

# Linguistic Representation of the Concept ART in Dan Brown's Novels

Olena Chernyk

National Mining University, Dnipro, Ukraine

## Abstract

*This article deals with the study of the concept ART as a unit of Dan Brown's individual world-view reflected in the language of his texts. The research is conducted on the material of Dan Brown's four novels making up the Robert Langdon series. The difference between universal concept, culture-specific concept and concept in fiction is revealed. The first type of concept reflects universal knowledge, typical of all people; the second represents culture-specific knowledge, which is peculiar to a group of representatives of a certain nation or linguistic community; and the third type reveals the subjective knowledge of a writer/poet. The paper also describes the main approaches to conceptual structure. The fiction concept ART is regarded as a hyperconcept, which is a domain for such hypoconcepts as ARCHITECTURE, PAINTING, SCULPTURE, LITERATURE and MUSIC. The paper explores linguistic means of objectivization of this concept, reveals cognitive features and describes its stratified structure and field-like content*

*Keywords: concept in fiction (fiction concept), writer's world-view, stratified structure of the concept, field-like content of the concept, cognitive features, hyperconcept, hypoconcept.*

## 1. Introduction

At the end of the 20th century, the problem of mentality acquired great importance in linguistics (Langacker, 1987; Jackendoff, 1993; Lakoff, 1989; Fillmore, 1982). Linguists began to regard human mental experience as structured knowledge about the external world, which is organized into concepts whose content can be explicated via language. In cognitive linguistics, language is thought to be the means of access to human consciousness, as it represents or symbolizes concepts. Evans and Green (2006) in their book

“Cognitive Linguistics”, describe this function of a language in the following way: “language encodes and externalises our thoughts by using symbols [...]. The meaning associated with a linguistic symbol relates to a mental representation termed a concept. Concepts derive from percepts” (p. 21). “When we use language and utter the form [...], this symbol corresponds to a conventional meaning, and therefore ‘connects’ to a concept rather than directly to a physical object in the external world” (p. 7). Concepts bring the variety of observed and imaginary phenomena together, putting them under a single rubric; two or more different objects may be regarded as representatives of one class/category (Kubryakova, 1996, p. 90).

Some linguists admit the necessity to differentiate between types of concepts. Wierzbicka (1997) distinguishes culture-independent concepts (or universal concepts) and culture-specific concepts. She maintains that “if the meanings of all words were culture-specific, then cultural differences could not be explored at all. The hypothesis of ‘linguistic relativity’ makes sense only if it is combined with a well thought-out hypothesis of ‘linguistic universality’” (p. 22). Studying knowledge conceptualization, Langacker (2008) distinguishes between what a single speaker knows and the collective knowledge of the whole society, admitting that “the former is arguably more basic, since collective knowledge consists in (or at least derives from) the knowledge of individuals” (p. 30). Thus, this statement by Langacker enables us to argue for the existence of concepts reflecting individual worldviews, as not all people think in the same way. The embodiment of such a concept can be found in a literary text, as through the means of literary works a writer aims at describing the reality and expressing his/her unique perception of the world. As Karaulov (1987) mentions, “the process of creating a literary text is based on the intentional choice of the linguistic material that reflects author’s conceptions, ideas and mottos” (p. 53).

Although the point of view that the analysis of conceptual structures represented in the language of literary works can contribute to their interpretation is gaining popularity (Holland (1988), Crane (2000), Kövecses (2002), Danaher (2003), Sinding (2005), Freeman (2007, 2012), Nikonova (2008), Tarasova (2012), Kuczok (2014), Anna Kędra-Kardela (2016), *the notion of concept in fiction* (in other terminologies *artistic concept* (Gasparyan, 2016, p. 8), *literary concept* (Tarasova, 2010, p. 745) is still at the stage of comprehension and development. Bespalova (2002) defines it as “a unit of the poet’s or writer’s consciousness represented in a literary work and reflecting the process of individualized interpretation of reality” (p. 6). Krasnykh (1998) claims that, “on the one hand, the fiction concept is a starting point to create a literary text, and, on the other hand, it is a final goal when perceiving the text” (p. 202). The distinctive features of concepts of this type are associativity, evaluativity and semantic extension (Tarasova, 2012).

The study of concepts verbalized in fiction implies the analysis of the linguistic means (lexical, phraseological, syntactic) that encode them. A great deal of research into concepts in fiction is based on the theory of conceptual metaphor (Peña Cervel, 1997-98; Freeman, 2009; Danaher, 2003; Kuczok, 2014; Tarasova, 2012), the theory of conceptual blending (Freeman, 2009; Kuczok, 2014) and the theory of image schema (Peña Cervel, 1997-98; Freeman 2002). Research into conceptual metaphorical structures in fiction shows that they may reveal the author’s conceptual attitudes and motivations and help the reader/researcher to embrace his/her viewpoint, which includes world knowledge, beliefs and

values (Freeman, 2007, p. 1181). The study of a concept in fiction is often preceded by the study of the general representation of the concept in a linguistic community (Danaher, 2003; Kuczok, 2014), as in the concept verbalized in a literary text, common knowledge and beliefs coexist with the unique extensions and elaborations added by the writer. Thus, concepts in fiction can enrich universal and culture-specific concepts.

Researchers maintain that there is a relation between conceptual structures of literary texts and their compositional structure. Kahanovska (2003) admits that the content of the thematic lines of investigated literary works corresponds with the names of conceptual constituents that “unfold” concepts in texts (p. 19). Freeman’s cognitive analyses “show how metaphorical patterns generalize to other patterns, such as plot and scene, and provide interpretations detailed and coherent enough to be compared against traditional interpretations” (Freeman, 2007, p. 1184).

The aim of the present study is to analyze the structure and the content of the fiction concept *ART*, taking into consideration the theory of domains (Langacker, 1987), the hierarchical model of concepts (Prykhodko, 2013), the semantic-cognitive approach (Popova, 2005) and methodology of studying concepts in fiction (Tarasova, 2012). Conducting research into the idiosyncrasy<sup>1</sup> of Dan Brown (based on the Robert Langdon series), I decided to study the concept *ART* as a component of the author’s conceptual system. Several reasons have driven my choice of this concept. Firstly, the protagonist of the series is an art critic, and all events unfolding in the novels are related to works of art. Secondly, as a result of a psycholinguistic experiment<sup>2</sup>, it was discovered that the lexical unit *art* is among the ten most frequent words given as reactions to the titles of Dan Brown’s novels. Thirdly, the statistical analysis of the text material showed the high frequency of the lexical unit *art* 128 and lexical units designating works of art and artists such as *painting* 151, *Leonardo da Vinci* 128, *Bernini* 108, *palace* 105, *basilica* 103, *Louvre* 91, *palazzo* 74, *Mona Lisa* 60, *Vasari* 58, *Raphael* 49, *Rotunda* 47, *sculpture* 46, *Michelangelo* 21.

## 2. Different views of conceptual structure

Opinions about conceptual structure differ, as do opinions regarding the nature of concepts themselves. The structure of a concept is quite complex and multidimensional; it is not strictly fixed. For this reason, there is no single approach to its investigation.

Generalizing existing investigations of conceptual structures, Evans (2007) distinguishes two approaches to their modelling: 1) in terms of relatively stable knowledge structures such as a domain, a cognitive model, a semantic frame, an idealized cognitive model and different kinds of conceptual projection including cross-domain mappings such as metaphor; 2) in terms of mental space formation, the establishment of a mental spaces lattice and the formation of a conceptual integration network (p. 36).

Stephen Laurence and Eric Margolis (1999) reduce all conceptual structures to two models: the Containment Model and the Inferential Model. The essence of the first model is that “one concept is a structured complex of other concepts just in case it literally has those other concepts as proper parts, i.e., a concept C might be composed of the concepts X, Y, and Z [...] occurrence of C would necessarily involve an occurrence of X, Y, and Z” (p. 5). The second model supposes that “one concept is a structured complex of other

concepts just in case it stands in a privileged relation to these other concepts, generally, by way of some type of inferential disposition. On this model, even though X, Y, and Z may be part of the structure of C, C can still occur without necessitating their occurrence” (p. 5).

Clausner and Croft (1999) claim that “concepts can only be comprehended (by the speaker as well as by the analyst) in a context of presupposed, background knowledge structures. The most generic term for this background knowledge structure is *domain*” (p. 2). Langacker (1987) defines domain as “a coherent area of conceptualization relative to which semantic units may be characterized” (p. 488). He uses the terms *profile* and *base* to describe the relationship between a concept and the domain in which it is found. A profile is “some portion of conceptual knowledge which stands in relation to a base of presupposed knowledge” (qtd. in Clausner and Croft, p. 5). In this respect, the theory of domains is very similar to the theory of frames developed by Fillmore. Fillmore (1982) conceives of frame as “any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits...” (p. 111). He “adopts the terms *figure* and *ground* from Gestalt psychology to distinguish between a particular lexical concept and the background frame against which it is understood” (qtd. in Evans, 2006, p. 222). Describing similarities between the theories of domains and frames, Evans (2006) mentions their distinction as well: “while Fillmore [...] views frames as a means of accounting for grammatical behaviour like valence relations [...], Langacker’s theory of domains is more concerned with conceptual ontology: the structure and organisation of knowledge, and the way in which concepts are related to and understood in terms of others” (p. 231).

The notion of domain as a theoretical construct is used in the conceptual metaphor theory developed by Lakoff. “The metaphor works by mapping roles from the source onto the target” (Evans, 2006, p. 295), where the target is the concept or domain being described, and the source is the concept/domain in terms of which another concept is described. In other words, the elements of one conceptual domain are “mapped” or projected onto elements of another conceptual domain. “Systematic correspondences across such domains” are called metaphorical mappings (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 246).

Prykhodko (2013) understands domains as concepts that are organized in a hierarchical fashion, and proposes that macroconcept should be regarded as a domain for hyperconcept, hyperconcept as a domain for hypoconcept, hypoconcept as a domain for mesoconcept, and mesoconcept as a domain for katoconcept (p. 185). The author stresses that the higher a concept is in the hierarchy, the more abstract the entity it represents.

In this paper, I regard the fiction concept *ART* as a complex one, and to investigate its verbal representation thoroughly, I employ several approaches. Firstly, basing my approach on Prykhodko’s classification of domains, I suggest studying the concept *ART* in Dan Brown’s novels as a hyperconcept which is a domain for the hypoconcepts *PAINTING*, *MUSIC*, *ARCHITECTURE*, *SCULPTURE*, *LITERATURE* and *MUSIC*.

The above-mentioned approach is combined with the semantic-cognitive approach developed by Popova (2007) and the methodology for studying concepts in fiction proposed by Tarasova (2012). Following Popova, I distinguish between the content and the structure of a concept. The structure of a concept includes basic structural components of

varying cognitive nature and is described as a set of cognitive features that belong to each of these structural components (p. 115). According to Tarasova, the structure of a concept verbalized in a literary text is composed of five strata: notional, physical, figurative, associative, axiological-evaluative and symbolic (p. 51). The description of the concept structure presupposes arranging the identified cognitive features into corresponding strata. The content of a concept is composed of cognitive features reflecting certain characteristics of the object or conceptualized phenomenon and is described as a set of these features according to the field principle – the core, the close periphery, the far periphery and the marginal periphery. The assignment of a feature to a particular zone is determined by the prominence of the feature in the consciousness of the concept bearer, the level of prominence being identified by its frequency of representation in the language material (Popova, 2007, p. 115).

### 3. Stratified structure of the fiction concept *ART*

#### 3.1 Notional stratum

According to Tarasova (2012), “the notional stratum of the concept in fiction is composed of typical, logically ordered information, basic denotative semes and distinctive generic features” (p. 55). To reveal these features, I consider it reasonable to analyze contextual usage and cases of collocability of the name of the concept, its derivatives and synonyms, as well as lexical units verbalizing each hypoconcept in the four selected novels by Dan Brown.

Dan Brown uses the lexical unit *art* in the texts of his novels in the narrow sense – painting (16 contexts), as well as in the broad sense – fine art, architecture, music, literature and other creative and practical activities (13 contexts). The lexical units designating other genres of art than painting have the following frequency: *sculpture* 44, *architecture* 38, *music* 30, *literature* 12, *theatre* 4. In the texts of the four novels, there are 105 names of architectural monuments, 45 names of sculptures, 37 names of paintings, 5 titles of works of literature, and 2 names of musical works. In addition, Brown mentions the names of 28 artists, 16 writers and poets, 13 architects, 13 sculptors, and 12 musicians. Other types of creative and practical activities which are nominated by the lexeme *art* in the works of Dan Brown analyzed here are woodworking, anagrams and ambigrams (3 contexts). The word is also used in the meaning “skill” (5 contexts).

In the texts of the novels, the following derivatives of the key lexeme are used: *artist* 53, *artwork* 30, *artifact* 26, *artistic* 13, *arts* 12, *artisan* 1, *artful* 1, *artfully* 1, *artistry* 1, *artifice* 1. The lexeme *artifact* has a semantic feature “historical and cultural value”. The frequent adjective *artistic* actualizes features “art-related” and “natural artistic abilities”. The noun *arts* is used to generalize various types of art, as well as to refer to a certain type of art and some other non-artistic practices when it is used with an adjective: “poetic arts”, “fine arts”, “dark arts”, “martial arts”, “magical art”. The lexeme *artisan* expands the lexical-semantic field of the key word with the seme “making things by hand”. The lexical unit *artistry* has the seme “mastery in a kind of art”. Such low-frequency lexical units denoting abstract notions and qualities such as *artful*, *artfully* and *artifice* include not only the seme “mastery”, but also “cunningness”.

The criterion for the selection of synonyms was the availability of common semes with a key word and its derivatives. Here I deal only with those contexts where the lexemes actualize semantic features peculiar to the lexical units nominating the concept. For instance, the lexical unit *science* is used 269 times in the novels, however there are only 5 contexts in which the lexeme contains the seme “high level of skillfulness and mastery”; consequently, the lexeme *science* is synonymous with the lexeme *art* only in 5 contexts. In addition, I examine contextual synonyms (lexemes similar in meaning only within the texts of the novels, e.g. *artist* and *titan*, *artist* and *prodigy*). Identified synonyms can be divided into the following groups: 1) designation of a creative activity: *composition* 6; *representation* 4, *craft* (v) 12, *crafting* 1; 2) designation of a set of techniques in a practical activity: *knowledge* 5, *aptitude* 1, *technique* 3; 3) designation of a high level of skillfulness and mastery: *skill* 18, *dexterity* 3, *expertise* 7, *craftsmanship* 1; *knack* 1, *science* 1, *ingenuity* 1; *mastery* 3, *talent* 3, *feat* 6; 4) designation of an artist: *craftsman* 5, *prodigy* 2, *art luminary* 3, *master* 6; *giant* 3, *titan* 1, *man of genius* 1, *wonder boy* 1; 5) designation of craft, profession: *craft* 2; 6) designation of an artwork: *piece of art* 10, *masterpiece* 47, *accomplishment* 1, *masterwork* 10; 7) designation of cunningness, tricks: *deceit* 2.

The analysis of the synonyms of the lexeme *art* which are present in the novels makes it possible to reveal additional semantic features of the concept. The lexeme *representation* demonstrates the feature “reflection of reality”; *knowledge*, *expertise* – “awareness”; *dexterity*, *wonder boy* – “cleverness”; *ingenuity* – “initiative”; *mastery* – “perfect mastery”; *aptitude*, *talent*, *prodigy*, *man of genius* – “being gifted”; *masterpiece*, *masterwork* – “excellence”; *feat*, *accomplishment* – “successful completion”; *luminary*, *giant*, *titan* – “success of an artist”.

As a result of the contextual analysis, the following semantic features which reflect the universal representations and associations connected with the concept *ART* are revealed in the novels:

1) “the ability to evoke admiration” (34 contexts). This feature is represented by the use of verbs to adore, to worship, to love, to marvel and the nouns *gusto*, *dedication*, *buffs*, *aficionado*, *lover*, *attraction*, *passion*, *love*, *admirers*, *pride* and *joy* in combination with the names of concepts under investigation or the lexemes denoting works of art;

2) “aesthetic and material value”: (30 contexts). This semantic feature is verbalized by the adjectives priceless, precious, valuable, the nouns treasures, assets, the verb to appreciate used in combination with words that denote works of art and by word combinations designating frequent cases of artwork theft: *art theft*, *art thief*, *art intruder*, *to steal artworks*, *often stolen art piece*. In addition, the value of art is emphasized by contexts describing the increased protection of art objects;

3) “the ability to inspire respect” (4 contexts). This feature is expressed by the verbs *to revere*, *to worship*, e.g. “*revered artists*”;

4) “famousness” (25 contexts), e.g. “famous works of art”, “illustrious artwork”, “celebrated sculpture”, “renowned fresco”, “famed Vasari Corridor”, “legendary ceiling mosaic”;

5) “lack of simplicity”, “intricacy” (12 contexts), e.g. “intricate holy sculptures of the Virgin Mary”, “artistic challenge of creating the mythical ambigram”, “architectural complexity”;

6) “uniqueness” (7 contexts). This feature is mainly represented by the adjective *unique*, but it is also stressed by the description of artists’ specific features, their individual manner: “Langdon recognized the work was pure Bernini – the intensity of the artistic composition, the intricate faces and flowing clothing, all from the purest white marble Vatican money could buy” (Angels and Demons, p. 147);

7) “strength”, “influence” (7 contexts). This feature is represented by the adjective *powerful* (a piece of art), the noun *power* (of a piece of art), the verb to *mesmerize*, as well as by other contexts describing the ability of art to influence a person in a certain way, e.g. “Langdon had been mesmerized by Michelangelo’s David when he first saw it as a teenager ...” (Inferno, p. 34); “[...] physical space so imposing that those who entered felt dwarfed, their egos erased, their physical being and cosmic importance shrinking to the size of a mere speck in the face of God ... an atom in the hands of the Creator” (Inferno, p. 394) (about Hagia Sophia);

8) “oddity”, “eccentricity” (6 contexts): “paintings with strange mythical theme”, “Saint-Sulpice’s famed architectural oddity”, “fresco’s bizarre imagery” (Apotheosis), “[...] the pyramid itself seemed an oddity”, “Salvador Dalí’s eccentric series of watercolors and woodcuts”, “Temple Church’s unusual sanctuary”;

9) “coexistence of science and art” (8 contexts), e.g. “It was a remarkable fusion of engineering and art” (Pantheon) (Angels & Demons, p. 271).

10) “improbability” (1 context): “Art is man’s attempt to imitate the beauty of the Creator’s hand” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 134).

11) “art as a discipline” (17 contexts), e.g. “art historian”, “art world”, “art books”, “art history”, “art scholar”, “art connoisseur”, “art student”, “professor of art history”, “art teacher”, “art department”, “art conference”.

12) “eternity” (3 contexts): “Rodin’s timeless sculpture of The Three Shades”, “timeless basilica”, “timeless statue”;

13) “inconsistency and incomprehensibility of modern art” (4 contexts). The feature is expressed by the adjective *controversial* as well as by other contexts, e.g. “Admitting you liked the pyramid made you a tasteless American, and expressing dislike was an insult to the French” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 36);

14) “the ability to inspire people to create new works of art” (12 contexts), e.g. “No single work of writing, art, music, or literature has inspired more tributes, imitations, variations, and annotations than the Divine Comedy” (Inferno, p. 83);

15) “belonging to a cultural-historical epoch, direction” (67 contexts): “Renaissance art”, “religious art”, “Christian art”, “Hagiographic art”, “Islamic art”, “classical art”, “modern art”, “Gothic architecture”, “Byzantine architecture”. Art of the Renaissance period, including religious art (30 contexts), assumes a central role in the texts of Dan Brown.

16) “nationality” (30 contexts): “Italian art”, “Norman castle”, “German engraver”, “German castle”, “Italian literature”, “Byzantine art”, “Roman aqueduct”, “Greek architecture”. The most frequent lexical combinations designate Italian art (13 contexts).

### 3.2 Sensory stratum

The sensory stratum of the concept correlates with the perception, i.e. the sensory perceived image, and includes a number of modalities: visual modality, hearing modality, smell modality and somatic modality (Tarasova, 2012, p. 55).

Visual modality is presented in the texts of the novels quite vividly. The author describes the appearance, namely colour, size, shape and other details that can be visualized, for almost every piece of art and especially for those that are viewed by the main characters, e.g. “Langdon and Sienna were now facing the side of the cathedral with its dazzling exterior of green, pink, and white marble” (Inferno, p. 231).

On the margin of the sensory stratum and axiological-evaluative stratum, the feature “the ability to impress by largeness of scale” is revealed (74 contexts), since it reflects both factual information which is perceived via visual modality and the author’s assessment which is expressed by the hyperbolized phrases (as opposed to *large*, *big*), e.g. “enormous image”, “massive fresco”, “sprawling Pinturicchio fresco”, “colossal building” (Hagia Sophia), “monumental building” (Hagia Sophia), “tremendous holed dome” (of the Pantheon), “magnitude of the building” (Westminster Abbey), “its enormity” (Hagia Sophia), “Hagia Sophia's prodigious size”. The listed lexemes express an unexpected and profound impression.

The analysis of Dan Brown’s novels revealed two layers of opposite vocabulary types which are used to describe the appearance of architectural structures. The first group includes lexical units which denote robustness and austerity (17 contexts): *stark*, *robust*, *coarse*, *rugged*, *cold*, *austere*, *austerity*, *severe-looking*, *ascetic*. The second large group includes words which denote brightness, splendour, richness in decoration (60 contexts): *dazzling*, *gilded*, *colorful*, *vibrant*, *shimmering*, *graceful*, *gleaming*, *glistening*, *blazing*, *smoldering*.

The analysis also revealed that Brown uses descriptions of natural phenomena as a background for the description of works of art (34 contexts). The use of this technique by Brown helps readers to easily visualize the work of art in their minds, to “draw” a picture that is close to reality, e.g. “On sunny days, the abbey floor was a prismatic patchwork of light” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 518). In addition, using this technique, the author emphasizes the distinctiveness of an artwork (9 contexts): “[...] his eyes ascending the illuminated spire, which shone stark white against the black winter sky” (The Lost Symbol, p. 493); size (3 contexts): “In the distance, on the very edge of Rome, Michelangelo's massive dome blotted the setting sun” (Angels & Demons, p. 326); beauty (10 contexts): “[...] a bank of arched windows offered a stunning panorama of the sun-drenched St. Peter's Square” (Angels & Demons, p. 169); uniqueness (1 context): “The sun's rays through the oculus, the graduated shadows on the gnomon, this is what makes Saint-Sulpice unique” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 67); mysticism (2 contexts): “Today, the rain and darkness gave this massive hollow a wraithlike aura ... more like that of the crypt it really was” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 518); and symbolism (1 context): “As the rays of sunlight strengthened, the golden glow engulfed the entirety of the thirty-three-hundred-pound capstone. The mind of man ... receiving enlightenment” (The Lost Symbol, p. 508).

Smell modality in Dan Brown's texts concerns mainly architectural structures (9 contexts), e. g. "When Langdon reached the bottom of the stairs, the unmistakable smell of linseed oil and plaster dust assaulted his nostrils" (the smell of a restoration workshop in the Louvre) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 144).

The effect of personal presence at the site of an artwork is also achieved through somatic (4 contexts) and hearing (4 contexts) modalities. For example: "[...] Langdon descended the curved staircase into the pyramid. He could feel the air grow cooler" (the Louvre's sprawling underground complex) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 591); "Stepping across the threshold into Westminster Abbey, Langdon felt the outside world evaporate with a sudden hush. No rumble of traffic. No hiss of rain. Just a deafening silence, which seemed to reverberate back and forth as if the building were whispering to itself" (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 518).

### 3.3 Associative stratum

This stratum comprises non-typical and individual associations connected with art which are actualized in the text.

First of all, art in the works of Dan Brown arises as a means of hiding information, ciphers and codes (54 contexts). For instance: "Leonardo was one of the keepers of the secret of the Holy Grail. And he hid clues in his art" (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 311); "[...] Mary Magdalene, her story and importance had to be passed on through more discreet channels... channels that supported metaphor and symbolism". "Of course. The arts" (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 348); "In 1563, these ten letters had been used to spell a message high on a wall inside Florence's famed Palazzo Vecchio [...]. Despite numerous theories, the significance of the message remains an enigma to this day" (*Inferno*, p. 95).

In each novel, Dan Brown emphasizes symbolism in art (64 contexts). On the one hand, this feature should belong to the notional stratum, since art is often associated with symbolism, but the persistent nature of this association in the texts and its individualized representation makes it possible to assign it to the associative stratum. The texts of the novels describe both well-known symbols in works of art and the author's own interpretation of symbolism. An example of the first case can be the description of the significance of the baptistery's octagonal form: "Langdon knew the octagonal shape [of Florence Baptistery] had nothing to do with aesthetics and everything to do with symbolism. In Christianity, the number eight represents rebirth and recreation [...]" (*Inferno*, p. 233). An example of the author's own reading of symbols in works of art can be the interpretation of Leonardo da Vinci's painting "The Last Supper". The novel "*The Da Vinci Code*" promotes the idea that the figure on the right of Jesus Christ in the picture is Mary Magdalene and not St. John, and the position of Jesus and Mary Magdalene in the picture form the sign "V", which is a symbol of the "sacred feminine" (*The Da Vinci Code*, pp. 327–329).

On the margin of the notional and associative strata, the feature "an artwork is a tourist attraction" is found (26 contexts). Although this feature represents a well-known fact, it is not directly represented in entries in any of the dictionaries I consulted (*Collins*, *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*, *Dictionary by Merriam-Webster*). In the works of Dan Brown, this feature is very stable and is represented by the contexts in which the names of artworks

are used together with the lexeme *tourist* and its contextual synonyms *guests*, *admirers*, *crowds / thunders of people*, etc.

In almost every work of Dan Brown, artists and artworks are associated with secret societies (20 contexts), e.g. “Priory [of Sion] Grand Masters included Leonardo da Vinci, Botticelli, Sir Isaac Newton, Victor Hugo, and more recently, Jean Cocteau, the famous Parisian artist” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 280).

All novels represent the cognitive feature of the associative stratum “indication of a route” (18 works of art). For example: “Each piece of course was a marker [...]. It functioned as a trail of clues disguised as religious art” (Angels & Demons, p. 209).

Dan Brown also associates works of art with mysticism (8 contexts) e.g. “[...] she knew, whatever Kryptos ultimately revealed, the message definitely had mystical undertones” (The Lost Symbol, p. 477).

### 3.4 Figurative stratum

The figurative stratum includes “elements of trope constructions containing the name of a concept” (Tarasova, 2012, p. 139). The central role within this stratum belongs to conceptual metaphor. As a result of analysis of the text material, 38 metaphorical patterns (mappings) with lexemes nominating works of art were discovered. It is convenient to group these patterns on the basis of the cognitive features that underlie them:

1) “importance” (5 contexts): an architectural structure is the heart: “The Palazzo Vecchio is the oldest symbol of Florence and, in Dante's time, was the heart of the city” (Inferno, p. 166); a picture is a member of the royal family: “After everything she'd heard about the Mona Lisa, she felt as if she were approaching royalty” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 141);

2) “a large number of mysteries” (1 context): a work of art is an explosion: “His [Da Vinci's] artwork seemed bursting to tell a secret” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 233);

3) “unattractiveness” (6 contexts): an architectural structure is an eyesore: “The boxy annex [of the Temple Church] jutting out to the right was an unfortunate eyesore” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 453); an architectural structure is a warrior wearing a party hat: “Vatican had ruined the building by constructing two large aluminum telescope domes atop the roof, leaving this once dignified building looking like a proud warrior wearing a pair of party hats” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 208); an architectural structure is a battleship: “The Church of Santa Maria del Popolo stood out like a misplaced battleship, askew at the base of a hill on the southeast corner of the piazza” (Angels & Demons, p. 292); an architectural structure during restoration work is a dark cave: “The interior of Santa Maria del Popolo was a murky cave in dimming light” (Angels & Demons, p. 296); an architectural structure during restoration work is a metro station: “It looked more like a semi-finished subway station than a cathedral” (about Santa Maria del Popolo) (Angels & Demons, p. 296); an architectural structure is a scar: “Langdon sighed, [...]. ‘Yes, your pyramid is magnificent.’ Fache grunted. ‘A scar on the face of Paris’” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 40);

4) “large size”: an architectural structure is a mountain (24 contexts): “Hagia Sophia. Not so much a building ... as a mountain” (Inferno, p. 383); an architectural structure is a desert: “Again he scanned the sprawling expanse of granite beneath his feet – St. Peter's

Square – an open desert surrounded by Swiss Guard” (*Angels & Demons*, p. 334); an architectural structure is a monster: “From the access road, Gandolfo resembled a great stone monster pondering a suicidal leap” (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 207); an architectural structure is a giant: “an immovable giant on the Piazza del Duomo” (*Il Duomo*) (*Inferno*, p. 33); an architectural structure is a city: “Hagia Sophia appeared to be a city to itself” (*Inferno*, p. 383). The first metaphorical pattern represents the shape of an architectural structure as well. Large size is also vividly verbalized by the following figurative expressions: “gargantuan, sword-wielding angel” (an angel statue on the castle roof); “castle’s elephantine double doors” (Castle of the Holy Angel), “monstrous stone structure across the river” (Castle of the Holy Angel), “the mammoth bronze angel” (an angel statue on the castle roof), “mammoth columns” (in Santa Maria del Popolo). The listed epithets, in combination with words denoting structures of architecture and their components, are individualized and represent not only the large size of the structure but also the writer’s evaluation. The adjectives gargantuan and mammoth, although indicating a large size, are not as a rule used with words which designate architectural structures. The first word is used to describe things related to food, the second one to describe the great complexity of a task or a situation (*Collins Dictionary*). In addition to the large size of the structures, all four adjectives convey their unattractiveness and excessive cumbersomeness;

5) “form” (17 contexts): an architectural structure is a ship: “Silas gazed up into the soaring ribbed vault of the ceiling, he imagined he was standing beneath the hull of an enormous overturned ship” (Saint-Sulpice) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 126); an architectural structure is a pencil: “pencil-shaped minarets” (*The Blue Mosque*); an architectural structure is a stalactite: “[...] a huge inverted skylight that hung from the ceiling like a stalactite” (*La Pyramide Inversée*) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 41); a sculpture is an iceberg: “The miniature structure itself protrudes up through the floor as though it were the tip of an iceberg [...]” (a miniature pyramid in the Louvre) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 592); an architectural structure is a horseshoe (2 contexts), e.g. “Shaped like an enormous horseshoe, the Louvre was the longest building in Europe [...]” (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 34); an architectural structure is a chess piece (2 contexts): “The Palazzo Vecchio resembles a giant chess piece” (*Inferno*, p. 146); an architectural structure is a cake (2 contexts), e.g. “Resembling a layer cake, some had claimed, the eight-sided structure consisted of three distinct tiers that ascended to a shallow white roof” (Florence Baptistery) (*Inferno*, p. 233); an architectural structure is a silo tower: “three domed, silolike appendages jutting off the building” (Hagia Sophia) (*Inferno*, p. 389); ribs of a dome are the sun’s rays: “From its central point, forty ribs radiated outward like rays of the sun [...]” (dome of Hagia Sophia) (*Inferno*, p. 393); an architectural structure is the mast of a ship: “The monolithic spire of the Washington Monument loomed dead ahead, illuminated against the sky like the majestic mast of a ship” (*The Lost Symbol*, p. 13); architectural structures are plants: “Gray stone columns are ascended like redwoods into the shadows, arching gracefully over dizzying expanses, and then shooting back down to the stone floor” (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 518); a part of an architectural structure is a canyon: “Before them, the wide alley of the north transept stretched out like a deep canyon, flanked by sheer cliffs of stained glass” (in Westminster Abbey) (*The Da Vinci Code*, p. 518);

6) “success”, “authoritativeness” (1 context): an artist is a behemoth: “Santi was a behemoth in the art world” (Angels & Demons, p. 253). The use of the lexeme behemoth in such a context is not typical; the semes success and authoritativeness can be determined through the synonymic relation with the word giant;

7) “brightness”, “beauty” (4 contexts): a carving is a smouldering fire: “Their white lacework carvings seemed to smolder with a ruddy glow as the last of the day's sunlight [...]” (Rosslyn Chapel) (The Da Vinci Code, p. 569); the surface of the vault of a baptistry is smouldering coals: “[...] the surface of the baptistry's octagonal vault [...] glistened and shimmered as if it were made of smoldering coals” (Inferno, p. 239); a copper ball on the dome of a cathedral is a beacon: “... its zenith adorned with a gilt copper ball that glistened like a beacon” (Inferno, p. 33); the facade of an architectural construction is fire: “The marble façade blazed like fire in the afternoon sun” (St. Peter's Basilica) (Angels & Demons, p. 143);

8) “perfection, beauty” (1 context): columns are the ribs of a beautiful beast: “On either flank, a shadowy row of sleek buttresses jutted out like the ribs of a beautiful beast” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 84);

The majority of the analyzed patterns represent “image metaphors” (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, pp. 89–96), as the art objects are depicted in terms of other concepts based on shared perceptual features (mostly visual).

All analyzed examples demonstrate the metaphorical pattern *the artwork (artist) is Y*, i.e. the source of the mapping is another concept. The analysis revealed only one case of the metaphorical pattern *Y is art (an artist)*, where the concept *ART* is a source domain: “Rather than definitive theological identities like God, Allah, Buddha, or Jesus, the Masons use more general terms like Supreme Being or Great Architect of the Universe” (The Lost Symbol, pp. 30–31). This sentence contains the metaphorical pattern *God is an architect*, which represents the cognitive features “creation” and “designing”.

Cognitive features of the figurative stratum are also actualized by personification (13 contexts), i.e. the “ontological metaphor” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 32) *artwork is an animate being*. The following features are revealed: “large size”: “La Pyramide Inversée [...] was large enough to swallow their Smart-Car in a single gulp” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 189); “shape”: “[...] the Vasari Corridor was like a broad serpent, snaking through the buildings [...]” (Inferno, p. 142); “keeping secret information”: “Langdon quickly told her about works by Da Vinci, Botticelli, Poussin, Bernini, Mozart, and Victor Hugo that all whispered of the quest to restore the banished sacred feminine” (The Da Vinci Code, p. 348); “distinctiveness” (2 contexts), e.g.: “Lit from beneath by banks of floodlights, the church's two bell towers rose like stalwart sentinels above the building's long body” (Saint-Sulpice) (The Da Vinci Code, p. 83).

### 3.5 Axiological-evaluative stratum

The axiological-evaluative stratum captures features in terms of positive and negative evaluation as well as the characteristics determined by emotional perception of the object (Tarasova, 2012, p. 141). This stratum covers the lexemes denoting large size that have been analyzed as part of the notional (*enormous, massive, sprawling, colossal, monumental,*

*magnitude, enormity, prodigious*) and figurative strata (*gargantuan, elephantine, monstrous, mammoth*, figurative patterns denoting the feature “unattractiveness”) as well as the evaluative adjectives *great, beautiful, impressive, magnificent, imposing, finest, perfect, refined, breathtaking, spectacular, dignified, stately, staggering, dramatic, majestic, astonishing, striking, elegant, commanding*. The last group of enumerated adjectives convey positive evaluation and reflect such cognitive features as “beauty” (58 contexts), “grandeur” (6 contexts), “impressiveness” (52 contexts), “perfection” (6 contexts). The grandeur of architectural construction is also expressed by the frequent noun *edifice* (14 contexts) and the word combinations *to rise majestically, majesty of the building, architecture's grandeur, to stand regally, robust architecture*. In addition, the analysis revealed a number of evaluative adjectives characterizing artists in a positive way (12 contexts): *great, gifted, accomplished, brilliant, prolific*. These lexemes reveal the feature “gifted nature”.

Dan Brown repeatedly stresses the ability of art to evoke fear (9 contexts). To actualize this feature, the writer uses the lexemes *daunting, frightening, horrifying, intimidating, startling* and the word combinations *to feel gooseflesh, to feel a chill*, e.g. “As always, Langdon felt a chill as he entered the cavernous room” (the Pantheon) (*Angels & Demons*, p. 271). Fear is also combined with admiration: “He was in awe, transported for an instant to another world. In his life, he had never imagined a chapel that looked like this” (Chigi Chapel) (*Angels & Demons*, p. 301).

Despite mostly positive evaluation of artworks, the novels also include cases of negative or ironic attitudes towards some of them (11 contexts), which is expressed by the lexemes *boring, bleak, clumsy, murky, despised, somber, unfortunate piece of “art”, hideous* and other contexts, e.g. “[...] all she saw was a niche containing what had to be the most hideous statue she had ever seen. Good God, the Medici could afford any artwork on earth, and they chose this? The statue before them depicted an obese, naked dwarf straddling a giant turtle...” (*Inferno*, p. 123).

The symbolic stratum of the concept is based on “archetypal symbolic associations or the symbolic associations typical of the author's poetic system” (Tarasova, 2012, p. 62). The analysis of Dan Brown's texts did not reveal associations of this type, therefore they can be considered more typical of poetic texts.

#### 4. Field-like concept structure

The revealed cognitive features are unified and integrated by cognitive classification features, each of which can be arranged by the frequency index in the field-like content of the concept. The formulation of cognitive classification features maintains economy in cognitive representation. The core cognitive classification features of the fiction concept *ART* are the most prominent cognitive features, and they are verbalized by the most frequent lexemes. The analysis shows that such features are “genres of art” 30 % (484 contexts), “exterior characteristics” 12.5 % (200 contexts), “emotional evaluation” 12.2 % (195 contexts) and “aesthetic evaluation” 11.6 % (186 contexts). The close periphery is composed of the cognitive classification features that represent the content of the most hypoconcepts and is actualized by a large number of lexical units: “function” 9.9% (159 contexts),

“significance” 6.4% (102 contexts), “characteristics of an artist” 4.3 % (69 contexts), “connection with other branches and activities” 2.9 % (46 contexts) and “directions in art” 2.7 % (44 contexts). The far periphery is composed of the cognitive classification features with a lower frequency of contexts in which they are verbalized: “national identity” 1.9 % (30 contexts), “individuality” 1.6 % (25 contexts), “ability to influence” 1.2% (19 contexts) and “field of knowledge” 1.1% (17 contexts). The marginal periphery consists of the cognitive classification features represented by a small number of lexemes and contexts: “small characteristics” 0.6% (9 contexts), “falseness” 0.3% (5 contexts), “sound characteristics” 0.3 % (4 contexts), “somatic characteristics” 0.3 % (4 contexts) and “temporal characteristics” 0.2 % (3 contexts).

## 5. Conclusion

As is evident from the analysis, the fiction concept ART has quite prominent and specific linguistic expressions in the works of Dan Brown. The research has shown that the representation of the concept within the notional stratum is wider than in dictionaries. It also demonstrated that within the sensory stratum, it is visual modality that prevails, as the author very carefully describes the colour, shape, size and other details of artworks which can be visualized. The description of natural phenomena serves as a background for emphasizing the peculiarities of art. Rather unusual knowledge about the concept is reflected by the cognitive features of the associative stratum “means of hiding information”, “indication of a route”, “connection with secret societies” which have frequent verbalization. The author uses and creates numerous cognitive metaphors to emphasize such features of the concept as “importance”, “a large number of mysteries”, “unattractiveness”, “size”, “shape”, “success”, “beauty” and “perfection”. The specificity of the axiological-evaluative stratum is that not all artworks receive positive evaluation. The symbolic stratum is lacking in the structure of the concept. The analysis reveals that the hypoconcept *ARCHITECTURE* has the most striking representation within each stratum of the concept, while the hypoconcept *THEATRE* (which is peculiar to the universal concept *ART*) is not expressed at all.

The determination of the core in the field-like content of the concept has shown that cognitive classification features of the concept such as “genres of art”, “exterior characteristics”, “emotional evaluation” and “aesthetic evaluation” are dominant in the conceptualization of art in the novels by Dan Brown. Some cognitive features show the close connection of the concept *ART* with other key concepts of the conceptual sphere of the writer: *MYSTERY*, *FEAR* and *RELIGION*.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In the works of Russian and Ukrainian linguists, idiostyle is understood as the “unity of concepts and cognitive structures of the author’s consciousness and their linguistic representation” (Tarasova, 2012, p. 11)

<sup>2</sup> According to Babenko and Kasarin (2005), the psycholinguistic experiment is aimed at analysing the conceptual perception of the text by a reader. It helps to determine the key words of the text on the basis of which the names of the concepts are revealed. During the experiment, the readers have to respond to a word-stimulus which is the title of the literary work with the words they associate with it. The most frequent reactions determine the key words of the text

## Bibliography

- Бабенко, Л. Г., Казарин, Ю. В. (2005). *Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. Теория и практика*. Москва: Флинта: Наука.
- Беспалова, О. Е. (2002). *Концептосфера поэзии Н.С.Гумилева в ее лексическом представлении. Автореф...канд. филол. наук*. Санкт-Петербург: Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А. И. Герцена.
- Brown, D. (2004). *The Da Vinci Code*. London: Corgi.
- . (2009). *The Lost Symbol*. London: Transworld Publishers.
- . (2013). *Inferno*. London: Transworld Publishers.
- . (2016). *Angels & Demons*. London: Transworld Publishers.
- Clausner, T. C., and Croft, W. (1999). Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 10 (1), 1–31.
- Crane, M. T. (2000). *Shakespeare's brain: Reading with cognitive theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Danaher, D. S. (2003). A cognitive approach to metaphor in prose: Truth and falsehood in Leo Tolstoy's 'The Death of Ivan Il'ich.' *Poetics Today*, 24, 439–469.
- Evans, V., and Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Evans, V. (2007). *A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.) *Linguistics in the morning calm* (pp. 111–138). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Freeman, M. H. (2002). Momentary stays, exploding forces: A cognitive linguistic approach to the poetics of Emily Dickinson and Robert Frost. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 30, 73–90.
- . (2006) From Metaphor to Iconicity in a Poetic Text. In Réka Benczes and Szilvia Csábi (Eds.) *The Metaphors of Sixty: Papers Presented on the Occasion of the 60th Birthday of Zoltán Kövecses* (pp. 127–135). Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- . (2007). Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Literary studies: State of the Art in Cognitive Poetics. In D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 1176–1195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (2012). George Eliot and Emily Dickinson: Poets of Play and Possibility. *The Emily Dickinson Journal*, 21(2), 37–58 •
- “gargantuan.” *Collins Online Dictionary*. Retrieved 13 Feb. 2018, from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/gargantuan>
- Gasparyan, S., Sargsyan, M. and Melik-Karamyan, A. (2016). Artistic Concept in the Cognitive Perspective. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 2 (16), 7–13.
- Hamilton, C. (2000). Cognitive poetics and H. D. *The Journal of Imagism*, 5, 3–9.

- Holland, N. (1988). *The brain of Robert Frost: A cognitive approach to literature*. London: Routledge.
- Jackendoff, R. (1992). *Languages of the Mind: Essays on Mental Representation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Кагановська, О. М. (2003). *Текстові концепти художньої прози: когнітивна та комунікативна динаміка (на матеріалі французької романістики середини ХХ сторіччя)*. Автореф. дис. ... д-ра філол. наук. Київ: КНЛУ.
- Караулов, Ю. Н. (1987). *Русский язык и языковая личность*. Москва: Наука.
- Kędra-Kardela, A. (2016). Fear in Gothic Fiction: A Cognitive Poetic Analysis of Angela Carter's "The Bloody Chamber". *Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich*, 59 (117), 13–23.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Красных, В. (1998). *Виртуальная реальность или реальная виртуальность? Человек. Сознание. Коммуникация*. Москва: Диалог–МГУ.
- Кубрякова, Е. С. *Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов*. Москва: МГУ.
- Kuczok, M. (2014). *The Conceptualisation of the Christian Life in John Henry Newman's Parochial and Plain Sermons*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (2001). *Metaphors we live by*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., and Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar volume I. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- "mammoth." Collins Online Dictionary. Retrieved 13 Feb. 2018, from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/mammoth>
- (2006). *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Margolis, E., and Laurence, M. (1999). *Concepts: Core Readings*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ніконова, В. Г. (2007). *Трагедійна картина світу в поезії Шекспіра*. Дніпропетровськ: ДУЕП.
- Peña Cervel, Sandra M. (1997–98). Pride and Prejudice: A cognitive analysis. *Cuadernos de Investigación Filologica*, 23–24, 233–255.
- Попова, З. Д., Стернин, И. А. (2007). *Когнитивная лингвистика*. Москва: АСТ: Восток-Запад.
- Приходько, А. Н. (2013). *Концепты и концептосистемы*. Днепрпетровск: Белая Е. А.
- Sinding, M. (2002). Assembling spaces: The conceptual structure of allegory. *Style*, 36, 503–523.
- Тарасова, И. А. (2010). Художественный концепт: диалог лингвистики и литературоведения. *Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского*, 4 (2), 742–745.
- Тарасова, И. А. (2012). *Поэтический идиостиль в когнитивном аспекте*. Москва: Флинта.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

*Address:  
National Mining University  
Electrotechnical Faculty  
Translation Department  
pr. Dmytra Yavornytskoho 19  
49600 Dnipro  
Ukraine  
perevodnmu@ukr.net*