

SOCIOLINGVISTIKA / SOCIOLINGUISTICS

A Living Language: An Alternative Approach to Interpreting Social and Geopolitical Processes

Julija Korostenskaja

crossref <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.24.6232>

Abstract. The aim of the present article is to lay the foundations for a methodology which could help account for the striking yet formally inexplicable phonetic and semantic similarities across languages. Grounding the present research in the mechanics of sound production, it is postulated that early language, as an immediate outcome of vocal vibrations produced by the humans, was primarily emotion-driven and consequently universal. It expressed generalized ideas, or archetypes, characterized by a certain conceptual load, which are still retained across various languages. A claim is made that the emotion-driven part of language vocabulary is hierarchical: it is composed of “major” archetypes, i.e. archetypes identifiable across a number of languages, and “minor” archetypes, i.e. groups of language-specific archetypal words sharing the same conceptual load. We then establish a set of criteria along which archetypal words may be identified. The proposed hypothesis may have a broad application in all social sciences, in particular, consulting, recruiting, making prospective solutions, and ultimately, the national identity and geopolitical self-determination of a given culture.

Keywords: *anthropocentricity, conceptual load, acoustic phonetics, articulatory phonetics, language evolution, archetypes.*

We no longer perceive or give expression to a world in which everything has intelligence, personality, and voice. Polyphonous echoes are reduced to homophony, a term Kane (1994) uses to denote “the reduced sound of human language when it is used under the assumption that speech is something belonging only to human beings” (Bell & Russel, 2000, p. 194).

Introduction

At all times, the broad range of questions concerned with the relationship between language, thought, and reality has been an appealing field of inquiry for many an inquisitive mind. Substantial research has been carried out to explore how language influences a person’s thinking, which inevitably raises the question of whether language has impact on social positioning, national identity, self-determination, and ultimately broad geopolitical processes (e.g., Humboldt, 1999). Over the two waves of breathtaking claims in the 20th century, first driven by the pioneering works of Sapir (1921) and Whorf (1956) and second, more recently, heralded by cognitive scientists like Slobin (1987, 2003), Levinson (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996; Levinson, 2009), and Boroditsky (2009, 2011), to mention but a few, the idea that there is indeed some correlation between the language and the way its users express their ideas has stood the tests of both time and criticism and gave rise to an ever-present interest in the field of language relativity (e.g., Wolff & Holmes, 2010; Sidnell & Enfield, 2012). Besides, with the solidification of cross-disciplinary research and connections in the scientific world, outsourcing and multinational companies in the business world, and globalisation in the socio-

political domain, the specific traits of an individual (Jung, 1981), as well as a particular culture (e.g., Hofstede, 1991) and ultimately the reasons for both differences and similarities across various cultures have offered a vast array of material that may be of interest to any scientific field.

The implications arising from the perception of language as *the* essential skill (Boroditsky, 2009) entertain the minds of linguists and non-linguists alike. Two related dimensions of the “panoramic” explorations related to linguistic relativity are parallels across languages at different levels and language evolution. The former dimension offers evidence of the correlation between the particular sounds and the meanings conveyed by relevant words either at the micro-level (i.e. at the level of one language (Magnus, 2001; Magnus, n.d.), or at the macro-level, i.e. cross-linguistic studies (Ohala, 1997; Tsur, 2006). The language evolution dimension is concerned with the biological and social formalization of language (e.g., McNeill, 2012; McNeill et al., 2008; Gell-Mann, Peiros & Starostin, 2009; Bickerton, 2005/2007; Mead, 1967). A third dimension might be perceived as non-mainstream analysis and criticism of formal approaches to language study, in particular those that stand in opposition to linguistic relativity (Feyerabend, 1975/1986; Quaegebeur & Reynaert, 2010; cf. Beaugrande, 1995). Due to the limitations of the present study, these approaches will not be discussed here although the general mood has been succinctly summarized by Boroditsky: “Language... appears to be involved in many more aspects

of our mental life than scientists had previously supposed” (2011, p. 4).

Taking the above into consideration, the **objective** of this research is to offer an alternative approach to language data by arguing that social phenomena are psychologically driven, which is encoded in their acoustic form, which is ultimately traceable to language-universal sound archetypes. In other words, an attempt is made to find a new solution to Sapir’s quest

if there are... certain preferential tendencies to expressive symbolism not only in the field of speech dynamics (stress, pitch, and varying quantities), but also in the field of phonetic material as ordinarily understood (1949, p. 62).

To fulfill this objective, the present article provides a **case study** of several Lithuanian, English and Russian social and political phenomena.

Theoretical Background: Vibrations as Archetypes

Unlike previous attempts at generalization within the fields of linguistic relativity and language and thought, which have been concentrated in the realm of either structural or semantic juxtapositions across various languages, the present article aims at defining a finer grain of distinction. We start from the point at which traditional research has faced an insurmountable obstacle interpreting the striking yet formally inexplicable phonetic and semantic similarities across languages (e.g., Wierzbicka, 1999a, 2003, p. 338; Blažek, 2011) and build the present analysis on the idea that “the sacred power of language” is still “underestimated” (Houston, n.d. (a); cf. Dugin, 2001). We go back to the Vedic perception of language as sacred, capable of conveying information through the “semanticised sound tissue” (Elizarenkova, 1989, p. 519) and follow Houston’s idea that

The design of a sacred language is such that the sounds perfectly express the vibrational essence of that which they describe (Houston, n.d.(b)).

Assuming that language originally was stipulated by emotions, we hypothesize is that it is sound vibrations that may help account for the diversity across cultures, but more importantly, for the unexpected similarities between languages, and ultimately for an entire range of social and geopolitical phenomena (cf. Houston, n.d. (b)). Consequently, we believe that there is a certain layer of language that is emotion-driven and consists of language-universal forms, which we will define later (just as main gestures, the smile among them, are considered to be at least near universals (Ohala, 1997)). As regards the language evolution debate, we believe that, in evolutionary terms, an acoustic correlate to gesture is not speech, but rather vocal expression (cf. McNeill, 2012), or to be more precise, a sound wave, and therefore it is not the gesture and speech, but rather the gesture and the sound wave that, following the proposed approach, are “equiprimordial” (Quaeghebeur, cited in McNeill, 2012; Pinker, 1994). This view is in line with Bickerton’s claim that “no inflected language preceded protolanguage”, while the protolanguage already had “a categorically complete, if severely limited vocabulary of items roughly equivalent to modern words” (Bickerton, 2007, p. 516), which in the

present study acquires a particular meaning. We believe that the vocabulary initially formed as a result of emotion-based sound vibrations, comprised what can be referred to as primary archetypes (and these might fall loosely within the domain of Bickerton’s (1995) *living-fossils* defined as

types of communication used by modern humans that are close to, but do not share all the features of, fully-modern language (Kirby, 2007, p. 7),

since their origins go back to the early stages of language development while traces can still be observed, primarily in ancient languages, like Sanskrit or, bearing in mind extant archaic languages, Lithuanian. In addition, in any given language, a set of language-specific archetypes can be distinguished, too, but these are already secondary archetypes (see discussion below). We believe that both types of archetypes are ultimately the lexical outcome of the emotion-based vibrations and prevail in human decision-making.

In this way, at its earliest stages, the designation of the acoustic vibration was the expression of a certain mood (cf. Coward, 2008, p. 103 ff.). The important distinction between the original, so to say primordial, vibration and, for instance, vibrations produced as a result of the subsequent development of speech and writing is that, unlike the early vibrations, a significant part of speech as we know it today and especially writing are based on logic (see, e.g. Ershova, 2004, p. 8). On the contrary, early vocal vibrations were driven by emotion and hence were void of logic. In the course of time and for a variety of reasons, vocal manifestations acquired a predominantly secondary nature—they started to express thoughts.

It should be mentioned that the present analysis is concerned exclusively with the synchronic cut of language. The proposed approach is not related to word etymology and, therefore, to preceding or following language contacts. This analysis is limited only to synchronic explorations and does not posit diachronic proof as its goal. It does not account for diachronic sound change (which is based on logic); nor does it trace the origin of words. Rather, through language data at a given time period, we seek to establish the major extant archetypes which have been formed on the basis of subconscious emotions and continue to bear a certain emotional load to the present day (cf. Coward, 2008, p. 113).

In this way, the distinction between the emotional and the logical is crucial for our analysis, as it enables us to divide the vocabulary of any given language into two unequal classes: the core, or archetypal, vocabulary, which is limited, stipulated by certain emotions and characterized by a marked vibrational structure; and the derived vocabulary, which is the outcome of infinite combinations and derivations within the language, language change and innovations, language contacts, etc. The two examples below illustrate the power of the expression of emotions manifest through acoustic vibrations: to stipulate and to determine a certain course pursued by an individual.

Manifestations of Archetypal Information

How does archetypal information become manifest and what are its possible applications? At the present stage, two main directions may be identified:

- a) The broader application: As the multi-layer outcome of audio vibrations with archetypal vibrations at the core, a particular language is a reflection of the emotions of the people who speak it and ultimately, their social and geopolitical position, national identity and geopolitical self-determination. For instance, studies by Hofstede devoted to the analysis of values of more than 50 national cultures, differentiated along a multi-dimensional model of differences in power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation, fall largely within this application though they are confined to the business domain (cf. Fairclough, 1996, where language is argued to be a traditionally oversimplified, yet significant medium for the construction of ideology and, most importantly, power);
- b) The narrower application: Within a particular language, the names of people (both Christian names and surnames), which are vibrations, largely determine people's behavior and inclinations. The implications of this hypothesis may have a broad application in all social sciences, in particular, consulting, recruiting, assignment to leading and political positions, analysis of the state-of-affairs at a given point of time, making prospective solutions and, ultimately, determining the long-term developmental perspectives.

Let us illustrate the narrow application by a brief analysis of the last name of a top leader: Russian President Vladimir Putin and British Prime Minister David Cameron.

As is known, over the past years, Russia has witnessed a wave of national revival and has been undergoing a period of profound reforms and in-depth renovation. Russian president is perceived as a pro-active reformer and is oftentimes criticized for taking a domineering position in the global political arena. Our analysis suggests that all these features are coded in the president's last name, *Putin*, which has striking similarities with the Lithuanian word *putinas* "guelder rose", Lat. *viburnum opulus*. The guelder rose has become a national symbol of Russia. It is frequently mentioned in Russian folk songs and is frequently depicted in Russian decorative objects (Potebnia, 2000), while the plant itself is widely spread and cultivated across the country and is treasured for its health-enhancing qualities. The fruit of the guelder rose has the vibrant red color. Red, the color of action and initiative, figures prominently in Russian folklore—artifacts and oral tradition. Therefore, the name *Putin* contains in itself an archetype of action and a major symbol of whatever may be perceived as Russian. These facts considered, there comes a natural explanation of all the policies implemented by Russia's current president. Interestingly, Russian president's last name also correlates with the English phrasal verb *put in*, the meanings of which include "to interrupt", "to make an official request, claim, offer etc.", and "to elect a politician to a parliament or a political

party to govern a country" (<http://www.macmillan.com>). All these meanings resonate with the fact that Putin emerged on Russia's political arena out of the blue, superseding Boris Yeltsin back in 1999.

We believe that archetypes and the symbolic information contained within a particular name have a prevailing influence on societies. The influence knows not of geographical borders or time periods. Just as new words may be coined in a language, new archetypes can be formed throughout time and claim their rights in a specific language by producing a certain influence on the speakers of that language. To illustrate, let us consider the victory of the British Prime Minister David Cameron in the elections on 6 May 2010. We believe that his victory was not at all a matter given to chance and was significantly bolstered by two external phenomena. First, the election took place shortly after the release of the widely acclaimed film *Avatar* by James Cameron, which had in fact its world premiere in London on 10 December 2009, six month prior to the elections. As an epic film shot by the world-acclaimed director and involving a multi-million dollar promotion campaign, the *Avatar* and its creator were destined to produce a very certain effect on the political arena of Great Britain as they prepared a favorable background for a very certain kind of the decision-making of the electorate.

The second factor that had a significant contribution to the name *Cameron* coming into prominence is the personality of Giovanni Boccaccio and his major work *Decameron*. The work is contemporary to Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, but more importantly, both are landmarks of world literature. Besides, Chaucer is known to have emulated Boccaccio's style and stories (Edwards, 2002; Heffernan, 2009). It is inevitable that the word *Decameron* has to have a presence in the British people's minds and evoke strong positive feelings of something solemn, noble, and time-proven. Within our hypothesis, however, this phenomenon points to the cyclic nature of cultural layers, which in the final analysis is a manifestation of the archetype—in this case, an archetype formed in the Middle Ages, characterized by a certain acoustic (hence vibrational) form and *conceptual load*, which has now received an opportunity to re-emerge on the political arena.

Towards a Methodology for Defining Archetypes: at the Interface of Lexis and Phonology

Let us now construct a description of the world in which the archetypal, emotion-based sound waves become manifest. It will hardly be questioned that from the very beginning of human activity to the present day, the world has been perceived by humans as anthropocentric (cf. Toporov, 1983, p. 243, note 32), which is often evidenced in art (Feyerabend, 1975/1986; Qvortrup, 1998). Hence, at the heart of the perception of the world should be a set of human-oriented fundamental values, or layers. Their distinction is based on the considerations of primacy of particular elements to the human world including classical elements are defined by the classical and Oriental traditions (e.g., Eberhard, 1986; Lloyd, 1996).

In the present analysis, five primary anthropocentric layers are distinguished. They are provided with an “umbrella term” covering related phenomena:

- a) Basic elements: fire, air, water, earth (with the possible further specifications subsuming stone, wood, and metal (cf. Dugin, 2008, p. 45));
- b) People: man, woman, human being, kinship;
- c) Instinct of self-preservation, such as food, shelter, etc.;
- d) Relations between people: e.g., friendship, anger, combat, emotions, etc.;
- e) Senses of perception: vision, hearing, touch, taste and smell (cf. Schwartz, 2006; Rolston, 1994).

The identification of these five layers of core human values is used as a hierarchy in sorting out the primary, core, emotion-based, or archetypal, vocabulary, which originally was language-independent, or, in other words, universal.

How can these language archetypes be approached linguistically, understanding language in its sacral sense, which, following Humboldt, may be defined as a creative power (Underhill, 2009; Toporov, 2006). We believe that the manifestations of archetypal vibrations may be further analyzed in terms of the distinctive features. As is known, the set of distinctive features is universal and limited; however, the distinctive features involved in the production of sounds of a specific language vary from language to language. This fact, as well as the earlier idea from acoustic phonetics that any sound is a vibration, enables us to consider sounds, of which vowels are to be given primary attention, as vibrations that immediately spread within and consequently, are immediately constrained, by the human vocal tract. Therefore, taking into consideration both the place of articulation (which is the traditional approach), and the predominant direction of the resulting vibration (which is our innovation grounded in the mechanics of sound production that, to the best of our knowledge, has not been made part of any linguistic enquiries), a simplified description of the set of vowels common to at least all Indo-European languages (see also Dugin, 2008, p. 53) may be presented as follows:

Table 1. A simplified description of the most common IE vowels

Sound	Generalised description in terms of distinctive features (International Phonetic Association, 2003)	Primary direction of the vibration
[u]	high back rounded	downward
[i]	high front unrounded	forward
[a]	low unrounded	upward
[o]	mid-back rounded	radiating
[e]	mid-front unrounded	forward, but less concentrated than that of [i]

Under our analysis, these nuclear-level elements convey a certain component of meaning that is encoded in all archetypal words. A closer look at the graphic representation of these sounds repeats the direction of the vibration produced: thus *u* has a downward curve, the

printed *A* has a sharp angle at the top, the enclosed shape of *o* represents the ideal vibration that harmoniously radiates its vibrations in all the directions; and the Latin *i* explicitly points to the very narrow opening of the mouth when the relevant sound is pronounced, but, possibly to ensure homogeneity of the notation system thereby the top-bottom, rather than left-right direction is prioritised and is positioned vertically. As for *e*, its shape symbolically represents the oral cavity or, to be more precise, the middle way through which *e* is uttered. The shape of the symbol suggests that there is less volume in it than in its back rounded counterpart, but more than in the high front *i*.

We believe that, when occurring in the word-initial position of an archetypal word, these vibrations are primary, hence, most significant, and delineate a certain meaning the word itself may convey. Let us illustrate this idea by a few examples from Russian. Placed high up in the back of the vocal tract, *u* produces downward vibrations. We believe that for Russian, these convey the archetypal meaning of inhibition or suppression, which becomes manifest in verbs like *ubit'* “kill”, *unichtozhit'* “annihilate”, and *unizit'* “humiliate”. The semantic component of suppression may also be deduced in words conveying a more positive meaning, such as *uteshit'* “comfort, appease”. We believe that the feature *rounded*, which, by comparison, is absent in the similarly categorical high front correlate *i*, conveys the idea of enclosure. The middle position of the back rounded vowel *o* and consequently the radiating vibrations produced by pronouncing the sound convey the meaning of an enclosed area that is put in opposition with what is beyond its limits. Archetypal words, such as *oko* “eye”, *oboroniat'sia* “to act on the defensive”, *ogorodit'sia* “to fence, to hedge oneself”, *ogorod* “garden”, *okovy* “fetters”, *okno* “window”—all reflect the meaning of being placed within and the state of being as if enframed by certain limits. Given its position in the vocal tract, the low back *a* has no other option but to produce upward vibrations. This is an essential feature reflected in the archetypal word *ataka* “attack”.

Both vowels and consonants become manifest through vibrations ultimately determined by the constraints of the human vocal tract. Vowels are vocally stronger than consonants, and consequently produce more powerful vibrations. Consonants are significant in terms of the place and type of obstruction, i.e., the place and manner of articulation, which condition what archetypal meaning is added to the one established by the vowel. As regards the inventory of consonants to be examined, we believe that the initial set may be the same as the one identified by Hermann Wirth: [t], [p], [k], [s], and their voiced counterparts [d], [b], [g], [z], and the sonorants [m], [n], [r], [l] (cited in Dugin, 2008, pp. 53–54; Dugin, 2002, n.p.; cf. Ohala, 1979). We suggest that in the early stages of research, the aspirated correlates of the voiceless set should not be considered due to their absence in many Indo-European languages. Thus, the meaning of an archetypal word ultimately depends on the sum total information of its component sounds, while their significance correlates with the order of appearance of the sounds in the word in question, with the sound that appears in word-initial

position being the bearer of the primary, or strongest, vibration, hence meaning. Consequently, the second sound produces the secondary vibrations, and so on. The further from the word-initial position the sound in question is, the weaker its archetypal meaning conveyed.

How can an archetypal word be identified? To begin with, we believe that the set of archetypes within each language will be limited; we expect it to be composed of “major” archetypes, i.e. archetypes identifiable across a number of languages, and “minor” archetypes, i.e. groups of language-specific archetypal words. Candidate archetypal words should meet a number of qualifying criteria, the first of which has already been defined: their initial sound (preference, as we have stated before, will be given to vowels) will produce the primary vibration which establishes the generalized meaning, or the “conceptual load”, of the archetype. Therefore, each of the sounds of any given language that can appear word-initially can be found in words that belong to the archetypal part of the vocabulary of that language. Another selection criterion is that relevant candidate words should be attributable to one of the five core layers of human values identified above. Under this analysis, every full-fledged simple phoneme of a language (the one that is made up of one sound and that is capable of taking the word-initial position) will have an archetypal realm of its own, delineated along the pre-established five core layers. The third criterion is the part of speech the word belongs to. We believe that *actions*, *states*, *objects*, and *attributes* are the essential meanings governing communicative processes in any period of time; given this treatment, verbs should occupy the central position in building up the archetypal hierarchy; they are to be followed by nouns, and adjectives (see also Humboldt, 1999; Wierzbicka, 1999b). At the level of minor archetypes, the group of archetypal words (formed, e.g., on the basis of the initial sound) will have a common conceptual load that will be manifest in each of the candidate words. An illustration of this will be given below.

The originally Romanian automobile Dacia, now part of the Renault company, takes its name from a geographical region in Romania (www.wikipedia.com). It is a relatively inexpensive car aimed at the middle-class consumer (www.renault.com). Over the years, both as a product of the independent company and a Renault subsidiary, this car has had a very basic design and has been considered a good value for a thrifty family (Diem, 2012), but will hardly appear on the agenda of a more or less demanding buyer. Meanwhile in Russian, the word *dacha* [da:tʃa] is primarily associated with a Soviet-era summerhouse, not as shabby as a shack, but far from being as luxurious as a cottage. A *dacha* normally has some minimum conveniences, possibly electricity, and “lower-quality utilities” (www.wikipedia.com). As its definition suggests, *dacha* is arguably the most frequent destination of a middle-class family during the vacation season. Although irrelevant in our approach (unlike traditional linguistics), it may also be said that the word takes its roots from Peter the Great’s times when *dacha* used to denote “something given” (ibid., Fasmer, 1964–1973; Ozhegov, 1990), this

usage now limited to some formal expressions like *dacha pokazanij* “testification”, Lith. “giving of evidence”, or *dacha vziatki* “bribing”, Lith. “giving of a bribe”.

A brief examination of the *Dacia* disambiguation page in WWW offers several geographical alternatives, the majority of which are either provinces, or villages (www.wikipedia.com, cf. www.britannica.com, www.newworldencyclopedia.org; see also Grumeza, 2009). We therefore believe that the two words, the Romanian *dacia* and the Russian *dacha* are manifestations of the same archetype the conceptual load of which embraces the ideas of something undemanding, characterized by modest design and/or quality. In this way, all semantic manifestations of sound vibrations produced by uttering the word *dacia/dacha* illustrate how the same conceptual load is reflected in different words of two or more different languages.

Considering all of the above, we can define the archetype as a word whose meaning conveys an identifiable conceptual load, which is the outcome of a particular acoustic vibration produced by uttering the word in question. We therefore suggest that the candidate archetypal word must meet the following criteria:

- 1) At the phonemic level, the relevant sound should appear in the word-initial position, i.e., produce the primary vibration;
- 2) At the lexical level, the candidate word or its part must have a meaning interpretable in light of the conceptual load of an archetype established in earlier analyses. The archetypal components of the candidate word might or might not be the same as, following Colunga & Gasser’s terminology, *formal linguistic categories* (1998, p. 244), i.e. such as morphemes and lexemes;
- 3) At the (macro-)semantic level, the word in question must belong to one of the five anthropocentric core values (i.e., element; people; instinct of self-preservation; relations; senses of perception);
- 4) At the part-of-speech level, the word in question must belong to one of the three main parts of speech: verbs, nouns, or adjectives.

Archetype Verification Criteria

Once identified, candidate archetypal words may be further verified in terms of the following three properties:

- 1) The archetypal word has a certain conceptual load that is reflected in the members of its subcategory, i.e. other (linguistically unrelated) words characterised by the similar vocalic form and conceptual load. This property presupposes that there is a certain hierarchy within the archetypes themselves, which we have touched upon already by using the terms “major” and “minor” archetypes. We see it by analogy with, for example, the Tarot cards, where the total number of cards (most commonly 78) is subdivided into 22 major arcana and 56 minor arcana. In a similar fashion, we believe that there are major archetypes that will preserve the similarities detectable at the

cross-linguistic level, and minor, language-specific archetypes, the conceptual load of which will be reflected in the relevant group of words. Minor archetypes may have lexical manifestations in a group of fairly easily detectable words within a given language. The analysis may also proceed in the opposite direction: the conceptual load may be defined by investigating a certain group of words that meet the selection criteria of an archetype, e.g., candidate words bear the same conceptual load and have the same vocalic vibrations. In this case, the primary vibration (whether it be a consonant or a vowel) and the vibration produced by the first vowel in a word will be of particular importance, the former stipulated by its word-initial position and the latter by the fact that vowels are vocalically stronger relative to consonants.

- 2) The archetypal word can joint together with another word to produce a word the meaning of which will be “translatable” into the archetypal meaning components and in fact, correlate with the “logical”, or traditional, meaning of the word traditionally cited in dictionary definitions. For example, if we consider Rus. *poedinok* “combat between two people, a duel”, it may be “translated” into two components: *poedanije inia* “the devouring of the yin”, that is, of what classical Chinese cosmology defines as the passive, submissive part of the being (Pankenier, 2013). Indeed, *poedinok* “combat” implies tenseness of relations, a certain amount of aggression and the ultimate victory of the strongest. Meanwhile the “devouring of the yin” is but a more figurative way of conveying essentially the same idea, aggressive behavior of one of the parts and the suppression of the weakest. As can be seen, the emotion driven archetypal analysis of the word correlates with its logical meaning. In both cases, the conceptual load, i.e., “the submission of the weaker” is the same. It should also be emphasized that analysis as the one presented above does not operate the traditional morphological boundaries, such as prefixes, roots, and suffixes. While our reasoning behind this approach is an attempt to free word analysis from purely logic-driven reasoning, the issue of mismatches between, for example, the morphological structure and prosodic is not new (e.g., Zsiga, 1992; Marantz, 1988).
- 3) The archetypal word pertaining to major archetypes will have correlates in other languages. In particular, we believe that old and conservative languages retain traces of the originally language-universal archetypal information better than languages that are more open to change. For example, at the vibrational/emotional level (and as opposed to the traditional etymological analysis), the English word *satisfaction* may be interpreted as a “pure fact”, since the word is composed of two archetypes: Sansk. *sati* “pure” and En. *fact*. Again, the meaning resulting from the interpretation of the emotional basis of the word correlates with its logic-driven, traditional definition: satisfaction refers to a substantial, pleasing degree of

a state or event. We also believe that, in an analysis of Indo-European languages, Lithuanian, as a living language with a fairly archaic system, may be employed as a certain verification criterion in analyses of other present-day Indo-European languages. For example, let us consider Rus. *suka* “bitch”, an offensive word to refer to a woman. If someone is called this way, what exactly prompts this offense? The description provided is likely to suggest that that the woman must have been annoyingly active and too self-centered in a certain situation. While this conceptual load is lost in the Russian term and will only be recognized in the cognate *suchit’* „twist“ (Fasmer, 1964–1973), it is perfectly preserved in the literal meaning of the Lithuanian present tense form *suka* “spins, turns”, of the verb *sukti* “to spin, to turn”. As we can see, the Russian offensive is an exact figurative expression of what in Lithuanian has a literal form. It is notable that the former pair would take us to the etymological analysis and hence logical language domain; meanwhile the latter, we argue, is a synchronic manifestation of a sacral, or, perhaps using modern terminology, psychologically-driven language archetype.

We believe that, while the ultimate set of language archetypes is language-universal, specific languages will incorporate only part of that most archaic, emotional archetypal vocabulary and will supplement their archetypal inventories with their own archetypes. We also believe that languages deriving from the same language family will share these archetypal concepts, which will be manifest in the core sound combinations. It is possible that archetypal concepts indeed may be expressed in words pertaining to older layers of the vocabulary of a given language that are becoming old-fashioned, but are still found in use, as, e.g., the Russian archaic word for the eye “*oko*” (vs the present-day “*glaz*”). But again, under the current approach, the fact that the archetype (or the conceptual load) may be better expressed in more archaic vocabulary is a manifestation of the sustainability of the archetypes in language and should not take us into diachronic explorations.

The proposed approach is seen as a linguistic domain of sacral sciences, the latter given a generic definition as

a certain intermediate level between the metaphysical treatment of a sacral doctrine and individual aspects of specific human activities (Dugin, 2002, p. 88).

What our analysis is primarily concerned with is an interpretation, which, as Ershova notes, while perceiving the sign as the bearer of the utmost meaning, is not protected by any proof system (2004 p. 95).

Conclusions

The aim of the present article was to propose an alternative view on the analysis of language data which could help account for the striking yet formally inexplicable phonetic and semantic similarities across languages. Grounding the present research in the mechanics of sound production, it was postulated that early language, as an immediate outcome of vocal vibrations produced by the humans, was primarily emotion-driven and consequently universal. It

expressed generalized ideas, or archetypes, characterized by a certain conceptual load, which are still retained across various languages. The emotion-driven part of language vocabulary was argued to be hierarchical and five major anthropocentric layers were put forward to be used for the identification of “major” archetypes, i.e. archetypes identifiable across a number of languages. Another large category distinguished was that of “minor” archetypes, i.e. groups of language-specific archetypal words sharing the same conceptual load. Then an attempt was made to establish a set of criteria along which archetypal words may be identified and provided how these hypotheses may be used drawing on a few examples from Lithuanian, English, and Russian. A number of suggestions for future research have been presented throughout this study in order to refine the theoretical framework and supplement it with new findings.

By taking the anthropocentric vision of the world, by incorporating the physical properties of sounds and by establishing the effect they produce on the experiencers (humans taken broadly), it is believed that the proposed ideas have far-reaching implications for all social sciences, in particular, consulting, recruiting, making prospective solutions, and ultimately, the national identity and geopolitical self-determination of a given culture.

References

1. Beaugrande de, R., 1995. The Geopolitics of Culture from a Systemic Functional Standpoint. Paper at the *Systemic Functional Congress on Cross-Cultural Currents, Language Functions, and Literacy*. Beijing, China, 18-22 July 1995. Proceedings suppressed. Available at: <http://www.beaugrande.com/Beijing.htm> [accessed January 2013].
2. Bell, A. & Russel, C., 2000. Beyond Human, Beyond Words: Anthropocentrism, Critical Pedagogy and the Poststructuralist Turn. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 188–203. Available at: <http://www.csse-scee.ca/CJE/Articles/FullText/CJE25-3/CJE25-3-bell.pdf> [accessed December 2012].
3. Bickerton, D., 1995. *Language and Human Behaviour*. University of Washington Press.
4. Bickerton, D., 2005/2007. Language Evolution: A Brief Guide for Linguists. *Lingua 117*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 510–526. Available at: <http://www.ucd.ie/artspgs/lanvevo/lanvevobriefly.pdf> [accessed January 2013].
5. Blažek, V., 2011. Perkūnas vs Perun. *The Balts and the Slavs: Intersections of Spiritual Culture. Abstracts of the International Conference dedicated to the memory of academician Vladimir TOPOROV*. Vilnius, 14–16 September 2011. Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo kanceliarija, pp. 55–58.
6. Boroditsky, L., 2009. How Does Our Language Shape the Way We Think? In: M. Brockman, ed. *What's Next? Dispatches on the Future of Science*. Vintage Press.
7. Boroditsky, L., 2011. How Language Shapes Thought. *Scientific American*, pp. 1–4.
8. Colunga, E. & Gasser, M., 1998. Linguistic Relativity and Word Acquisition: A Computational Approach. *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, pp. 244–249.
9. Coward, H., 2008. *The Perfectibility of Human Nature in Eastern and Western Thought*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
10. Dugin, A., 2001. *Evoliucija paradigmahy osnovanij nauki*. Moscow: Arktogeya.
11. Dugin, A., 2002. *Filosofija tradicionalizma*. Moscow: Arktogeya.
12. Dugin, A., 2008. *Znaki velikogo norda. Giperborejskaja teorija*. Moskva: Veče.
13. Eberhard, W., 1986. *A Dictionary of Chinese Symbols*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, pp. 93, 105, 309.
14. Edwards, R. R., 2002. *Chaucer and Boccaccio: Antiquity and Modernity*. Palgrave Macmillan.
15. Elizarenkova, T., 1989. *Rigveda. Mandaly I-IV*. Moskva: Nauka.
16. Ershova, G., 2004. *Maja: Tajny drevnego pis'ma*. Moskva: Aleteja.
17. Fairclough, N., 1996. *Language and Power* (first published in 1989). Longman Group UK Limited.
18. Fasmer, M. P., 1964–1973. *Etimologicheskij slovar'*. Moskva: Progress. Available at: <http://fasmer-dictionary.info> [accessed November 2013].
19. Feyerabend, P. K., 1975. *Against Method. Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London: New Left Books. Cited from P. Feyerabend, 1986. Protiv metoda. Ocherk anarkhistskoj teorii poznanija. In: P. Feyerabend, 1986. *Izbrannye Trudy po metodologii nauki*. Moscow, pp. 125–467.
20. Gell-Mann, M., Peiros I. & Starostin, G., 2009. Distant Language Relationship: the Current Perspective. *Journal of Language Relationship / Voprosy yazykovogo rodstva*, 1, pp. 13–30.
21. Grumeza, I., 2009. *Dacia: Land of Transylvania, Cornerstone of Ancient Eastern Europe*. Hamilton Books: Lanham.
22. Gumperz, J. J. & Levinson, S. C., eds., 1996. *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Heffernan, C.F., 2009. *Comedy in Chaucer and Boccaccio*. Boydell & Brewer. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/UPO9781846157035>
24. Hofstede, G., 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill UK.
25. Houston, V., n.d. (a). Sanskrit and the Technological Age. *Vedic Sciences*. Available at: <http://www.vedicsciences.net/articles/sanskrit-enlightenment.html> [accessed January 2013].
26. Houston, V. n.d. (b). *Sanskrit, a Sacred Model of Language*. Available at: http://veden-akademie.de/index.php?article_id=141&clang=1 [accessed January 2013].
27. Humboldt von, W., 1999. *On Language: On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Cambridge University Press.
28. International Phonetic Association, 2003. *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association: A Guide to the use of the international Phonetic Alphabet*. Cambridge University Press.
29. Jung, C.G., 1981. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, Collected Works*, 2 ed. Princeton, NJ: Bollingen.
30. Kirby, S., 2007. The Evolution of Language (pre-final draft). In: R. Dunbar and L. Barrett, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*. OUP, pp. 1–16. Available at: <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/~simon/Papers/Kirby/The%20Evolution%20of%20Language.pdf> [accessed January 2013].
31. Levinson, S. C., 2009. Language and Mind: Let's Get the Issues Straight! In: S. D. Blum, ed. *Making Sense of Language: Readings in Culture and Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25–47.
32. Lloyd, G. E. R., 1996. *Aristotelian Explorations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
33. Magnus, M., 2001. *What's in a Word? Studies in Phonosemantics*. PhD dissertation. Available at: <http://ntnu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:123799/FULLTEXT01> [accessed November 2012].
34. Magnus, M., n.d. *Margo's Magical Letter Page*. Available at: <http://www.trismegistos.com/magicalletterpage/> [accessed November 2012].
35. McNeill, D., 2012. *The Origin of Language in Gesture-speech Unity*. Available at: <http://cup.linguistlist.org/2012/10/the-origin-of-language-in-gesture-speech-unity/> [accessed January 2013].
36. McNeill, D., Duncan, S.D., Cole, J., Gallagher, Sh., and Bertenthal, B., 2008. Growth Points from the Very Beginning. *Interaction Studies*, 9:1. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 117–132.
37. Mead, G.H., 1967. *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, Vol.1, ed. Ch. W. Morris. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
38. Ohala, J. J., 1979. *Phonetic Universals in Phonological Systems and Their Explanation* [Summary of symposium moderator's introduction].

- Proc., 9th Int. Cong. of Phonetic Sciences*, Vol. 2. Copenhagen: Institute of Phonetics, pp. 5–8.
39. Ohala, J. J., 1997. Sound Symbolism. *Proc. 4th Seoul International Conference on Linguistics [SICOL]*, 11-15 August 1997, pp. 98–103.
 40. Ozhegov, S. I., 1990. *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo yazyka*. Moskva: Progress. Available at: <http://enc-dic.com/ozhegov/Dacha-6496.html> [accessed March 2014].
 41. Pankenier, D., 2013. *Astrology and Cosmology of the Early China*. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139017466>
 42. Pinker, S., 1994. *The Language Instinct*. London: Penguin Books.
 43. Potebnia, A., 2000. *Simbol imif v narodnoj kul'ture*. Moskva: Labirint.
 44. Quaegebeur, L. & Reynaert, P., 2010. Does the Need for Linguistic Expression Constitute a Problem to Be Solved? *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 9 (1). Springer Science & Business Media B.V., pp. 15–36.
 45. Qvortrup, L., 1998. *The Aesthetics of Interference: From Anthropocentrism to Polycentrism and the Reflections of Digital Art*. Aalborg University. Available at: <http://www.hotelproforma.dk/Userfiles/File/artikler/lq.pdf> [accessed January 2013].
 46. Rolston, H., 1994. *Conserving Natural Value*. Columbia University Press.
 47. Sapir, E., 1921. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Available at: www.projectgutenberg.org [accessed January 2013].
 48. Sapir, E., 1949. A Study in Phonetic Symbolism. In: D. G. Mandelbaum, ed. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 61–73.
 49. Schwartz, Sh. H., 2006. Basic Human Values: Theory, Measurement, and Applications. *Revue française de sociologie*, 47/4. Available at: http://seangallagher.com/cross-culture_management [accessed October 2013].
 50. Sidnell, J. & Enfield, N.J., 2012. Diversity and Social Action: A Third Locus of Linguistic Relativity. *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 302–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/665697>
 51. Slobin, D. I., 1987. Thinking for Speaking. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 435–445.
 52. Slobin, D. I., 2003. Language and Thought Online: Cognitive Consequences of Linguistic Relativity. In: D. Gentner and S. Goldin-Meadow, eds. *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 157–192.
 53. Toporov, V., 1983. Prostranstvo I tekst. In: *Tekst: Semantika I struktura*. Moskva, pp. 227–284.
 54. Toporov, V., 2006. Drevneindijskij jazyk. In: *Issledovanija po etimologii i semantike*. Vol. 2: *Indoevropejskie jazyki i indoevropeistika* (original work published in 1985). Moskva: Jazyki slavianskix kultur.
 55. Tsur, R., 2006. Size-sound Symbolism Revisited. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, pp. 905–924. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.12.002>
 56. Underhill, J. W., 2009. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9780748638420.001.0001>
 57. Whorf, B., 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 58. Wierzbicka, A., 1999a. *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, Japanese* (trans. by A. Shmelev). In: *Semanticheskiye universalii i opisaniye yazykov* (original work published in 1997). Moskva: Yazyki russkoj kul'tury, pp. 263–484.
 59. Wierzbicka, A., 1999b. The Semantics of Grammar (trans. by A. Shmelev). In: *Semanticheskiye universalii i opisaniye yazykov* (original work published in 1988). Moskva: Yazyki russkoj kul'tury, pp. 91–263.
 60. Wierzbicka, A., 2003. Interjections across Cultures. In: *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics – The Semantics of Human Interaction* (original work published in 1991). Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 285–340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110220964.285>
 61. Wolff, P. & Holmes, K., 2010. Linguistic Relativity. *WIREs Cognitive Science*. Available at: http://userwww.service.emory.edu/~pwwolf/Papersheavy/WolffHolmes2010WIREs_10_PW.pdf [accessed November 2012].
 62. Zsiga, E. C., 1992. A Mismatch between Morphological and Prosodic Domains: Evidence from two Igbo Rules. *Phonology*, 9, pp. 101–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0952675700001512>

Online Encyclopedia and Newspaper Articles

1. Avatar: James Cameron's 3D Picture Has its World Premiere. *Guardian*, 11 December 2009. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/gallery/2009/dec/11/avatar-premiere> [accessed January 2013].
2. Avatar (2009 film), n.d. *Wikipedia*. Available at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avatar_\(2009_film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avatar_(2009_film)) [accessed January 2013].
3. Automobile Dacia, n.d. *Wikipedia*. Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Automobile_Dacia [accessed January 2013].
4. Cameron, D., n.d. *Wikipedia*. Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Cameron [accessed January 2013].
5. Classical Elements, n.d. *Wikipedia*. Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_element [accessed November 2012].
6. Dacia, n.d. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Available at: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/149413/Dacia> [accessed January 2013].
7. Dacia, n.d. *New World Encyclopedia*. Available at: <https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Dacia> [accessed January 2013].
8. Dacia Cars, n.d. *Renault*. Available at: <http://www.renault.com/en/vehicules/aujourd-hui/vehicules-dacia/pages/index.aspx> [accessed January 2014].
9. Dacia Disambiguation, n.d. *Wikipedia*. Available at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dacia_\(disambiguation\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dacia_(disambiguation)) [accessed January 2013].
10. Satisfy, n.d. *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Available at: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=satisfy&allowed_in_frame=0 [accessed November 2013].
11. Five Element Theory, n.d. *White Crane Taichi*. Available at: <http://www.whitecranetaichi.com/FiveElementTheory1.html> [accessed November 2012].
12. Diem, W., 2012. European Malaise Not Slowing Down Dacia. *Wardsauto*, November 27. Available at: <http://wardsauto.com/europe/european-malaise-not-slowing-down-renault-s-dacia> [accessed January 2013].
13. Put in, n.d. *Macmillan Dictionary*. Available at: http://www.macmillan.com/dictionary/british/put-in#put-in_15 [accessed February 2014].
14. Working with the Elements, n.d. *Azothalchemy*. Available at: <http://www.azothalchemy.org/elements.htm> [accessed November 2012].

Julija Korostenskaja

Gyva kalba: alternatyvus socialinių ir geopolitinių reiškinų interpretavimo būdas

Santrauka

Straipsnio tikslas – padėti pamatus metodologijai, kurią būtų galima pasitelkti interpretuojant ryškus, tačiau formaliai nepaaiškinamus fonetinius ir semantinius įvairių kalbų panašumus. Remiantis garso produkavimo mechanika, teigiama, jog ankstyvoji kalba, tik išsivysčiusi iš žmonių produkuojamų vokalių vibracijų, pirmiausiai buvo lemiamą emocijų ir todėl buvo universali. Ji išreikšdavo apibendrintas idėjas arba tam tikru konceptualiuoju svoriu charakterizuojamus archetipus, kurie geriausiai pasireiškia senosiose kalbose, pvz., sanskrite, arba, turint omenyje tebeegzistuojančias archajiškas kalbas, lietuvių kalboje. Tikima, kad emocijų lemiamą kalbos dalis turi tam tikrą hierarchiją: ji susideda iš „didžiųjų“ archetipų, t. y. archetipų, identifikuojamų įvairiose kalbose, ir „mažųjų“ archetipų, t. y. tam tikros kalbos specifinių archetipinių žodžių, pasižyminčių vienodu konceptualiuoju svoriu. Skirtumas

tarp emocinio ir loginio kalbos komponentų yra svarbus šiai analizei, kadangi leidžia suskirstyti bet kurios kalbos žodyną į dvi dideles grupes: pamatinį arba archetipinį žodyną, kuris yra ribotas, lemiamas tam tikrų emocijų ir charakterizuojamas žymėta vibracine struktūra; ir išvestinis žodynas, kuris yra tos kalbos begalės kombinacijų ir derivacijų, kalbos pokyčių ir inovacijų bei kalbos kontaktų su kitomis kalbomis rezultatas. Straipsnyje nustatomi penki pamatiniai žmogiškųjų vertybių sluoksniai – kriterijai, skirti archetipiniams žodžiams identifikuoti. Manoma, kad archetipinės vibracijos gali būti toliau analizuojamos pasitelkiant artikuliacinės fonetikos distinktyviusius bruožus, kurių skaičius yra ribotas, tuo tarpu minėtų bruožų kombinacijos, vartojamos konkrečios kalbos garsams produkuoti, skiriasi skirtingose kalbose. Šis faktas, bei ankstesnis akustinės fonetikos principas, kad kiekvienas garsas yra vibracija, leidžia analizuoti kitus kalbos garsus, iš kurių, remiantis idėja, jog vibracijos pasiskleidžia ir yra ribojamos žmogaus kalbos aparato, pirmiausiai analizuotini balsiai. Siūloma hipotezė gali būti plačiai pritaikoma visuose socialiniuose moksluose, ypač konsultuojant, darbo atrankoje, priimant ilgalaikius sprendimus ir, galiausiai, tautiniam identitetui ir geopolitiniam tam tikros kultūros savęs suvokimui aiškinti.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2014 02
Parengtas spaudai 2014 06

About the author

Julija Korostenskaja, Dr., Associate Professor at Vilnius University, Institute of Foreign Languages.

Academic interests: formal syntax, syntax and semantics interface, sacral linguistics.

Address: Vilnius University, Institute of Foreign Languages, Universiteto str. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.

E-mail: julija.korostenskaja@uki.vu.lt