

## LEXICAL AND PAREMIA OBJECTIVATION OF THE CONCEPT OF WEALTH IN THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

<sup>a</sup>PETRO MATSKIV, <sup>b</sup>VIRA KOTOVYCH, <sup>c</sup>LESIA LEHKA,  
<sup>d</sup>LYUBOV MELNYK, <sup>e</sup>LIDIA PROKOPOVYCH, <sup>f</sup>OKSANA  
FEDURKO

<sup>a,b,c,d,f</sup>*Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24,  
Ivan Franko Str., 82100, Drohobych, Ukraine*  
*<sup>e</sup>Mukachevo State University, 26, Uzhhorodska Str., 89600,  
Mukachevo, Ukraine*  
email: <sup>a</sup>*petro\_matskiv@ukr.net*, <sup>b</sup>*virako@ukr.net*,  
<sup>c</sup>*lesya.lehka@gmail.com*, <sup>d</sup>*lyubov.melnik.73@ukr.net*,  
<sup>e</sup>*tubek25gmail.com*, <sup>f</sup>*fedurko19@gmail.com*

**Abstract:** The article is devoted to outlining the peculiarities of objectification of the concept of БАГАТСТВО (WEALTH) in paremias, witnessed in the “Halatsko-ruski narodni prypovidky” (“Galicia-Ruthenian Folk Tales”) by Ivan Franko, in the context of the study of Ukrainian paremia units on the basis of linguo-cognitive approach. First, the lexical means of implementing the concept of WEALTH in lexicographic sources representing the functioning of the Ukrainian language in the period from the 11th to the beginning of the 21st century were analyzed using the method of dictionary definitions. Then, taking into account the established continuum of explicit concepts as core in the paremia, as well as relying on the method of conceptual analysis, the components of the concept of WEALTH within the corpus of Ukrainian paremiological units recorded by Ivan Franko were studied with the components of “wealth”, “wealthy”, “a wealthy man”. It was found that in Ukrainian paremias the concept of WEALTH is mostly objectified in the following frames: WEALTH AS A PERSONIFICATION OF PERSONALITY; WEALTH AS IGNORANCE OF POVERTY; WEALTH FROM EVIL; WEALTH IS MONEY. The principles of objectification of the collective consciousness related to the concept of WEALTH are traced with the help of one or another frame, the parameters of each frame are identified, the factors influencing the existence of a certain type of collective consciousness and its implementation in paremia units are outlined.

**Keywords:** Cognitive model, Concept of WEALTH, Conceptual metaphor, Conceptual metonymy, Conceptualization, Frame, Paremia, Paremia unit.

### 1 Introduction

Today, the problems of the relationship between linguistic thinking and the social environment of the individual, the reflection in the deep layers of the conceptual sphere of the uniqueness of ethnocultural features of society are becoming especially relevant. The solution of these problems is connected with a detailed study of the structure of the collective language consciousness, in which universal notions coexist with the national, ethnospecific ones. Among the linguistic expressions of such a collective consciousness, paremias claim the leading place, which are considered a means of preserving and transmitting human experience, people’s culture, traditions, customs, and established characteristics [16, p. 68].

The inconsistency of the interpretation of the place of paremias in linguistics causes increasingly more attention to their study - beginning with the traditional, according to which paremias are included in the phraseological system of the language on the basis of common features of stability, integrity, reproducibility, expressiveness with phraseology, to the polar opposite one, emphasizing their proximity to sentences, communicative and syntactic structure, which is characteristic of syntactic units, the diversity of the study of paremias, which, in turn, determines a different set of characteristics and functions, as well as unequal role in the system of units of speech and speaking activity. Recently, given the ability of paremias to most clearly reflect the national and cultural specifics of the categorization of the world, as well as their ability to identify and describe the typical realities of society, they are increasingly seen as a means of objectifying certain concepts.

The concept of WEALTH is the central universal concept of human culture, the expression of the linguistic consciousness of representatives of different linguistic cultures and social communities. In Slavic linguistics, there is a number of works devoted to the analyzed concept, both on the material of the Ukrainian language and other languages. Ukrainian linguistic studies are represented by the works of such scientists as I. Paten, T. Moroz, H. Cheremysina, I. Golubovska, and others. I. Paten, in particular, conducted a comparative analysis of binary

concepts of “wealth – poverty” in Slavic phraseology (on the material of Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish languages), resulting in the finding that the concepts of “wealth – poverty” are closely related to the presence / absence of money, these concepts are perceived differently in different language cultures: the Slavs usually condemn wealth, for them it (wealth) is not an indicator of success, so most paremias have a negative connotation. The author also noted that Slavic culture is permeated by the pathos of spirituality, which clearly differentiates between material and spiritual wealth [21]. Polish paremia units with antonymous components which denote the social sphere of human life were studied by T. Moroz, who singled out thematic subgroups “Wealthy vs poor”, “Wealth vs poverty”, “Lord vs peasant” and analyzed the paremias in these subgroups, namely the subject of characterization of the social status of man, as well as the relationship between wealthy and poor [20]. The linguistic and cultural concept of WEALTH in the context of its objectification by innovative units in the American language picture of the world (based on the journalistic discourse of the United States) became the object of the study by H. Cheremysina [5]. I. Holubovska [11] devoted her studies to the analysis of the concepts of wealth and poverty in national pictures of the world, including the Ukrainian one, with the distinction of the national peculiarities of a certain ethnic community, which were formed under the influence of historical and social factors.

In Polish linguistics, K. Sobolewska and B. Rodziewicz raise this issue among others. For example, K. Sobolewska considers the concept of wealth in her work “Bieda i bogactwo w życiu dawnych Mazurów i Warmiaków”. This study is based on the dialect material collected with the help of the field method by Warsaw dialectologists. It describes cultural phenomena (stereotypes), two of which (the state of wealth determines every aspect of life; a wealthy man is always someone else) are devoted to the outlined problem [26]. B. Rodziewicz highlights the problem of wealth as an axiomatic unit in the linguistic consciousness of Poles, Russians, and Germans in the socio-cultural dimension [24].

Russian linguists G. Izhbayeva and A. Mirzagaliev consider the concept of “wealth” in the paremic units of the Russian language [15], and E. Gracheva – in a comparative aspect on the material of Russian and English proverbs and sayings [8].

The relevance of the proposed study is due to the need for further study of the paremia system of the Ukrainian language, which is implemented on the basis of cognitive models that contribute to a more complete and adequate disclosure of the semantics of paremia units with the conceptual meaning of wealth. In addition, the study of the scientific problem within a certain period of time allows clarifying the peculiarities of the implementation of a certain amount of knowledge and ideas about the reality of the cognitive model, parameterize the external outlines of the model and trace the possibilities of internal structuring, determine the potential of the development of a quantum of knowledge and the indicative vector of this development.

The purpose of the article is to outline the peculiarities of objectification of the concept of WEALTH in Ukrainian paremia units. Ivan Franko’s “Galicia-Ruthenian Folk Tales”, the material of which has not yet been the subject of a comprehensive study in this aspect, served as a source base.

### 2 Materials and Methods

The view of paremia as a cognitive model is determined by its very nature (prelogical expression of logical relations) and functioning. Cognitive linguistics connects the problems of the study of forms representing knowledge and the very structure of knowledge enclosed in human consciousness into a single node. Proverbial mini-texts as typical and reproducible utterances are

part of the general system of information processing in the space of language as a cognitive system.

Given the chosen perspective of the study of paremias, the most adequate means of organizing the selected factual material, in our opinion, is the frame. This systematizing unit makes it possible to identify the mechanisms of conceptualization of the phenomena of the surrounding reality related to the concept of *wealth* within the paremia body, to establish the internal hierarchy of the concept and accordingly build a frame model of it.

Researching the problem of frame organization, linguists are not unanimous in understanding the concept of frame. It is qualified as a set of standardized actual and potential knowledge about phenomena that have a complex multicomponent structure [23, p. 82-83], or as a cognitive model that represents knowledge and assessments related to specific, often recurring situations [29, p. 259; 31, p. 211], or as a unit of knowledge organized around a concept that contains information about what is essential, typical, and possible for that concept within a particular culture [6, p. 17; 17, p. 140]. In view of this, in the proposed work, the frame, following its final understanding by Charles Fillmore, is identified with cognitive structures, knowledge of which is associated with concepts represented by words [7, p. 314].

Frames as a hierarchically organized data structure can be correlated with paremia in two ways. Firstly, paremia is a manifestation of the presence of a frame, and most often this frame or its component is presented in a linguistic form by means of a proverb. Secondly, the frame is the reference space to which one or more components of the paremia are referred as a presupposition (i.e., the necessary additional knowledge) [28]. Without the presumption, the meaning of the statement remains unclear.

The study of paremias using a frame model of knowledge representation involves identifying: a) typical structures of knowledge reflected in paremias; b) typical frames involved in the formation of the presupposition of statements with a general referent: "frame as a tool that allows attracting part of the so-called extralingual information" [7].

Speaking about the role of the frame in the formation of the presupposition, it should be emphasized that the language unit receives reference not directly, but always through the frame inclusion, which is an intermediary between the meaning of the language unit and its symbolic function. Another important concept related to the frame is normativeness. The frame is a priori set as the norm (behavioral, cognitive). In this sense, it turns out that paremia can set the norm, and can include this norm in the presupposition, thus forming its pragmatic potential.

The frames will be studied on the basis of the theory of cognitive metaphor. Metaphor in modern cognitive linguistics is defined as "mental operation as a way of knowing, categorizing, conceptualizing, evaluating, and explaining the world" [1, p. 11; 25]. The essence of the cognitive theory of metaphor, developed by American scientists G. Lakoff and M. Johnson in the monograph "Metaphors we live by", lies in the fact that "...at the heart of metaphorical processes, there are procedures for processing knowledge structures – frames and scenarios. The knowledge realized in frames and scenarios is a generalized experience of human interaction with the world around us – both with the world of objects and society" [18, p. 157] (Lakoff says that "according to the theory of conceptual metaphor, metaphorization is based on the process of interaction of two structures of knowledge (frames and scenarios) of two conceptual domains – sphere-source (source domain) and sphere-target (target domain)" [18].

Following Y. Stepanov, we consider the concept as an operational semantic unit of thinking, a quantum of structured knowledge. On the one hand, it includes what is the meaning of the concept, on the other hand – what makes the concept a cultural phenomenon: etymology, associative series, evaluations and connotations (additional semantic or stylistic nuances that

overlap with the basic meaning of the word and serve to express emotionally expressive coloring. It is obvious that the layer of vocabulary meanings, which are fixed by the analyzed lexemes, has the greatest cognitive significance and priority from the functional and cognitive point of view, which determines in our case the separation of wealth as a basic level of categorization.

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 The Semantic Scope of the Wealth Lexeme in the Ukrainian Language

The semantic space of the *wealth* lexeme in the ancient Ukrainian language is formed around the conceptual core formed by the meanings of the lexemes *wealth* and *wealthy*, which reflect the our ancestors' understanding of the outlined concept. The semantic realm of 'wealth' has nuclear, perinuclear, and peripheral zones. It represents the notion of wealth in the context of awareness of its ethnocultural specifics at different stages of the Ukrainian language functioning.

The origins of the semantic space are clarified in some way by the etymology of the root of "bogat" of Proto-Slavic origin "the one who has a large allotment". This word, in turn, is formed from \*bog "destiny, property, wealth" [4, p. 109]. The original meaning of wealth – "bogat" – is associated with Indo-European vocabulary with the meaning of "divide, receive a share, endow" [4, p. 29]. The above-mentioned lexeme is found in most Slavic languages (Compare: Ukrainian *багатуї*, Old Slavic *богатъ*, Bulgarian *богатъ*, Serbo-Croatian *богат*, Slovenian *bogàt*, Czech *bohatý*, Polish *bogaty*, Upper Sorbian *bohaty*, Lower Sorbian *bogaty*). Later, as we will see, the root "bogat" loses its original meaning and is more realized in the structure of the original meanings of the word \*bog "destiny, property, wealth".

The nuclear zone of the analyzed semantic sphere is formed by the direct meanings of the lexemes *wealth*, *wealthy*. According to most researchers, the core of the concept of "богатство" ("wealth") is verbalized not only by the lexeme of the same name, but also by the adjective "багатий" ("wealthy") in its basic meanings, while other meanings belong to the perinuclear zone.

The meaning of the word "богатство" ("wealth") in the materials for the dictionary of the ancient Russian language by I. Sreznevsky is interpreted on the basis of Greek and Latin equivalents: πλούτος "wealth"; "abundance"; "happiness"; divitiae "wealth" [27, p. 126] (The authors of some etymological dictionaries believe that the analyzed lexeme structurally corresponds to the Latin "fortunatus" meaning "rich" (from "fortuna", "wealth, happiness, destiny")). The dictionary presents three phonetic variants of the word "wealth": богатство, богатество та богатъствие. Giving such a number, I. Sreznevsky in the dictionary article Ostannee Slovo ("The Last Word") explains what gives us the reason to speculate about the expansion of the semantics of the word with the help of the mentioned equivalents, while adding another Greek one χρηματα, which means "property, good, wealth"; "money". In support of this, the author cites an excerpt from the 11th century cultural property of the Ostromir Gospels (1073): Не оудобъ имащимъ богатъствие въ Царствіе Божіе вѣнати (Лук. 18:24). (How hardly shall they have riches enter into the kingdom of God! (Luke 18:24)).

Let us note that, according to the Greek lexicon of Strong, the very mentioned word χρηματα is contained in the Greek text of the quoted Gospel, which is translated in the memo with the lexeme of богатъствие (wealth) [9]. If we compare modern Ukrainian translations of the Bible by I. Ohienko, or I. Khomenko, or R. Turkonyak, none of them accurately reproduces the Greek text: Як побачив Ісус, що той засумував, то промовив: Як тяжко багатим увійти в Царство Боже!.. (When Jesus saw that he was sad, he said: How hard it is for the rich to enter the Kingdom of God!..) Instead, the translations made in the nineteenth century are closer to the original: Побачивши ж його Ісус, що вельми сумний став, рече: Як

тяжко багатства маючи увійти в царство Боже! (When Jesus saw him, he was very sad, and said, "How hard it is for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God!"). The Greek words πλούτος, χρήματα translated into Ukrainian, as we have tried to prove, should be translated with different lexemes, respectively багатий and багатство (wealthy and wealth) [9]. The sources of the illustrated material of Sreznevsky's dictionary allow speaking about the functioning of the following meanings of the lexeme багатство (wealth) in the Ukrainian language of the 11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries: 1. Material values, money. 2. High moral qualities. The development of the latter meaning is connected first of all with the active spread of Christianity, with the translations of Christian literature into the Old Slavonic language.

In the dictionary of the Old Ukrainian language of the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, this word is absent, which is probably due to the fact that it was built on the basis of secular cultural properties written in the Ukrainian language of that time. Cultural properties of the cult character weren't under study [13, p. 10-11]. This middle-of-the-road approach does not contribute to the complete coverage of the vocabulary of the Ukrainian language of this period.

The time period of 16<sup>th</sup> - the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century significantly expanded the semantic palette of meanings of this word:

1. Large property, valuables, money;
2. Abundance of everything, luxury;
3. The set of material values;
4. Large number, diversity;
5. Indirect: something very important, valuable, significant [3, p. 134-135].

The semantic structure of the word *багатство* (wealth), on the one hand, maintains a connection with the original meaning of the word ("great property"), and on the other hand expands its semantic space. Of particular interest is the metaphorical construction *вечное богатство* (eternal wealth) meant as "paradise", "eternal kingdom" (ibid, p.135), in which we observe the separation of the sacred spectrum of this concept, which harmonizes with the Christian understanding of wealth.

According to linguists, "the vocabulary of the 18<sup>th</sup> - late 19<sup>th</sup> century in Ukrainian lexicography is represented mainly by translated dictionaries, the explanatory aspect of which is presented only sporadically, which makes it difficult to fix lexical and semantic features of words" [19, p. 113-114]. That is why we will study this period on the basis of the sources of illustrative material from the Little Russian-German dictionary of Ye. Zhelekhivskiy and S. Nedil'skiy, the Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of Umanets and Spilka, the dictionary of the Ukrainian language, edited by B. Hrinchenko. Malorussian-German Dictionary translates the analyzed lexeme with such words as *der Reichtum* "wealth, luxury, richness" and *die Wohlhabenheit* "wealth" [32, p. 35]. The Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of M. Umanets and A. Spilka gives the following equivalents of Russian *богатство* (wealth): 1. *багатство, скарб* (wealth, treasure). 2. *розкіш, пишність* (luxury, splendor) [30]. Instead, the dictionary of the Ukrainian language, edited by B. Hrinchenko, fixes this word as a monofamily vocation [12, p. 17]. The lack of meanings of the whole semantic spectrum of the analyzed lexeme is rather evidence of insufficient elaboration of artistic, religious, chronicle sources of this period and/or professionalism of linguists, the level of Ukrainian linguistics in general.

In lexicographical sources of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> - first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the studied lexeme continues to function with primary and secondary meanings that are characteristic of the Ukrainian language since the 16<sup>th</sup> century [3, p. 83].

The meaning of the word багатий (rich) in Sreznevskiy's dictionary is interpreted (as well as багатство (wealth) with the help of Greek and Latin equivalents: πλούτος "wealth"; "abundance"; "happiness", dives "rich, wealthy, well-off"

(Srezn., 127-128). It is typical to use the analyzed lexeme in the sense of adjective and noun. Interestingly, the same functioning is typical for all subsequent periods of the Ukrainian language. In the 11<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, there were no changes in the semantic structure of the word, while in the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries the emergence of additional semantic shades of meaning took place, along with traditional, initiated in previous periods:

1. "The one who has great values, property, money", "wealthy";
2. "The one who has something in abundance";
3. "Big, sufficient";
4. "Lush, luxurious, very beautiful";
5. "Valuable, dear";
6. "Spiritually higher" [3, p. 136-137].

As we have noted, the 18<sup>th</sup> -19<sup>th</sup> centuries are still insufficiently represented in Ukrainian lexicography, so the data on this period are selective and do not give a complete picture. The semantics of the lexeme багатий (wealthy) is no exception: in the MaloRussian-German dictionary, it corresponds to the words *reich* "wealthy" and *reinlich* (Zhelekh., p. 35). The latter word in German is polysemantic. Only in one of the meanings ("багатий, розкішний" which means "rich, luxurious") can it be the semantic equivalent of the Ukrainian variant. Its other meanings – "рясний" as well as "поживний, ситний" (abundant as well as nutritious, nourishing) do not correlate with the idea of wealth. The Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of M. Umanets and A. Spilka records the following meanings of the Russian word богатый: "грошовитий, (дуже) – багатіючий, (не дуже) – багатенький, заможний". Here we see an attempt to represent values using descriptive constructions. We come across a similar practice in the Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, ed. by B. Hrinchenko (Compare: "1. Who has wealth" // rich in what; rich in words". 2. "Valuable") [12, p. 17]. In the lexicographical sources of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> - first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the semantic scope of the mentioned lexeme is preserved, objectifying the meanings of previous periods. However, the meaning of "духовні цінності" (spiritual values) is not found [3, p. 78], although we consider the phrase Багатий вечір (*Wealthy evening* (word for word translation), which means Christmas Eve, when many different dishes are served). The considered semantic space of lexemes багатство, багатий (wealth, wealthy) is the basis for the conceptual analysis of paremia units, which objectifies the outlined concept based on frame modeling.

### 3.2 Frame Representation of the Concept «Багатство» (Wealth): Paremia Segment

The concept of wealth is verified in the analyzed lexicographic source in the following frames: WEALTH AS A PERSONIFICATION OF PERSONALITY; WEALTH AS AN ANTITHESIS OF POVERTY; WEALTH IS MONEY; WEALTH FROM EVIL. Let us analyze the slot filling of selected frames in the system of conceptual metaphors.

FRAMEWORK WEALTH AS PERSONIFICATION OF PERSONALITY objectifies the psychological characteristics of a rich person, his character traits, which are characterized by certain ambivalence, due to the complexity and multifaceted nature of this mental unit, as they contain many linguistic and cognitive properties of binary type. Character traits as basic components of the macroconcept "character" determine the qualitative specificity of character and are able to reflect its dynamic characteristics, being largely the result of socialization of the individual under the influence of environmental conditions, customs, traditions, and others.

Being manifested as typical and distinctive features of a person, character traits can serve as a basis for reflecting the conceptual understanding of багатство (wealth) in the paremia segment of the naive picture of the world of Ukrainians in the diachronic dimension. There is an asymmetry in the expression of positive / negative traits of a rich person (which is generally typical for this type of units), the verbalizers of which are cognate lexemes

багатий, багач, багачий (wealthy, wealthy man, well-off) and other descriptive constructions. Isolated cases of positive characterization are based on conceptual metaphors, the source of which is the somatic sphere-donor (голова (head): О, то головач! (What a big-head!)). However, in this case, there is no original conceptual sphere, which contributes to the expansion of the semantic space of the donor sphere: it is not only wise, but also rich, proud person. As we can see, here the concept of pride is interpreted in a positive sense, although the negative attitude towards this trait is dominant. This is particularly vividly demonstrated by the paremia Отто рогата душа! (What a stubborn soul!). The source of the expansion of conceptual metaphorization is the oxymoronic spheres-donors: the devil (secondary name рогатий (horned)), the soul, which already explicates "a proud, stubborn, disobedient person". Religious, or rather Christian meanings are conveyed by the paremia Гордий карк пригне Господь до землі with the meaning "to humble a proud man". The next proverb Стоїш високо – не будь гордим, стоїш низько – не журися (You stand high – do not be proud, you stand low – do not get upset) nominates the rules of life wisdom. The last two proverbs are based on orientational metaphors, which structure different conceptual spheres according to basic (non-metaphorical) linear orientations in space, based on sensory experience. Such metaphors give the concept a spatial orientation with oppositions to "top – bottom", "inside – outside", "front – back", and so on. In our case, the mentioned orientation metaphors conceptualize the idea of "top – bottom" (Lord - earth; High - low). In general, any progress or positive development is perceived as an upward movement, while decline and destruction are associated with a downward movement. The last of these proverbs does not reflect the idea of being below as a certain negation, but only conveys the quasi-antimony of relationships.

The idea of greed, avarice of a rich man, reflected in the proverbs Хто багатий, той не любить дати (He who is rich does not like to give); Хто багача має, той ще жадає (He who is wealthy is insatiable); Богач би око виймив за кавалок хліб (A wealthy man would take your eye out for a piece of bread); Богач два рази єдно їв би (A wealthy man would eat the same thing twice); Богач крає дрібно (A wealthy man cuts thin slices); Богач сі трясє над грейцаром (A wealthy man fusses over every penny), it is based on substituting the meanings of predicate words and phrases (не любить, ще жадає, око виймив, єдно два рази їв би, крає дрібно, трясє над грейцаром). In turn, these units represent such domains as hatred, greed, unhappiness, insatiability, avarice, trembling hands. Such metaphorical orientations are by no means arbitrary – they are based on our physical and cultural experience.

The peculiarity of the considered frame is its single conceptual characteristic based on the metaphorization of the zoomorphic donor sphere: Як би не був свиноватий, то би не був багатий. (If he weren't piggy, he wouldn't be wealthy.) Negative characterization of the rich is objectified with the help of such areas of donors as boastfulness, laziness, thievery (Compare: Багатого з хвастливим не розпізнаєш (You can't tell apart a rich man and a boastful one); Без лайдацтва нема багатства (Without laziness there is no wealth); Хто не злодійкуватий, то не буде багатий (He who is not a thief will not be rich)). A peculiar result of the negation of the rich man is the semantic content of paremias Тіло в золоті, а душа в мерзоті... в болоті (The body's in gold while the soul's in the swamp) (orientation metaphor body - soul) or Богача хіба землі свїята нагодє (The soil is what will feed a rich man). The slot content of this frame illustrates a scenario in which wealth is usually obtained not in a very honest way, but by human wrongdoing, avarice and greed, meanness, inhumanity, and so on.

The frame WEALTH AS AN ANTITHESIS OF POVERTY is represented by proverbs, the format of which involves the opposition of these concepts within a single paremic unit. That is, two situations are objectified and compared. These differences (obviously, it is more correct to say), in many cases are based on rich ignoring the poor, on avoiding company with him, meetings (Багатий бідного й знати не хоче... не пізнає

(The rich do not want to know the poor)). He is not interested in material deprivation, needs, his family: Богач не відає, що бідний обїдає (The rich man does not know that the poor man eats); Богач не знає, що бідному дольгає (The rich man does not know what bothers the poor man); Богач ся дивує, чим ся вбогий годує (The rich man watches as the poor man feeds); Богач ся дивує, чим убогий діти годує (The rich man wonders what the poor man feeds his children with). Своєрідністю семантичного наповнення відзначається паремія The peculiarity of the semantic content is present in the paremia Куди журови до паски! (It won't do to be sad at Easter!) In it, the source of the goal and the donor sphere are expressed in abstract terms: sorrow and Easter. These conceptual metaphors express, on the one hand, the Christian interpretation of this proverb, which consists in joy, the glorification of Christ's Resurrection against the background of sorrow (where there is sorrow, there is no God). Then, apparently, there is desacralization of these meanings. Joy and sorrow begin to objectify the rich and the poor, respectively (the poor are saddened by their material needs, the rich rejoice in sufficient or large fortunes).

Rich people are very often lucky, and even unfavorable circumstances often turn out well for them, while the poor cannot take advantage of the most useful ones. When a rich man does something stupid or behaves badly, he is forgiven in front of people (Богачеві вітер гроші несе, а бідному пологою очі засипає (The wind brings money to the rich, and scatters the eyes of the poor with chaff); Богача і серп голит, а вбогого і бритва не хоче (The sickle shaves the rich, but the razor won't shave the poor); Богачеві можна й чорта з'їсти, а бідному засі (A rich man is allowed to do anything while a poor man is not); Богачу все вїде (A rich man can get away with anything)).

Rich person has respect, everyone clings to him, and no one to the poor. Even after death, he is honored better than a poor man (В багатого приятелів багато, а в бідного ні одного (The rich have many friends, but the poor have none); Умер багатий: ходім ховати! Умер убогий: шкода дороги (The rich man died: let's go bury! The poor one died: sorry for the time spent on the way)).

The frame WEALTH IS MONEY in the studied paremy fund finds its expression in proverbs, a component of which is the concept of the same name (the sphere of the source of the goal), which functions in the sense of 'a wealthy man': Коли гроші говорять, то всі мусять губи постулювати (When money speaks, everyone must shut their mouths); Грошом усюди місце дають (Money is given place everywhere); Де бринькачі [гроші], там і слухачі (Where there is money, there are listeners); Тепер за гроші й до неба зайдеш (Now for the money you will go to heaven); Тепер все за гроші, лише рідна мама ні (Now all is for money, except for the mother); Хто має гроші, той все хороший (He who has money is always good); Де гроші говорять, там ти розумє мовчи (Where money speaks, keep silent, brain). The given examples testify to the use of somatic and anthroponymic spheres-donors. They make it possible to construct such a scenario: the rich is revered everywhere, sometimes despite his intellectual poverty. He enjoys to be accepted in serious societies, he, with few exceptions, can buy everything (even paradise). This scenario is somewhat dissonant about wealth (money), when it comes to their projection on the cognitive and analytical abilities of man, due to which the intelligence of the individual is formed (Compare: Ліпший розум, як готові гроші (It's better to have brains rather than ready money); Розуму за гроші не купиш (You can't buy brains for money); Хто має гроші, той має розум (He who has money has brains); Без розуму гроші розтратиш (You will waste money without brains)). Money is also associated with misery, but this view does not prevail in the paremic discourse under study. (Великі гроші – готова біда (Big money is a ready misfortune); Гроші біду робит (Money makes trouble)).

The frame WEALTH FROM EVIL demonstrates the mythological paremic segment of the naive picture of the world

of Ukrainians. Demonology as a component of mythology occupies an important place in the worldview of Ukrainians. According to V. Halaychuk's observations, there is every reason to believe that this mythological level, based mainly on the belief in the afterlife and the so-called "cult of ancestors", was more significant than ideas about higher deities also in pre-Christian times [10, p. 88]. One of the central characters of demonological discourse is the devil (demon), whose idea still exists today, objectifying the generalized concept of "evil force", gathering under the umbrella of almost all other demonic beings. Paremia unit Богатий, як чорт лабатий ...рогатий (Rich as the devil) refers us to Ukrainian legends, according to which, according to I. Franko, the devil is considered the lord and ruler of earthly riches, one of the most common negative characters of ancient Ukrainian mythology and demonology of the Christian era [22, p. 12].

A kind of continuation of this idea may be paremia Богач – певно хованцьи має (A rich man must have a goblin), after all, according to the ancient beliefs of Ukrainians, goblin is an evil spirit, brought up from a chicken egg, which gives wealth to those who write down their souls to him. The rich man instead gives his soul to the devil. The goblin is also called the house devil. This indicates that the ideas of the devil belong to the most archaic layers of Slavic demonology.

There are also plots among Ukrainians where the devil resembles the West Slavic enriching spirit known as the snake. Belief in the impure origin of wealth is reflected in the next paremia Богатому дідько доносить... додає (The devil keeps the rich man). According to mythology, after the rich man's death, the devil takes away his good. Devils also allegedly protect hidden treasures from people: Богач гроші складає, а дідько мошонку шиє... чорт калитку. (The rich man saves up the money, while the devil takes it away). There are close good relations between the rich and the wicked, according to which Богатому й чорт діти колише. (The devil even rocks the rich man's children in the cradle). Such relationships are not typical of other groups (Богатому чорт діти колише, а бідному і нянька не хоче (The devil even rocks the rich man's children in the cradle while even a nanny refuses to do that for the poor man's kids)).

#### 4 Conclusion

Lexicographic research is considered to be the basis for explication of the concept, because in its process the defining meaningful indicators of the concept are revealed in the minds of native speakers of the conceptual sphere, thanks to which the concept receives vocabulary objectification in each token, representing the corresponding levels of abstraction.

Semantic space of a lexeme багатство (wealth) is formed around the conceptual core formed by the meanings of lexemes багатство (wealth), багатий (wealthy). As the material shows, the nuclear zone of the concept of WEALTH consists of the meanings of the eponymous lexeme "Big property, values, money", "Set of material values", as well as the lexeme багатий (wealthy) ("Who has great values, property, money", "Who has plenty of something"). The perinuclear zone of this concept is represented by the meanings "large numbers, diversity" (figurative: "Something very important, valuable, significant"), characteristic of both tokens. In the peripheral zone, we find the meaning of "spiritually higher", which is not typical for all periods of functioning of the Ukrainian language.

A comprehensive frame description of the paremiats of the Ukrainian language, attested in Ivan Franko's "Halysko-ruski narodni pryrovodky", showed that the most frequent frames were: WEALTH AS PERSONIFICATION OF PERSONALITY; WEALTH IS MONEY; WEALTH FROM EVIL. The frame generally generates an internal form of paremia, acting as a metalanguage tool for the direct facts of speech and speaking. In most paremiats, verbal activity is described through a correlation with another frame, known and acceptable within the same cultural model, based on customs and traditions. However, there are a small number of proverbs and

sayings that postulate the frame itself, actually introducing it through paremia.

#### Literature:

1. Baranov, A.N. (2004). Kognitivnaya teoriya metafory: pochti 20 let spustya. In *Lakoff Dzh., Dzhonson M., Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem*, 7–21. Moscow: Yeditorial URSS.
2. Belova, T.M., & Kolomiets, S.V. (2016). K voprosu o spetsifike kontseptov "bogaty chelovek" i "bedny chelovek" v russkoy i tanzaniyskoy kulturakh. *Culture and Civilization*, 6/6A, 194–204. Available at: [publishing-vak.ru/file/archive-culture-2016-6/18-belova-kolomiets.pdf](http://publishing-vak.ru/file/archive-culture-2016-6/18-belova-kolomiets.pdf).
3. Bilodid, I.K., et al. (Eds.) (1970). *Slovnnyk Ukrainskoi movy* Kyiv: Naukova dumka (SUM), 11(1).
4. Boldyriev, R.V., & Kolomiets, V.T., et al. (1982). *Etymologichnyi slovnnyk ukrainskoi movy*. In Melnychuk, O.S., Kolomiets, V.T., Lukinova, T.B., Skliarenko, V. H., and Tkachenko, O. B. (Eds). Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 7(1: A–H).
5. Cheremysina, H.O. (2021). *Obiektivatsiia linhvokulturnoho kontseptu WEALTH innovatsiynomy odnyntsiamy v amerykanskkii movnii kartyni svitu*. Doctoral Dissertation. Zaporizhzhia.
6. Deyk, T.A. (2000). *Yazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikatsiya*. Blagoveshchensk: BGK named after I. A. Boduena de Kurtene.
7. Fillmore, C.J., & Baker, C.A. (2010). Frames Approach to Semantic Analysis. In B. Heine, and H. Narrog (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, 313–340. Oxford: Oxford Un-ty Press.
8. Gracheva, Ye. A. (2017). Analiz kontseptu "bogatstvo" na materiale russkoyazychnykh i angloyazychnykh posloviat i pogovorok. *Yazyk i tekst langpsy.ru*, 4(3), 129–138. DOI: 10.17759/langt.2017040313.
9. *Grecheskiy Leksikon Stronga*. (2022). Bob Jones University. Available at: <http://www.godrules.net/library/Slavic/>.
10. Halaichuk, V. (2016). Chort yak personazh tradytsiinoi demonolohii Polissia. *Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu Lvivskoho universytetu*, 17, 73–96. Available at: <https://cli.o.lnu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/8-9.pdf>.
11. Holubovska, I.O. (2004). *Emichni osoblyvosti movnykh kartyn svitu*. Kyiv: Logos.
12. Hrinchenko, B.D. (1907). Uporiadnyk z dod. vlas. materialu. *Slovar ukrainskoi movy*, 1. Kyiv.
13. Hrynchshyn, D. (Eds.) (1994). *Slovnnyk ukrainskoi movy XVI – pershoi polovyny XVII st., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed*. Lviv: Vidrozhennia.
14. Hrynchshyn, D.H., Humetska, L.L., & Kernytskyi, I.M. (1977). *Slovnnyk staroukrainskoi movy XIV–XV st., 1 ed*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
15. Izhbaeva, G.R., & Myrzagalieva, A.S. (2018). Kontsept "bogatstvo" v paremiologicheskikh edynitsakh russkogo yazyka. *Vestnik Volzhskogo universiteta imeni V.N. Tatishcheva*, 2/2, 108–114. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontsept-bogatstvo-v-paremiologicheskikh-edynitsah-russkog-o-yazyka/viewer>.
16. Juskiw, B. (2013). Paremiina kartyna svitu: problemy doslidzhennia. *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, 1, 67–73.
17. Koliadenko, O.O. (2013). Termin freim u linhvistytsi. *Terminologichnyi visnyk*, 2(1), 139–144. Available at: <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/51266/15-Koliadenko.pdf?sequence=1>.
18. Lakoff, Dzh., & Dzhonson, M. (2004). *Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem*. In A.N. Baranov (Eds.) Moscow: Yeditorial URSS.
19. Matskiy, P.V., & Botvyn, T.M. (2021). Semantychnyi obshyr leksem dobro, dobryi: slovnkovy-diakhronnyi aspekt. *Naukovyi visnyk Drohobyskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Seria: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo)*, 15, 111–117. Available at: [http://ddpu-filolvisnyk.com.ua/uploads/arkhiv-nomerov/2021/NV\\_2021\\_15/22.pdf](http://ddpu-filolvisnyk.com.ua/uploads/arkhiv-nomerov/2021/NV_2021_15/22.pdf).
20. Moroz, T. (2020). Polski paremiini odnyntsi z antonimichnymy komponentamy na poznachennia sotsialnoi sfery zhyttia liudyny. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*, 28(3), 4–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.3/28.208728>.
21. Paten, I. (2018). Linhvokulturnolohichni kontsepty "bahatstvo – bidnist" u slovianskii paremiolohii. *Ridne slovo v*

*etnokulturnomu vymiri*. Drohobych: Posvit, 59–68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2411-4758.2018.140229>.

22. Plachynda, S.P. (1993). *Slovnyk davnoukrajinskoj mifolohii*. Kyiv: Ukr. Pysmennyk.

23. Popova, Z.D., & Sternin, I.A. (2007). *Semantiko-kognitivnyy analiz yazyka*. Voronezh: Istoki.

24. Rodziewicz, B. (2017). “Gdybym był bogaty...” Bogactwo jako jednostka aksjotyczna w świadomości językowej Polaków, Rosjan i Niemców...” *Slavica Wratislaviensia CLXV*. Wrocław, 339–347. DOI: 10.19195/0137-1150.165.30.

25. Shevchenko, I., & Shastalo, V. (2021). The conceptual metaphor of modesty in English and Ukrainian. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 21, article 2462. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/>.

26. Sobolewska, K. (2021). Bieda i bogactwo w życiu dawnych Mazurów i Warmiaków. [W:] *J. Porayski-Pomsta, K. Sobolewska* (Eds.). *Polszczyzna jest zobowiązaniem, a dla niektórych pasją*, 79–97. Tom prac ofiarowanych Prof. Barbarze Falińskiej w 90 rocznicę urodzin. Warszawa.

27. Sreznjevskiy, I.I. (1958). *Materialy dlya slovary drevnerusskogo yazyka*. M.: Gosudarstvennoe izd-vo inostrannykh i natsionalnykh slovary, 3(1).

28. Stepanov, V.V. & Shvachko, S.O. (2016). Freymove modelyuvannya kontseptiv na materialy paralelnogo korpusu paremiy. *Filologichni traktati*, 8(1), 69–78. Available at: <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/44516>.

29. Talmy, L. (2000). Lexicalization patterns. In L. Talmy (Eds.) *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*, 21–146. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

30. Umanets, M., Komarov, M., & Spilka, A. (Eds.). (1893). *Slovar rosiisko-ukrainskyi*. In K. Bednarskyiy (Eds.) Lviv: Z druk. Nauk. tovarystva im. Shevchenka, Vol. I–IV. Available at: <https://r2u.org.ua>.

31. Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H.J. (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

32. Zhelekhivskiy, Ye., & Nediilskiy, S. (1886). *Malorusko-nimetskyi slovnyk*. Lviv: Z drukarni tov. im. Shevchenka, 2(1).

**Primary Paper Section: A**

**Secondary Paper Section: AI**