

Приходько А. М. Концепти і концептосистеми в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики. Запоріжжя : Прем'єр, 2008. 332 с.

Сытнікова С. И. Языковая репрезентация пространства в тексте немецкой народной сказки. *Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В. Н. Каразіна*. Харків : Константа, 2006. С. 153 -156.

Duden Lexikon : Bedeutungswörterbuch : режим доступа : <https://www.duden.de/suchen/dudenonline/Zauberei>

Hauff W. Märchen. Харьков : Фолио, 2017. 255 с.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 15.05.18. Прийнято до друку 28.06.18)

УДК: 81'37:81'373.612.2:398.9

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135/2019-75-10>

MANAKIN V.

(Chicago, U.S.A., Independent Scholar)

THE SYNERGY OF BASIC FACTORS OF SEMANTIC COMMONALITIES IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

*We may have different religions, different languages,
different colored skin, but we all belong to one human race.*

Kofi Annan

This article surveys the idea of commonalities in cross-cultural communication through examining potential semantic universals in languages, particularly in their proverbs — the smallest verbal folklore genre that vividly reflects the mentality and culture of any nation. At the proverb level, it is possible to identify,

- 1) basic cognitive universal mechanisms that lead to the creativity of metaphorical thinking;
- 2) principles of verbalization of common human values in different languages; and
- 3) statements of effability, translatability, and as a result, mutual understanding between nations.

At the global level, diverse human languages and cultures exist and are interconnected in a dialectical unity reflecting both its universal/common and specific features. Based on the idea of Noosphere, i.e., the latent planetary source of any kind of intellectual and spiritual information, this metaphysical perspective enables us to identify the synergy of human universality in all its forms.

Key words: Noosphere, proverbs, linguistic universals, cultural commonalities

Манакин В. Синергія основних факторів семантичних подібностей в різних мовах. Стаття розглядає ідею крос-культурних подібностей через аналіз потенційних семантичних універсалій в мовах, зокрема в приказках – найменших мовних фольклорних текстах, що наочно відбивають національну ментальність і культуру. На такому рівні можливо ідентифікувати:

- 1) базові когнітивні універсальні механізми, що спричиняють метафоричне мислення;
- 2) принципи вербалізації спільних людських цінностей у різних мовах;
- 3) положення ефабілізації (здатності вираження будь-якої думки мовою), перекладацької здатності і, як результат, - досягнення взаєморозуміння між націями. На глобальному рівні мовна і культурна розмаїтість існує у діалектичній єдності, відбиваючи водночас універсальні/спільні та специфічні риси. Спираючись на теорію Ноосфери як на планетарний ресурс будь-якої інтелектуальної і духовної інформації, стає можливим пояснити синергетику людських універсалій в усіх їхніх можливих формах.

Ключові слова: Ноосфера, приказки, лінгвістичні універсалії, культурні спільності

Introduction. Language provides the foundation for human communication, and must be seen as the basic element enabling cross/intercultural communication. It is a window that allows people to find commonalities between cultures, since all languages verbalize and by doing so, fix cultural constants of their nations.

In spite of observed differences, however, languages and cultures have a lot in common, perhaps to the extent that similarities are more noticeable than differences. This explains why, with or without words, people are able to understand each other, whether by using words, using nonverbal gestures, or even by spiritual means, to communicate.

This raises an important question as to how commonalities and universal features and laws can be observed in different languages and cultures, and what makes it possible for us to identify such features. Can we trust the idea of mutual symmetry between communicative, linguistic, genetic, mental, and other synergetic codes? How are common values verbalized similarly in different languages? Is it possible to detect an invisible world of intelligence in the universe, as

revealed through human language(s) as a visible cultural and cross-cultural phenomenon, which connects people and makes languages translatable? This inquiry on commonality is important and significant, as it helps steer us away from scholars' extensive over-concentration on cultural differences, to envision an alternative route in analyzing culture and communication.

By applying the concept of Noosphere, the latent source of intellectual information, I argue that language, being the most reliable window into the human mind, can reveal to us the most important concerns that people of different cultures have raised, from which universal qualities can be identified. Specifically, this article explores cultural commonalities by means of comparative analyses of proverbs across languages.

Proverbs are short sentences of wisdom [Mieder 1989, p. 15]; they are simple, often repeated sayings that usually originate from folklore, riddles, fables, and myths. Cao compares a proverb with a beautiful flower of thought, a rich art treasure, and the most precious cultural heritage [cited in Chang, 2011 p. 127]. Proverbs can be found in all languages and may pass from one language and culture to another. Proverbs and sayings express some sort of constant cultural values, morals, and truth and therefore are part of long-term semantic as well as cultural memory for their speakers.

Through examining lexical representations of value concepts in variant European and Asian languages that reveal a variety of nuances and show a contrastive map of value scales, I hope to identify commonalities among people. I will then move to discuss the concept of Noosphere and its implications; and finally, I will examine various proverbial expressions in both European and Asian languages to ascertain universal aspects of language expression.

Universals versus differences. In the history of linguistics, there are two positions concerning the relationship between languages—theories of linguistic universalism and theories of linguistic relativism. The position on universals in language was enunciated in the *Port-Royal Grammar, General and Rational Grammar, containing the fundamentals of the art of speaking, explained in a clear and natural manner*, published in 1660 by Antoine Arnauld and Claude Lancelot. The main argument of language grammar is that there is basic grammar of logical processes and rules which are universal [Marinov 2011]. The ideas of the Port Royal grammarians are reflected in the twentieth-century generative/universal grammar advanced by Chomsky [Chomsky 1957, 1968], which attempts to reveal the unity underlying separate grammars in different languages [Robins, 1997] as well as to identify the universal principles underlying the art of speaking [Harris & Taylor 1989; Marinov 2011].

The other theory was put forward at the beginning of 19th century, after spreading Wilhelm von Humboldt's idea about language diversity and its influential power on the human mind.

A hundred years later Humboldt's theory was transformed into the Sapir-Whorf theory. Here is a classic passage from Sapir [1929]:

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the "real world" is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached... We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation. (p. 69)

This view was extended by Whorf (1940) in no less widely-cited language:

We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every

observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds—and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. (pp. 213-14)

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can be further divided into two associated theories, i.e., linguistic determinism theory, according to which human thinking is determined by language, and linguistic relativity theory, which claims that people who speak different languages perceive and consequently think about the world quite differently. Considerable research supports linguistic relativity theory and its popularity surged following the rapid and widespread expansion of intercultural communication as a subject of inquiry. The linguistic dimension has become a specific and very important part of inter/cross-cultural communication studies [Manakin 2012]. Differences between languages are correlated with differences between cultures, which often are defined at the national level—in other words, the focus has been on exploring how different worldviews of speakers belong to different national mentalities.

Related to the debate concerning linguistic determinism and linguistic relativity is the issue of linguistic universality or the extent to which languages share universal qualities. Scholars endorsing linguistic universalism try to prove their arguments by analyzing the process of translation among languages. As Bach (2010) claims, "The best argument in favor of the universality of natural language expressive power is the possibility of translation. The best argument against universality is the impossibility of translation" (p. 17).

Regardless of language used, speakers manage to say what they wish to say and any utterance in any language can still be translated into another language. "The fact is that even totally different languages are not untranslatable" [Popper 1970, p. 56]. Hence, from the cross-cultural perspective we fully agree with Jacobson's (1959) statement, "... the true difference between languages is not in what may or may not be expressed but in what must or must not be conveyed by the speakers" (p. 21).

In fact, there should be a realistic balance between the two opposing positions in studying the relationship between language and thought. As the truth is usually somewhere in between, taking an absolute or extreme position is likely to be counterproductive. On the one hand, there is no doubt that there is a huge spectrum of variation across languages that have attracted our attention and generated extensive studies over the past decades. On the other hand, there is also no need to overstate language differences, as many scholars have inadvertently done in the past.

Our "folk linguistics" is likely to be flawed: the fact that speakers of different languages belong to different cultures does not necessarily entail that language has a profound influence on thought. Simply put, "although there is a strong impression that the language one speaks must influence how one thinks, we think that this impression is more seductive than it is instructive" [Bloom & Keil 2001, p. 365]. Indeed, the link between language and thought is likely to be mediated by a host of social factors and situational demands.

The belief in language's power over its speaker's thought and hence the idea that different languages lead to different thought processes tends to be exaggerated not only by folk linguistics, but also by cross-cultural communication scholars, myself included. We should be reminded of the idea articulated by Edward Sapir (1929), one of the founders of linguistic relativity theory, that, "The outstanding fact about any language is its formal completeness...No matter what any speaker of it may desire to communicate, the language is prepared to do his work...Formal completeness has nothing to do with the richness or the poverty of the vocabulary" (p. 153).

Thus, the most productive approach is to take a dialectical perspective in treating different languages and cultures – whether Asian or otherwise – as in a unique unity of differences, i.e., differences which are embedded within an inclusive unity. In the next section, I will address issues of what particular principles support this unity; whether linguistic universalism should be taken into account when exploring cultural commonalities; and what appropriate terms to use, among others.

Hypotheses about linguistic universals. One important issue addressed by general linguistic theory is to identify what the languages of the world have in common. There is a special domain in this area that describes language universals. Linguists have tried to differentiate absolute universals from statistical universals. Absolute universals refer to properties found in all languages. Since we do not have access to all (approximately six thousand or so) languages, the existence of absolute universals must remain hypothetical. As for statistical universals, they refer to phonological, morphological, grammatical, lexical, and other important trends identified in the majority of known languages. Hence, it should be noted that the concept “universals” is always seen as a relative theoretical assumption.

Explanations for linguistic universals refer to some well-known hypotheses, such as:

- 1) monogenesis hypothesis;
- 2) language contact hypothesis;
- 3) innateness hypothesis;
- 4) effability hypothesis.

1. Monogenesis hypothesis. Very briefly, *monogenesis hypothesis* refers to the idea that all languages stem from the same proto-language. Topologists usually are able to prove some universal traits regarding certain groups of proto-languages. For instance, Indo-European proto-language has been more popular for investigation since the 19th century. The monogenetic hypothesis is mostly based on finding similar sound-and-meaning small linguistic forms (roots, words, morphemes) in languages across the globe. Since proverbs are composed of words and function as complete sentences or their parts, i.e., units that are usually beyond protolanguage reconstruction, it would be challenging to apply this hypothesis to explain cultural commonalities revealed through proverbs in different languages.

2. Language contact hypothesis. The hypothesis is based on the sociolinguistic fact that languages are constantly influenced by each other. This is true regarding proverbs, sayings, and other idioms that travel across the world enriching other languages and cultures.

Most European cultures readily use the same Latin or Old Greek proverbs that have been translated or transformed, and spread among other languages. For instance, similar proverbs to the Latin proverb *dura lex, sed lex* (“strict law is still law”) can be seen in many other languages: *No man is above the law* (English); *Recht bleibt allzeit recht* (German, “law is always right”); *złe czy dobre, prawo jest zawsze prawem* (Polish, “right is always right, regardless of good or bad”); *Kto bez prawa (zakonu)ż yje, ten bez prawa (zakonu) ginie*; *Закондержаву держит* (Russian, “law holds power”); *Закон – неого,водую не заллешь* (Ukrainian, “Law is not fire, no one can flood it with water”); among others.

Latin proverbs concerning the concept *liberty*, such as *libertas fulvo pretiosior auro est* (“freedom worth more than gold”) also appear in other languages, though maintaining the original sense, including *liberty is worth more than gold*, *liberty is a jewel*, or *liberty is a pearl* (English); *Freiheit geht über Silber und Gold* and *freiheit ist über allen Reichtum* (German, “Freedom is above silver and gold” and “Freedom is above all worth”); and *Свобода дороже денег (золота)* (Russian, “Liberty worth more than money [gold]”).

Many languages have accepted the proverb *time is money*, whose origin lies not in British or American culture, as it is usually thought, but Old Greek culture: *Zeit ist geld* (German); *Le temps, c’est de l’argent* (French); *Il tempo è denaro* (Spanish); *Время – деньги* (Russian); *Час – то гроши* (Ukrainian); *Czas to pieniądz (zloto, kapital)* (Polish); and so on. The idea underlying this proverb may also be transformed into sentences like the following: *Nothing is more precious than time, yet nothing is less valued; he that gains time gains all things; take time when time comes, lest time steal away (for time will be away).*

It is clear that proverbs from ancient and modern languages express common human ideas, values, and life principles that all people share have been efficiently spread in many cultures. Of course, in many cases it is also questionable how such common or near-universal language features

could be spread across the entire world in ancient times, when cultural contact between nations was limited, such as between the East and the West.

It probably takes more than the language contact hypothesis to explain the fact that many languages, including Western and Eastern cultures, verbalize the same basic/key semantic patterns in their proverbs; for example:

English: *The grass is always greener on the other side (of the fence)*

Russian: *A neighbor's grass is always greener*

Ukrainian: *A neighbor's house is whiter, and his wife is nicer*

Korean: *The beans are larger in another's soup*

German: *A neighbor's hen is a goose; a neighbor's wheat always grows better.*

Japanese: *A neighbor's hen always looks as big as a goose.*

Chinese: *It seems from this mountain that the other mountain is higher.*

Consider as well some Chinese proverbs and sayings that sound very much like English proverbs, such as the following [Famous Chinese Sayings]:

好書如		
摯友	hǎo shū rú zhì yǒu	<i>A good book is a good friend</i>
廣交友		
無深交	guǎng jiāo yǒu wú shēn jiāo	<i>A friend to everybody is a friend to nobody</i>
活到老	huó dào lǎo	
學到老	1	<i>A man is never too old to learn</i>
愛屋及		
烏	ài wū jí wǔ	<i>Love me, love my dog</i>
一言既		
出	yì yán jì chū	<i>A word spoken can never be taken</i>
駟馬難		
追		<i>back</i>

3. Innateness hypothesis. The *innateness hypothesis* explains language universals genetically, seeing our ability to use language as a part of our genetic endowment. Under this hypothesis, scholars have tried to explain why children tend to learn languages more easily according to their general genetic development. Chomsky [Chomsky 1957; 1968] describes an effect of innate generative grammar as a genetic programme specifically designed to determine our language ability. The basis of Chomsky's theory is that the principles underlying the structure of language are biologically determined in the human mind/brain and hence genetically transmitted. Some scholars also seek a specific gene of language, though so far unsuccessfully. Perhaps the time for this rather important finding has yet to come.

4. Effability hypothesis. The *innateness hypothesis* relates to the idea of *effability*, which is also widely assumed by modern linguists [van Benthem 1991; Fintel & Matthewson 2008; Katz 1976; Li & Gleiman 2002]. The strong *effability hypothesis* states, "Every proposition is the sense of some sentence in each natural language" [Katz 1976, p. 37]. Compare S. Beckett's philosophical aphorism, "There are many ways in which the thing I am trying in vain to say may be tried in vain to be said" (quoted from [Fintel & Matthewson 2008, p. 142]). *Effability* in its broad meaning would be the most basic general semantic universal. It would assert that all natural languages have the same expressive power in the sense of being able to express any proposition whatsoever. Furthermore, *effability* should be seen as the unique feature that distinguishes human languages from animal communication systems [Fintel & Matthewson 2008, p. 142; Katz 1976, p. 36].

For example, English has different proverbs to express the concept "labor" in many positions, such as *labor overcomes all things; he that will not endure labor in this world, let him not be born; no bees, no honey; no work, no money; if you won't work you shouldn't eat or he that will not work shall not eat; he that will not work will want; plough deep, while sluggards sleep; and you shall have corn to sell and to keep; he that would have the fruit, must climb the tree.*

On the other hand, this effability can be discerned in different languages as well, with some proverbs exhibiting the same semantic pattern—the above-discussed example, *the grass is always greener on the other side*, well illustrates this idea. Consider one more example—*everybody's business is nobody's business*—of how a common proverbial pattern has been verbalized differently in some languages: *sange heshang mei shui he* (Chinese, “three monks get no water to drink; У семи нянек дитя без глазу).

Hence, effability is not even close to translatability. Each language has its own set of grammatical and lexical rules and units that satisfy speakers for conveying their thoughts and covering different aspects of the specifics of their worldviews. The art of translation means to get as close as possible to all of these peculiarities when using another language, whereas the property of effability is a natural lingua-cognitive tool that helps find the best way in the process of translation into other languages. Thus, the hypotheses about linguistic universals is closely associated with a fundamental idea that leads to explanation of the main principles of cross-linguistic uniformity of meanings and basic semantic continuum that unites languages and all forms of human communication that exist at the global level.

Language universals/differences from the prospective of the Noosphere theory. The intellectual history on proving human universals [see Brown 1991] is tied to the idea of cosmic universality, considered to be the fundamental law of nature, of the universe, and of everything. Greeks and others were fascinated by the symmetries of objects and believed that these would be mirrored in the structure of nature and Logos. Newton's laws of mechanics embodied symmetry principles, notably the principle of equivalence of inertial frames, or Galilean invariance. Similarly, Einstein's great advance in 1905 was to put symmetry first, to regard the symmetry principle as the primary feature of nature that constrains allowable dynamical laws [Gowan 2014]. With the development of quantum mechanics in the 1920s, symmetry principles came to play an even more fundamental role.

Noosphere: The third phase of Earth development. Significantly enough, in this period Vladimir Vernadsky, notable Russian and Ukrainian scholar, was developing Pierre T. de Chardin's theory of Noosphere (from Greek νοῦς, “mind and intelligence”) based on the same fundamental principles of universality. Noosphere can be viewed as the sphere of the human mind on the planetary level. According to Vernadsky (1989), the Noosphere is the third phase of Earth development, following the geosphere and the biosphere stages.

According to the hypothesis to which I have devoted my attention for several years [Manakin 2004, 2011], human language(s) – or human mind with its verbal and nonverbal types of thinking—is a specific manifestation of the Noosphere, and a unique phenomenon, with basic principle reproducing universal patterns of all living (i.e., cognitive) systems as well as the microcosm and macrocosm of nature and the universe.

The Noosphere can be seen as a cognitive-semantic continuum, embedded in all languages and cultures of the world. Noosphere is the source of linguistic and other types of cultural and intelligent activity, and a latent storage facility for information and consciousness in all its forms. By taking the Noosphere theory into consideration, we can detect the invisible world of mind, and even intelligence of the universe through human language via the idea of mutual symmetry among mind, linguistic, genetic (DNA), and other synergetic codes.

It is to be assumed that the general system organization of the web of Noosphere consists of networks within networks. This principle, as well as a pattern organization principle, works equally in culture(s), language(s), and human mind. A *pattern organization* is nothing but a miracle phenomenon that displays at every scale any kind of nature providing its evolution and function. The recognition that patterns rule the human mind came into science when cyberneticists, in particular, tried to understand the brain as a neural network made up of various small components [Capra 1996]. The neural network in its turn produces a network of mind, which is based on verbal and other types of thinking.

Cognitive universals in proverb creation. Modern cognitive linguistics views language meaning in terms of mental spaces and specific conceptualization. Cognitive linguists [Lakoff & Turner 1989] argue that the same cognitive mechanism supposedly unites the process of creating proverbs. Proverbs have a common origin in cognitive processes speakers use to formulate and disseminate them, a trait highlighted in the great chain metaphor theory (GCMT) [Honeck & Temple 1994, cited in Moreno 2005]. The basic Great Chain concerns the relation of human beings to lower forms of existence; likewise all networks of life and universe exist accordingly to the law of symmetry in nature and mind.

In other words, according to GCMT, metaphor is a specific cultural model or network, which is based on universal cognitive operation that defines attributes and behavior applied to humans, animals, plants, complex objects, and natural physical things. It means that proverbs create a particular understandable situation, arranged according to a metaphorical approach. This is why Lakoff (1989) defines proverbs as metaphoric in nature. How animals are conceived and presented in different metaphorical schemas via application of folk knowledge is a subject addressed by Lakoff and Turner (1989, pp. 193-194, cited in Moreno [2005]):

- *Pigs are dirty, messy and rude.*
- *Lions are courageous and noble.*
- *Foxes are clever.*
- *Dogs are loyal, dependable and dependent.*
- *Cats are fickle and independent.*
- *Wolves are cruel and murderous.*
- *Gorillas are aggressive and violent.* (p. 45)

For instance, the cognitive domain from this list, *Dogs are loyal, dependable and dependent*, appears in a proverb *A dog is a man's best friend*, found in many languages regardless of their historical and genetic relations.

Liu's (2013) comparative study of animal proverbs in English and Chinese shows that some proverbs are identical in both form and meaning – that is, they share the same animal images, and literal and metaphorical meanings – although the proverbs in this category are limited in number. Here are some examples from the study (pp. 1845-1847):

- (1) Mouse is used to refer to timid people.

Chinese: 老鼠愛打洞 (The mouse loves to dig holes)

English: The mouse does not trust to one hole only.

- (2) Tiger is used to refer to ferocious people and dangerous situations.

Chinese: 老虎的屁股摸不得 (A tiger's behind cannot be touched).

English: A tiger does not have to proclaim its "tigri-tude."

- (3) Pig is used to refer to worthless people or objects.

Chinese: 人生不讀書，活著不如豬 (If one does not study, one's life is no better than that of a pig.)

English: What can you expect from a pig but a grunt?

Liu (2013) notes, "These proverbs are not hindered by national boundaries or cultural barriers, instead they have taken some universal significance" (p. 1846).

Human value universals in a mirror of proverbs

Human values appear to us as the ultimate and most refined basic principles for building cultural, language, and many other human worldviews. In the modern multicultural global community, value concepts that are basic and common across cultures enable us to become tolerant and enhance mutual understanding between people. Core human values that unite all nations are revealed through varieties of social proverbs.

From the cross-cultural perspective the category "values" could be understood as general concepts people endorse and believe in. Most basic human values are about social standards, moral

qualities, and education approaches; whether expressing them in similar ways or not, proverbs of different cultures teach people to be devoted to similar human values, i.e., *love, justice, fairness, cooperation, caring, honesty, respect, faith, equality, trust, integrity, harmony, confidence, modesty, loyalty, goodness*, and so on. What is special about these and other concepts of value is that we typically think that they should constitute norms not only for one cultural group or community but also for everyone. A large number of core values can be found, for example, in Lee (2010).

However, fundamental concepts of value are always *experienced* as valid from a particular point of view, woven into a person's social and cultural context. Depending on cultural codes and orientations, expressions of basic human values may differ from culture to culture, as each culture has its own set of concepts concerning value. Therefore, it is important to study similarities and differences in the hierarchy, quantitative and qualitative characteristics of these values. Asian cultures, for instance, mostly respect the past and tradition, whereas Western countries tend to focus on the future. As can be observed, many English proverbs reflect the value of the future and change, such as "*newer is truer; change brings life and variety is the spice of life.*" This stands in contrast to the Chinese focus on the importance of the past as teacher in present life, as the proverb has it: 前事不忘 後事之師 [Zhao 2013, p. 398].

Nevertheless, from a more general perspective, some fundamental human values are universal — they can be observed from the proverbs of different cultures that express collective human wisdom, and that have spread over generations and the world. Here are some similar proverbs from different languages that express the value of words and silence:

English: *Speech is silver, silence is golden*

German: *Reden ist Silber, Schweigen ist Gold*

French: *La parole est d'argent, la silence est d'or*

Polish: *Mowa srebro, milczenie złoto*

Ukrainian: *Слово – срібло, а мовчання – золото*

Russian: *Слово – серебро, молчание – золото*

There are some variations of this proverbial semantic pattern in Hebrew: *If a word be worth one shekel, silence is worth two; Teach thy tongue to say, "I do not know"*; in Korean: *Words have no wings but they can fly many thousands of miles*. Consider as well the Russian proverb: *A word is not a sparrow, if a word fly out you will never catch it*. There are very common Chinese proverbs and sayings, such as: *Silence is golden; too many words must lead to losses*; as well as Daoist dictum which says, *those who know do not speak, and those who speak do not know* [Chang 2011, p. 4]. While specific proverbs reveal divergent attitudes toward words and silence, all these cultures — as expressed through their proverbs—reveal how words and silence are valued in each culture.

In many cases, we do not consider the origin of proverbs in terms of whether they are adopted from other languages or created independently. Most important is to understand that these proverbs reveal the same human values, and it is such commonalities that unite people and nations throughout the world.

Conclusion. The commonalities/universals in human values, cross-cultural proverbial commonalities are based on the synergy of: (1) a cognitive universal mechanism that in turn reveals; (2) convergent types of common metaphorical and semantic patterns in proverbs from different languages; and (3) general linguistic universals (language contacts, property of effability).

The main factor of linguistic and cultural commonalities refers to the Noosphere theory that is assumed to be a global source of linguistic, cultural, and other intelligent (as well as spiritual) activities of humankind.

References

- Van Benthem, J. (1991). Linguistic universals in logical semantics. In D. Zaefferer (Ed.), *Semantic universals and universal semantics* (pp. 17-36). Berlin, Germany: Foris Publications.
- Bloom, P., & Keil, F. C. (2001). Thinking through language. *Mind and Language*, 16(4), 351–367.
- Brown, D. E. (1991). *Human universals*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Capra, F. (1996). *The web of life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Chang, H.-C. (2011). *Clever, creative, modest: The Chinese language practice*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education

Press.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Chomsky, N. (1996). *Cartesian linguistics: A Chapter in the history of rationalistic thought*. New York: Harper & Row.

Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 429-492.

Famous Chinese Sayings. URL : <http://www.chinahighlights.com/travelguide/learning-csehinese/chinese-sayings.htm>

Fintel, K., & Matthewson, L. (2008). Universals in semantics. *The Linguistic Review*, 25, 139-201.

Harris, R., & Taylor, T. J. (1989). *Landmarks in linguistics thought: The Western tradition from Socrates to Saussure*. London: Routledge.

Honeck, R. P., & Temple, J. G. (1994). Proverbs: The extended conceptual base and great chain metaphor theories. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 9(2), 85-112.

Humboldt, W. (1999). (Ed. by M. Losonsky). *On language: On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species* (pp. 25-64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gowan, J. A. (2014). *Extending Einstein's equivalence principle: Symmetry conservation*. Available at <http://www.johnagowan.org/equival.html#links>

Katz, J. J. (1976). A hypothesis about the uniqueness of natural language. In S. R. Harnad, H. D. Steklis, and J. Lancaster (Eds.), *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Volume 280: Origins and evolution of language and speech* (33-41).

Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 232-239). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989) *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee, H. (2010). List of human values: Core values assessment. Retrieved from <http://hayyalee.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/List-of-Personal-Values1.pdf>

Li, P., & Gleitman, L. (2002). Turning the tables: Language and spatial reasoning. *Cognition*, 83(3), 265-294.

Liu, J. (2013). A comparative study of English and Chinese animal proverbs: From the perspective of metaphors. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(10), 1844-1849.

Manakin, V. (2004). *Sopostavitel'naya leksikologiya* (Contrastive lexicology). Kiev, Ukraine: Znanie Publishing House.

Manakin, V. (2011). *Language and the general symmetry of the universe*. *Movoznavstvo* [linguistics], 3, 26-40 (Theoretical Journal of Potebnya Institute of Linguistics, Ukrainian National Academy of Science).

Manakin, V. (2012). *Mova i mizhkulturna komunikacia* (Language and cross-cultural communication). Kyiv, Ukraine : Academia Publishing House.

Marinov, S. (2011). Generative ideas in Port Royal grammar. Retrieved from <http://wiki.ling.gu.se/Main/TheRenaissanceAnd17thCentury/Generative R.pdf>

Robins, R. H. (1997). *A short history of linguistics*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. In D. G. Mandelbaum (Ed.), *Culture, language and personality: Selected essays*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press Snell

Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: new paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Talmy, L. (2006). The fundamental system of spatial schemas in language. In B. Hamp (Ed.), *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* (199-234). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Talmy, L. (2008). Universals of semantics. In P. C. Hogan (Ed.), *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the language sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vernadsky, V. I. (1989). *Biosphere and Noosphere*. Moscow : Science Publishing House.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 3.05.18. Прийнято до друку 19.05.18)

УДК : 811. 111: 81' 42: 821. 111

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135/2019-75-11>

ПЕШКОВА О. А.

(Запорізький національний університет)

КОНЦЕПТ МИСТЕЦТВО У НАРАТИВНО-СЕМІОТИЧНОМУ І ОБРАЗНОМУ ЗОБРАЖЕННІ В ХУДОЖНЬОМУ ТЕКСТІ

Стаття присвячена дослідженню концепту МИСТЕЦТВО в різноманітних його проявах в межах художнього тексту. Художній текст розглядається як система, в якій перехрещуються коди різних медіумів, а саме мистецьких. Концепт МИСТЕЦТВО в межах художнього тексту може виявлятися на наративному рівні та образно-символічному. В цьому дослідженні акцент робиться саме на дослідженні образного переосмислення мистецтва – архітектурних споруд, зокрема.