

KOSTIANTYN MIZIN / OLEXANDR PETROV

Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda State Pedagogical University

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubinsky State Pedagogical University

## **METAPHORICAL MODELLING OF COGNITIVE STRUCTURE OF THE CONCEPT *STINGINESS* IN BRITISH, GERMAN, UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN LINGUOCULTURES**

**KEYWORDS:** contrastive linguoculturology, concept of stinginess, metaphoric models, cognitive structure

**ABSTRACT:** This article deals with determining peculiarities of metaphorical modelling of cognitive structure of the concept *STINGINESS* in British, German, Ukrainian and Russian linguocultures by the way of analysing phraseological objectivation of the concept in the light of the relevant contrastive-linguoculturological approach. The authors establish that mainly common metaphoric models lie at the basis of the metaphors representing the concept *STINGINESS*. It is determined that despite the prevalence of metaphors containing common meaning of stinginess in the researched linguocultures distinct prevalence of common cognitive features over the specific ones within the metaphors themselves (metaphoric models), the concept *STINGINESS* is largely filled with ethnically and linguoculturally specific meanings in the contrasted language communities, that is proved by the metaphors *STINGINESS IS ILLUSION* by British and Germans, *STINGINESS IS MEANNESS* by British, *STINGINESS IS SHAME* by Ukrainians, *STINGINESS IS NOT A FULLISH THING* by Ukrainians and Russians. It is noteworthy that most of the conceptual metaphors representing the concept *STINGINESS* are commonly found in all the four linguocultures.

### **1. Introduction**

One of the main fundamentals of the cognitive linguistics is an assumption that language is an instrument for organising and categorising environment and the bearer of information used by representatives of the certain cultural community for receiving, accumulating and actualising knowledge and new experience about the world. It means that words and phraseological units (further – PU) must not be viewed as isolated phenomena but in the light of tight interaction of language, cognition and collective knowledge of the cultural community (Palmer 1996). In spite of the dispute, often even severe, the supporters (e.g., Зыкова 2015; Мізін 2015) and critics (e.g., Киклевич 2010; Павлова 2015) of the (ethnic)culturological

approach to the analysis of language signs, contemporary linguistics is characterized by intensification of anthropological studies the settling of the linguoculturology is connected herewith.

Entrance of anthropological research onto the intercultural space at the beginning of the 21st century has favoured to singling out a new area – contrastive linguoculturology. Extraction of the culture-bearing information from language signs is a prior task for contrastive linguoculturology since the subject of the last one is representation and interpretation of the embodiment of certain culture in the language system on the background of comparison with other cultures and languages for determining common and divergent features of these linguocultures in synchronism (Мізін 2012, 43–44). In our opinion, contrastive linguoculturology in comparison to linguoculturology can give the methodological apparatus which would meet the requirement of modern linguistics the most adequately.

Taking into account this fact we continue the series of articles dealing with complex analysis of the forming cognitive features of the binary concepts GENEROSITY – STINGINESS on the basis of their phraseological objectivation in English, German, Ukrainian and Russian languages in the light of contrastive-linguoculturological approach. Methodological openness of linguoculturological concepts offers a variety of methods to research them, that is why the previous articles determine philosophic-religious and moral-ethical parameters of the concepts GENEROSITY – STINGINESS, establish their inner form, determine nominative fields of the contrasted concepts, etc. (e.g., Мізін 2014; Петров 2014).

However, the completeness of the methods of linguoculturological description of concepts provides minimum two more moments: 1) modelling cognitive structure of the concept (figurative component of the concept fixes cognitive (conceptual) metaphors supporting the concept in the consciousness); 2) uncovering value dominant of a certain linguoculture accumulated in one or another culturally significant concept. Thus, the topic of this article is to determine cognitive features of the main metaphors representing the concept STINGINESS in British, German, Ukrainian and Russian language communities with the help of phraseological objectivation of this concept.

## 2. Main cognitive metaphors representing the concept STINGINESS

The practical material-based analysis confirms that the most frequent and the most ramified metaphor representing the concept STINGINESS is the anthropomorphic metaphor STINGINESS IS A SICK PERSON, represented by the following cognitive features (e.g., Mizin 2016):

1) “pathological unwillingness to let somebody to the depository of their resources”, e.g.: Eng. *dog in the manger* – “dog in the hay”; Germ. *Der Geizhals*

*liegt auf seinem Geld wie der Hund auf dem Heu*; Ukr. *Сидить, як пес на сніні: і сам не їсть, і другому не дає*; Russ. *Как собака на сене: и сама не ест, и другим не дает*;

2) “unhealthy disability of the stingy person to spend resources on the necessary or share the most needed”, e.g.: Eng. *Big bellies were never generous*; Germ. *die Hand auf der Tasche halten* – “to be very stingy”; Ukr. *У стайні є хвіст, але в хаті – постійний ніст*; Russ. *Щедрый дает, а у скупого сердце болит*;

3) “uncontrolled longing for profit (pathological insatiability)”, e.g.: Eng. *Love is blind and greed is insatiable*; Germ. *Dem Geiz ist nichts zu viel*; Ukr. *Убогому мало що бракує, а захланному всього*; Russ. *Стоит по горло в воде, а пить просит*;

4) “constant worry of the stingy person (spiritual illness and mental disorder), excessive suspiciousness”, e.g.: Eng. *He looks twice at every penny*; Ukr. *За копійку аж труситься*; Russ. *Жадный сам себе покою не дает; Над каждой копейкой дрожит*;

5) “pathological envy of the niggard”, e.g.: Eng. *Greed and envy are good neighbors*; Ukr. *За очей завидющих і руки загребущі*; Russ. *Не столько смущает свой убыток, сколько чужой прибыток*. Interlacement of the semantics of envy and stinginess can be traced both in the German idiom *Je mehr man hat, je mehr man will* and Ukrainian PU (*придавила*) *давить кого-н. жаба* – “1) very stingy; 2) very envious”;

6) “excessive amorality of the stingy person”, e.g.: Eng. *A greedy father has thieves for children*; Germ. *Der Geizige trägt seine Seele feil*; Ukr. *Скупому душа дешевше гроша*; Russ. *Скупому душа дешевле гроша*. In the imagination of the representatives of English-, Ukrainian- and Russian-speaking communities, stinginess incites the niggard to the most unpredictable behaviour, often even to paradoxes, e.g.: Eng. *to shave an egg* – “about stingy behaviour”; *smb. cannot spare the reek off his own shit* – “to be extremely stingy”; Ukr. *хто-н. за копійку плигне в колодязь* – “very stingy”; Russ. *Из песку верёвки вьёт*.

Stinginess is perceived by representatives of the contrasted language communities both as spiritual (mental) and physical illness destroying the person from inside. This is the motive for the basis of cognitive feature “stinginess is a deathly disease” which also represents the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS A SICK PERSON, e.g.: Germ. *Geiz zerstört die Seele und den Körper*; Ukr. *Скупі, – що бджоли: завжди мед збирають, а після й самі пропадають*; Russ. *Скупые, ровно пчелы: мёд собирают, а сами умирают*. Singling out one more illness as a cognitive feature of stinginess – rheumatism – by British and Germans is linguoculturally contrastive, e.g.: Eng. *smb. born with a cramp in his fist* – “niggard”; Germ. *Er hat Rheumatismus zwischen Daumen und Zeigefinger*. As we can see, in the imagination of representatives of the English-speaking community the niggard cannot unbend the fist / hand (the motives “reticence” / “keeping” are clearly traced) and for the German-speaking people the thumbs and the forefingers used for taking money

from wallets are relevant in this case. When fingers suffer from rheumatism, it is impossible to take money.

The conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS A POOR PERSON is also actual, e.g.: Eng. *A greedy man is always poor*; Germ. *Geiz ist die größte Armut*; Ukr. *Скнупий багач бідніший за жебрака*; Russ. *Скупой богач беднее нищего*. It is known that nobody, including the stingy person, has any profit from his / her belongings. While the economical person does not want to waste anything, the stingy person does not want to spend anything. Every penny is so important to the niggard that he / she is ready to wear rags and eat only dried bread to keep his / her savings. It is noted that illogicality of contrasting the concepts STINGINESS – POVERTY is levelled by existence of the integral motive “constant need”, because in the first and in the second cases the person lives in constant need (poverty); however the poor one – in the physical one, and the niggard – in the psychological one, e.g.: Russ. *Убогого одна нужда гнетет, скупого две (убожество и скупость)*. This illogicality creates paradox and the above given PU expression where stingy and poor people are identified. Although a rich person is in constant need, i.e. they permanently search for bigger profit that is why rich people are considered to be stingy, e.g.: Eng. *A rich man is always narrow with his money*; Germ. *Ein Reicher und Geiziger ist Salomons Esel*; Ukr. *Хто багатий, той не любить дати*; Russ. *Вкуне богат и убог; Не проси у богатого, проси у тороватого (тороватый – «generous»)*.

In the consciousness of representatives of the contracted linguocultures stinginess is associated with grief (bad luck) that is proved by the metaphor STINGINESS IS GRIEF, e.g.: Eng. *There is no greater calamity than being consumed by greed*; Germ. *Man kann einem Geizigen nicht mehr Unglück wünschen, denn daß er lange lebe*; Ukr. *Від користи серце кам'яніє*; Russ. *У скупого, что больше денег, то больше и горя*. However the German-speaking people associate stinginess not so much with grief but with evil, e.g.: *Der Geiz ist die Wurzel alles Übels*. Here should be mentioned the idiom *Der Geiz ist seine eigene Stiefmutter*, where we can find semantics of evil, since in the naive world picture the step-mother is perceived as a negatively marked member of opposition “mother – good, step-mother – evil”.

Analysis of the practical material shows that the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS LOSS is common for British, German, Ukrainian and Russian linguocultures, e.g.: Eng. *If you buy cheaply, you pay dearly*; Germ. *Der Geizige verstört sein eigen Haus*; Ukr. *Лінивий двічі ходить, скупий двічі платить*; Russ. *Скупой платит дважды (compare also the neologism: Скупой платит дважды, тупой платит трижды, а лох платит постоянно)*. Existence of this conceptual metaphor objects to some extent the shallow logics of the cause and effect chain “stingy → wealth / / profit”, since the analysis of the conceptual world pictures (further – CWP) of the contrasted linguocultures proves the opposite dependency: stinginess as a motivator of irrational behaviour often leads to the loss but not to the wealth. That is why the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS USELESSNESS OF ACCUMULATION

is actual especially for the Russian CWP, e.g.: Eng. *Every man goes to his death bearing in his hands only that which he has given away*; Germ. *Den Geizhals und ein fettes Schwein sieht man im Tod erst nützlich sein*; Ukr. *Скупий дбає не про себе*; Russ. *Всех денег не заработаешь; Помрёшь – ничего с собой не возьмёшь*.

Since stinginess is one of the main sins and stinginess covers significant, much more negatively marked notional volume of greediness, stinginess is considered to be a bigger sin that is realized on the level of CWP in the contrasted language communities in the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS SIN, e.g.: Eng. *When all other sins are old, greed stays young; A greedy man God hates*; Germ. *Wenn alle Sünden alt werden, wird der Geiz jung; Geizhalses Gut, des Teufels Opferherd*; Ukr. *Скупий збирає, а чорт калитку шие; скупий як чорт* – “very stingy”; Russ. *Скупому человеку убавит Бог веку; скупой как черт* – “very stingy”. The practical material proves that stinginess as a sin is directly connected to the evil spirit – devil – in German, Ukrainian and Russian CWP. The fairy “evil spirit” *Кощей* (бессмертный) and the biblical idiom *Иуда* are specific for the Russian language consciousness, e.g.: *скупой как Кощей* (бессмертный) – “very stingy”; *как Иуда* – “very stingy”, and the biblical idiom *Cain* for the Ukrainian one: *дрижить як Кайн за алтин* – “very stingy”. Linguoculturological contrast is created by Ukrainian and Russian proverbs with semantics of stinginess where figurative-motional basis is formed with folksy determination of the vergers – priests which are considered the biggest sinners in the naive world picture of Ukrainians and Russian since they are supercilious, greedy, envious, insatiable, etc., e.g.: Ukr. *У попа очі завидючі, а руки загребучі*; Russ. *У попа и среди зимы снега не выпросишь; У попа глаза завидующие, а руки загребущие*.

The statement that stinginess finds its paradise in the shit is a linguocultural characteristic of the German imagination, e.g.: *Geiz sucht seinen Himmel im Kot*, because the hell obviously waits for stingy people, e.g.: *Der Geiz macht sich seine Höllenfahrt sauer*, they have sold their souls, e.g.: *Der Geizige trägt seine Seele feil*. It is obvious that the hell darkness comes from the secretiveness in the German CWP, e.g.: *Der Geiz will nicht leiden, daß man das Licht bei ihm anzünde*. It is worth stating that German-speakers use specific metaphors *Knausrigkeit*, *Knickerigkeit*, *Pfennigfucherei*, and say *Geizkragen* or *Geizhals* about a person. In the imagination of the German-speaking linguoculture the stingy person has a long neck or a high collar (long neck and sharp nose of the niggard affirm his / her special skill to go through every clink seeking for profit and the high collar is used by a stingy person to cover him- / herself from the outer world since he / she is reversed, secretive).

The conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS ILLUSION is specific for British and German CWP, e.g.: Eng. *Deceit sleeps with Greed*; Germ. *Alle Laster nehmen mit der Zeit ab, nur Geiz und Lüge nehmen zu*. Some linguoculturological specifics, especially for English-speakers, have the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS MEANNESS. Here we can even find contaminated composites where semantics

of meanness and stinginess are combined, e.g.: *mingy* (mean + stingy) – “very stingy” (Lavrova 2010, 148). In the previous articles (Петров 2014) we have already written about the tight intersection of the CWP of the ancient Anglo-Saxons MEAN (mean) and STINGY (stingy), that is connected with contrasting the motive “mean – noble”: the noble (the king, the aristocracy, etc.) cannot be mean so they cannot be stingy. That is why the concept MEAN represents the meanings of not only meanness, baseness but also stinginess.

Our analysis has established that the conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS SHAME is actual only for Ukrainian CWP, e.g.: *Грубе поліно вогонь гасить, скупа хазяйка дім соромить* and the metaphor STINGINESS IS NOT A FOOLISH THING for Ukrainian and Russian CWPs, e.g.: Ukr. *Скупий не глупий, а щедрий не мудрий*; Russ. *Скупость – не глупость; Скуп не глуп, себе добра хочет; Лучшие поскупиться, чем промотаться*. This conceptual metaphor levels to some extent the stereotype about extreme intolerance to stinginess in the Russian linguoculture. Even the Russian language consciousness can percept stinginess as the highest degree of economy and such human trait is not so much negative because in this case the stingy person just does not want to lose what he / she has, saving and increasing his / her holdings at the same time (compare also the irony: *Скупой жадному сказал: скупость – не глупость, а та же добыча*).

The conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS A STRANGER is actual for the contrasted linguocultures, e.g.: Ukr. *скупий як грек* – “very stingy”; *скупий як жид* – “very stingy”; Russ. *скупой как жид* – “very stingy”. According to psychologists only few people acknowledge themselves to be stingy and the rest impart this feature with the others – from neighbour to representative of the foreign linguoculture. This is the basis for numerous stereotypes. So, Australians ascribe stinginess to Chinese, e.g.: *meaner than the goldfield Chinaman* – “a very stingy person” (Baker 1966, 89).

Heterostereotypes can be found with the help of psycho-linguistic experiments. The results of such experiments prove, for example, that the Russian respondents believe greediness to be a national characteristic of the English people (Кочетков 2002, 22–49). It is obvious that this fact is connected to the polar perception of axis autostereotype – heterostereotype by the representatives of one or another linguoculture that is based on the deep archetype “own (positive) – strange (negative)”. That is why Russians, contrasting themselves, ascribe generosity and openness to themselves as traditional traits of their character, although contrastive research of the concept GENEROSITY certifies some falsity of this autostereotype (Петров 2014).

The table exemplifies common and specific cognitive metaphors that represent the concept STINGINESS.



Conceptual metaphor STINGINESS IS...	Linguoculture			
	British	German	Ukrainian	Russian
a sick person	+	+	+	+
a poor person	+	+	+	+
grief	+	+	+	+
loss	+	+	+	+
uselessness of accumulation	+	+	+	+
sin	+	+	+	+
illusion	+	+	–	–
meanness	+	–	–	–
shame	–	–	+	–
not a foolish thing	–	–	+	+
a strangeR	+	+	+	+

### 3. Conclusion

Analysis of the phraseological objectivation of cognitive features of the metaphors representing the concept STINGINESS in British, German, Ukrainian and Russian language communities allows us to determine that common metaphorical models constitute a basis for the metaphors in the contrasted languages. The authors have established that stinginess is perceived by representatives of the contrasted language communities both as spiritual (mental) and physical illness destroying the person from inside. It explains the fact that the anthropomorphic metaphor STINGINESS IS A SICK PERSON represented by the most numerous cognitive features formed in the contrasted language communities chiefly on the common perceptive-imaginative ground is the most quantitatively ramified. Singling out such diseases as rheumatism caused by stinginess as a cognitive feature of stinginess by British and German is linguoculturally contrastive.

Research of the practical material allows us to state that despite the prevalence of metaphors containing common senses of stinginess in the researched linguocultures and the distinct prevalence of the common cognitive features over the specific ones within the metaphors themselves (metaphoric models), the concept STINGINESS is largely filled with ethnically and linguoculturally specific meanings in the contrasted language communities, that is proved by the metaphors STINGINESS IS ILLUSION by British and Germans, STINGINESS IS MEANNESS by British, STINGINESS IS SHAME by Ukrainians, STINGINESS IS NOT A FOOLISH THING by Ukrainians and Russians.

### References

- BAKER, S. (1966), *The Australian language*. Melbourne.
- LAVROVA, N. (2010), Contamination: An Apt Linguistic Term or a Misnomer? In: *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*. 3 (16), 148–153.
- MIZIN, K./PETROV, O. (2016), Concept metaphor “STINGINESS IS A SICK PERSON” in British, German, Ukrainian and Russian linguocultures: contrastive-linguoculturological analysis. In: *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. IV (17)/78, 51–53.
- PALMER, G. (1996), *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin TX.
- ЗЫКОВА, И. (2015), Теория и методы лингвокультурологического изучения фразеологии. В: *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*. VI/1, 181–195.
- Киклевич, А. (2010), Концепт! Концепт... Концепт? К критике современной лингвистической концептологии. В: Киклевич, А./Камалова, А. (ред.), *Концепты культуры в языке и тексте: теория и анализ*. Олштын, 175–219.
- Кочетков, В. (2002), *Психология межкультурных различий*. Москва.
- МІЗІН, К. (2012), Нові напрями в українському мовознавстві: зіставна лінгвокультурологія. У: *Мовознавство*. 6 (268), 38–52.
- МІЗІН, К. (2015), Методологічна валідність лінгвокультурології vs зіставної лінгвокультурології: аргументи та контраргументи. У: *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету ім. А. Нобеля*. 2 (10), 104–110.
- Мізин, К./Петров, О. (2014), Морально-етичний параметр концепту «ЩЕДРИСТЬ» у британській, німецькій, українській і російській лінгвокультурах. У: *Мовознавство*. 5 (278), 71–80.
- Павлова, А. (2015), Лингвокультурология в России: «за» и «против». В: *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*. VI/2, 201–221.
- ПЕТРОВ, О. (2014), Філософсько-релігійний, психологічний і морально-етичний параметри концепту СКУПІСТЬ у британській, німецькій, українській і російській лінгвокультурах. У: *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету ім. М. Коцюбинського*. Вінниця. 20, 269–277.