

**LEGE ARTIS**

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. I. No 2 2016

**LANGUAGE WORLDVIEW OF YAKIMA INDIANS, COMPARED
WITH ENGLISH AND UKRAINIANS***Andrei Levitsky*

Levitsky, A. Language worldview of Yakima Indians, compared with English and Ukrainians // *Lege artis*. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2016, vol. I (2), December 2016. p. 80-128. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2016-0011 ISSN 2453-8035

Abstract: The problem of conceptualization the information as well as its further verbalization remains one of the topical issues of present-day linguistic research, though the languages of Native Americans (like Sahaptin – the language of the Yakima nation) still need a more detailed analysis. The present study is the first to single out the means of verbalization the information on ENVIRONMENT & TIME in two distantly related languages (English and Ukrainian) on the background of Sahaptin (the language of Yakima people).

Key words: Yakima nation, the Sahaptin language, English, Ukrainian, language typology, semantics, language world-view, concept, categorization levels, verbalization.

1. Introduction

The present-day state of the development of Linguistics is characterized by the significant interest of scholars to those issues which touch upon the problem of the correlation of language and culture (Алефиренко 2010; Верещагин, Костомаров 1990; Воробьев 2008; Гудков 2003; Красных 2002; Маслова 2001; Mikula 2008; Wierzbicka 1997). Within this framework the representation of real world that surrounds a person, circumstances of life, consciousness, national character, mentality, a definite set of values, and morality are studied through the prism of the analysis of language units (Воркачев 2001; Карасик, Слышкин 2001; Колесов 2004; Красавский 2001; Quinn & Holland 1987).

Language reflects knowledge processes acting as the main means of expression of thought. Language starts to be perceived as a possible way of getting into people's ideas. At the center of attention of modern researchers there is a problem of the interaction of a person, his/ her language and culture (Воркачев 2001; Гришаева, Цурикова 2006; Тер-Минасова 2004; Lakoff & Kövecses 1987; Wierzbicka 1991). The way of conceptualization of the reality which has specific and universal features is inherent in each language (Корнилов 2003; Evans 2009; Mikula 2008; Wierzbicka 1997).

At the present-day stage of the development of linguistics, much attention is paid to the principal issue of reflecting the reality in human mind and the role of language in this process (Воркачев 2001; Карасик 2002; Кубрякова 2004; Панасенко 2000; Степанов 2007; Croft & Cruse 2004; Wierzbicka 1992). The totality of such verbalized reflections constitutes **a language worldview** – a consciousness-reality image encoded in a language (Голубовская 2002; Колшанский 2006; Корнилов 2003; Пименова 2011).

Since its essence is anthropocentrically determined – it combines both universal and nationally unique features – the study of a language worldview is a primary concern of anthropology, cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology (Воркачев 2001: 64).

Such American linguists and anthropologists, as Rigsby and Rude (1996), Beavert-Martin (1999), Beavert and Hargus (2009) carried out solid investigations of the Sahaptin language and culture, thus shedding light on the Yakima language worldview.

The **topicality** of the research is conditioned, on the one hand, by the anthropocentrism of the contemporary linguistic paradigm and the focus of linguistics on conceptual and

language worldview studies and, on the other hand, by the fact that Native American languages, and, consequently, worldviews, are waiting for more investigations.

2. Material and methods. Worldview: conceptual and language axes in Sahaptin, English and Ukrainian

The **aim** of the research consists in the comparison of the worldviews verbalized in the Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English languages.

It is attained by fulfilling the following **tasks**:

- pointing out the ways of the national worldviews' reflection in the language structure the lexical units in particular languages;
- comparing specifics of the concepts activated in the worldviews compared;
- determining, classifying and comparing the specifics of verbalizing the main concepts by means of the languages compared;
- singling out common and divergent features of the semantics of the concepts analyzed in the languages under study.

The **object** of the research is the lexical units used for the verbalization of the key concepts in the Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English languages.

The **subject** is the specificity of the verbalized concepts, their distinctions and place in the worldviews of the languages compared.

The **material** of the work is composed of the verbalized Yakima basic concepts obtained from Yakama/Yakima Sahaptin Dictionary (Beavert & Hargus 2009) and compared with the Ukrainian and English correspondences.

The **methods** of the investigation correspond to the goal, tasks and the analysed material: contrastive, semantic and etymological analyses. Besides, word motivation, word formation and the specifics of verbalized concepts have been taken into account.

2.1 Approaches to language comparison

It is generally accepted that language comparison is a universal means in theoretical and applied linguistics (Аракин 2005; Кочерган 2004; 2006; Кошечая 2014; Кошечая, Дубовский 1980; Левицкий et al. 2009; Левицкий, Славова 2006; Манакин 2004; Нариси... 1979; Панасенко 2000; Порівняльні дослідження... 1981; Швачко et al. 1977; Andreichuk 2015; Croft 2002; Gvishiani 2010; Korunets 1995; Lado 1957; Theoretical issues... 1981). Therefore, it appears to be the most effective means of investigating the specificities of world conceptualization by different languages, since every language not only reflects the objective world, but also interprets it in its own way (Кочерган 2004: 12). So, there are the following approaches to language comparison on all its levels: phonetic, morphological, lexico-semantic and syntactic:

- on the phonetic level, languages are compared according to the distinctive features in the systems of vowels and consonants (Нариси... 1979: 9). The following steps are usually adhered: a) determining the quantity of phonemes and interrelation between vowels and consonants; b) ascertaining the range, pitch, labialization, articulation stability, length and the degree of tension in the vowel systems; c) considering the position of the tongue, the role of vocal cords, the manner of production of noise etc. in the systems of consonants; d) examining the distribution of vowels and consonants in the opposed groups (e.g., the English front and back ranges of vowels include more phonemes than the corresponding Ukrainian ones); e) finding distinctions in articulation of sounds belonging to the same group (Порівняльні дослідження... 1981: 18-23);

- on the morphological level, comparison is fulfilled depending on the ways of expressing grammatical categories (though, some categories may be expressed syntactically, e.g., the category of mood in English) and formation of lexico-grammatical word classes (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, modal verbs, prepositions, conjunctions, particles and interjections) (Порівняльні дослідження...1981: 64);
- there are several approaches to language comparison on the lexico-semantic level: contrastive, componential (Швачко et al. 1977: 94), distributional and valency analyses (Супрун 1988: 27-28); investigating synonymic ranges, antonyms, interfiled connections, comparison of the inner word-form, analyzing culturally specific and emotionally charged vocabulary, phraseological units (Кочерган 2004: 13-19);
- comparison of impersonal sentences is rather efficient for, on the one hand, it demonstrates the syntactico-typologic characteristics of the languages compared, and on the other hand, the results allow certain conclusions to be drawn as for national world-views (Кочерган 2004: 21).

Another approach to language comparison is connected with the 'tertium comparationis' theory, when languages are compared in relation to a language-model (also called *a metalanguage* (Кочерган 2004: 12)) represented either by one of the compared languages, usually native (in this case the contrastive analysis is called *unilateral* (Сепир2001: 12), or living, extinct, or artificial (worked out in the process of typological analysis of a number of languages) (Порівняльні дослідження...1981: 12-13).

Thus, these approaches presume the revelation of general, similar and specific features on all the language levels, which conduces to a worldview comparison.

2.1.1 Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English data compared. Sahaptin in the Penutian language family

The Indian languages of America are little investigated and the connections between them have not been ultimately ascertained (Мови світу 1982: 56). However, there exist several classifications, within which these languages are grouped into families. The most widely accepted classification of Native American languages is that made by Sapir in 1929. He arranged the numerous linguistic groups in six major unrelated linguistic stocks, or families, which include Eskimo-Aleut, Algonquian-Mosan, Na-Dené, Penutian, Hokan-Siouan, and Aztec-Tanoan (Сепир 2001).

According to another classification, the following Native American language families are distinguished: Na-Dené, Algonquian-Mosan, Penutian, Hokan-Siouan, Aztec-Tanoan (the name derived from the Uto-Aztecan and the Tanoan languages (Мови світу 1982)), Chibchan, Otomanguean or Otomi (the languages of central and southern Mexico, including Mixtec and Zapotecand (NOAD 2005; Мови світу 1982: 57)).

As for of the Penutian stock or phylum, its existence has been the subject of debate among specialists (Beavert-Martin 1999; DeLancey & Golla 1997; Rigsby & Rude 1996). Even the unity of some of its component families has been disputed. Some of the problems in the comparative study of languages within the phylum are the result of their early extinction and minimal documentation.

In 1916 Sapir expanded Dixon and Kroeber's California Penutian family with a sister stock, Oregon Penutian (the Coosan language, Siuslaw, Takelma (Сепир 2001)). However later, Sapir and Frachtenberg added the Kalapuyan and the Chinookan languages, and then – the Alsean and the Tsimshianic families, culminating in Sapir's 1921 four-branch classification: 1) the California Penutian grouping – Maiduan (Maidu), Utian (Miwok-Costanoan), Wintuan (Wintu), Yokutsan (Yokuts); 2) the Oregon Penutian grouping – Coosan (Coos), Siuslaw, Takelma, Kalapuyan (Kalapuya)

and Alsean (Yakonan); 3) the Chinookan family (Chinook); 4) the Tsimshianic family (Tsimshian) (Сепир 2001).

By 1929 Sapir had added two more branches: 1) the Plateau Penutian family – Klamath-Modoc (Lutuami), Waiilatpuan, Cayuse, Molala and Sahaptian (Sahaptin); 2) the Mexican Penutian grouping – Mixe-Zoque and Huave. This resulted in a six-branch family: 1) California Penutian; 2) Oregon Penutian; 3) Chinookan; 4) Tsimshianic; 5) Plateau Penutian; 6) Mexican Penutian (Сепир 2001).

Another classification of the languages belonging to the Penutian phylum has been put forward by DeLancey (DeLancey & Golla 1997). He suggests the following relationships within and among language families typically assigned to the Penutian phylum: a) Maritime Penutian: Tsimshian, Chinook and Oregon Coast Penutian – Alsea, Siuslaw and Coosan; b) Inland Penutian: Yok-Utian-Utian and Yokuts, Maidu (from the Great Basin or Oregon); c) Plateau Penutian – Klamath, Molala and Sahaptian.

In 1962 when Rigsby began his fieldwork in Sahaptin, the old Yakimas did not use 'Sahaptin' to name their language. Instead, people described themselves as speaking *ichishkínk* (Yakama) or *chishkín* (Umatilla and Walla Walla), both of which mean "in this manner, this way." There was then no traditional indigenous name for the Sahaptin language corresponding to the Nez Perce language names, *Nuumiipuutímt* and *Niimiipuutímt* (Beavert & Hargus 2009: xx).

Sahaptin does not originate as a word from either the Sahaptin or the Nez Perce languages. It was in the fur trader Thompson's *Narrative* where the first use of 'Sahaptin' in English was found. Thompson's 'Sahaptin' is without doubt his attempt to spell in English the Moses-Columbia Salish word *sháptənəx*, their name for the Nez Percés. *Sháptənəxis* the indigenous language prototype for the names *Sahaptin*,

Shahaptin, *Sahaptian* and *Shahaptianin* English. The same word, pronounced a bit differently, is found in other Interior Salishan languages. The occurrence of cognate forms across three southern Interior Salishan languages indicates that this ethnonym is ancient (Beavert & Hargus 2009: xix).

2.1.2 English and Ukrainian within the Indo-European family

The family comprises twelve branches: Indic (including Sanskrit and its descendants), Iranian (Baluchi, Pashto, Kurdish), Anatolian (an extinct group including Hittite and other languages), Armenian, Hellenic (Greek), Albanian (possibly descended from Illyrian), Italic (including Latin and the Romance languages), Celtic, Tocharian (an extinct group from central Asia), Germanic (including English, German, Dutch, Gothic and the Scandinavian languages), Baltic, and Slavic (NOAD 2005).

The latter one (originating from the Medieval Latin *Sclavus*, the Late Greek *Sklabos*, and later from the Medieval Latin *Slavus* (NOAD 2005) branch of the Indo-European language family) splits into the following subgroups: a) Eastern Slavic including Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian; b) Western Slavic – Polish, Czech, Slovak, Sorbian and Lusatian; c) the Southern Slavic subgroup – Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian and Slovenian (NOAD 2005). As for Ukrainian as an Eastern Slavic language, it is worth mentioning that its name originates from the Russian 'ukraina' meaning frontier regions, from *u* meaning 'at' and *kraï* – 'edge' (NOAD 2005).

The Germanic branch (from Latin *Germanicus*, from *germanus* meaning 'related, akin' (NOAD 2005)) of the Indo-European family has three distinct groups (sub-branches): a) North Germanic or Scandinavian consists of Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Icelandic (descending from Old Icelandic, a form of Old Norse, which was spoken up to the XVI century, and in which the medieval sagas were composed) and their associated dialects. The common language-ancestor of the Scandinavian languages is Proto-Norse (the North Germanic language spoken up to about 700 AD (NOAD 2005)); b) East

Germanic – the extinct eastern group of languages, the only member of which records survive is Gothic; c) West Germanic comprising English, Frisian (spoken in provinces of the Northern Netherlands, with their oldest literary sources dating from the 14th century), German with two dialects – Low German occupying the northern parts of Germany, and High German, which is located in the mountainous regions of the South of Germany; Dutch, Flemish, Afrikaans, Yiddish, and their associated dialects (NOAD 2005).

2.2 Generic discrepancies of the languages compared

Having considered the place of Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English in their language families, one may conclude that Ukrainian and English belong to different branches of the Indo-European family (Ukrainian – to the Slavic group, Eastern subgroup, and English – to the Germanic group, Western subgroup), thus being distantly related, while Sahaptin as a language of quite a different family is related neither to Ukrainian nor English.

Though Ukrainian and English belong to the same language family, which presupposes the existence of a common language ancestor – Proto Indo-European – and, subsequently, some common morphological, lexical and other features, there are some generalities between them, since the proto language (used 5000-6000 years ago (Фолсом 1974: 83)) split into the Slavic and the Germanic groups three or four thousand years ago, and even then these groups diverged substantially in their lexis and grammar. However, the languages still preserve some similarities on the lexical level represented by basic language units such as numerals, pronouns, relationship terms, names of body parts, celestial bodies, names of some animals, birds and plants, dwellings, instruments, time and natural phenomena, names of basic actions, processes and qualities, e.g., *один*–one, *твій*–your, *сестра*–sister, *око*–eye, *сонце*–sun, *сніг*–snow, *лиса*–fox, *береза*–birch, etc. The relative stability of these units indicates their central position in the language worldviews. So, Ukrainian and English are distantly

related languages while Sahaptin is generically non-related to them, which leads to the assumption that they have very little in common in their structures and, consequently, worldviews encoded in them.

2.2.1 Approaches to lexis comparison

Since language worldview specificity is best reflected in lexical units (Кочерган 2004: 13), it appears to be justified that there exist a number of approaches to language comparison on the lexico-semantic level.

Contrastive analysis deals with language comparison on all the levels. It is a complex procedure consisting of several steps:

- description of the languages' structure, which provides the necessary comparison data. In such a way, Coseriu claims that contrastive grammar is not a method of description, but rather a means of applying the description for a certain purpose of comparison (Coseriu 1980). Besides, the description must be fulfilled in terms of one and the same linguistic theory and applying the same stratification model – language level hierarchy;

- establishing comparability, a very important intervening stage between description and comparison. Thereby, the categories or means of content expression, which correspond to one another in the given languages, should be established (Кочерган 2004: 18). Consequently, the problem of correspondences arises: what is expressed in one language morphologically may be expressed lexically, syntactically or with the help of intonation in another one, or may not be expressed at all (Кочерган 2004: 22). Thus, the plane of content and the plane of form are differently interrelated. In case of the same plane of content but different ways of expressing it one deals with language equivalents (Порівняльні дослідження...1981: 10). A similar, but rare phenomenon comes into being if there is a semantic equivalence of the language units, which also coincide in form. It is called *congruence* (Нариси...1979: 10).

Componential analysis is aimed at revealing dissimilarities in the semantic structure of words belonging to different languages by segmenting each word into semantic constituents (semantic differential features (Супрун 1988: 27)). For example, the English verb *to smell* falls into the following semantic components: a) to perceive or detect the odour or scent of something; b) to detect or discover something by the faculty of smell; c) to detect or suspect something by means of instinct or intuition; d) to emit an odour or scent of a specified kind; e) to have a strong or unpleasant odour. This verb largely corresponds to Ukrainian *пахнути* and *нюхати* (Кочерган 2004: 13), and to Sahaptin *tíwa-* (to smell (good or bad), to have a scent) and *núkshi-* to smell, to sniff (Beavert & Hargus 2009). Thus, these verbs have a common semantic component – 'to have an odour or scent'. However, the English verb *to smell* has a broader meaning than the Ukrainian *пахнути*, since the latter excludes the components 'to perceive the odour of something' (*нюхати*) and 'to detect or suspect something by means of instinct or intuition'. *To smell* in the meaning of *пахнути* is close to Sahaptin *tíwa-*, but it differs from *núkshi-* in the sense that it does not embrace the meaning 'to sniff' inherent in the Sahaptin word. So, on the one hand, the same semantic meaning may be rendered by one or more words in different languages (different sense distribution), and, on the other hand, semantic constituents of the corresponding polysemantic words in two or more languages never coincide. These discrepancies are based on the specific ways of world conceptualization by different languages.

Distributional analysis lies in the fact that corresponding lexemes in the compared languages have a different combinative power (Нариси...1979: 28). It resembles the above described componential analysis in respect that it indicates distinctions in word meaning (Супрун 1988: 28), e.g., the English word *grey* corresponds to the Ukrainian *сірий* and to the Sahaptin *lúmt* (blue-grey), *lúumt* (dark purple, grey), *páapxw*, *pu'úux* (grey, faded). However, the word-combination *grey hair* is rendered into Ukrainian as *сіве волосся*, *сивина*, and *kukúk* (brain, grey hair) in Sahaptin. Besides, there is still

a different word to name the corresponding colour of a horse in Sahaptin – *lámt* (*light purple, grey* – about a horse (Beavert & Hargus 2009)).

Valency analysis consists in the description of word meaning in the contrastive plane aimed at determining the main semantic structure. All the meanings of words in a semantic field are based on this structure. So, the goal in this case is not a comparison of separate lexical units, but rather a comparison of the conformable semantic fields (Нариси...1979: 57), e.g., the semantic field of the verb *to kill* (Sahaptin *ítł'yawi, íyatna-*) includes the verbs *to knife, to poison, to drown, to strangle, to shoot*, etc. (*wátł'ik-* to beat with a stick, to kill by clubbing; *píttł'yawi-* to fight in combat, to kill). The transitive character of the verbs presupposes the existence of agents and patients. Therefore, the semantic structure of the verb *to kill* is as follows: X kills Y. The quality of X is 'to make Y dead' and the quality of Y is 'to be a living being, able to die'. That is why, the verbs *to knife*: X makes Y dead (with the help of a knife); *to poison*: X makes Y dead (with the help of a poison), etc.; and Sahaptin *wátł'ik-*: X makes Y dead (with the help of a stick) and *píttł'yawi-*: X makes Y dead (with the help of some weapon) specify the main semantic structure by indicating instruments. By comparing the corresponding instruments one arrives at a conclusion concerning cultural specifics.

Comparison of interfiled connections is based on polysemy and, consequently, on the transference of meaning (figurative word meaning), e.g., the Ukrainian *вушко голки*, the English *an eye of a needle*, the Sahaptin *cháwi'iipi* (from *cháwi'iip* – to pull through, to pass through with a hand, to pull a needle through a cloth).

Comparison of the inner word-form, i.e. the way of word motivation (phonetic, morphological and semantic), contributes largely to a worldview comparison because it is unique in each of the considered languages. For example, the name of a wading bird with a long bill and typically long legs, nesting on the ground near water and

frequenting coastal areas on migration is *нісочник* in Ukrainian (originated from the word *нісок* – 'sand'), *sandpiper* in English (on the ground of the words *sand* and *pipe* – probably, indicating the form of its bill), and *yiityiit* in Sahaptin meaning 'kill-deer' (connected with a Yakima legend and the bird's screeching *Yiit!* – 'kill a deer').

Thus, each of the approaches, depending on the techniques it applies, reveals certain aspects of national worldviews by analyzing corresponding units on the lexico-semantic level and establishing relations within and among them. Furthermore, these worldview specifics being the subject of comparison reflect the mode of life and cultural singularity of a nation, thus being anthropocentrically determined.

2.3 Anthropocentric approach

In recent years, the statement that linguistics is a scientific study about 'a language in a person and a person in a language' has become axiomatic (Воркачев 2001). Consequently, according to Koubriakova, language as the object of linguistics is to be studied not for its own sake, but for a more profound comprehension of a person (nation) and their worldview(s). That is why language is considered as both the object and the means of explanation of such phenomena as consciousness, thinking, community and culture (Кубрякова 2004).

Thus, anthropocentrism is justly referred to the chief linguistic principles by Stepanov (2007). Accordingly, a language is viewed as a creative product of an ethnic society, a key element of national culture (Жайворонок 2004: 23).

The idea that language influences the way people perceive the world is advocated by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which combines two principles. The first is known as *linguistic determinism* claiming that language determines the way people think. The second follows from this, and is known as *linguistic relativity* and states that the distinctions encoded in one language are not found in any other language. Thereby,

Whorf suggested that 'the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions, which has to be organized by our minds – and this means largely by linguistic systems in our minds' (Whorf 1956).

So, the essence of the anthropocentric approach consists in the idea that a person is regarded as a reference point in the analysis of certain linguistic phenomena (Попова 2002: 71) and a language appears to be 'the mirror of human spirit' (Воркачев 2001: 65).

2.4 Conceptual and language worldviews

The study of language worldview is the reverse side of the controversial subject concerning language and mind. In other words, a world-view is not the model representing the world, but the world understood as a model (Ляпин 1997: 43).

We define *the language worldview* as a consciousness-reality image reflected by means of a language, a model of the integrated knowledge of the conceptual sphere manifested in a language. *The conceptual worldview*, like the language one, is constantly changing while reflecting the results of human cognitive and social activity.

However, some fragments of the language worldview partially preserve people's archaic ideas on the world. For instance, the idea of ancient people that the Earth is flat is reproduced in the word-combination *the sun sets/rises*. The heathen taboo to mention the names of their gods can be traced from the impersonal forms of a verb: *it drizzles, it freezes, it rains* (Манакин 2004: 44).

To crown it all, it should be noted that since the processes and forms of thinking are of universal character and the content of thinking are nationally conditioned, each language objectifies its unique worldview.

2.4.1 Notion of concept and conceptual world

The term *concept* denotes a unit of mental and psychological resources of people's consciousness, and a reflection of their knowledge and experience, according to Koubriakova (2004). It may also be defined as the reflection of real objects and phenomena in their essential features and relations in the human mind (Карасик 2002: 167). Thus, a concept is a cognitive unit of meaning – an abstract idea or a mental symbol.

The term *concept* is traced back to Aristotle's 'The classical theory of concepts' definition of terms. This notion has been borrowed by linguists from mathematical logic. In the Russian Linguistic Tradition, for instance, the term *concept* is not monosemantic from the early 90s (Лихачев 1997; Ляпин 1997; Степанов 2007). However, during recent years it has become apparent that the term *concept* according to its frequency of use is much ahead of all other coinages. The meaning of *concept* is explored in cognitive science, metaphysics, and philosophy of mind.

The study of the concept in modern linguistics is of paramount importance. However, any attempt to comprehend the nature of the concept is associated with a number of the most diverse points of view. The intensive research of it in the field of cognitive linguistics has demonstrated a great disparity in the understanding of the term *concept*. Discrepancies cause ambiguity and terminological confusion (Грузберг 2003:184).

Thus, the term *concept* is an umbrella term for several scientific directions: first of all for cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics, dealing with thinking and cognition, storing and transforming information, as well as for cultural linguistics, which is still defining and refining the boundaries of the theory formed by the postulates and basic categories. We can assume that as in mathematics, the concept in cognitive science is the basic axiomatic category which is undetectable, intuitively

understanding; the hyperonym of the notion, ideas, frame, script, gestalt, etc. (Лихачев 1997).

According to Stepanov, concepts are just phrases, fragments of conversation, but they are subtle phrases that force our minds create such content, as if it has been familiar for us for a long time (Степанов 2007). Concept can be understood as bunch of culture in the consciousness of people; it is something in the form of which the culture enters the mental world. Moreover, people through the concept enter the culture and affect it. Concepts are not only contemplated, they are experienced. They are the subject of emotions, likes and dislikes, and sometimes collisions. The concept is also a discrete unit of the collective consciousness, which is stored in the national memory of native speakers in verbally determinate form. As a cognitive unit of meaning, a concept is an abstract idea or a mental symbol sometimes defined as a 'unit of knowledge', built from other units, which act as a concept's characteristic. A concept is typically associated with a corresponding representation in a language such as a single meaning of a term (Dillon 2000: 51-71).

In linguistics, the concept, in contrast to a word, has a more complicated structure. The content of the concept is divided into linguistic meaning and cultural sense. That is why it is often called a unit of knowledge, an abstract idea or a mental symbol. Wierzbicka (1997) states that the concept is an object from the ideal world, which has the name and reflects the people's cultural understanding of real world. Concept describes typical situations of culture and is the subject of cultural science studies.

According to Stepanov, the concept is a basic cultural cell in the mental world of a human being (Степанов 2007). Concept is a mental structure that represents the knowledge of an individual about a particular segment of the world. Being a part of the world picture, the concept reflects the orientation of values of both the individual

person and the entire linguistic community. It implies that the concept may include the generally valid features as well as the individual characteristics of native speakers.

There are other points of view on the structure of the concept. Karasik and Slyshkin (2001) propose to consider the cultural concept as a multidimensional meaningful construct, where the notional, figurative and value sides are distinguished. The notional aspect of a concept is the linguistic fixation of a concept, its name, description, feature structure, definition, and comparative characteristics of this concept in relation to other groups of concepts. The imagery side of a concept is its visual, auditory, tactile, taste characteristics of objects, events, events, which in one form or another are reflected in our consciousness. The value side of a concept specifies the importance of educational process, both for an individual and for a team.

Scholars consider the concept as a multidimensional mental unit where the evaluative element predominates (Карасик, Стернин 2007). The concept groups around some strong point of consciousness, from which associative vectors diverge. Most relevant associations to native speakers constitute the core of the concept, the less significant – the periphery. According to them, the concept has not any clear boundaries, while receding from the nucleus the associations are gradual fading.

Human knowledge about the surrounding reality and the way which he classifies the world are expressed in his language; on the other hand, language is the only means by which we can get into the sphere of mentality hidden from us, because it defines a way of partitioning of the world in a certain culture.

The efforts of modern researchers are directed at studying the mechanisms of language conceptualization and categorization of the world (Rosch 1978). Various fragments of national language worldview are specific and find a reflection in concepts of cultures. Without knowledge of the concepts of national culture, it is impossible to carry out the

high-grade communication. The account of interaction of language and culture has allowed researchers to allocate the so-called 'key concepts' of national cultures behind which the major concepts of national consciousness are located.

Thus a concept is a multidimensional meaningful formation represented by language means (Карасик, Стернин 2007: 129), which helps to analyse content, structure and place of a concept in the conceptual worldview. Any concept consists of notional, valuable and image-bearing components (Карасик 2002: 5).

This idea may be illustrated through the difference between meaning and concept that allows us to compare synonymous words and word-groups expressing the same concept but possessing the linguistic meaning, which is perceived as different in each of the units, e.g., *to die, to pass away, to join the majority, to kick the bucket* (ЛЭС 1990: 132); Sahaptin: *átna-*, *tʔyáwiandcháawi-* (a gentler term than *tʔyáwi-*); Ukrainian: *померти, випустити дух, зіграти в ящик, відкинути ноги*. Another example is the concept of a child in these languages (in English: *child, baby, babe, infant*; in Ukrainian: *дитина, дитятко, немовля*; in Sahaptin: *туánash* (child, youth), *туáákin, yalmílk, туánash* (illegitimate child), *láymut* (the youngest child, the baby of the family)).

The notional component comprises all the shades of meaning of a verbalized concept, e.g., the notional component of the Sahaptin concept *taxús* implies such meanings as 'hemp dogbane, Indian hemp, milkweed'. The notional component of this concept distinguishes it from other verbalized concepts denoting plants, e.g., *xuushlí* – an oval-leaved blueberry; *xasya* – wild celery, etc.

As far as the Sahaptin *taxús* is concerned, this plant is typical of North America. Its valuable component lies in the fact that it is of exceptional utility (Beavert & Hargus 2009: 211) for the Yakimas. Besides, there is even some fibre from an Indian hemp

plant kept as an exhibit in the Yakima Valley Museum (Ibid.: 211). The stalks of this plant are crushed to loosen the paper-thin bast from the stem. The bast is then shredded to separate the long fibres. During long winters in the past, women twined literally miles of hemp string from these fibres, rolling the finished string into large balls for later use. A strong string is essential to the people of the Plateau, who used it for snares and fish nets and to hold together the mats that served them as lodge and floor coverings (Ibid.: 210).

As for the image-bearing constituent, it appears to be at the basis of any concept because images are mental units of people's consciousness. Images are a starting point of concepts, and concepts are the nuclei of words. E.g., *taxus* brings to mind the image of a tall plant with a stiff upright stem, divided serrated leaves, and glandular hairs.

After the transformation of a mental image into a concept, the letter is put into words to express one's thoughts and ideas. Thus, *verbalization* (a process of using words to communicate the meaning) takes place.

2.4.2 Language worldview

The conceptual system of language preserves everything learned by people. The worldview is dynamic. It is developed and supplemented with the new data caused by movement of human thought and directed to the knowledge.

Language reflects not only reality, but also interprets it, creating special reality where man lives. Heidegger, an outstanding thinker of the last century, named language 'the house of reality' (Heidegger 1971: 93).

All refinements of nation's culture reflect in language, which is specific and unique. Huge part of information about the World comes to a person through linguistic channel that's why person lives rather in the world of concepts, created by him for intellectual,

spiritual and social needs, than in the world of objects and things; enormous information comes to him through a word and human's success in society depends on that how good he possessed the language, and not so much on possession of cultural speech, but rather on his abilities to understand the secrets of language. One of the most valuable source of the information about the culture and mentality of the nation are phraseological units, metaphors, symbols and others, because they keep the myths, legends and traditions of the target culture.

Every language reflects the World in its own way; also, it has its way of conceptualization. Thereby linguists decided that every language has a unique worldview and a language speaker needs to arrange utterances accordingly. Thus, we observe the specific perception of the world fixed in language.

Language is an important method of knowledge formation and existence about the World. Reflecting the objective world in the process of activity, in word people fix the results of cognition, knowledge. The sum of this knowledge fixed in language represents itself what we call 'language intervening world', 'language model of the world', or ultimately 'language worldview'. According to wide usage, we mostly choose the last term.

For a native speaker the mother tongue represents a form of the conceptualization of the world, characteristic for the given culture. The system of values, created within the culture, has its reflection in the language. Moreover, according to von Humboldt, each language reflects some definite worldview (Гумбольдт 1984). Consequently, 'to the extent perception and activities of a person depend on his views'; person's attitude towards objects is defined by the language. The same can be said about Gadamer's famous statement of 'the tradition in which we live', which implies 'linguistic tradition' (Гадамер 1991: 43-59).

For understanding this aspect of the human culture, some lexical units represent 'priceless clues' as Wierzbicka puts it. 'Key words – the words which are extremely important and meaningful for the given culture'(Wierzbicka 1997: 1-30). From this, we may conclude that the accumulated experience somehow is encoded in the language. For example, Geertz and his co-authors gave to the notion of *culture* the following definition 'historically transferred model of notions, put in symbols, as a system of inherited conceptions, that are expressed by means of symbols, through which people communicate with each other and based on which their knowledge about life and their attitudes are formed' (Geertz et al. 1979: 89).

The concept of Worldview (including language) is the ground of the studies of a person's view of the World. If the world is the interaction between a human being and environment, worldview is a result of the processed information about the person and environment. Thus, the representatives of cognate linguistics fairly asserted that our conceptual system, reflected in the form of language 'picture' of the world, depends on physical and cultural experience and ingeniously connected with it.

Apresyan underlined the pre-scientific character of language worldview, calling it naive. Studying semantics of words such as *atom*, *dot*, *light*, *heat*, etc., we can reveal the specificity of cognate models, which determines the originality of naive worldview. As cognition of the world is not deprived of mistakes and delusions, its conceptual worldview is always changing, whereas language worldview keeps longitudinally the tracks of those mistakes and delusions (Апресян 1995).

Language worldview forms the type of persons treat to the world (nature, animals, to him as the element of the world). It sets the norms of people behaviour in the world and defines their relations to the world. Every natural language reflects the defined way of perception and organization (conceptualization) of the world. Expressed, their

senses take shape of some united system of visions, like collective philosophy, which binds as obligatory to the whole bearers of the language.

Hereby, the role of the language is not only sending messages, but first of all, in internal organization of that which is liable to send. It arises some kind of 'space of meanings' (in Leontiev's terminology) (Leontiev 2005), that is knowledge about the world fixed in language, where certainly enters the national-cultural experience of the concrete language community. It forms the world of speakers who spoke the given language; there is language worldview as totality of knowledge about the world, imprinted in vocabulary, phraseology and grammar.

It is the worldview that lies on the basis of individual and social consciousness. Language fulfils requirements of informative process. Conceptual projections of the world at different people can be various, for example at representatives of different epoch, different social, age groups, different areas of scientific knowledge, etc. People speaking different languages, can have, under certain conditions, close conceptual views of the world, and the people speaking in one language, – different. Hence, in a conceptual worldview universal, national and personal features cooperate.

Every language worldview can keep casual standard lacunas, logically unexplainable. At the use of complete images as standards without instructions of the basis of comparison on the foreground the approving or disapproving emotional relation of the subject of speech to the designated, as a rule, is put forward.

Thus, the important circumstance is differentiation of the universal human factor and national specificity in various language worldviews. As the genetic mechanism is an estimation of corporal sensations, that, intertwining with human activity, simultaneously both universal, and national-specific, it invariably leads, as a result of such interaction, to creation of language worldviews with typologically general and

specific features. These properties define both the originality of a language worldview, and its universality.

The naïve worldview fixes collective stereotypic and reference representations, objectify and also does interpreting activity of human consciousness accessible to studying. It represents a complete image of the world, which grows out of all spiritual activity of the person. The person acquires it in the process of detailed practical activities, directed at the world reconsideration. The person feels the world, beholds it, comprehends, learns, interprets, reflects, and stays in it. Thus, the image of the world arises in various certificates of attitude, world outlook, a worldview, attitude, outlooks—in certificates of experience of the world as integrity.

Language worldview is a totality of knowledge about the world reflected in a language and the ways of getting and interpreting new information (Пименова 2011: 67). At this point, language is treated, on the one hand, as a verbalized conceptual worldview (which is actually fragmentation of the conceptual world by means of a language, i.e. by lexical and grammatical units (Верещагин, Костомаров 1990: 94)), and on the other hand, as a means of its formulation (Пименова 2011: 26).

The language worldview was first studied by von Humboldt, whose ideas about the inner language form were later transferred into the theory of the language worldview within the scope of anthropolinguistics (Гумбольдт 1984). Later on, it was assumed that the language worldview had universal and nationally specific character (Потебня 2001; Сепир 2001; Whorf 1956).

Since any language worldview is objectified by the national singularity of the speakers, one may assume that there are as many language worldviews as there are languages. The universality and distinctions of language worldviews are determined by the spheres of language existence: the sphere of micro-socium (inherent of a certain nation

or ethnos) and the sphere of macro-socium (common for all people) (Лихачев 1997: 280). So, on the one hand, language world-view establishes in the minds of native speakers, and a person (nation) views the world in its light (Пименова 2011: 27). On the other hand, however, the fact that language is influenced by individuals presupposes certain changes in the language worldview.

There are two main trends in studying language worldview in contemporary linguistics. The former presupposes a systematic semantic analysis of lexical units with the purpose of constituting a general system of people's ideas reflected in a language, regardless of the fact whether this system is specific or universal (Апресян 1995; Маслова 2001). The latter focuses on investigations of 'key' cultural concepts (Пименова 2011; Wierzbicka 1997).

3. Language worldviews comparison

3.1 Classification principles

Verbalized Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English basic concepts may be classified, on the one hand, from the point of view of the categorization levels distinguished by Rosch, and, on the other hand, according to the semantic criterion. There are two dimensions of categorization suggested by Rosch: vertical and horizontal (Rosch 1978). The vertical dimension concerns the level of inclusiveness of the category, e.g., the dimension along which the terms *hound*, *dog* and *animal* vary. The horizontal dimension concerns the segmentation of categories at the same level of inclusiveness, e.g., the dimension along which the terms *car*, *dog*, *chair*, etc., vary. The vertical dimension presupposes three levels of categorization: basic (e.g., *dog*), superordinate (e.g., *animal*) and subordinate (e.g., *hound*) and that the internal organization of each of these levels is distinct (cf. Rosch 1978).

At the basic level of categorization (*dog*), perceptual and functional attributes are shared by all or most members of the category but are distinct from the attributes of

other basic level concepts within that hierarchy (*cat*). At the superordinate level of categorization (*animal*), few attributes are common to all members of the category (dogs share few attributes with mice). Instead, superordinate categories are internally organized around a few prototypical members (*dogs, cats*), which alone share significant numbers of attributes with other category members. At the subordinate level (*hound*), attributes are shared not only by all or most members of the category, but also by members of contrast categories (*borzoi*).

Since the basic level is the level, at which attributes common to members within a category (attributes of *dogs*, for example) most fully delineate the concept and most clearly distinguish that concept from others at the same level of the hierarchy (*dogs*, for example), the basic level is claimed to be the most natural and useful level of categorization. The superordinate level lacks sufficient shared attributes within each category for attributes to be delineating; the subordinate level lacks sufficient non-shared attributes in each category for attributes to be distinguishing (Ibid.).

Thus, Sahapatin, Ukrainian and English key verbalized concepts *ENVIRONMENT* and *TIME* split into smaller units, which undergo the classification in accord with the categorization levels, on the one hand, and semantic grouping, on the other hand. Besides, the concept naming units are classified in the alphabetic order within each of the groupings.

Lastly, it should be noted that the choice of the verbalized concepts in question is determined by their frequent occurrence in the dictionaries as well as their importance in the national worldview (Красных 2002; ЛДЭС 2008: 27).

3.2 ENVIRONMENT AND TIME: fundamental aspects of the worldview comparison

3.2.1 ENVIRONMENT and TIME as the core of the worldview

The concepts ENVIRONMENT and TIME are viewed as fundamental aspects of language worldviews (Красных 2002; Кубрякова 2004; Степанов 2007). Hence, the comparison of lexical units, which denominate these notions, is aimed at disclosing common and divergent ways of conceptualizing the world and verbalizing the concepts. Therefore, the following techniques seem to be appropriate to apply: 1) etymological comparison; 2) the comparison of word motivation; 3) semantic analysis; 4) cultural specifics.

3.2.2 ENVIRONMENT

The concept ENVIRONMENT is represented by the verbalized micro concepts denoting relief (OCEAN, LAKE and PLAIN), natural phenomena (THUNDER, RAINBOW and WIND) and flora (BUTTERCUP).

OCEAN

The concept OCEAN is rendered into words in different ways in all of the compared languages. In Sahaptin, it is conveyed by the noun *atáchiish*, which is actually the composition of *atá* meaning 'great, enormous, giant' and *chiish* 'water'. The Ukrainian word *океан* and the English word *ocean* derive from Greek *okeanos*, which is quite justified as the languages are more or less allied. The Greek word came into use in Old Russian as *океанъ*, *окиянь* and *окианъ*, whereas it was borrowed into Middle English from Greek via Latin and then through Old French.

In Sahaptin, *atáchiish* denotes 'ocean, salt water, coast', while in Ukrainian and in English, the verbalized concept has direct ('water expanse, which covers the major part of the earth and divides the land into continents and islands'; 'one of the five oceans of the world') and indirect (in English: 'a very large expanse or quantity' and in Ukrainian: 'something limitless') meanings, with the common semantic component being 'a vast

expanse of something'. Apparently, *atáchiish* is a polysemantic word characterized only by direct meanings, while *океан* and *ocean* have also figurative meanings.

So, unlike its Ukrainian and English correspondences, ATÁCHIISH is a macroconcept consisting of several minor ones, thus denoting rather a wide range of referents. Thereby, the scope of meaning reflects the way the Yakima perceive the world: there is no distinct limit between OCEAN and COAST in Sahaptin, both of these concepts being expressed through one word, presupposing, on the one hand, a relatively short distance from the Yakima residence in north-central Washington and northern Oregon (Beavert & Hargus 2009: 492) to the Pacific Ocean and, on the other hand, the Yakima's perception of this element.

LAKE

To begin with, the origin of Sahaptin *watám* (lake, pond) is not registered in the dictionary. As for the genesis of Ukrainian *озеро*, it comes from Old Slavic *jezero*, with the initial *je* changed into *o* on the eastern Slavic ground. As far as English *lake* is concerned, it derives from Latin *lacus* meaning 'basin, pool, lake'. So, the words nominating the concept LAKE are of different origin in the languages compared.

The Sahaptin verbalized concept WATÁM means 'lake, pond', while Ukrainian *озеро* conveys the following meanings: 1) an expanse of fresh or salt water entirely surrounded by land and separated from a sea or ocean; 2) a large amount of some liquid, generally coinciding with the meanings of English *lake*.

Thus, there is no differentiation between LAKE and POND (natural and artificial reservoirs) in Sahaptin, both of which are named by the noun *watám*, which, probably, implies that artificial water bodies are not typical of the Yakima environment. Nonetheless, there is such a distinction in Ukrainian (*озеро, ставок, став*) and in

English (*lake, mere, pool, pond*) with the concepts denoting natural and scooped reservoirs being rendered by separate language units.

Furthermore, WATÁM is endowed with cultural connotation: 'a long time ago, people respected and were afraid of lakes. They preferred to establish their villages along the running streams and rivers'. In English legends about King Arthur, LAKE is also viewed as a mysterious place, where the setting sun plunges.

PLAIN

There are two words denoting PLAIN in Sahaptin, both of which are of native origin: *áypx* (from *-aipax* – 'outlet or mouth of river', where *-aipx-* (or its variant *-ipx-*) is an independent verb stem meaning 'go down river') and *k'áax* (from the adjective *k'áax* meaning 'torn, level'). Similarly, the Ukrainian word verbalizing this concept, *рівнина*, belongs to the Ukrainian native word stock, with its roots going back to Old Slavic *orwino*. As for the word *plain*, it was borrowed into Middle English from Latin *planus* meaning 'flat' via Old French *plain* and became completely assimilated. So, the native origin of the words naming the concept PLAIN emphasizes its importance with regard to the national worldviews.

Though *áypx* and *k'áax* are synonymous, they still differ at the point that the primary meaning of *áypx* is 'mouth of river'. However, the Ukrainian and English correspondences signify a much narrower range of referents: they denote only a large area of flat land with few trees. The meaning of 'mouth of river' and 'plateau' is conveyed by other nouns in these languages.

Consequently, the difference among Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English nouns, which denominate the concept PLAIN, lies in their sense capacity: what is communicated by one word in Sahaptin is realized through a few words in Ukrainian and English. However, taking into account the fact that the territory of Washington and Oregon is

chiefly mountainous with some plains along the Columbia River, it appears to be specific of the Yakima to name plain, plateau and mouth of river with one word – *áypx*. Thereby, the geographical position and landscape influence the people's world outlook and, thus their language worldview.

THUNDER

There are two words nominating the concept THUNDER in Sahaptin *-inimla* and *nawinalá*. The first one derives from the verb *inim-* (to make loud noise, roar; 'especially environmental noise or the one produced by an animal'). However, the origin of the other one is not recorded in the dictionary (Beavert & Hargus2009). As for English *thunder*, it is of Germanic origin and related to Dutch *donder* and German *Donner*. The word descends from an Indo-European root shared by Latin *tonare* 'to thunder'.

Further on, Sahaptin *inimla* denotes only 'thunder', while *nawinalá* implies both, 'thunder' and 'lightning', thus being more extensive and less concrete than *inimla*. Unlike the Sahaptin correspondences, Ukrainian *зпим* and English *thunder* are characterized not only by the primary meaning ('a loud rumbling or crashing noise heard after a lightning flash due to the expansion of rapidly heated air'), but also by the figurative ones: in both languages, it denotes strong and loud sounds. Moreover, English *thunder* is used to refer to an angry facial expression or tone of voice.

So, the common semantic constituent of the verbalized concept THUNDER in all the three languages is 'a loud noise', which, in Sahaptin worldview, is associated with natural sounds, and is the ground for deriving figurative meanings in Ukrainian and English. Besides, the presence of two words denoting THUNDER in Sahaptin indicates its importance in the language worldview.

RAINBOW

The concept RAINBOW in Sahaptin is realized through the noun *kápashaayat*, the descent of which requires more investigation. Its Ukrainian correspondences are *веселка* and *райдуга*, both of which belong to the native word stock: *веселка* comes from the Old Slavic attribute *радъ* – 'merry, joyful', and *райдуга* – from Old Slavic *дуга* combined with the noun *рай*, which is a folk etymology component. In English, the word *rainbow* stems from Old English *regnboga* and is actually the composition of the words *rain* and *bow*.

The Sahaptin and the Ukrainian words denominating the concept RAINBOW are monosemantic as opposed to English *rainbow*, which has the following derivative meanings: a wide range of related and typically colourful things; any similar display of bright colours; an illusory hope. Thereby, the common semantic component is 'the rainbow's colourfulness'. In English, it is also viewed as something unattainable.

Furthermore, there is such a belief in Sahaptin that rainbow signifies a new birth: '*Ikápashaayatisha. Áwiwyánawimiyánashtiichámyaw*. – There is a rainbow. 'A baby has just arrived on this earth'. In Europe, it betokens a bridge between the earthly and the heavenly worlds.

WIND

The Sahaptin concept WIND is expressed through the words *hulí* and *wislátsaykt*, which correspond to Ukrainian *вiмep* and English *wind*. The noun *вiмep* made its way into Ukrainian from Latin *ventus* through Old Slavic, where it was called *вѣмрѣ*. The corresponding English noun also descends from an Indo-European root shared by Latin *ventus*. The common origin of *вiмep* and *wind* is explained by the languages' affinity.

Besides *hulí* and *wislátsaykt*, which denote 'wind' in general, there are also nouns to name the north wind (*átya*) and the chinook or warm wind (*wináawa* (from *wíni-* – 'to

distribute gifts')) in Sahaptin. However, such notions do not have complete correspondences (equivalents) in Ukrainian and in English: the word combination *нівнічний вітер* / *north wind* denotes quite a different atmospheric phenomenon (as to its speed, humidity, etc.) and *чінук* / *chinook* is only a calque from American English. Hereby, it is appropriate to mention that Tomakhin refers *chinook* – a warm humid south-western wind in Washington and Oregon (after the tribe of the same name, which lives at the mouth of the Columbia River) – to specifically American realities (a *reality* denotes the names of objects and phenomena inherent only in certain nations and treated as culture-specific vocabulary (Томахин 1988: 5, 89). Furthermore, it is characteristic that another name of Washington is 'Chinook State' (Томахин 1980: 173).

Though there are some terms to name WIND in Ukrainian and English (*бриз, пасат, сарма, бора; trade wind, bora*, etc.), but their usage is restricted to certain spheres, e.g., meteorology, as far as they are not typical (except *breeze* in Britain) of the countries' climate.

To conclude, in Sahaptin different kinds of wind are distinguished, thus reflecting the people's perception of this phenomenon, while no such variety of notions is found in the Ukrainian and English worldviews.

BUTTERCUP

The Sahaptin word combination *Spilyamíáchaash* corresponds to English *buttercup* and Ukrainian *жовтець* and is motivated in all these languages: *Spilyamíáchaash* is composed of *Spilyamí* (Coyote) and *áchaash* (eye), with the root *cha'ásh* meaning 'flirtatious', so that as a unity it signifies 'Coyote's (flirtatious) eye'; *жовтець* is motivated by the adjective *жовтий*; and *buttercup* is a compound word consisting of two bases: *butter* (indicating the colour) and *cup* (referring to the shape of the flower).

Besides, the word to nominate the concept is monosemantic in all the languages, meaning a herbaceous plant with bright yellow flowers, common in grassland and as a garden weed. All its kinds are poisonous and generally avoided by livestock. Moreover, this herb is known to be native to Europe and widespread throughout North America.

Thus, word motivation reveals some aspects of the Yakima, Ukrainian and English worldviews: the reference to the flower's shape is enclosed within the word form: the Yakima perceive it as an eye-shaped flower and for the English, it resembles a cup.

3.2.2 TIME

The concept TIME is represented by the verbalized concepts denoting the time of day (DAYTIME, AFTERNOON, TWILIGHT), working days (MONDAY, TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY) and days-off (SUNDAY and SATURDAY).

DAYTIME

The Sahaptin verbalized concept *káyx* derives from the adjective *káyx* 'gold, bright yellow, bright, clear' and corresponds to Ukrainian *день* and English *daytime*. The Ukrainian word goes back to Proto-Slavic *dьнь* meaning 'clear, shining', which, in its turn, descends from Indo-European *din-*, that is the combination of the root *di-* / *dei-* 'to shine' and the suffix *-n-*, *-en-*. The Indo-European root preserved its meaning in the Latin word *diēs*. The English equivalent to the verbally realized concept is *daytime*, which consists of two stems, both of which are of Germanic origin: *day*, from Latin, and *time*. So, the origin of the Ukrainian and the English words nominating the concept DAYTIME is Indo-European, while Sahaptin *káyx* is a native word.

Sahaptin *káyx* has two meanings: 1) daytime; and 2) (drinking) glass. The meanings of *день* and *daytime* coincide: 1) a period of twenty-four hours as a unit of time, reckoned from one midnight to the next, corresponding to a rotation of the earth on its axis; and

2) the time between sunrise and sunset. Thus, the common semantic component of the Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English correspondences is 'clarity'.

Thereby, *daytime* and *день* descend from the common Indo-European source and are not related to the conformable Sahaptin word. Besides, the verbally realized Sahaptin concept combines the abstract and the concrete meanings, while its Ukrainian and English correspondences imply only the abstract ones.

AFTERNOON

The Sahaptin concept AFTERNOON is conveyed by the words *sitkumsáanaḱ'it* and *kwláawit*. The former is a partially assimilated loan word that came into Sahaptin from Chinook Jargon *sitkumsan* 'noon, half day', from English *sit-come-sun*, which describes the sun's apogee at noon. The latter is a native word formed through the composition of *kwláa* ('slight') and *wit* ('abstract'). Its Ukrainian correspondence is *полудень* (from *полу-* 'half' and *день* 'day') and the English one is *afternoon* (the composition of *after* and *noon*). So, all the words to denominate the concept AFTERNOON in the languages compared belong to the native word stock (except *sitkumsáanaḱ'it*) and are formed through composition.

Sahaptin *kwláawit* has the meaning of 'early evening, late afternoon' and denotes the time of the day when it is still light. The Ukrainian and the English words have the same meaning: the period of the day between noon and evening.

Thereby, the meaning of *kwláawit*, *sitkumsáanaḱ'it*, *полудень* and *afternoon* appears to be identical. However, the fact that there are two words, native and loan, to denote one and the same concept in Sahaptin indicates the influence of the English culture on the Yakima world-outlook.

TWILIGHT

The concept TWILIGHT is put into words *táa'ash* in Sahaptin, *сумінки* in Ukrainian and *twilight* in English. The Sahaptin noun is related to the homonymous adjective, which means 'temporarily insane (or other dark change in mind or mood)', which suggests its native origin. As for the word *сумінки*, it represents the plural form of the Proto-Slavic noun *sqmorkъ*, where sq- (cy-) is used to express joining or convergence.

The Sahaptin noun means 'the time just after the sun sets and disappears behind the horizon'. In Ukrainian, it means both: 'semidarkness between the sunset and nightfall' and 'the one preceding the dawn'. In English, *twilight* purports 'the period of the evening between daylight and darkness' and 'a period or state of obscurity, ambiguity, or gradual decline' (a derivative meaning). Thus, the common semantic constituent of all the words in question is '(semi)darkness'.

So, the Sahaptin verbalized concept TWILIGHT completely coincides with the English one and differs from the Ukrainian correspondence at the point that it doesn't include the meaning of darkness preceding the dawn.

WORKING DAYS

The concept MONDAY is rendered by the word *Wánaġ'it* in Sahaptin, *понеділок* in Ukrainian, and *Monday* in English. The Sahaptin word consists of two bases: the verb *wá-* – 'be, have' and *naġ'it* – 'end' and literally means 'end [of Sunday]'. There are two views on the origin of Ukrainian *понеділок*: it either comes from Old Slavic *понеѡльникъ* or is a calque from Latin *feria secunda* – 'next after the free day'. As for English *Monday*, it descends from Old English *Mōnandæg* 'day of the moon' and is the translation of Late Latin *lunae dies*. So, the corresponding words in all the languages are not related.

Sahaptin words, which nominate the concepts TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY (*Náplkw'i*, *Mitáلكw'i*, *Pináplkw'i* and *Páxalkw'i*) are derived from the numerals *níipt* 'two', *mitaat* 'three', *píniipt* 'four' and *páxat* 'five'. The corresponding Ukrainian nouns *вівторок*, *середа* (Old Slavic *срѣда* – 'middle'), *четвер* and *п'ятниця* were introduced into Old Slavic in the 8-9th centuries together with the adoption of Christianity. Like the Sahaptin correspondences (though not related to them), they are grounded on numerals, thus presenting the count of days starting with Sunday. However, the names of the English weekdays are mainly literal translations from Latin: *Tuesday*, Old English *Tīwesdæg*, is named after the Germanic god *Tīw* associated with Mars (translation of Latin *dies Marti* 'day of Mars'); *Wednesday*, Old English *Wōdnesdæg*, got its name from the supreme Scandinavian god Odin, the one of victory and the dead (translation of Latin *Mercurii dies*); *Thursday* coming from Old English *Thunresdæg* means 'the day of thunder' (translation of Latin *Jovis dies* 'the day of Jupiter'); and *Friday* is named after Frigga, the Germanic goddess of love (translation of Latin *Veneris dies* 'the day of the planet Venus').

As for the cultural background, it should be noted that in the Yakima Longhouse religion, FRIDAY, *Páxalkw'i*, is the day 'to clean one's home and clear one's mind and body bathing and taking sweat baths in preparation for the holy day, Sunday'.

To resume, though the words expressing the concepts MONDAY, TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY are not related in the languages compared, both the Sahaptin and Ukrainian nominations imply the count of days beginning with Sunday (still, nowadays the Ukrainians consider Monday to be the first day of the week). In English, the origin of weekdays' names reflects some religious ideas of ancient people about the world.

DAYS OFF

SUNDAY

There are two words to name SUNDAY in Sahaptin: *Pachwáywit* and *Sapálwit*. *Pachwáywit* is formed by suffixation: the stem *páchway* ('middle of day'; from *páchu* 'half, middle') is suffixed with *-wit* indicating that the noun is abstract. *Sapálwit* is a derivative from *sapálwit* ('a week'). Supposedly, both of these words belong to the native word stock. The Ukrainian word for SUNDAY is *неділя*, which comes from Old Slavic *недѣля*, from *недѣлати* – 'not to work'. The English word *Sunday* developed from Old English *Sunnandæg* meaning 'the day of the sun' and is the literal translation of Latin *dies solis*. Thus, *Pachwáywit*, *Sapálwit*, *неділя* and *Sunday* originate from different sources, are built according to different word-formation patterns (suffixation in Sahaptin, prefixation in Ukrainian and composition in English) and are differently motivated.

Further on, *Pachwáywit* and *Sapálwit* are considered to be partial synonyms, with *Sapálwit* being the name for an ordinary Sunday and *Pachwáywit*, on the other hand, is a holy Sunday (in respect of both, traditional longhouse religion and the Christian one). In Ukrainian and English Christian tradition, holy Sunday (*вербна неділя* and *Palm Sunday*) is connected with Christ's entry into Jerusalem, when people saluted him with palm branches (in Ukraine, palm branches are substituted by the willow ones, which gave the name to the holiday). Besides, each Sunday of the week is considered by the Ukrainians to be the day of rest, which may be seen from the word motivation and is explained by the Ukrainians' Christian beliefs.

Thus, in all the languages compared, there are names for SUNDAY as the day of week and as a holiday. Moreover, 'ordinary' Sunday is motivated by the word 'middle' in Sahaptin, the prohibition to work in Ukrainian and the sun in English. In all the languages, holy Sunday is connected with religion, either Christian, Catholic or the Longhouse one.

SATURDAY

The Sahaptin name for SATURDAY, *Tamáts'aakt*, comes from the verb *tamáts'aak-* 'approach, get close, draw near to' implying its approach to Sunday. As for Ukrainian *cyᄅoma*, its origin is controversial. Hitherto, it has been considered that *cyᄅoma* retains the Old Jewish name for this day of week – *sābbat* – mentioned in the Old Testament, where it was connected with the god's rest on the seventh day after creating the Earth. However, in contemporary semasiology, there is another point of view, according to which the word is of Babylonian origin, where it named the feast to worship the moon. This word came into Old Russian in the 14-15th centuries. English *Saturday*, from Old English *Sæterndæg*, is the translation of Latin *Saturni dies* 'day of Saturn'.

To recapitulate, all the peoples considered SATURDAY to be a festive day, either the one before SUNDAY or connected with Christianity (or the Babylonian traditions), or with the Jupiter feast.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

So, *language worldview* is a totality of knowledge about the world reflected in a language and the ways of getting and interpreting new information. At this point, language is treated, on the one hand, as a verbalized conceptual worldview (which is actually fragmentation of the conceptual world by means of a language, i.e. by lexical and grammatical units), and on the other hand, as a means of its formulation.

As far as the interrelation of language and thought is manifested on all the language levels (phonetic, morphological, lexico-semantic and syntactic), it proves to be quite acceptable to establish the degree of the linguistic affinity of Sahaptin, Ukrainian and English to find similarities and distinctions in the corresponding worldviews. Since, Ukrainian and English are distantly related languages and Sahaptin is generically non-

related to them, one may conclude that they have very little in common in their structures and, consequently, the worldviews encoded in them.

In this research, the language worldview comparison is accomplished on the ground of verbalized concept comparison, i.e., the comparison of those lexical units, which preserve relative stability in time and reflect some specifics of world perception and conceptualization.

To make the orderly ground of the comparison and facilitate it, Sahaptin basic verbally realized concepts have been selected from the lexicographic sources and classified according to the categorization levels suggested by Rosch (1978) and the semantic principle. The classifications present the models of the language worldviews of the Yakima, the Ukrainians and the English. The results of the research prove that the majority of the considered verbalized concepts in the language worldviews investigated belong to the basic level of categorization and the minority – to the superordinate one. This fact may be explained by the assumption that in everyday life people use basic level units much more often than the superordinate ones.

Further on, the Sahaptin verbalized concepts ENVIRONMENT (represented by the verbally expressed concepts OCEAN, LAKE, PLAIN, THUNDER, RAINBOW, WIND and BUTTERCUP) and TIME (DAYTIME, AFTERNOON, TWILIGHT, WORKING DAYS and DAYS-OFF) have been put in contrast with their Ukrainian and English correspondences to disclose similar and specific ways of verbalization. To achieve this aim the following steps have been adhered: 1) etymological comparison; 2) the comparison of word motivation; 3) semantic analysis; 4) cultural specifics.

Thus, the results of the language worldview comparison suggest that a number of Sahaptin basic concepts are rendered by the words with direct meanings (figurative

meanings are not so widespread in Sahaptin as they are in Ukrainian and English), the meanings of which correspond to several words in Ukrainian and English.

References

Alefirenko, N.F. / Алефиренко Н.Ф. (2010). *Лингвокультурология: ценностно-смысловое пространство языка*. Москва: Флинта: Наука.

Andreichuk, N. (2015). *Contrastive linguistics*. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv Publishing Centre.

Apresyan, Yu.D. / Апресян Ю.Д. (1995). *Избранные труды*. Т. II. *Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Arakin, V.D. / Аракин В.Д. (2005). *Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков*. Москва: Физмалит.

Beavert-Martin, V. R. (1999). Native songs taught by Ellen W. Saluskin (Hoptonix Sawalilx). In *Spirit of the first people: native American music traditions of Washington state*. Esme, R. & Willie, S. (eds.). Seattle: University of Washington Press, p. 62-71.

Beavert, V. & Hargus, S. *Ichishkiin Sinwit. Yakama / Yakima Sahaptin dictionary*. (2009). Toppenish: Heritage University in association with University of Washington Press.

Comparative investigations of English, Ukrainian and Russian grammar / Порівняльні дослідження з граматики англійської, української, російської мов. (1981). Жлуктенко Ю.О. (ред.). Київ: Наукова думка.

Coseriu, E. (1980). Der Sinn der Sprachtypologie. In *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*, 20, S. 157-170.

Croft, W. (2002). *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, W. & Cruse, A.D. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, S. & Golla, V. (1997). The Penutian hypothesis: Retrospect and prospect. In *International journal of American linguistics*, 6, p. 171-202.

- Dillon, J. (2000). The question of being. In *Greek thought: A guide to classical knowledge*. Brunschwig, J. & Lloyd, G.E.R. (eds.). Harvard: Harvard University Press, p. 51-71.
- Encyclopedic dictionary of linguistics / *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. (1990). Yartseva V.N. (ed.) / Ярцева В.Н. (гл. ред.). Москва: Советская энциклопедия.
- Evans, V. (2009). *How words mean: lexical concepts, cognitive models and meaning construction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Folsom, F. / Фолсом Ф. (1974). *Книга о языке*. Москва: Прогресс.
- Gadamer, H.-G. / Гадамер Г.-Г. (1991). *Актуальность прекрасного*. Москва: Искусство.
- Geertz, C., Geertz, H. & Rosen, L. (1979). *Meaning and order in Moroccan society: three essays in cultural analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Golubovskaya, I.A. / Голубовская И.А. (2002). *Этнические особенности языковых картин мира*. Київ: Київський університет.
- Grishayeva, L.I. & Tsurikova, L.V. / Гришаева Л.И., Цурикова Л.В. (2006). *Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации*. Москва: Академия.
- Gruzberg, L.A. / Грузберг Л.А. (2003). Концепт. In *Стилистический энциклопедический словарь русского языка*. Кожица, М.Н. (ред.). Москва: Флинта: Наука, с. 181-184.
- Gudkov, D.B. / Гудков Д.Б. (2003). *Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации*. Москва: Гнозис.
- Gvishiani, N. (2010). *An introduction to contrastive lexicology (English-Russian cross-linguistic correspondences)*. Moscow: LIBROCOM.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). The nature of language. In *On the way to language*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 57-110.
- Humboldt, W. von / Гумбольдт В. фон. (1984). *Избранные труды по языкознанию* / Пер. с нем. Г.В. Рамишвили. Москва: Прогресс.

- Parion, Metropolitan / Іларіон, Митрополит. (1979-1995). *Етимологічно-семантичний словник української мови*. Mulyk-Lutsyk, Yu. (ed.) / Мулик-Луцик Ю. (ред.). Т. 1-4. Вінніпег: Товариство Волинь.
- Karasik, V.I. / Карасик В.И. (2002). *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Волгоград: Перемена.
- Karasik, V.I. & Slyshkin, G.G. / Карасик В.И., Слышкин Г.Г. (2001). Лингвокультурный концепт как единица исследования. In *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики*. Стернин И.А. (ред.). Воронеж: Воронежский государственный университет, с. 75-80.
- Karasik, V.I. & Sternin, J.A. / Карасик В.И., Стернин И.А. (2007). *Антология концептов*. Москва: Гнозис.
- Kocherhan, M.P. / Кочерган М.П. (2004). Зіставне мовознавство і проблема мовних картин світу. In *Мовознавство*, 5-6, с. 12-22.
- Kocherhan, M.P. / Кочерган М.П. (2006). *Основи зіставного мовознавства*. Київ: Академія.
- Kolesov, V.V. / Колесов В.В. (2004). *Язык и ментальность*. Санкт-Петербург: Петербургское Востоковедение.
- Kolshansky, G.V. / Колшанский Г.В. (2006). *Объективная картина мира в познании и языке*. Москва: КомКнига.
- Kornilov, O.A. / Корнилов О.А. (2003). *Языковая картина мира как отражение национальных менталитетов*. Москва: ЧеРо.
- Korunets, I.V. (1995). *Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian languages*. Kiev: Lybid.
- Koshevaya, I.G. / Кошечая И.Г. (2014). *Типология английского и русского языков в схемах и диаграммах: Теоретический курс*. Москва: ЛЕНАНД.
- Koshevaya, I.G. & Dubovsky, Yu.A. / Кошечая И.Г., Дубовский Ю.А. (1980). *Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков*. Минск: Вышэйшая школа.

- Krasavsky, N.A. / Красавский Н.А. (2001). *Эмоциональные концепты в немецкой и русской лингвокультурах*. Волгоград: Перемена.
- Krasnykh, V.V. / Красных В.В. (2002). *Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология: Курс лекций*. Москва: Гнозис.
- Koubriakova, Ye.S. / Кубрякова Е.С. (2004). *Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In *Cultural models in language & thought*. Holland, D. & Quinn, N. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 195-221.
- Leontiev, A.N. (2005). Lecture 13. Language and consciousness. In *Journal of Russian and East European psychology*, 5 (43), p. 5-13.
- Levitsky, A.E., Borisenko, N.D., Borisov, A.A. et al. / Левицкий А.Э., Борисенко Н.Д., Борисов А.А. et al. (2009). *Сравнительная типология английского, немецкого, русского и украинского языков*. Киев: Освита Украины.
- Levitsky, A.E. & Slavova, L.L. / Левицкий А.Э., Славова Л.Л. (2005). *Сравнительная типология русского и английского языков*. Житомир: Житомирский государственный университет им. И. Франко.
- Likhachev, D.S. / Лихачев Д.С. (1997). Концептосфера русского языка. In *Русская словесность*. Москва: Academia, с. 280-288.
- Linguodidactic encyclopedic dictionary: more than 2000 units / *Лингводидактический энциклопедический словарь: более 2000 единиц*. (2008).
- Shchukin A.N. / Щукин А.Н. (сост.). Москва: Астрель: АСТ: Хранитель.
- Lyapin, S.Kh. / Ляпин С.Х. (1997). Концептология: к становлению подхода. In *Концепты*, 1, с. 32-45.
- Manakin, V.N. / Манакин В.Н. (2004). *Сопоставительная лексикология*. Киев: Знання.
- Maslova, V.A. / Маслова В.А. (2001). *Лингвокультурология*. Москва: Академия.

- Mikula, M. (2008). *Key concepts in cultural studies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Papers in contrastive linguistics / Нариси з контрастивної лінгвістики* (1979). Жлуктенко Ю.О. (ред.). Київ: Наукова думка.
- New Oxford American Dictionary*. (2005). 2nd ed. Stevenson, A. & Lindberg, Ch.A. (eds.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Panasenko, N.I. / Панасенко Н.И. (2000). *Когнитивно-ономасиологическое исследование лексики (опыт сопоставительного анализа лекарственных растений)* / Дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук / Московский государственный лингвистический университет. 10.02.19 – теория языка. Москва.
- Pimenova, M.V. / Пименова М.В. (2011). *Языковая картина мира*. Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
- Porova, Ye.A. / Попова Е.А. (2002). Человек как основополагающая величина современного языкознания. In *Филологические науки*, 3, с. 69-77.
- Potebnya, O.O. / Потебня О.О. (2001). Думка і мова. In *Дискурс. Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* Зубрицька М. (ред.). Львів: Світ, с. 34-55.
- Quinn, N. & Holland, D. (1987). Culture and cognition. In *Cultural models in language & thought*. Holland, D. & Quinn, N. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 3-42.
- Rigsby, B. & Rude, N. (1996). Sketch of Sahaptin, a Sahaptian language. In *Handbook of North American Indians*. Vol. 17. Languages. Goddard, I. & Sturtevant, W.C. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, p. 666-692.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In *Cognition & categorization*. Cotton, J. & Klatzky, R. (eds.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, p. 1-48.
- Rude, N. (2009). Transitivity in Sahaptin. In *Northwest journal of linguistics*, 3, p. 1-37.
- Sapir, E. / Сепир Э. (2001). *Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии*. Кибрик А.Е. (ред.). Москва: Прогресс.

- Stepanov, Yu.S. / Степанов Ю.С. (2007). *Концепты. Тонкая плёнка цивилизации*. Москва: Языки славянских культур.
- Suprun, A.Ye. / Супрун А.Е. (1988). Принципы сопоставительного изучения лексики. In *Методы сопоставительного изучения языков*. Ярцева В.Н. (ред.). Москва: Наука, с. 26-31.
- Shvachko, K.K., Terentiyev, P.V., Yanukyayn, T.G. et al. / Швачко К.К., Терентьев П.В., Янукиян Т.Г. et al. (1977). *Введение в сравнительную типологию английского, русского и украинского языков*. Киев: Вища школа.
- Ter-Minasova, S.G. / Тер-Минасова С.Г. (2004). *Язык и межкультурная коммуникация*. Москва: Изд-во МГУ.
- Theoretical issues in contrastive linguistics* (1981). Fisiak, J. (ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Tomakhin, G.D. / Томахин Г.Д. (1980). *По Соединенным Штатам Америки*. Москва: Просвещение.
- Tomakhin, G.D. / Томахин Г.Д. (1988). *Реалии-американизмы*. Москва: Высшая школа.
- Vereshchagin, Ye.M. & Kostomarov, V.G. / Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. (1990). *Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного*. Москва: Русский язык.
- Vorkachev, S.G. / Воркачев С.Г. (2001). Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. In *Филологические науки*, 1, с. 64-72.
- Vorobyov, V.V. / Воробьев В.В. (2008). *Лингвокультурология*. Москва: Российский университет дружбы народов.
- Whorf, B.-L. (1956). Language and logic. In *Language, thought and reality. Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Carrol, J.B. (ed.). Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press, p. 233-245.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture and cognition. Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding cultures through their key words (English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Languages / Мови світу. In *Українська Радянська Енциклопедія*. (1982). Bazhan, M.P. (ed.) / Бажан М.П. (гол. ред.). Вид. 2-е. Т. 7. Київ: Голов. ред. УРЕ, с. 56-57.

Zhayvoronok, V.V. / Жайворонок В.В. (2004). Етнолінгвістика в колі суміжних наук. In *Мовознавство*, 5-6, с. 23-35.

Abbreviations:

ЛЭС – Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistics

ЛДЭС – Лингводидактический энциклопедический словарь / Linguodidactic Encyclopedic Dictionary

NOAD – New Oxford American Dictionary

<p>Contact data Andrei Levitsky, DrSc. (Philology), Professor at the Department of Linguistics, Translation & Intercultural Communication, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory, 1, Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation e-mail: andrelev@list.ru</p>		<p>Fields of interest Cognitive linguistics, discourse, contrastive linguistics, intercultural communication.</p>
---	---	--

Résumé in English

The article triggers the problem of information conceptualization as well as its further verbalization means by two distantly related languages (English and Ukrainian) represented on the background of Sahaptin, which is both genetically and typologically different from two above-mentioned Indo-European languages. Lexicographic resources compose the material for the research. Contrastive, semantic, and etymological analyses made it possible to single out isomorphic (common) and allomorphic (divergent) ways of information verbalization through ENVIRONMENT and TIME as the most important concepts for the human beings. These two megaconcepts and their constituents like OCEAN, LAKE, PLAIN, THUNDER, etc. reveal the understanding of ENVIRONMENT in Yakima linguoculture; DAYTIME, AFTERNOON, TWILIGHT, DAYS OF WEEK represent different aspects of TIME for Yakima people). All those concepts of different levels of information representation are treated within the framework of a worldview as a unified form of the knowledge about the world reflected by language means and the ways of getting and interpreting new information. At this point, language is treated, on the one hand, as a verbalized conceptual worldview, i.e. segmentation of the conceptualized information about the surrounding world by language means, and on the other hand, as a means of its unification. The reasons of diversities of world perception and their conceptualization are grounded upon ethnic and cultural specifics. The article proves the acceptability of establishing the degree of the linguistic affinity of the languages analyzed (Sahaptin – the language of the Yakima people, as well as Ukrainian and English), which reveal similarities and differences in the corresponding worldviews. The article analyzes presence / absence of the concepts and their semantic specificity in corresponding worldviews verbalizers. The results of the research prove that the verbalized megaconcepts in question (ENVIRONMENT and TIME) in the language worldviews represent the basic level of categorization. The superordinate categorization level of information possessed is characterized with a substantial variety of microconcepts to

focus the attention upon relief, nature phenomena and flora (ENVIRONMENT); part of the day, work days and days-off (TIME).

Key words: Yakima Indians, Sahaptin language, English, Ukrainian, language typology, semantics, language worldview, concept, categorization levels, verbalization.

Résumé in German

Der Artikel widmet sich dem Problem der Konzeptualisierung von Informationen und ihrer nachfolgenden Verbalisierung in den entfernt verwandten Sprachen Englisch und Ukrainisch und der indianischen Sprache Sahaptin (die Sprache der Yakima Indianer), die sich genetisch und typologisch von den obengenannten indoeuropäischen Sprachen unterscheidet. Die Untersuchung wurde aufgrund lexikographischer Daten durchgeführt. Kontrastive, semantische und etymologische Analysen ermöglichten die Zuordnung der isomorphen (übereinstimmenden) und allomorphen (distinktiven) Verbalisierungsverfahren der für Menschen zentralen Konzepte Umgebung und ZEIT. In Sahaptin wird der Oberbegriff UMGEBUNG durch Konzepte wie OZEAN, MEER, FLÄCHE, DONNER usw. spezifiziert, während ZEIT in der Kultur der Yakima durch TAGESZEIT, NACHMITTAG, DÄMMERUNG, TAGE DER WOCHE spezifiziert wird. Die untersuchten Konzepte werden als Elemente eines Weltbildes betrachtet, die das Wissen über die Welt in der Sprache widerspiegelt, und zugleich ermöglicht, neue Information über die Welt zu erwerben. Unter diesem Blickwinkel wird Sprache einerseits als ein verbalisiertes und konzeptualisiertes Weltbild gesehen, d.h. als Segmentierung der konzeptualisierten Information über die Welt, und andererseits als integrierendes Bindemittel dieses Weltbildes. Die Gründe für unterschiedliche Wahrnehmung und Konzeptualisierung der Welt liegen in der ethnischen und kulturellen Spezifik. Der Artikel zeigt, dass es möglich ist, den Grad der sprachlichen Verwandtschaft zwischen den Sprachen Yakima, Ukrainisch und Englisch zu bestimmen, welche zugleich Übereinstimmungen und Unterschiede in den

entsprechenden Weltbildern aufdeckt. Die Forschungsergebnisse belegen die Tatsache, dass der Großteil der Unterschiede in den sprachlichen Weltbildern auf dem Basisniveau der Kategorisierung stattfindet und weniger auf der übergeordneten Ebene.

Stichwörter: Yakima Indianer, Sahaptin Sprache, Englisch, Ukrainisch, Sprachtypologie, Semantik, sprachliches Weltbild, Konzept, Kategorisierungsebenen, Verbalisierung.

Résumé in French

L'article traite le problème de la conceptualisation de l'information ainsi que sa verbalisation par deux langues appartenant aux groupes différents (l'anglais et l'ukrainien), comparé à la langue sahapline, qui en diffère aux niveaux génétique et typologique. La recherche se base sur des données lexicographiques. Les analyses contrastive, sémantique et étymologique ont permis de dégager des procédés isomorphiques et allomorphiques afin de verbaliser des informations relatives L'ESPACE et LE TEMPS, concepts extrêmement importants pour les humains. Ces deux méga-concepts et leurs constituants comme L'OCEAN, LE LAC, L'AVION, LE TONNERRE, etc. découvrent la compréhension de L'ESPACE dans la culture linguistique de Yakima; LE JOUR, L'APRES-MIDI, LE CREPISCULE, LES JOURS DE LA SEMAINE représentent les aspects différents du TEMPS pour les Yakima. Tous ces concepts sont considérés comme propres à la structure de la perception du monde déterminée par la langue et comme outils pour obtenir et interpréter de nouvelles informations. La langue est donc présentée d'une part comme une perception conceptuelle du monde – fragments de l'information conceptualisée sous forme verbale, d'autre part, comme moyens de son unification. Les différences des procédés d'obtention des informations sur le monde et de leur conceptualisation s'expliquent par des spécificités ethniques et culturelles. L'article démontre la possibilité d'établir le degré des liens de parenté linguistique des langues analysées (sahapline – la langue du

peuple de Yakima, ainsi que l'ukrainien et l'anglais) qui découvrent les ressemblances et les différences dans la perception du monde. L'article analyse la présence / absence des concepts ainsi que leur spécificités sémantiques dans les verbes de perception du monde correspondants. Les résultats de la recherche montrent que les méga-concepts (L'ESPACE et LE TEMPS) concernant la perception du monde représentent le niveau de base de la catégorisation. Le niveau supérieur de la catégorisation des informations possédées est caractérisé par une grande variété de micro-concepts qui servent à attirer l'attention sur un relief, sur des phénomènes naturels ainsi que la flore (L'ESPACE), une partie de la journée, des jours de travail et des jours de congé (HEURE).

Mots-clés: Indiens de Yakima, langue sahapline, anglais, ukrainien, typologie des langues, sémantique, perception du monde, concept, niveaux de catégorisation, verbalisation.

Résumé in Russian

Статья посвящена проблеме концептуализации информации и её последующей вербализации средствами двух неблизкородственных языков (английского и украинского) на фоне языка индейцев якима, который как генетически, так и типологически отличается от вышеназванных индо-европейских. Исследование проведено на основе лексикографических данных. Контрастивный, семантический и этимологический анализ позволили выделить изоморфные (совпадающие) и алломорфные (отличительные) пути вербализации информации наиболее важных для человека концептов ОКРУЖАЮЩАЯ СРЕДА и ВРЕМЯ. Эти два мегаконцепта и их составляющие – ОКЕАН, ОЗЕРО, РАВНИНА, ГРОМ и др., отражают понимание первого из них в лингвокультуре якима. Микроконцепты ДЕНЬ, ПОСЛЕОБЕДЕННОЕ ВРЕМЯ, СУМЕРКИ, ДНИ НЕДЕЛИ раскрывают разные аспекты концепта ВРЕМЯ для народа якима. Данные мегаконцепты и их составляющие рассматриваются в структуре картины мира как единства знаний о мире, отражённых в языковой форме, и как пути

получения и интерпретации новой информации. В этом ракурсе язык трактуется, с одной стороны, как вербализованная концептуальная картина мира, т.е. фрагменты концептуальной информации об окружающем мире в форме языковых единиц, а с другой – как средства её объединения. Причины отличий между путями получения информации и её последующей концептуализации содержатся в этнической и культурной специфике. В статье доказывается возможность установления степени лингвистической близости рассмотренных языков (сагаптин как языка индейцев якима, а также английского и украинского), характеризующихся сходствами и отличиями согласно наличию / отсутствию концептов и специфике их семантической репрезентации в соответствующих картинах мира. Результаты исследования доказывают то, что рассмотренные вербализованные мегаконцепты (ОКРУЖАЮЩАЯ СРЕДА и ВРЕМЯ) в языковых картинах мира относятся к базовому уровню категоризации, суперординатный же уровень категоризации соответствующей информации характеризуется большим количеством микроконцептов, которые фокусируют внимание на рельефе местности, явлениях природы и флоры (ОКРУЖАЮЩАЯ СРЕДА); времени суток, рабочих и выходных днях (ВРЕМЯ).

Ключевые слова: индейцы якима, язык сагаптин, английский и украинский языки, типология языков, семантика, языковая картина мира, концепт, уровни категоризации, вербализация

Article was received by the editorial board 20.08.16;

Reviewed 11.09.16. and 12.09.16.

Similarity Index 15%.