Concept *Human Age* as Archetypal and Stereotypical Mental Structure in the Consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English Native Speakers

The paper offers a new complex methodology for analyzing the linguocultural concept *HUMAN AGE* as a multidimensional archetypal and stereotypical mental structure of human consciousness. To recognize the systemic essence of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers’ world mapping and their cultural stereotypes, the concept *HUMAN AGE* is studied by considering its realization through lexical, phraseological, and paremiological units. The study assumes the analysis of such concept structure components as an etymological/historical layer that reflects the essential notional features of the concept, an additional layer, formed as a result of the concept in growth, and an active layer that is regarded relevant for the modern native speakers and represented by axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative stereotypes that help forward mentalizing the concept in the Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers’ consciousness. The archetypal basis of the concept is identified by considering the etymology of the concept names and nominations of age stages and persons by age in the three languages. The stages of stereotyping the axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative images of the human age that reveal the

similarities (universal features) and differences (nationally specific features) in the mapping of archetypal and stereotypical images of the human age in the consciousness of Ukrainians, Russians, and the English are analyzed as well. Ultimately, the most complete set of archetypal and symbolic features (universal and nationally specific), sociocultural age stereotypes (neutral, positive, and negative), numerological, coloristic, phytomorphic, and zoomorphic metaphorical nominations of age stages and persons by age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English linguocultures is presented.
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**Introduction**

The article aims to present the results concerning the reconstruction of mechanisms of archetypal and stereotypical mapping of the concept HUMAN AGE in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers. This aim is achieved through finding answers to such research questions as follows: What is an archetype in terms of Carl Jung’s archetypal theory? How are an archetype and a stereotype defined within the context of modern linguoculturological and linguoconceptual studies? What is the archetypal basis for the concept HUMAN AGE in the three languages under analysis? What are the stages of stereotyping the representation of human age in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers, in particular stereotypes of the notional, figurative, and evaluative components of the concept HUMAN AGE in the languages compared? What are the common and distinctive features reflecting the archetypal and stereotypical nature of the concept HUMAN AGE concept in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers?

---

**Theoretical Background**

The linguocultural concept (hereinafter – LC) as a unit reflecting the phenomena of human existence in a person’s consciousness is still being much debated among scholars. Various approaches to determining the structure of LC (Kolesov, 2004; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993; Wierzbicka, 2001; Vorkachev, 2001 among others) have not been agreed yet on determining the structure of LC. In this regard, linguoconceptual studies have generally got into “the state of crisis” (Karasi, 2006; Selivanova, 2012). A perspective view on this crisis offers considering the structure of LC as a diachronic (Alefirenko, 2004; Eliade, 2005; Krasavskii & Moskvin, 2003; Krymskii, 1998; Levi-Bruhl, 1994; Osborn, 2009; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993) and synchronic mental formation (Baranov, 1989; Bartminski, 2007; Krysin et al., 2016; Rakhilina, 2002). In recent years, archetypal and stereotypical nature of LC has been examined in a number of linguistic studies (Ageieva, 2014; Tishchenko, 2000). These studies suggest that the origin of concepts is defined as related to the content of some important ethnic notions which have accumulated the ethnoses’ socially and culturally significant experiences (Kassirer, 2002; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993), and in this respect the LC HUMAN AGE is regarded to be the proper one (Aries, 1962; Smelzer, 1994; Stelmakhovich, 1997). Currently, special consideration is given to understand various aspects of human representations concerning the age and age periods, such as childhood, adolescence, youth, elderly age, and old age through analysis of their verbalization in particular languages and in the course of comparative and contrastive studies (Kaliuzhnaia, 2007; Liubina, 2006).

An overview on the current studies proves that the LC under analysis has a complex layered structure which should be studied by reconstructing both deeply diachronic archetypal and modern stereotypical representations of ethnic groups about the human age.

**Fundamentals of Carl Jung’s archetypal theory**

For now, the term archetype has firmly entered the paradigm of modern scientific knowledge (Donchenko, 2011; Krymskii, 1998, etc.). Within the framework of available approaches (anthropological (Benedict, 1934), psychological (Jung, 1996, 2001; Kant, 2020), literary (Propp, 1963), culturological (Krymskii, 1998; Meletinskii, 1991), and linguistic (Belekhova, 2015), archetype is defined as: 1) collective unconscious (psychological archetype as featured by Jung, 1988); 2) the basic element of culture that forms the norms of spiritual life (cultural archetype); 3) archetypal image that is the essence of some ideas and motives universal for the humankind (Toporov, 1999). In reviewing some current linguistic studies, it was found that the subject of any archetype research nowadays is to recognize the way that archetypes are individualized and thus given names (lingualized) (Slukhai, 2004).
It is commonly assumed that the term *archetype* was introduced into scientific use by Jung for naming *collective unconscious* that was distinguished by the psychoanalyst as one of the components in the structure of personality. We found that the fundamentals of Jung’s archetypal theory can be formulated in twelve distinct but interrelated ways. Archetypes (or mental prototypes) are thus defined as follows: 1) universal initial inborn mental structures that comprise the insight of collective unconscious; 2) typical ideas and images experienced by a person as a result of inherent collective unconscious; 3) an invariably collective phenomenon that is common for entire nations and epochs; 4) a certain class of psychological quintessences coming up to the consciousness and manifesting in behaviour under a typical situation as an unconscious reaction to any object or occasion; 5) visualized in dreams as images and ideas, and in culture as symbols and repeating motives; 6) may have an infinite number in the collective unconscious; 7) there are archetypes common for the humankind that is proved by the analysis of myths (Jung, 1996); 8) functioning of archetypes of collective unconscious triggers running a person’s cognitive sphere; 9) a means for interaction between conscious and unconscious; 10) correlating to instincts; 11) varying within the culture and fixed in the consciousness (Jung, 1988); 12) opposing to the “archetypal image” as the form of representation of archetype in the consciousness, as far as archetypes are not the elements of consciousness but conceptualized in the process of an individual’s adaptation to the reality (Jung, 1996).

**Theory of archetype within the framework of linguocultural and linguocognitive studies**

In fact, within the wide scientific discourse, archetypes are referred to as universal ways for arranging individual human experiences. It is caused by the specificity of archetype to be given in to subjectification, i.e. reinterpretation through the national prism that is directly relevant to lingual adaptation. It was revealed that archetypes are common for a group of nations being a priori, although they share some traits of a certain national mentality formed under religious, psychological, geographical, and ethnic criteria. The stability of archetypal images is induced by metaphorical thinking (Meletinskii, 1991; Osborn, 2009). Archetypes are reflected in the consciousness as genetic inheritance (along with the structure of the brain) (Jung, 2004) and represented by concepts and symbols (Medvedeva, 2014). Besides, archetypes have the ability to produce such forms of culture as myth, religion, art, and literature (Jung, 1991, 1996, 2009; Monaghan, 2004). Within these spheres, archetype loses Jung’s consideration and comes into use to name the universals of global culture. Among them, the myth becomes as the fundamental one, in particular the myth of world tree, river, wheel/cyclic myth (Bryniak, 2015; Kolesnikova, 2010; Lozko, 2004). In such a way, archetype is considered both a lingual and mental phenomenon (Bolshakova, 2010; Kalita, 2012; Selivanova, 2012). It is important to mention that one of the fundamental characteristics of archetype is its dichotomous structure, when essential archetypal binary oppositions come around, namely: Strong / Weak; Good (Right) / Bad (Wrong); Top / Bottom; Right / Left; Light / Darkness. These pairs are actualized by means of such particular oppositions as physical, spacial (three-dimensional), biological, psychological, and social ones (Ivanova, 2017; Kaftandzhiev, 2016; Krymskii, 1998).

**Methods**

To recognize the stages of archetypal and stereotypical reflecting the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers, a complex methodology was applied and carried out in four stages.

The first stage implied determining the etymology of the concept names вік, возраст, age and etymology of the lexemes nominating age stages and persons by age in the three languages. In addition, the method of semantic microfield (Tolstoi, 1997) was used to determine the etymology of the lexemes synonymous with the concept names. The second stage provided building the nominative field of the concept (Popova & Sternin, 2007; Semashko, 2014) by applying the structural method, in particular the method of componential (definitional) analysis for lexemes representing the concept *HUMAN AGE*. In such a way, the stereotypical and conceptual features of the axio-notional component of the concept formed as the result of historical transformations of some archetypal images were described. The method of semantic reconstruction was applied for observing the changes in the semantic structure of the concept in diachronical aspect (Usyk, 2017).

The third stage implied the cognitive and onomasiological reconstruction of some motivating conceptual features of the concept. The method of cognitive reconstruction was used to identify the metaphorical patterns of
axio-figurative stereotyping of the concept HUMAN AGE in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers (Gibbs, 1999; Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Ortony, 1993; Teliia, 1986). Onomasiological reconstruction was also applied to identify the linguocultural codes of phraseostereotyping the concept HUMAN AGE in the three languages alongside with specific thematic groups of human age metaphorical nominations. The cultural and semiotic method served to analyze the linguistic means of human age metaphorical nominations as the symbols of culture and etiquette (Krasavskii & Moskovin, 2003). The fourth stage ensured defining the sources of neutral, positive, and negative archetypal and stereotypical (axio-evaluative) ideas of the concept HUMAN AGE specific for Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers. The comparative and contrastive study was applied at all the stages. For this purpose, tertium comparationis is supposed to be the etymological, semantic, and conceptual features of lexemes representing the concept HUMAN AGE.

Archetype as a cultural background for the process of stereotyping

Archetypes can be qualified as a manifestation of ancestral memory and formal patterns of behavior which may serve as the basis for concrete meaningful images called stereotypes of conscious human activity. To reproduce and store the ethnic traditions, the archetypal background for mentalization is transformed into stereotypes – schematized sustainable structures of collective consciousness of the representatives of different groups, in particular ethnic (Selivanova, 2012). The term stereotype (from Greek stereos – solid, typos – print) was introduced into scientific use by American sociologist Lippman (1950). As Lippman (1950) stated, an individual has a clear idea about most of things before directly coming across them in reality. Such stereotyped images are formed as affected by cultural environment that an individual lives in (Lippman, 1950), as stereotypes are originated from religious images, ethnos’s experiences, and authentic traditions.

The results of reviewing prior studies found that stereotypes are understood as images determined by culture, or behavior patterns resulting from adaptation to habitual and new situations appearing in the human life (Batsevych, 2004; Lippman, 1950; Semashko, 2014). As reported by Svitsova (2005), stereotypes are fixed in consciousness in the form of a mental invariant image and specifically verbalized in a particular linguoculture (Brown, 1990; Bartmińska, 2007; Eysenck, 1994; Krysin et al., 2016; Shutova, 2016). If stereotyping is a cognitive activity, stereotype is a cognitive generalization making the process of thinking easier. It comprises both negative and positive evaluation and correlates with national conceptual mapping of the world being a co-active constituent of the language worldview. In particular, in cognitive linguistics mental stereotypes (term proposed by Andreieva, 2001) are considered as memorized words and concepts. Doing research on the lingual objectification of stereotypes makes it possible to get into the depth of ethnos’s way of life and its national values (Rozvod, 2015). The carriers of such linguocultural codes are considered to be staticodynamic (Stepanov, 2004) informative cognitive structures of collective and individual consciousness (Selivanova, 2012) called concepts (Asher, 1994; Croft, 2004; Malmkjær, 2004; Sternin, 2001). As we suppose, the concept HUMAN AGE is one of the most exponential to represent its archetypal and stereotypical architectonics.

Archetypal basis for the concept HUMAN AGE
(based on Ukrainian, Russian, and English etymological dictionaries)

Studying the mechanisms for conceptualizing knowledge about the world around assumes taking into account extralinguistic knowledge (Kuprieva & Diatchenko, 2010). It is proposed to consider the means of objectivization of the concept HUMAN AGE in the scientific world mapping in terms of logical and philosophical, historical and genetic, bio-/socio-/cultural interpretations reflecting extralinguistic reality in the consciousness of the native speakers (Apresian, 1995; Karpenko, 1994).

Philosophical legitimization of the concept under study verified the assumption that the basis for mentalization of ideas concerning human age is such archetypes as TIME, SPACE, MOVE, and archetypal situations (seasonal and calendar/religious ritualism) (Orlova, 2019). It was revealed that the prototypical pattern of the analyzed concept is experience of cyclic and linear time resulting from the following reasons: 1) the observation of such
ontological parameters of being as the rhythm of some celestial phenomena and natural cycles anthropomorphized over time; 2) the Christinization and, as a result, a new perception of time as an eschatological process (Arutjunova & Yanovskaia, 1997). The matter is that archaic consciousness, as opposed to the modern one, is characterized as a syncretic type of thinking. The extremely delicate emotionally affective sensibility of an archaic human being provoked the development of metaphorical thinking, and, consequently, consciousness got anthropomorphized. It is clearly shown by getting aware of a four-act nature’s rhythm (childhood – morning – spring, youth – morning – spring, maturity – daylight – summer (autumn), old age – evening – autumn (winter) (Brogan & Simons, 2000), which was first associated with age stages by Pythagor comparing them to permanent natural phenomena – forces of nature that mentally supplied a human being with the feeling of cyclic motion and actualized the archetype of quaternity (Jung, 1988). Such a type of temporal and spatial cyclic motion is reflected in the semantics of i.-e. roots 1 *uert “move, turn around” and 2 *per “move forward”, 3 *tere – with the meaning “turn around”, 4 *kwel “move in a circle”, 5 *y(s)penn “stretch, turn around”: compare 6 Rus. верста, Old Rus. въерста “age”, 7 Rus. сверстник “of the same age”, 8 Ukr. покоління, 9 Rus. поколение “of the same cycle; generation” (Stepanov, 2004, p. 121), 10 Eng. turn of life, life cycle / span”; 11 Lat. orbis that develops into the following semantic chain “circle” > “the globe” > “world” > “full-year cycle” > “year”, 12 Gr. αίών “century, epoch, eternity, the lifetime, generation”, and 13 Old Icelandic. verðld “the world of people; people” (Eng. world) that is the contamination of оld “time, century” and verr “a human” (OED). Cultural, historical, and biosociocultural nature of the phenomenon of human age is coherent with the idea of age symbolism appearing as a consequence of ethnosess’ reflection in the process of cultural genesis that gradually formed ethnically varied normative age criteria (age periodization), ascriptive age-related features and stereotypes (behaviour patterns / norms of age), symbols of age-related processes (confirmation), age-related rituals (the rituals of initiation for men and women) (Cahill, 1982; Cunningham, 1995; Dacey & Travers, 2003), subcultures (modes, teddy-boys, hipsters, styliahy (Eng. dandy), yuppies, emo kids) / counterculture (Cockerham, 2005; Roszak, 1969) (beat-generation, hippy (huppie), skin heads).

It was proved that sociocultural information and norms of law are represented in such formal and informal age norms as the age of starting school / school leaving, working age, age of getting identification documents (passport / driving license), voting in elections, age of puberty / consent, age limit / qualification for getting married / holding public office, buying alcoholic drinks and cigarettes, and stereotypes of 1 Ukr. стара діва, 2 Rus. старая дева, 3 Eng. spinster; 4 Ukr. нерова, 5 Eng. idler; stereotypes of the elderly and children under 3 years old as sexless, the elderly as “victims” of the society, stereotypes concerning age norms of human gender behavior (Eng. dirty old man) (Schaefer & Lamm, 1995).

It is proposed to start the approbation of a new developed complex methodology for revealing the stages of archetypal and stereotypical reflection of the concept HUMAN AGE by specifying the origin of concept names (Dzhenkova et al., 2003) and key nominations of age stages and persons by age given in Ukrainian, Russian, and English etymological dictionaries (Fasmer & Trubachiov, 2004; Kolesov, 2004; Liberman & Mitchell, 2007; Makovskii, 2000; Melnychuk, 1982; Chernykh, 1999; OED; Preobrazhenskii, 1958; Semenov, 2003; Shanskii & Bobrova, 1994; Tsyganenko, 1989). It implied determining the origin of such key age nominations as (Kaliuzhnaia, 1997): 1) concept names Ukr. вік, Rus. возраст, Eng. age (see Table 1); 2) their synonyms naming the human existence in a course of time (see Table 2) (Orlova, 2019); 3) lexemes that name the age stages and persons by age (Liubina, 2006). The formal (Stepanov, 2004) and semantic overlaps of mentioned above key nominations in other Indo-European languages were taken into consideration, too (Tolstoi, 1997).

The findings show that the following Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes denoting age stages and individuals by age are genetically related: 1 Ukr. юний, Rus. юный, Eng. juvenile (derived from i.-e. *iium), 2 Ukr., Rus. мужчина, 3 Eng. man (derived from Germ. *mann “human, man; a brave person, hero; ability to think; servant, vassal, adult male controlled by another person”); in Ukrainian and Russian: 4 Ukr. дитина, дівчина, Rus. дитя, девочка, девушка (derived from i.-e. *dhei “breast-feeding”; “suck in”, “dher “bear”, “give birth”), 5 Ukr. малюк, Rus. мальчик (derived from mel > mol “small”), 6 Ukr. парубок, Rus. парень (the origin is not exactly determined, it might be borrowed from Slav. паръ “boy, mate, fellow”), 7 Ukr. хлопець, Rus. хлопец (the origin is not exactly determined, it might be borrowed from old Rus. холопь “slave”), 8 Ukr., Rus. отрок (Proto-Slav. отъ) 9 rokъ, *otъ β “not” / + rokъ “говорити, казати” (“speak, say”) > “that one who has no right to speak”),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The concept name</th>
<th>Initial meaning of the motivators of HUMAN AGE concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. вік / вик</td>
<td>i.-e. * uei “strength”, “action”, *ueik- / uоіk “be strong”, *ueik-t- або *уїк-“vital force”, Old Slav. ве‌къ “strength; life; health”; health &gt; Old Slav. *сьдorъ, съ &gt; Old Ind.- su “good” + dorvo “made from good tree” (Melnychuk, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus. возраст / возрост</td>
<td>Old Slav. сcn. *orstъ &gt; *ord-to, likely в’озростъ / возрост, compared with Lat. arbor “tree”, Irish. ard “tall, big”, Albanian ri “I grow up” compared to Ukr. рід / рид, рос. род / род (Eng. family) (Fasmer &amp; Trubachiov, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. age</td>
<td>i.-e. *aiw “vital force”, “life”, “eternity”, related to Lat. evum “the time of life”, “eternity”, “age”; ae‌vum “age” &gt; aiw + evum; oе‌tas-aеvitas “period, generation” &gt; аіw + еvum + Lat. vita “life” (OED)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 The etymology of HUMAN AGE concept names вік, возраст, age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synonyms of the concept names вік, возраст, age</th>
<th>The etymological origin of initial meaning of the motivators of HUMAN AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. життя (life)</td>
<td>Old Rus. живьо́т “life, property, animal” (Rus. животное)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. чоловік (a human)</td>
<td>Versions of the origin: Proto-Slav. 1) *чъло (has the same root with *чьлабсть &gt; descendant / successor of the family; 2) *чъло, “higher” + ве‌къ (”strength”) &gt; “superior strength”; 3) чъло + ве‌къ (“life”) &gt; “over life” (Tsyanenko, 1989); “an adult man” (Cherny, 1999); “child, descendant of the family / clan” (Semenov, 2003); “one facing the eternity / talking to eternity”, “human as a whole”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. людина (a human / person)</td>
<td>Old Slav. людинь “a free person”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. human</td>
<td>Lat. humanus, homo “a human being”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. час (time)</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. чо́сь “cuts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus. время</td>
<td>i.-e. *uert “move, turn, spin”, borrowed from Church Slav. for *веремя “weather”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synonyms of the concept names вік, возраст, age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng. time</td>
<td>і.-е. root <em>да</em> “divide, break into pieces”</td>
<td>Old Rus. рокъ “age, fate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. рік (a year)</td>
<td>Old Slav. *lĕto “year, season, good (time), the period of rains”</td>
<td>Old Rus. годъ “time”, “time limit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus. рік (a year)</td>
<td>i.-е. “yer- “season, spring” or &gt; verb root <em>е</em> “do, perform”, apparently, “one doing a full cycle”</td>
<td>i.-е. “do “give”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. year</td>
<td>Ukr., Rus. пора (period), дата (date), Eng. date</td>
<td>Gr. πορεĩν “give; define”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. період, Рус. період, Eng. period</td>
<td>i.-е. *do “give”</td>
<td>Lat. periods “spinning, wheeling”; Gr. periodos “cycle” &gt; peri “around” + hodos “journey: way, road”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. етап, Rus. етап, Eng. stage</td>
<td>i.-е. “sta- “stand, get; be strong, reliable”</td>
<td>Midl.-L.-Germ. stapel “shelter” &gt; Fr. étape “going over”, “stop”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stereotypization of actual/current knowledge in the structure of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

#### Stereotypes of the notional component of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Axio-notional images of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers about human age were studied on the basis of explanatory dictionaries (Busel, 2005; Dal, 1998; Hornby & Cowie, 1989; Krysin et al., 2016; Lopatina, 2013; Bilodid, 1970–1980; Shushkov, 2003) by the structural method, in particular the method of componential (definitional) analysis for lexemes representing the concept HUMAN AGE. It was proved that axio-notional images of human age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English are based on 19 integral semes: 1) quantity, 2) year, 3) duration, 4) life, 5) period, 6) stage, 7) growth, 8) development, 9) intelligence, 10) ripeness, 11) spirituality, 12) law, 13) responsibility, 14) cyclic nature, 15) dynamism, 16) localization, 17) sequence, 18) generation, 19) old age. On the basis of semes above, 8 common types of stereotypical conceptual features were formed: 1 – quantitative and temporal: 1 Ukr. третя (Eng. a three-year-old child), 2 Rus. годовальный (Eng. one-year-old child), 3 Eng. thirty-something; 2 – spatial: 1 Ukr. вік знижений / підвищений (Eng. under age limit / above age limit), 2 Rus. середовик (Eng. middle-aged), 3 Eng. median age; 3 – continuous / gradual changes: 1 Ukr. активний вік (Eng. active age), 2 Rus. возраст становлення (Eng. reasonable age), 3 Eng. rising twenty; 4 – thinglike: 1 Ukr. на літках / порі (Engl. grown up), 2 Rus. в / на возрасте (Eng. coming into age), 3 Eng. be in teens, the under-5s; 5 – psycho- / anatomic- / physiological: 1 Ukr. вік життєздатності (Eng. age of vitality), 2 Rus. ментальний возраст (Eng. mental age), 3 Eng. fertile age; 6 – socio-legal: 1 Ukr. правоздатність (Eng. legal age), 2 Rus. гражданско-правове повелення (Eng. lawful age), 3 Eng. legal (drinking) age; 7 – socio-cultural: e.g. 1 Eng. addresses like 2 Ukr. пан(-i), панчика, 3 Rus. молодой человек, 4 Eng. master, sir, madam, miss, missy; 8 – gender: 1 Ukr. відмолоджувати (Eng. become mature / adult for a male) / 2 віддівувати (Eng. become mature / adult for a female), 3 Rus. юноши (парни) / девушки, 4 Eng. boy- / girl- / man- / womanhood; and 1 different psycho-physiological type of stability/instability in English (poise “calm confidence in a person’s way of behaving and balance in the way a person holds or moves their body”) (Hornby & Cowie, 1989).

16 types of conceptual cohesion of HUMAN AGE with other fields within the conceptosphere HUMAN were established. Among them, the common ones for the three languages are as follows: appearance, body build,
gender, traits of character, way of life, mental abilities, behavior, marital status, sexual relations, stage of studies, occupation, kinship; and such different ones for Ukrainian as bad luck, murder, wedding, life/death, and for English as social status.

**Stereotypes of the figurative (metaphorical) component of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English**

The cognitive reconstruction method was employed at this stage of the research to discover metaphorical patterns of axio-figurative stereotypes of the concept HUMAN AGE in the minds of representatives of Ukrainian, Russian, and English cultures.

Onomasiological reconstruction was applied to identify the linguocultural codes of phraseostereotyping the concept HUMAN AGE in the three languages alongside with specific thematic groups of metaphorical nominations of human age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English. The results of the study show that axio-figurative images of human age in the three languages comprise 8 basic metaphorical types (Baranov, 1989; Kravtsova, 2014):

- HUMAN AGE → PLANT
  1. Ukr. спіла ягода
  2. Rus. старый гриб / пень
  3. Eng. the fruit of womb
- HUMAN AGE → ANIMAL
  1. Ukr. старий вовк
  2. Rus. олень
  3. Eng. polar beaver
- HUMAN AGE → INANIMATE OBJECT
  1. Ukr. бабин смик
  2. Rus. шпингалет
  3. Eng. the pinafores
- HUMAN AGE → RELIGIOUS BELIEFS
  1. Ukr. Аред
  2. Rus. Христова невеста
  3. Eng. answer to a maiden’s prayer
- HUMAN AGE → INANIMATE NATURE
  1. Ukr. снігом вибілені коси
  2. Rus. бабье лето
  3. Eng. the twilight of life
- HUMAN AGE → MOTION / PROCESS
  1. Ukr. непосидько, ходульчик
  2. Rus. резвун "a playful child", за парнями побежать
  3. Eng. advancing / declining years
- HUMAN AGE → OCCUPATION
  1. Ukr. козак
  2. Rus. доказать гусара
  3. Eng. good sport
- HUMAN AGE → LIVING BEING (MYTH / RITUAL / BIBLE / LITERATURE CHARACTER) (a person by age) → LIFELESS THING (age period)
  1. Ukr., Rus. божич, сенектута
  2. Eng. harpy, dame

The associative constituent of this component was reconstructed by analyzing idioms, proverbs and sayings. The findings revealed 4 universal theme types of stereotypical metaphors serving as the basis for phraseological units and paroemias: natural (5 groups), biological (4 groups), social (6 groups), cultural and historical (10 groups). Quantitative calculations of thematic groups of metaphorical nominations in the three languages were also performed and revealed 22 groups in Ukrainian, 23 in Russian, and 25 in English (See Tables 3, 4, 5, 6) (Orlova, 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Associative complexes of natural sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural sphere</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate nature (season, part of the day)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora / colour</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural phenomena</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of groups coincides in the three languages and equals 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Associative complexes of biological sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological sphere</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of health / appearance</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body parts</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits of character / habits</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food / drinks</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of groups coincides in the three languages and equals 4.

**Table 5** Associative complexes of social sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social sphere</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal culture</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and moral values</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of groups equals 4 in Ukrainian, 6 in Russian, and 7 in English.

**Table 6** Associative complexes of cultural and historical sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural and historical sphere</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical events</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes / footwear</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon / trade tools</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary / religious character</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper names</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions / entertainments / music (musical instruments)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory administration units</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3–6 demonstrate that the number of categories pertaining to the cultural and historical realm is the most numerous, totaling nine in both Ukrainian and Russian and ten in English. Comparing the results, it can also be seen that Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes and phraseological units nominating HUMAN AGE are characterized by spatial metaphor for reflecting the time arrangement. Spatial archetypes UP / DOWN; LEFT / RIGHT are anthropomorphic and determined by biological reasons, i.e. the body organization in the upper part of which the main organs – the head and the heart – are placed. To prove that, it is particularly interesting to turn to Russian words 1 человек (Eng. human) and 2 лицо (Eng. face) which are synonymous. Moreover, the upright position of body is the factor that determines dimensional metaphors (in terms of HIGH / LOW opposition). Such oppositions as UP / DOWN, LEFT / RIGHT, and HIGH / LOW are recognized as correlating with oppositions GOOD / BAD, YOUNG / OLD, and LIFE / DEATH. It must be noted that local, horizontal, and vertical semantic and conceptual features of expressing HUMAN AGE through spatial metaphor are natural to the three languages.

Current results suggest that common semantic and conceptual features include: 1) UP movement as the symbol of growing, moving into adulthood; 2) ALONG / DOWN movement as the symbol of old age and an inevitable
death (1 Ukr. Молодість пне до зорі, старість гне до землі, іхати з ярмарку, 2 Rus. молодому – все дороги, старому – одна тропа, впадати в детство, 3 Eng. upcoming generation, be bent with years, along in years). It was found that semantic and conceptual feature of ALONG movement as the symbol of a lack of prospects for a young male later in professional life in English differs from Ukrainian and Russian: 1 Eng. a dead-end kid.

It was also revealed that lexemes of metaphorical use are either common or nationally specific culture codes. Thus, floristic symbolism includes such universal symbols as tree, flower, fruit, berry. Tables 7 and 8 list the obtained results as for colouristic and animalistic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative lexemes nominating the HUMAN AGE concept.

**Table 7** Colouristic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative lexemes nominating the HUMAN AGE concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Universal symbol</th>
<th>Nationally specific symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>OLD AGE</td>
<td>IMMATURITY (in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>VITALITY</td>
<td>BEAUTY (in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLD</td>
<td>the universal solar symbol PERFECTION YOUNG AGE OLD AGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>INEXPERIENCE because of young age (in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DECAY DEATH (in the English culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER</td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEWAL OLD AGE (in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINK</td>
<td>of childhood as a period in the life of a female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>of nature, fertility, life, young age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8** Animalistic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative lexemes nominating the HUMAN AGE concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal symbol</th>
<th>Nationally specific symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIRDS</td>
<td>EAGLE EAGLE (both in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALCON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(both in the Slavic culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stereotypes of the axiological component of the concept
**HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English**

This stage implied defining the sources of neutral, positive, and negative archetypal and stereotypical (axio-evaluative) ideas of the concept **HUMAN AGE** specific for Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers. Axio-evaluative ideas of **HUMAN AGE** in the three languages represent 6 regular common axiological dominant values: education and upbringing; memory of generations; good mental abilities / traits of character; obedience of children; health; parenthood; 5 specific ones for the Slavic culture: respect for elders (1 Ukr. слухай старших людей, то й чужого розуму наберешся, й свого не загубиш, 2 Rus. почитай старших – сам будешь стар); healthy and active way of life (throughout life) (1 Ukr. старий, старий, але ярий, 2 Rus. не жаль молодца ни бита, ни ранена, жаль молодця пожмельного); following moral and religious norms throughout life (життя, жизнь) (1 Ukr. бережи плаття знову, а честь змолоду, 2 Rus. в чём молод отпахались, в том стар покойешься); having a family, owning a private house for a newly-married couple; love (1 Ukr. молодим потрібен власний дім, 2 Rus. мужик без баби пуще малых деток сирота) and different in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal symbol</th>
<th>Nationally specific symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORSE</td>
<td>TIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>WHALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANIMALS**

The most essential obtained results of the current study may be presented as follows: 1) first proven genetically related Indo-European origin of the Ukrainian and English concept names вік (derived from *ueī, *ueīk- / uoīk, *uei-k-t- / *uīk-t- as shown in Table 1) and *age (derived from Proto-Germanic *aiw as shown in Table 1), and genetically unrelated Proto-Slavic origin from *ǫrstъ > *ord-to- of the concept name возраст in Russian; 2) common origin of key nominations of age periods in Ukrainian, Russian, and English 1 юний, юный, juvenile, young, 2 Ukr., Rus. мужчина, 3 Eng. man; in Ukrainian and Russian: 4 Ukr. дитина, дівчина, 5 Rus. діти, девочка, девушка, 6 Ukr. маля, 7 Rus. мальчик, 8 Ukr. парубок, 9 Rus. парень, 10 Ukr. хлопець, 11 Rus. хлопець, 12 Ukr., Rus. отрок, молодість, молодость, 13 Ukr. жінка, 14 Rus. женщина, зрілість, зрелость; старість, старость, и different in
studies about languages / kalbų studijos

15 Ukr. немовля; 16 Rus. ребёнок; 17 Eng. baby, infant, child, boy, girl, young, adult, maturity, old. It was proved that the archetypal (primary) semantic structure of key nominations of age periods in Ukrainian, Russian, and English are formed on nineteen common semes: vital force / health; a human / body; spirit / soul; freedom / slavery; fate; the whole / part of the whole; shelter; clan / descendant; mother / woman; man; hero; weak / helpless; small; worker/ servant /slave; space/ motion (in particular, wheeling / moving along); growth / top (up); season / the state of nature; water; eternity; speech; gender.

Further transformation of the primary archetypal meaning of the concept names вік, возраст, age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English was established as stereotyped in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers into such 19 integral semes as: 1) quantity, 2) year, 3) duration, 4) life, 5) period, 6) stage, 7) growth, 8) development, 9) intelligence, 10) ripeness, 11) spirituality, 12) law, 13) responsibility, 14) cyclic nature, 15) dynamism, 16) localization, 17) sequence, 18) generation, 19) old age.

It is possible to conclude that there are 8 common types of stereotypical conceptual features of human age that we classified in the following manner: quantitative and temporal (chronological, chronographic and chronometric patterns of human age), spatial and orientational (patterns of location, capacity, regularity of age periods), continuous / gradual (patterns of age periods as moving up / down / along), psycho- / anatomic and physiological (patterns of wisdom / unwisdom, experience / inexperience, maturity / immaturity, thinglike (patterns of human age as a subject of feeling / sense), social and legal (patterns of legal/illegal age), social and cultural (represented by forms of address towards males and females of young / middle / elderly years, gender (represented by means of binary oppositions nominating age stages through the lifespan of male and female). This consistency may come due to the single conceptual frame of the representatives of different ethnoses.

Conclusions

Consequently, twelve essential conceptual features of the concept HUMAN AGE key nominations as forming its archetypal basis in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers were established. They come as follows: human, body, strength, life, natural time, natural space, moving around, moving along, making no move, physical action of a man, physical condition of a person, the social status of a man. The process of stereotyping the human age specific nature implies that universal axioliogical focuses remain constant as being the result of archetypal images getting transformed. Stereotypical conceptual features of axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative constituents of the concept HUMAN AGE are based on the sample parameters that may be summarized as follows: HUMAN AGE is revealed as a temporal / spatial / psycho- / anatomic / physiological / social / legal focus; the object of feeling (aesthetic and ethical stereotypical conceptual features of human age) / sense (stereotypical conceptual features of visual, kinesthetic, gustatory perception); the object of thought (artifactual stereotypical conceptual features).

It must be noted here that such identified stereotypical conceptual features of human age as processing, psycho- / anatomic / physiological / social / legal status are binary oppositions reflecting dichotomous nature of archetype and human thinking as a whole. Besides, we conclude that there is a certain genetic similarity among the Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes naming the HUMAN AGE, viz. the prototypical structure of the concept defined as experiences of the cyclic-linear course of time (the circling and moving along the straight line) and the expansion of the semantics of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes that verbalize the concept HUMAN AGE by reframing it, based on a naturalmorphic archetypal metaphor. Phytomorphic and zoomorphic, especially ornithological, ichthynological and entomological stereotypical conceptual features are significant for semantic reconstruction of the concept HUMAN AGE and make up 30% of all the age nominations in the languages compared. These features were identified as belonging to the archetype of the ANIMAL and the TREE of LIFE (FLOWER).

We determined the symbolic basis of the HUMAN AGE concept nominations that are images of animals (totems), natural phenomena / forces, landscapes, physical processes / states of a person / animal, types of food, kinds of drinks, items of clothing / fibre, agricultural tools, weapon, (semi-) precious metals, colors (red, green, yellow, etc.), numerology (numbers 3, 4), relics of Slavic pagan beliefs (God Rod, Roshanytsi, Yarylo), the Christian (Bozych, Christ), mythological images (Aevum, Cronos / Chronos, Senectus), and motives (weaving on a spindle, the creation of the Universe).
Other archetypes were reconstructed: physical (Light / Darkness, Colored / White), spatial (Up / Down, Right / Left, Center / Periphery), biological (Young / Old, Healthy / Sick, Strong / Weak), psychological (Honest / Dishonest), social (Rich / Poor), cultural (Paradise / Hell), gender and socio-categorical: Man / Woman, Parents / Children, Older / Younger, Life / Death; Time (Summer / Winter, Day / Night), and the archetype of CHILD and WISE OLD MAN / WOMAN. The most typical mental and cultural archetypal and symbolic images, neutral, positive, and negative stereotypes / stereotypical oppositions were revealed in the phraseological and paremiological systems of the three languages. It was defined that their content comprises the axiological and evaluative components of the concept: a set of verbalized role models, norms, values as fixed in the society for females and males of different age groups and got developed in various figurative situational interpretations due to the unique habitats and specific historical development of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English ethnoses.

Santrauka

Yulia Orlova, Nataliya Lemish, Svitlana Matvieieva, Olga Aleksieieva, Iryna Vainorenlie, Nataliia Safonova. Žmogaus amžiaus sąvoka kaip archetipinė ir stereotipinė mentalinė struktūra gimtakalbių ukrainiečių, rusų ir anglių sąmonėje

Straipsnyje pristatoma nauja kompleksinė metodologija siekiant ištirti lingvokultūrinę žmogaus amžiaus sąvoką kaip archetipinę ir stereotipinę žmogaus sąmonės mentalinę struktūrą. Sąvoka „žmogaus amžius“ tiriamą analizuojant, kaip ji reiškiamasi leksiniuose, frazeologiniuose arba paremiologiniuose vienetuose. Taip pat analizuojami tokie sąvokos struktūros elementai kaip emisinio požymiaus atspindintis etimologinis istorinis sluoksnis, sąvokai evoluciniojant atsiardęs papildomas sluoksnis ir aktyvusis sluoksnis, kuri sudaro aksiologiniai prasminiai, metaforiniai ir vertinamieji stereotipai, leidžiantys mentalizuoti šią sąvoką ukrainiečių, rusakalbių ir anglakalbių sąmonėje. Nagrinėjant sąvokos pavadinimo etimologiją ir amžiaus tarpsnių bei žmonių pagal amžių įvardijimą trijose kalbose, atskleidžiamas archetipinis šios sąvokos pagrindas. Pateikiami ukrainiečių, rusų ir anglų lingvokultūroms būdingus universalūs ir nacionaliniai archetipiniai ir simboliniai bruožai, neutralūs, teigiamai ir neigiamai sociokultūriniai su amžiumi susiję stereotipai, numerologinės, koloristinės, fitomorfinės ir zoomorfinės metaforinės amžiaus amžiais ir asmenų pagal amžių nominalijos.
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