

національні мови (як наприклад у Франції), вивчення римського права і рецепції з нього було найважливішою складовою частиною юриспруденції. Звідси широке проникнення латинської лексики в новоевропейські мови, насамперед як джерела наукової, богословської, юридичної і загалом абстрактної термінології.

Як мова науки латина не втратила свого значення і до тепер. Вона продовжує бути наукою школи, науки і літератури, мовою церкви, законодавства і дипломатії.

Завдяки латинській мові біологічна, медична та ветеринарна термінології стали міжнародними, що в значній мірі полегшує зв'язки між вченими всього світу.

*Лісковська Дар'я Олександрівна
Науковий керівник – ст. викл. Подворна Л.А.
Державний біотехнологічний університет*

LANGUAGE AS A MIRROR OF CULTURE

The linguistic principle saying that language is a mirror of the culture leads to a long-standing claim concerning the relationship between language and culture (Wardhaugh, 1988). This claim is best understood through the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis or the Whorfian hypothesis – the latter term will be used since the claim seems to owe much more to Whorf than it does to Sapir – which states that the structure of a language determines how speakers of that language view the world. This may imply that “people are prisoners of their language” (Chaika, 1982). Referring to the Whorfian hypothesis, Fishman (1978) suggests three kinds of claims it makes.

Fishman’s first claim is that if speakers of one language have certain words to describe things and speakers of another language lack similar words, then speakers of the first language will find it easier to talk about those things. That is, if language A has a word for a particular concept, then that word makes it easier for speakers of language A to refer to that concept than speakers of language B, who lack such a word and are forced to use a circumlocution. Moreover, it is actually easier for speakers of language A to perceive instances of the concept. Speakers of Javanese, for example, will find it easier to talk about “tingkeban” – Javanese traditional ceremony held for a woman’s seven-month pregnancy – than speakers of English who lack such a word. We may also see how this might be the case seen when technical vocabulary (terms) is used in a communication act. Pharmacists, for instance, talk easily about pharmaceutical phenomena, more easily than mathematicians do, because they have the vocabulary to do so. Similarly, pilots discuss aviation problems with less trouble than we do.

As for the second claim, Fishman argues that if one language makes distinctions that another language does not, then those who use the first language will more readily perceive the differences in their environment which such linguistic

distinctions draw attention to. In other words, if a language requires certain distinctions to be made because of its grammatical system, then the speakers of that language become conscious of the kinds of distinctions that must be referred to. If we have to classify rice, camel, snow in certain ways, for example, we will perceive rice, camel, and snow differently from those who are not required to make these differentiations. Moreover, if certain material objects must be classified as long and thin and others as round, we will perceive material objects that way; those objects will fall ‘naturally’ into those classes. These kinds of distinctions may also affect how speakers learn to deal with the world. That is, they can have consequences for both cognitive and cultural development.

Thirdly, Fishman claims that the grammatical categories existing in a particular language both help the users of that language to perceive the world in a certain way and at the same time limit such perception as well. The grammatical categories act as “blinkers” – something which prevents us from broadening our perception. This means that we perceive only what our language allows us to perceive. In other words, our language controls our ‘world view’. Speakers of different languages will, therefore, have different worldviews. The Whorfian hypothesis can be more easily understood through a smoker’s experience on which Whorf’s ideas were based. He argued that someone has to behave in a certain way because his or her language says or does not say something. His famous example is that the man who tossed a cigarette butt into a gas drum marked: “Empty.” He claimed that English forces the word empty even though fumes are still in the drum. He argued that the use of the word empty allowed the careless smoker to think that the drum had nothing in it. Therefore, the man disregarded the vapors and acted as if they were not there. This kind of reasoning seems to be logically presented and, thus, constitutes the strength of his hypothesis. However, upon further and deeper analysis, one weakness of such reasoning can be identified. Concerning the careless smoker’s case, Whorf did not show that an empty drum could have vapors. In other words, the mistake the man did could have been caused by sheer ignorance.

*Малина Ксенія Геннадіївна
Науковий керівник – канд. філол. наук., доц. Підгородецька І.Ю.
Державний біотехнологічний університет*

ВАЖЛИВІСТЬ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ В СУЧАСНОМУ АГРОБІЗНЕСІ

У світі існує близько 250 країн, а мов, якими розмовляють їхні мешканці, ще більше: науковці стверджують, що їх кілька тисяч. Як же землянам зрозуміти один одного? Якраз для цього й існують міжнародні мови, що дають змогу спілкуватися представникам різних національностей. Однією з міжнародних мов є англійська, яка, окрім того, є мовою міжнаціональної комунікації для всього людства.

Яку ж роль у сучасному житті відіграє англійська мова? Жодну зі сфер діяльності людства не можна уявити без англійської мови: політика й