form, because the content of this notion implies the inner structure of the whole language, the key principle of its generation. The external form of the language, manifesting and incarnating the internal form, embodies it on all levels of language structure in phonetic, semantic and grammatical language substance. Thus, Humboldt's idea of "the form of the language" is rather like the modern linguistic concept of "the language world model", the working definition of which has already been given.

The national and cultural peculiarity finds its expression not only on semantic, but also on morphological and syntactic levels of the language structure, that was excellently shown in the works of Anna Wierzbicka (Wierzbicka, 1992). However, the vocabulary (lexical staff) of that or other language doubtlessly remains the leading substance for the expression of the mental-language peculiarity of certain peoples. The language world model, embodied by the lexical means of language, comprises 3 parts, namely: the reflected material universe, the world of subjective language substance, and the world of mythical language substance (Kornilov, 1996, p.167).

Three Parts of Language World Model

The first group of the words (the reflected material universe) demonstrates the unevenness of the semantic mapping of the world by different languages. This fact once again confirms thesis about the national character of concepts. In the scientific linguistic literature the variety of semantic mapping produced by different languages is usually shown by means of the terms of relationship, color designations, names of the animals and birds, names of the parts of a human body, etc. For example, Russian word “*аист*” (a stork) has three counterparts in Ukrainian language, namely: “*чорногуз*”, “*лелека*”, and “*бусол*”; the Japanese adjective “*aoi*” covers meanings of three Russian colors: “light-blue”, “dark-blue”, “green”. The Russian word “*пальцы*” in the modern Russian language refers to the both fingers and toes, while English and French languages have two lexemes - one for designation of fingers on a hand (Eng. “*finger*”, Fr. “*Doigt*”), the other for denotation of fingers on a leg (Eng. “*toe*”, Fr. “*orteil*”). The Chinese language has no lexemes to designate the concepts of brother and sister. The content of these terms of relationship is distributed among following lexical items: 哥 *ge* - elder brother, 弟 *di* - younger brother, 姐 *jie* - elder sister, 妹 *mei* - younger sister, 伯父 *bofu* - father's elder brother, 叔父 *shufu* - father's younger brother, 舅父 *jioufu* - mother's brother, 姨媽 *yima* - mother's sister, 姑媽 *guma* - father's sister.

The second part of the language world model is covered by words, containing so-called connotations-emotional associations of positive or negative character determined by the scale of values within certain language community. Forming part of the meaning of a word, the connotation is as though added to the main denotational meaning of a lexeme, which points to an entity in the world to which a word refers. The connotational meaning of a word expresses all sensual, emotional, behavioral, volitional elements of consciousness. Symbolic of colors in various languages is in this connection rather indicative. Within the framework of European culture the yellow color, for example, has rather negative connotations, symbolizing cowardice, betrayal, envy and bad style. The understanding of this color in China contrasts with these ideas of the West. Chinese consider the yellow color to be a symbol of glory, progress and development.

The words, referring to the third part of the world language model, denote mythical, never existed objects, which were created by the collective language consciousness of different peoples in the process of historical development of the mankind. The words of that sort are embodied in myths, legends, and epic pieces of the peoples. For example, classical Greek and Latin mythology presented the world with *minotaur*, *unicorn*, *centaurs*, *harpies*, *satyrs*, *nymphs*. In Russian folk fairy tales one comes across the images of *леший*, *русалка*, *водяной*, *домовой*, *скатерть-самобранка*, *меч-кладенец*. The Arabian folklore enriched the world folklore with the image of *magic carpet*. Chinese cosmology gives much attention to the dragon - 龍 *long*, a magic animal that is able to shrink to the size of a silkworm and then again it can swell up till it fills the space between Heaven and Earth. In sharp contrast to Western ideas on this subject, the Chinese dragon is a good-natured and gentle creature; it symbolizes the natural male vigor and fertility. (Eberhard, 1986, p. 84).

Inner Form of Lexical Unit

Speaking about the specific features of language reflection of the reality, it is necessary to dwell upon the notion of the “inner form of lexical unit”. The inner form of the word (the etymon) is considered to be a semantic attribute fixed in the name of the designated subject or a phenomenon. Etymon gives reasons for a phonic substance of a word, exposing the motive of expression of the given meaning just by the given combination of sounds. Being a full-value language sign, a word is characterized by the close cohesion of the form (sound sequence) and the meaning (content). Sometimes the connection between the form and the meaning as though “lays on a surface”. For example, the bearers of the Russian language can realize quite easily the inner form of Russian numerals: *пятьдесят* (50), *шестьдесят* (60), *семьдесят* (70), etc., that actually means five tens (50), six tens (60), seven tens (70). Native speakers of English language (or people having a good command of it) will determine without any difficulty the inner form of words like *lifeguard*, *casebook*, *freeway*, *half-truth*, etc. In these examples the inner form is transparent, the motivation of words' meaning is clear, for it is given by a morphemic structure of lexical units; in other words, the inner form of the examples above is stipulated by their morphological composition.

However, not always the inner form of a word might be uncovered through structural correlation of its morphemes or words of the certain language. As a result of essential

historical changes, which occur in language, the inner form of a word might be obscured or completely lost.

This process is predetermined by the following main reasons: 1) by the loss of a producing word, from which the given word was derived; 2) by the loss of one of the subject's attributes, which was characteristic of it before; 3) by essential historical changes of the phonetic face of a word. Here is an example to show the operation of the first factor: disappearance from Russian language of a word “*коло*” (a wheel) led to the loss of the inner form in a word “*кольцо*” (a ring) and in a word “*около*” - literally “around”. The second factor's operation could be illustrated by such an example: at the present time Russian language consciousness doesn't relate the inner form of Russian word “*мешок*” (a sack) with a word “*мех*” (fur), because sacks are now made not only from fur, but from other stuff too. Change of the phonetic appearance of a word in the process of a long historical development of language may also be a cause of a loss of the inner form of a word. Now it is hard to believe, that so different from phonetic and semantic points of view Russian words as “*городить*” (to fence off) and “*жердь*” (a pole), “*коса*” (a plait) and “*чесать*” (to comb), “*цена*” (a price) and “*каяться*” (to repent) originally ascended to the same root (Lingvisticheskiy encyclopedicheskiy slovar', 1990, p. 86). In all cases like that the etymologists' work is needed for the study of the origins and history of the form and meaning of words, for the restoration of words' etymons. The etymological dictionaries of the different languages show, that etymons of the correlated lexical items do not coincide.

Thus, different language communities use different attributes (signs), while naming the same objects of the material universe. Here are some examples, proving this statement.

A star

German word “*stern*” and Latin one “*stella*” ascend to the Indo-European verbal root **ster* – “to strew”, “to spread”; Old-Indian *naksatram*, probably, appeared from **nakt-ksatra*, which meant “someone, who dominates over the night”; Nenets word “*numgy*” has in its basis a sign “something that is located in the sky”.

A village

German word for village “*dorf*” is etymologically linked with Gothic word *Baurp*, that meant “a cultivated land”, “a field”. Rumanian word “*sat*” and Albanian word “*fshat*” both come from Latin “*fossatum*” – “something surrounded by a ditch”. Russian word “*деревня*” (a village) through the word “*дерево*” (a tree) is being tied with a word “*драть*” (to tear). A sign fixed in a basis of the name of a word “a tree” might be formulated as “something that is torn out or stripped”. Thus, the initial meaning of Russian word for village “*деревня*” is “a place cleared off trees”. Ossetic word for village “*gaw*” ascends to Old-Indian “*gava*” or “*gavya*” with the initial meaning “cattle” (Jazykovaya nominatsiya, 1970, p.163). Examples like these, given above, are very numerous.

Where lies the reason of such a variety of the inner forms revealed in words - correlatives in different languages?

Making himself familiar with the outer world, with its objects and phenomena, noting their signs and attributes, a man usually picked up the most characteristic sign, which already was named in the language, and used this “named sign” for designation of a new entity. The choice of the attribute motivating a new denotation is not always determined by its importance or great distinctive force: the direction of arising association is free, not strictly bound by certain features or qualities of the object to name. Thus, it is not so important whether or not a motivating sign is essential: the main demand is its relation to a class of subjects and phenomena being named. That is why the inner forms of the words-counterparts in different languages show such a variety and “...etymology exposes rather diverse picture both within the framework of one language and for language families” (Jazykovaya nominatsiya, 1977, p. 164).

Role of Metaphors in Constituting of LWM

While investigating LWM, a special attention must be given to metaphors and idioms, because of their very important role in forming of what we call "language world model". The operation of metaphor is closely linked with the so-called "human factor in language." For humans there is no other way to think about different abstract notions, various phenomena of nature or emotional world of a person except as in terms of anthropocentric paradigm. Anthropomorphic principle operates in different languages through different language incarnations of metaphor.

In linguistic literature several kinds of metaphor have been recognized. To our mind, the most important role in the formation of LWM is played by expressive metaphor, which appears to have rather complex structure if compared with other types of metaphor, such as nominative or conceptual metaphors. Expressive metaphors are emotionally saturated and

stylistically determined; their connotations (affective meanings) correspond to the scale of values accepted within this or that ethnic community. Being the bearers of some national associative stereotypes expressive metaphors reveal some very special landmarks in understanding of the objective world by certain ethnic collective.

Let's look upon some aspects of operation of the expressive metaphor on language material of animals' names (**wolf, cow, snake**) and bird's name (**goose**) used in their figurative meanings in three languages: Chinese, English and Russian.

Phraseological staff of the language also reflects cultural and historical experience of the certain ethnic community, embodying national coloring of any language. That gives us all necessary background for widening the object of our research at the account of idioms with figurative meanings, which contain the animals' names.

In Chinese, English and Russian cultures **wolf** symbolizes cruelty, rapacity and greed. In English and in Russian a person with any of these qualities could be metaphorically called a wolf. In Chinese a cruel pitiless person is named as having "a wolf's heart and dog's lungs": 狼心狗肺 *lang xin gou fei* - or is simply called 狼心 *lang xin*; a greedy person might be also designated as 狼貪 *lang tan*. Negative attitude to the wolf could be clearly seen in such idioms as *keep the wolf / wolves from the door* (Eng.) - to keep poverty and hunger away earning enough money to buy the basic things; *to throw / toss someone to the wolves* (Eng.) - to place somebody in a dangerous situation, usually in order to protect oneself from attack or danger; *смотреть волком* (Rus.) - to look at somebody in a very unfriendly manner; 狼子野心 *lang zi ye xin* (Chin.) – designs of the wolves and wolfish nature – (of a person) greedy, cruel and full of wild ambitions; 狼狽為奸 *lang bei wei jien* (Chin.) - to contemplate a crime together with somebody. A lecher is called in Chinese 色狼 *se lang* - a sex-wolf. In the English language there is somewhat similar idiom - *a wolf-whistle*. In this expression wolf stands for the boy or man who flirts with girls and shows that he thinks a woman is attractive by wolf-whistle. In sharp contrast with these approaches is the idea of wolf in Turkish culture, where wolf is considered to be a sacred animal and even ranks as ancestor of Turkish race.

In English a word **cow** could be used metaphorically in the spoken language, when you want to denote a stupid and not very pleasant woman: "*Judy is a silly cow - don't pay any attention to what she is saying!*" In Russian informal language the same metaphor is used to convey one more meaning: large size or awkwardness of the woman: "*Где же найму*

подходящее платье для такой коровы? " - Where to find a suitable gown for such a cow? The most cow idioms and expressions in English and Russian don't treat the cow with much respect: *a cow town* (a small town in which there are few activities and entertainments); to have a cow (spoken) to be angry or surprised about something; until the cows come home (spoken) - for a long-long time or for ever; *дойная корова* (Rus.) - a person who is constantly used by others to get a profit; *как корова языком слизала* (Rus.) - said about a thing which suddenly disappears and is hard to find again.

In Chinese the word 牛 *niu* (ox, cow, and bull) is surrounded with much respect and honor. Even in nowadays, many Chinese don't eat any beef, believing it to be immoral to kill and eat the creature which helps country people with the harvest. Some medieval Emperors issued edicts prohibiting the slaughter and the consumption of oxen. This positive attitude to ox has also found an adequate reflection in the Chinese language. For example, an obstinate, persistent person is associated with cow that could be clearly seen in such a usage: 牛脾氣 *niu piqi* ; positive connotation is also seen in the idiom: 牛性 *niu xing*; 牛勁 *niu jing* (lit.:bull's strength, said about an obstinate, not easy to change by argument person). The last expression is also used to denote great strength and tremendous effort.

All investigated languages are unanimous in negative evaluation of snakes. In fact, snakes have never had anything good said about them in the whole history of language. The word "**snake**" metaphorically denotes someone sneaky, cunning and treacherous; a worthless, ungrateful person; and a friend who cannot be trusted. English idioms *a snake in the grass* and *a snake under one's nose* (spoken) denote a person who pretends to be your friend but who is in fact an enemy: "*Steven is nothing but a snake in the grass: I discovered he was telling terrible things about me.*" Negative connotation is also characteristic of such idioms as *a snake charmer* (anyone who appears to be nice, but is ready to harm you); *a snake doctor* (a very badly trained doctor or one with no medical training); *a bag of snakes* (a very complex and unpleasant problem); *to scotch the snake* (to act quickly to prevent a danger). In Russian *змея* has the same symbolical meaning as in English embodying a notion about insidious, dangerous person: *змея подколотная* (a snake laying under a log); *змеиная улыбка* (a snake's smile). In the Chinese culture snake is considered to be clever, but wicked and treacherous creature. It is one of the five creatures regarded by Chinese as noxious ones (the centipede, the snake, the scorpion, the gecko and the toad). Pejorative

meaning is obvious in such figurative word combinations as 蛇口蜂針 *she kou feng zhen* (venomous, malicious); 蛇吞象 *she tun xiang* (lit.: a snake wants to swallow an elephant; said about a person with a discontented heart or inordinately greedy); 蛇豕 *she shi* (reptile); 蛇蠍美人 *she xie mei ren* (about a young girl who is beautiful but has an evil heart); 佛口蛇心 *fo kou she xin* (lit.: words of Buddha, heart of snake; said about a hypocritical person). As we see, associative perception of snake fixed in different languages has very many in commons. None the less, mental anthropomorphic stereotypes could differ much. For example, in Russian a word *goose*, on the one hand, provokes, an idea of "big knob" and, on the other hand, calls forth a notion of cunning and shrewd person: *экий гусь!* (a fine fellow indeed!), *важный гусь* (a pompous goose), *гусь лапчатый* (a goose with webs). The third metaphor is used to denote a person who is able to get out of a tight spot without prejudice to himself and definitely has a pejorative meaning. In spoken Russian language a comparison *как с гуся вода* (like water off a duck's back) is rather often used. It is said to denote a carefree indifferent person who is very hard to impress. This comparison is based on the fact that goose's feathering never becomes wet: water rolls down off it. In old times this expression was used in Russian spells to exorcize melancholy, depression or disease: "as water rolls off goose, let diseases roll off me".

In English *goose* finds other associations being linked with notions of wealth and stupidity. Such idioms as *a golden goose* and *to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs* (or simply *to kill the golden goose*) are coming from Aesop's fable about a man who killed a remarkable goose that laid eggs of gold to find the source of all the gold inside him. They refer to something that is a source of profit and pleasure and *to kill the golden goose* means to destroy or ruin this source. English proverb *the older the goose the harder to pluck* also reveals goose's association with money and wealth: the older the person is the harder to force him to part with money. Association with stupidity could be illustrated through such a comparison: *silly (stupid) as a goose*. Chinese has a similar expression 呆頭鵝 *dai tou e* which designates a silly indifferent person, who is very poor in feelings. At the same time the goose in China (like the mandarin duck or the phoenix) is a symbol of married bliss. According to a very old Chinese custom the bridegroom's family sends a gander to the bride's family, and the bride's family answers by sending back a goose. As to wild geese, they are often regarded as bearers of glad tidings: 千里送鴻毛 *qian li sung hong mao* (being

very far to send a goose's feather as a sign of friendship and love); 鴻圖 *hong tu* (vision of a wild duck, which symbolizes a favorable perspective for business).

Conclusion

Thus, national character of language becomes quite clear on lexical and semantic levels of language structure. Three parts of the world language model - the reflected material universe, the world of subjective language substance, and the world of mythical language substance - are differently fixed by lexicon of various languages.

Inner forms of words-counterparts in different languages usually show great diversity, because different peoples picked up various characteristic signs of a new entity while naming it.

As it was shown on the material of animal names and animal idioms, expressive metaphors of different languages sometimes coincide in connotation and sometimes differ: it depends on cultural background of this or that language. Metaphors fix mental associations of the ethnic community exposing a mysterious level of the language: "between semantics and cognition". Being an embodiment of national cultural heritage any language imprints in its staff people's beliefs and trusts. There exist some general laws of the historical development of mankind and human thinking: that's why mental ethnic stereotypes often coincide, though national originality comes to light through their difference. As to words denoting animals, we can already preliminarily assume basing on the investigated language material, that they are likely to get more common figurative meanings in different languages, than any other language lexical staff (not-alive objects, for example).

Uncovering common and peculiar features in language reflection of reality and human consciousness we are getting a chance to penetrate into the culture and mentality of the peoples - bearers of different languages.

Notes:

(1) Humboldtianism is a totality of views on language and approaches to its study, which formed under the influence of the linguistic conception of an outstanding German scientist of the 19th century W. Humboldt. The kernel of his theory might be characterized as anthropological approach to language, supposing its study in close connection and interaction with consciousness and thinking of the person, with human's cultural and spiritual life. Humboldt's ideas were revived in the 20th century within the framework of a linguistic trend called neohumboldtianism.

References

1. Eberhard, W. (1990). Times dictionary of Chinese symbols (Routledge & Kegan Paul, Trans.). Singapore : Mentor Printers Pte Ltd. (Original work published 1989).
2. Humboldt, W. (1985). Jazyk i filozofija kul'tury [Language and philosophy of culture]. (M. Ramishvili, Trans.). Moscow : Nauka. (Original work published 1968).
3. Kornilov O. A. (1996). Obuchenie leksike russkogo jazyka kak sisteme [Teaching Russian lexics as a system]. In Ming Ji (Ed.) Lingvometodicheskiye i didakticheskiye problemy obuchenija russkomu jazyku v vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenijakh (pp.161-172). Taipei, Taiwan : University of Chinese Culture.
4. Likhachiev D. S. (1993). Kontseptosfera russkogo jazyka [Concepts of Russian language]. Izvestija Akademii nauk. Ser. literatury i jazyka, 52, 3-9.
5. Lingvisticheskiy enciklopedicheskiy slovar'.(1990). [Linguistic encyclopaedic dictionary]. Moscow : Sovetskaya encyclopediya.
6. Wierzbicka A. (1992). Semantics, culture and cognition: Universal concepts in culture-specific configurations. New York: Oxford University Press.
7. Yazykovaya nominatsiya (1977) [Language nomination]. Moscow: Nauka.