

LANGUAGE MEANS OF ‘ENVY’ AND ‘BETRAYAL’ CONCEPTUALIZATION: SPHERE OF SOCIALLY EVALUATING AND EMOTIONAL CONCEPTS AND THEIR INTERACTION

Tyshchenko O. V.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays conceptual studies are one of the most relevant areas of linguistics, as evidenced by a large number of works on linguo-cultural concepts which are the verbal embodiment of complex mental formations that exist “on ethno-cultural, sociocultural and individual levels of consciousness¹.”

According to N.D. Arutyunova, common analogues of philosophical and ethical terms create a vast field of natural languages vocabulary which reflects the practical philosophy of a person. The latter is the result of different factors interaction among which there are national tradition and folklore, religion and ideology, life experience, feelings and values. The researcher distinguishes two semantic layers of vocabulary – TRUTH and KNOWLEDGE which include the epistemic concepts belonging to the sphere of mental notions and mental action and FATE which describes everything that happens to a person².

From epistemological point of view, “the inner universum of a person is described through the interaction of three spheres – will, feelings and intelligence and, thus, there are few purely voluntary or emotional and mental predicates in the semantic continuum of a particular language³.”

¹ Алефиренко Н.Ф. Лингвокультурология. Ценностно-смысловое пространство языка: учебное пособие. Москва, 2010. С. 5.

² Арутюнова Н.Д. Ментальные действия: Сборник статей / Логический анализ языка. Избранное 1988–1995; под общ. ред. Н.Д. Арутюновой. Москва: Индрик, 2003. С. 456–461.

³ Danielewiczowa M. Główne problemy opisu i podziału czasownikowych predykatów mentalnych / Studia z semantyki porównawczej. Nazwy barw. Nazwy wymiarów. Predykaty mentalne; pod red. R.Grzegorzczkovej i K.Waszakowej. Cz 1. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2000. S. 228.

Language modeling of cultural values includes the formation of sociocultural vocabulary reflecting the basic categories of culture, regulatives of a person's spiritual and practical experience, his/her emotions and assessments, and also a specification of the semantics, the forms and the spheres defining the application of language means by which these categories are explicated. In the process of formation and development of a certain type of culture, cultural and axiological senses that have been formed in language ("clots of culture in language" and concept spheres) harmonize cultural memory, form ideas about cultural identity and continuity, moral and ethical, philosophical and life values of a certain linguistic community and stereotypical views on valuable and spiritual matters and can be modeled as concept spheres⁴.

The cognitive orientation of modern semantics is determined by the necessity to systematize various fragments of knowledge about the world and to explain the mechanisms of their reflection in the consciousness of a language personality, in human psychology, socio-cultural stereotypes, folklore, the language of ethnic culture, etc. It is linguo-cognitive perspective that distinguishes the inner world of a person as a part, a fragment of the general picture of the world reflected in the human psyche and interpersonal relations and verbalized by means of a certain ethnic language in certain axiological spheres or in the language of values («język wartości», J. Puzynina, J. Bartmiński, R. Grzegorzyczkowa).

On the other hand, it should be noted that emotional experience is a part of human psychoemotional and an important component of cognitive activity, behavior, communication with the external world and other people. Human emotional sphere was the subject of deep and detailed analysis by representatives of different scientific fields, first of all by psychologists, who analyzed envy from the position of human behavior social models (M. Klein, P. Kutter) as well as by philosophers (Aristotle, F. Bacon, R. Descartes, I. Kant, B. de Spinoza, A. Schopenhauer) and linguists (A. Wierzbicka, Ya.Ya. Stefansky, V.I. Shakhovsky, Ya.Sazonova, O. Yasinovska, etc.).

The analysis of verbal explication of mental images which differently reflect phenomena of culture and society and their emotional

⁴ Запольская Н.Н. Спасение, любовь, милосердие: К вопросу о языковом моделировании культурных ценностей / Эволюция ценностей в языках и культурах; ответ.ред. И.А.Седакова. Москва: Пробел, 2000. С. 37.

notions makes it possible to observe in culture and society the specificity of the usage of linguistic means in the form of socioally evaluative concepts as “clusters of culture and people`s mentality in a language”, which encompass Envy, Betrayal, Slander and others. We suggest considering these concepts in linguocognitive and comparative coverage in the Slavic language and conceptual pictuers of the world based on lexicographical facts, data of bilingual phraseological and special dictionaries as well as text corpora of different Slavic languages (Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Chesh compared with other not closely related languages).

This approach allows distinguishing three components in the structure of the concept: notional (stating distinctive features of primary nomination in terms of dictionary definitions), associative-imagery (represented by figurative and metaphorical nominations) and value (that displays a number of secondary associative meanings related to norms and evaluations of different aspects of the phenomenon of Betrayal, Envy, or other analyzed ones).

1. Conceptualization of *Envy* and Related Concepts

Anna Wierzbicka notes, that there is always some reason for the motive of *envy*, that is, the existence of something that “I do not have, and I suffer from it, I consider it unfair to me and I would like to have (and therefore I wish I had it, achieved the same thing)”. It is indisputable that both emotions (envy and greed) have a destructive character, since their deep structure is characterized by the general idea of suffering and hatred. For a clearer delineation of these nuances of the investigated emotions, the researchers use the principle of semantic primitives, suggested by A. Wierzbicka: 1) X feels envy: “Something good happened to someone else. It did not happen to me. I do not want that to be the case. I want such good things to happen to me, not to someone else. Therefore, I suffer and hate the others”; 2) X feels jealous: “It fear that the person who is dear for me has good feelings for someone else. I'm afraid that the person who is dear for me may loose good feelings to me. I do not want that to be the case. I wish the person who is dear for me the expensive face had good feelings only to me. Therefore, I suffer and hate the other”⁵.

⁵ Wierzbicka A. Semantyka. Jednostki elementarne i uniwersalne. Lublin, 2006. S. 123.

It is worth mentioning that in Russian predicates that consist of stable word combinations in some regional language and various Russian dialects, *envy* is also a subject of ownership (*feel, state*) and a verb with the meaning of movement. For example, *Зависть кидать* “experiencing feelings of jealousy” (*Богатущая, а всё зависть кидает, всё ей мало, больше хочет*)⁶. It performs the function of a certain substance, as evidenced by the combination with verbs “*входить в*” and the action from somebody’s side, something external to the subject – the disease as well as malicious look, etc.: *входить в урос, урос напал* “somebody got sick from an envious, malicious look” (*Вчера пришла из бани, так хорошо было, да пришла соседка и изурочила меня, поглядела на меня нагую и всё, урос напал на меня: голова болит, жар поднялся, спать не могу, ворочаюсь всю ночь. Ой, кака баба, взгляд её тяжелой*⁷).

With the same motivation people used the *network* in the Russian North to get rid of the evil eye. In Pinega, when they spoke of a “wasting disease” they cut off a piece from the fishing net and pounded it with hemp fiber “away from oneself” (that is like twisting in the opposite direction) and read the charm: «*Как от сети узла никто не может ни развязать, ни распустить – ни еретик, ни клеветник, ни завидник, так же бы рабу божью (имярек) никто не мог бы ни испортить, ни изурочить*»⁸. In the traditional people’s culture there are folk beliefs connected to some notions of timing charged with negative symbolism in the traditional folk Christian calendar, especially in the traditional leap year calendar as adverse period. V. Dahl presents the following facts in the “Dictionary”: 29th February is the day of *Касьяна завистливого: Касьяна злопамятного, ill-willed, unmerciful, stingy personality. Касьян на скот взглянет, скот валится; на дерево, дерево сохнет. Касьян, на что ни взглянет – все вянет. Касьян на народ – народу тяжело; Касьян на траву – трава сохнет; Касьян на скот – скотдохнет*⁹. In this respect it is worth mentioning some Russian humoristic

⁶ Прокошева К.Н. Фразеологический словарь пермских говоров. Пермь, 2002. С. 65.

⁷ Ibidem. С. 395.

⁸ Толстой Н.И. Этнографический комментарий к древним славяно-русским текстам. 1. Сеть (мрежа) / Литература и искусство в системе культуры; отв.ред. акад. Пиотровский. Москва: Наука, 1988. С. 122.

⁹ Даль В.И. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка: в 4-х т. Москва, 1989–1991. Т. 1. С. 167.

wishes: *Поздравляю с плешью. И зазывают шутливо: «Милости прошу к нашему грошу со своим пятаком!» Везде, по пословице: «Привет за привет и любовь за любовь, а завистливому – хрену да перцу, и то не с нашего стола»¹⁰.*

Envy in the Russian language, as in other languages, as a kind of semantic universal, correlates with the idea of someone else's good and material well-being, happiness; compare: *Берут завидки на чужие пожитки, Завидки берут, что нам не дают;*, in the Kuban subdialects this proverb is fixed in the Ukrainian form *Беруть завидки на чужі пожитки, Зависть – враг счастья*¹¹. In the Smolensk Russian subdialects it is fixed that envy is directed to someone's goodness and well-being: *Чужое добро подпирает ребро кому*¹². Partial correspondence and cultural analogue of the above mentioned statements can be traced in Polish: *Cudza dola pod bok kole*¹³. Compare with Russian: *Зобастый беззобому не в зависть, Зависть прежде нас родилась, всегда была и будет*¹⁴.

When referring to the idea of envy, greed and conscience or its absence in the composition of many dialectal idioms and proverbial constructions the names of human body parts and, above all, the *eyes* are objectified (with ascribed to them corresponding attributes which reinforce the feature of the subject and have negative connotation, compare, Russian: *грабущие* (with augmentative formant), *руки: Руки грабущие у кого*¹⁵, *облизал бы глаза* (referring to shame) (*От стыда облизал бы глаза и ушел*)¹⁶.

V. Dahl highlights the following contexts of an “envier”: *Глазища колом тычут, Глаза завидущи, а руки загребущи, Глазом не*

¹⁰Максимов С. Крылатые слова по толкованию С.В. Максимова / послесл. и коммент. Ю.М. Медведева. Москва: Астрель, 2000. С. 240.

¹¹Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. С. 356.

¹²Словарь русских народных говоров. Вып.1–36. Москва–Ленинград (СПб.): Наука, 1965–2002. С. 137.

¹³Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. 1. S. 464.

¹⁴Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. С. 356.

¹⁵Мокиенко В., Никитина Т. Словарь псковских пословиц и поговорок. Санкт-Петербург, 2001. С. 66.

¹⁶Фразеологический словарь русских говоров Сибири; ред. А.И. Федоров. Новосибирск: Наука, 1983. С. 124.

наворотишь, упустив, Глаза человеку вороги ненасытностью, Глазам-то стыдно, а душа-та рада, У него поповские глаза, Глазы ямы, а руки грабли. Свинные глаза не боятся грязи, Завистливый своих двух глаз не пожалеет, У зависти глаза велики¹⁷. In some dialectal phraseological units of the Russian language there also appear “fingers” as components of phraseological combinations correlated with another free syntactic prototypes (direct variable phrases) – scenarios of eating, tasting and licking as a figurative expression of desire to have the same (Vologda subdialect): *Облизывать пальчики* “to envy somebody”¹⁸. Concerning the so called “priest’s eyes” S. Maximov remarks: “Our popular expressions dates back to that time when the priesthood became so common and obligatory in the terms of national life of a separate class that the people became to feel some inconveniences and burdens and began to say: «От вора отобьюсь, от приказного откуплюсь, от попа не отмолюсь». Then they recognized that the latter had «не карманы, а мешки», and they got used to numerous priests’ customs saying: «Родись, крестись, женись, умирай – за все попу деньги отдавай». At the same time “поповские глаза завидующие, руки загребующие и поповы детки непутные” and are rarely successful, while the priests’ habits and temper “на кривой не обведеш”¹⁹.

In conceptualization of envy and avarice the somatic code (*throat, mouth*) is combined with parametric adjectives (*broad*) and the idea of quantity (relative size “с губой”, obviously, with an omitted implied adjective “большой” speaking about envious person: *жалеть себе в рот* “be extremely meager”²⁰, which are usually transformed into images of insatiability and are marked as derogative in the above mentioned dictionaries of dialects. The same negative connotation is characteristic for the following sayings: *Горло широкое* “A greedy, stingy person” (*Мало плотят – шестьдесят рублей. И больше напоят – все равно мало. Горло шибко широкое у ей; Нет, они не дадут: горло широкое у них, загребастые глаза*). This connotation obviously occurs

¹⁷ Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. С. 356.

¹⁸ Мокиенко В.М, Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. С. 479.

¹⁹ Максимов С. Крылатые слова по толкованию С.В. Максимова / послесл. и коммент. Ю. М. Медведева. Москва: Астрель, 2000. С. 268.

²⁰ Фразеологический словарь русских говоров Сибири; ред. А.И. Федоров. Новосибирск: Наука, 1983. С. 69.

by analogy with “hands”: *В два горла хватать* «begrudge» (*Им всё мало, в два горла хватают*) [Прокошева: 399]; *мороженные глаза* – speaking about unscrupulous, arrogant person (*Ты чо эта врешь, хлопнуша лешава, мороженные твои глаза*²¹, *глаза заморожены* (*Нет смущения, совести*). *Чё он будет стыдиться кого-то? Глаза-то у его заморожены*)²², *Глаза разбегаются в разные стороны у кого* – speaking about the feeling of surprise or envy²³; *Хоть плюй ему в глаза, он говорит божья роса*. Sometimes some rare examples may be observed – substances “sweat” and “blood” in combinations with description of complexion: *На щеках потники у кого* «о бессовестном человеке» (*Бессовестный, у него на щеках потники*)²⁴.

A psychosomatic and kinetic code in combination with a spatial one can designate a different degree and character of the following emotional manifestation: beginning, intensity, growth, gradation: *Глаза не в ту сторону забегают* “Envy flares up” (*Ох, у его глаза не в ту сторону забегают; у соседа мотоцикл – и ему надо нажать*²⁵), *Набирать зависти* “to begin envying smb”²⁶. In this case envy is compared to a certain substance, liquid which is ladled out and poured into a container: *Body is like a VESSEL, CONTAINER*, which is filled with emotions.

Let's consider the nomination of envy in the Polish language picture of the world. First of all, we have to note that in most European languages the lexeme *envy* has wider semantic scope than in the East Slavonic language and cultural continuum due to interlanguage homonymy. For example, the Polish lexeme *zazdrość* (compare its semantic variant *zawiść*, which almost completely coincides with the Ukrainian *зздріть*) covers the semantic sphere that corresponds in Ukrainian or Russian to two denotations – *зздріть* and *ревнощі* (compare *scena zazdrości* – literally “the scene of jealousy”). Proverbial contexts in

²¹ Фразеологический словарь русских говоров Сибири; ред. А.И. Федоров. Новосибирск: Наука, 1983. С. 42, 47, 69.

²² Прокошева К.Н. Фразеологический словарь пермских говоров. Пермь, 2002. С. 76.

²³ Мокиенко В., Никитина Т. Словарь псковских пословиц и поговорок. Санкт-Петербург, 2001. С. 148.

²⁴ Фразеологический словарь русских говоров Сибири; ред. А.И. Федоров. Новосибирск: Наука, 1983. С. 149.

²⁵ Прокошева К.Н. Фразеологический словарь пермских говоров. Пермь, 2002. С. 76.

²⁶ Мокиенко В.М., Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. С. 238.

Polish are mainly associated with the spatial idea of a repository (a person falls in jealousy, as well as in anger): *Zazdrość jest gdyby rów: kto w nią wpadł, bywaj zdrów*.

In many languages moral properties of bad conscience, slander, gossip are realized with the help of metaphorical signs of impurity, dirt, stains and, respectively, predicates of purification, ablution: Ukrainian: *Якби сам був білий, то б не чорнив другого; Хто обкидає болотом других, у того руки брудні, Водюю що хочеш, лиш сумління не сполочеш*²⁷; Russian: *Мазать/ замазать чёрной краской что* “slander someone”²⁸, *Мазать/ вымазать дёгтем, Клевета – как (что уголь): не обожжет, так замарают*²⁹.

2. Conceptual Sphere BETRAYAL: Ways of Representation in Slavic Languages

Let's consider the individual cognitive metaphorical representations, where **false, deceit, slander and betrayal** appear as one-order phenomena, which belong to the same semantic row: reside on the surface or inside: *Falsz się nie zatai, Falsz zawsze wynurzy się musi, Falsz wyniknie, jednak zdrada się wytoczy*³⁰. Polish proverbs fixed the idea that slander is more dangerous than direct and simple betrayal, these images are motivated by the idea of sharp teeth, an animal grin: *Trudno się złośliwego zebu ustrzec* “Trudno si ustrzec obmowy, oszczerstwa”³¹. In this respect it's worth paying attention to the interesting old expression in the Polish language *Psim głosem odszczekać* – literally “Bark in the dog's voice”, which is recorded in the famous and one of the oldest dictionaries of the Polish language. According to historical evidence, the person who slandered Queen Jadviga should have had a degrading punishment for causing offense: in the Sejm, sitting under the bench, *bark in a dog's voice*, thereby recognizing his false testimony and betrayal. Such a punishment was at one time appointed to storekeeper Gnevosh for

²⁷ Плав'юк С. Приповідки, або українсько-народня філософія. / зібрав, підготував до друку та опублікував Володимир С. Плав'юк. Едмонтон, 1998. С. 236.

²⁸ Мокиенко В.М, Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. С. 178.

²⁹ Ibidem. С. 178, 406.

³⁰ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. 1. S. 560.

³¹ Ibidem. T. III. S. 839.

a slander (*oszczerstwo*)³². The punishment for slander is inevitable – a Russian proverb says *Легко клеветается, нелегко отвечается*. V. Dal recorded Christian motives of punishment for slander, as a punishment after death, in the afterlife: *Клеветники на том свете каленые сковородки лизут*³³.

Some Russian dialectal expressions, such as *оскалять зло*, also appear similar in their internal form “it is not fair to bring your anger, irritation, slander on smb.”,³⁴. Some proverbial constructions and idioms in Russian naturally correspond to the idea of evil tongue, for example, *змеиный язык* “about the evil man who is a slanderer”. The Yaroslavl dialects of Russia produced expressions: *метровый язык* “about the gossip, slanderer”; *Величается клеветник, изрывая яму языком ближнему, и сам впадет в ю* – such testimony is found in historical dictionaries of the XI-XVII centuries³⁵. In this respect there are remarkable contexts where the predicates of gnawing and destruction are highly frequent: *Клевета беззуба, а грызья грызет*³⁶.

In the Polish language consciousness, BETRAYAL can be expressed through torsion or thread spinning, for example: *Niechaj ten zdrajca takich wici więcej już nie kręci* ‘slip out’, *Kręcisz wici, jezuito*³⁷; identified by comparison to a fragile item that can be broken (*Zdradliwe szczęście, szklane jest wszystko gdy ldyńi się, wnet się złamie*)³⁸. Treason in Polish phrases is motivated by the metaphors of impurity, dirt, stains, directed towards the subject himself: *plamić się zdradą* (*Nie wymienię jego nazwiska, bo splamił się zdradą, podał gestapo informacje o żołnierzach Armii Krajowej*)³⁹. Similar moral and ethical ideas are also found in some Ukrainian dialects (Ukrainian Eastern Slobozhansky dialects)

³² Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. III. S. 376.

³³ Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. С. 410.

³⁴ Мокиенко В.М., Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. С. 255.

³⁵ Ibidem. С. 410.

³⁶ Ibidem. С. 409.

³⁷ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. III. S. 658.

³⁸ Ibid. S. 385.

³⁹ Muldner-Nieckowski S. Carofano-Bugajska Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2003. S. 935.

characterized by the attributive function (in Ukrainian: *Гнилимми нитками шитий* “to be inclined to treason”⁴⁰). Let us also pay attention to the sensations: *zdrada* enters into phraseological ties with the verbs of sensation and perception, for example, *węszyć / wietrzyć zdradę*, containing metaphors of taste and smell. The latter objectify treason both as a direct meaning, in particular, the idea that treason can be felt, smelled, like a beast sniffs out, searches for its prey (the verb *wietrzyć* is used in relation to animals as part of this phraseological expression, to feel with the help of smell the presence of someone or something, “feel and anticipate something”), and a series derivative meanings of the verb *węszyć* recorded in the latest explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the Polish language: “to constantly search for something, to follow something or someone”, “to trace something in something”⁴¹, “to suspect someone of treason, to be afraid of adultery, to trust no one”⁴².

Conceptually, this frame is associated with the frame of hypocrisy represented in a set of figurative nominations. Let’s scrutinize it more deeply. The conceptual metaphor **treason – disguise – camouflage** is represented by units of bodily somatic and zoomorphic code (the Biblical motif of wolf in sheep's clothing), where the heart acts as a container of different emotions: *Zrzucić maskę Spada maska, a zdrajca, co pod nią przebywa*⁴³, *Wielu się pięknie układa, a w sercu ich skryta zdrada*⁴⁴, *Bernardyńska postawa, ale wilcze serce*. The main motivators are oriented towards opposing the bodily top and bottom: *Z przodu liże, a z tyłu drapie, Gdzie nie staje wilczej skóry, tam lisiej nadstawia*, often with actionable predicates – to lick (sickly-sweet, pleasing, kissing someone, fawning before someone, betraying friendship (approach, false testimony, prevaricate): *W oczy mi się liżesz, a za oczy krzywa podstępna świadczysz przyjaźń, Słowa w języku jedwabne, ale w piersiach serce zradne, Miodowe albo jedwabne słówka tworzyć, a zradliwym sercem, co może być najgorszego, myśleć*; to taste differentiation **sweet / bitter**: *Słówka*

⁴⁰ Ужченко В., Ужченко Д. Фразеологічний словник східнословобожанських і степових говірок Донбасу. Луганськ, 2000. С. 214.

⁴¹ Dunaj B. Słownik języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2005. S. 771.

⁴² Muldner-Nieckowski S. Carofano-Bugajska. Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2003. S. 935.

⁴³ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. II. S. 410.

⁴⁴ Ibid. T. III. S. 852.

*słodkie, a pod językiem piołun*⁴⁵; Сладкие слова, а под языком полынь; *Znam cię ziółko, żeś pokrzywka, znamy ziółko pokrzywka: piękna, ale zdradzi* / I know a plant: nettle, beautiful, but unstable⁴⁶, *Pełno słów gładkich, wdzięcznych gębie, a zdrada w sercu, Wielu się pięknie układa, a w sercu ich skryta zdrada*⁴⁷.

According to N.V. Skorodumova, “Treason, like a person, can manifest itself in different spheres of life, perform some actions, generate or initiate, send, carry, etc”. To confirm this thesis, let us turn to the ways of metaphorical expression of betrayal in Polish literary discourse which presents this phenomenon by conceptual metaphors that are diverse in their ontology, origin and evaluation, or its figurative cognitive discursive possibilities.

In the works of G.Senkevich, treason can wait for someone: *Bogaty jesteś, lecz nie wiesz, czy jutro nie każą ci porzucić bogactw; młodym jesteś, lecz jutro może ci trzeba będzie umrzeć. Miłujesz, lecz czyha na ciebie zdrada* (H.Sienkiewicz «Quo Vadis», 162).

In Y. Slovatsky, the Treason can act as a symbolic Bottom, expressed by spatial verbs – *wpadać*: a precipice or a pit filled with treacherous snakes: *Więc zdradziłem ją! Boże, w jakąż przepaść wpadłem! Nie wierz mi! Ona tego sobie nie wyznała I mnie się nie zwierzyła, z rumieńca odgadłem...»* (Juliusz Słowacki «Maria Stuart», 26), *Jamy węzową napelnione zdradą... Powiem... wyroki wypełniając wieczne, które to na mnie dzisiaj brzemię kładą* (Juliusz Słowacki «Król-Duch», 1).

The somatic code is categorized through the concept of the Body, its upper and lower parts for the cognitive representation of human feelings: *le nie zaniepokoił się tym, albowiem z zapadniętych, mistycznych oczu suchotnika patrzyła nie zdrada, lecz jakby głęboka melancholia człowieka, który jest u brzegu życia... (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Baśnie i Legendy», 123).*

Occasionally, the cognitive categorization of person’s perception correlates with the verbs of taste (to taste the betrayal), such as, for example, in G. Senkevich’s works: *Poznasz, jako to fructa zdrady*

⁴⁵ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. III. S. 242.

⁴⁶ Ibid. S. 865.

⁴⁷ Ibid. S. 603.

smakują. Będiesz ty mnie jeszcze za przyjaciela uważał, ale jeśli lepszych przyjaciół nie znajdziesz, to nie poluj nigdy na niedźwiedzia, chyba ci skóra nie miła... (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Potop», 194).

The metaphor of the disease ‘object is sick and requires treatment’ as a key metaphor of different texts and genres was identified in political communication and publicistic texts by A. Chudinov; it is manifested in the frame of ‘Treason as an infection’, for example, in the works of G. Senkevich: *W pień ich!... Zdrada najzaraźliwsza, mości panowie!... Wyrwać kąkol, bo inaczej zginiemy wszyscy!* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Potop», 115), *Jakże?... I waćpan był pod Ujściem?... i waćpan patrzył na to wszystko własnymi oczyma?!... Toż to po prostu zdrada była najzaraźliwsza, w dziejach niesłychana!* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Potop», 133), which is represented in particular by comparative constructions: *Straszna rzecz, wiarę przechodząca! – mówił Stanisław Skrzetuski. – Gdzie się coś podobnego działo? Ratujcie mnie, mości panowie, bo czuję, że mi się w głowie miesza...Dwie wojny, trzecia kozacka... a do tego zdrada jak zaraza* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Potop», 191).

In Y.Slovatsky’s idiosstyle, the analyzed concept is combined with other emotional concepts – *conscience, care*, that fill or poison everyday life and human fate imbibed with mother’s milk: *Gwiazdy winne, że knuleś cudzą śmierć lub zdradę, W kolebce byłeś takim jak dzisiaj zbrodniarzem, Z pokarmu matki ssaleś dni strute zgryzotą!* (Juliusz Słowacki «Maria Stuart», 22). Pejorative assessment can be attributed to treason, as evidenced by the combinability of this word with moral and evaluative adjectives as well as other ethical concepts – *honor, przysięga, grzech, hańba*: *Nikomiu nie ufam – mówił zgryźliwie starzec. – Bo jaką mi dać kto może rękojmię?... Przysięgę czy słowo honoru?... Za stary jestem, aby wierzyć w przysięgi... Tylko wspólny interes jako tako zabezpiecza od najpodlejszej zdrady, a i to nie zawsze...*(Bolesław Prus «Lalka» 56), *Dokonano okropnej zdrady – odparł Mefres chwytając się za głowę...* (Bolesław Prus «Faraon», 527), *On umiera! Królowo, okropna to zdrada! Nicku! Nicku! i cóż mam uczynić dla ciebie? Oczy twoje ściemniały i twarz śmiercią blada...* (Juliusz Słowacki «Maria Stuart», 76), *Mości zwróć, zanimbym do tej haniebnej zdrady miał dobrowolnie przyłożyć ręki. Bogu Waszą Książęcą Mość polecam...* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Potop», 185); *A jak widzę, to mnie tu on haniebnie zdradza I sam pięknie przy własnej patronuje sprawie* (Juliusz Słowacki «Mazepa», 36).

The conceptualization of breach of faith as a sin and dirt is represented in Henryk Sienkiewicz's texts: „*Raz pan nas już zdradził, chyba nie skorzystamy z pańskich usług...* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Przygody Kanoniera Dolasa», 72), *Grzech nieczystości. Zdradziłem moją żonę* (Henryk Sienkiewicz «Przygody Kanoniera Dolasa», 94).

Artifact metaphors, as a rule, correlate with spatial and sensory code. So, in «Pharaoh» by Prus, Treason is encoded as a liquid flowing from a leaky barrel: *Zdrada ciągle sączy się jak woda z pękniętej beczki...* (Bolesław Prus «Faraon», 925) or it can change in size: grow, increase (the prototypical agricultural donor sphere), this parameterization of the trait is observed in Y. Slovatskiy's works: *Czuć, że na twojej, mój staruszku, roli Nie rośnie zdrada...*(Juliusz Słowacki «Fantazy», 52).

Object symbolic metaphors appear in relation to the scenario of hunting prey and tools and can be found in the texts of “*Psalterz Dawidów*” by J. Kokhanovsky (the image of *a fishing net* as a symbol of treason, a trap, a bird caught in a net as a symbol of treacherous actions and deeds) : *Strzeż mię od fortelów ludzi nieżyczliwych, Abych się nie pobił w ich sieciach zdradliwych* (Jan Kochanowski «Psałterz Dawidów», 136), *Wywikłaliśmy się z ich sieci zdradliwych, jako więc lichy ptaszek z ręku myśliwych* (Jan Kochanowski «Psałterz Dawidów», 125); *Rybacy to rąbali Przelomkę biednym rybkom zdradliwą... Nagle okropny krzyk – w przelomkę człowiek pada* (Juliusz Słowacki «Balladyna», 22), *Napędzał zaś ryby do zdradzieckiej sieci za pomocą Kinga, który, wprowadzony w wodę, mącił ją i burzył tak niestychanie...*(Henryk Sienkiewicz «W Pustyni i w Puszczy», 239). These Biblical motives are recorded in dictionaries of symbols, for example, «Co więcej, człowiek jest nieświadomy swego jutra, jak ryby schwytane w zdradliwe sieci albo ptaki w sidła. „Jak one, tak też ludzie uwikłani zostaną w złej chwili, gdy spadnie na nich zniecka» (Koh 9, 12). “Old Testament”, literally – “Moreover, a person is not always confident in his future, like a fish falling into a net or birds trapped; people similar to them can get into adverse circumstances where they are jeopardised”⁴⁸.

It is also worth recalling in this respect the action-related predicates connected to the opposition “to buy- to sell” which in their internal form is close to Russian “передавать”, “спредать” or “одступать”

⁴⁸Lurker M. Słownik obrazów i symboli biblijnych; tł., red.bp K.Romaniuk. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1989. S. 211.

(apostasy from smth, oath, faith, ideals, betrayal of Christ): *Zarzucomu odstępstwo od wiary*⁴⁹. The image of lentils as a Biblical symbol of the betrayal of Jesus Christ is actualized in the Czech linguistic culture: *Prodat, zradit koho za mису čočovice/čočovici/pro čočovici* (sell, betray someone) – literally for lentil soup (for a bowl of lentils)⁵⁰. Let us also compare Russian and Polish typologically similar verbal phrases with the variable lexical and syntactic composition: *продать душу дьяволу, Ni wie, gdzie Boga zdradzono, Nie wie, gdzie go przedano*⁵¹, *Za pieniądze diabłu duszę sprzeda, Być dla kogoś judaszem* (człowiekiem fałszywym), *Patrząc przez judasz* (otwór w dziwiach), *Judaszowski uśmiech, Judaszowski/judaszowy pocałunek, Judaszowskie srebrniki*⁵², Russian: *Иуда лжет блюда, Иуда ест и без блюда, Иуде верить, не беда заплатиться*⁵³. An echo of the Biblical motives are represented in the Ukrainian language: *І найсолодший поцілунок може бути затроєний* (profile “Biblical treason”, “Sin / Devil”, “Soul”, “God). The insidiousness (with the semantic component “on the sly”, “secretly”) is conceptualized by the Poles through the idea of an unjust, black path: *Iść czarnym szlakiem (borem) ’robić co zdradziecko, podstępnie’*.

Recurring to the subframe “adultery”, which is the most richly represented in the Russian dialect language, including the boyfriend’s treason, it is worth mentioning that the latter is also represented by the slot “to encroach other’s property”, for example *заняться чужбинкой* (Mordovian dialects) “betray a partner”, *поджечь чужую масленицу* “betray somebody” (Novgorod subdialects)⁵⁴. This expression is part of a rather extensive synonymous row of phraseological units associated in

⁴⁹ Dereń E., Nowak T., Polański E. Słownik języka polskiego z frazeologizmami i przysłowiami. Warszawa, 2008. S. 259.

⁵⁰ Mokienko V., Wurm A. Česko-ruski frazeologický slovník. Olomouc, 2002. S. 88.

⁵¹ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. III. S. 677.

⁵² Dereń E., Nowak T., Polański E. Słownik języka polskiego z frazeologizmami i przysłowiami. Warszawa, 2008. S.146; Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4. / Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. I. S. 508.

⁵³ Мокиенко В.М, Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. С. 392.

⁵⁴ Моргунова О.В., Кривошапова Ю.А., Осипова К.В. Русский народный календарь. Этнолингвистический словарь. / науч. ред. Е. Л. Березович. Москва: Аст-пресс книга, 2015. С. 253.

different languages with different realities of life, agricultural and other instruments, cutlery. Compare for example, Russian (Arkhangelsk) *Парить кишку в чужом горшке* “live with someone else's wife”⁵⁵. In the Ukrainian language some proverbs are also formed according to the model ‘attack on someone else’s property, wife, etc’’: *Не скакай у чужу гречку, бо лихо тобі буде, Чужая жона – здоровье чиесь, Як против сонця води не напиться, так з чужою жоною, або з мужем чужим не нажитися*⁵⁶. Similar notions are found in the Belarusian tradition, according to which “extramarital relations of married people were perceived as a loss of individual vital energy” (*Не паглядай на чужых жонак: ці скасееш, ці здурнееш*) and the fate of the family: *Чужую галубіць – сваю сям'ю згубіць*»; it was believed that the most active in terms of extramarital relations men eventually begin to resemble their genitals: «*Чужая падушка лысіну працярэбіць*»⁵⁷. The idea of encroaching another's property is clearly represented in the popular consciousness. Let us compare Russian *Зачем жениться, когда чужая ложиться*⁵⁸ [БСПП: 996] and the image of a sickle in someone else's rye in English idioms: *Put your sickle in another man's corn* which means adultery, extramarital contact⁵⁹, as well as some parallels, for example, in the Lemky dialect phraseology of Ukrainians: *ходити до чужого ревіру* – break adultery⁶⁰.

CONCLUSIONS

All discussed secondary ways of conceptualization of ENVY, BETRAYAL and SLANDER are united by the universal mental predicates of action and state in their close relations to the corporal metaphors and the verbs of destruction and physical influence (whine, ache, hurt, gnaw, stab, feel hunger, etc.). Similar semantic regularities are observed in ontologically and pragmatically different conceptual spheres – TRUTH, JUSTICE, SHAME, MELANCHOLY, YEARNING,

⁵⁵ Алексеенко М.А., Белоусова Т.П., Литвинникова О.И. Человек в русской диалектной фразеологии. Словарь. Москва, 2004. С. 97.

⁵⁶ Номис М. Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Київ, 2004. С. 183.

⁵⁷ Санько С., Валодзіна Т., Василевич У. і інш. Беларуская міфалогія. Энцыклапедычны слоўнік. Мінск, 2004. С. 570.

⁵⁸ Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. С. 996.

⁵⁹ Wilkinson P.R. A thesaurus of traditional English metaphors / P. R. Wilkinson. London; New York, 1993. P. 159.

⁶⁰ Вархол Н., Івченко А. Фразеологічний словник лемківських говірок Східної Словаччини. Пряшев, 1990. С. 112.

CARE, FATE which, except destructive psychical correlates in their semantic structure (see metaphor of *worm* or *gnawing creature*, *conscience as a judge and its actions*), have specific means of correlations between corporal and spiritual, mental notions (as in the Czech language, where *shame* is transferred onto the human clothing, compare: *má z ostudy kabát ušitý* “he has neither shame no conscience” – lit. “his suit is made of shame”). Let remind in this respect the mythological and naïve ideas that shoes, clothes and hair represent the human being as a whole.

These and similar moral and ethical aspects require special consideration both from the perspective of ethnic culture and customs and in their relations to specific emotions. An old English proverb quoted by social anthropologists may serve as an example (*The greatest shame is to envy people for their money, clothes or wealth*⁶¹) or the Ukrainian cycle of “shaming songs” in Ukrainian wedding traditions which were performed in case when the bride turned to be impure and the wedding was claimed “improper”.

Concerning the SLANDER, this concept is closely related to ENVY, FRAUD and BETRAYAL as well as to hypocrisy (black colour and sensational metaphors, for example, sweet or sour) manifesting deep Christian and Bible roots verbalized in the idea of betrayal of Christ and the punishment for slander and treason (compare, the national and cultural symbolism of these motives represented in the image of “bowl of lentil” in the Czech linguistic culture against the background of other international phraseological units and proverbs, or the idea of punishment for the calumny in the Polish linguistic culture). All discussed emotions and axiological expressions from the cognitive treatment of the language metaphorically codify and actualize the notions of surface and middle and can function both as objects (to attack somebody ...) and as subjects of predicative constructions or patient (to overwhelm, encompass, overtake).

Imagery and notional centers of these expressions and idioms are created by secondary evaluative philosophical and moral senses of good and evil (pure and dirty in respect to the conscience, slander, betrayal), mud, stain, purification embodying the principles of religious ethics or violation of the conventional norms. Envy as betrayal (in Polish

⁶¹ Гельмут Шёк. Зависть: теория социального поведения / пер. с англ. В. Кошкина; под ред. Ю. Кузнецова. Москва: ИРИСЭН, 2008. С. 30.

phraseology and literary discourse) manifests itself in the repertory of similar metaphors – to emaciate, break, etc.; disease and corresponding physical and psychological sensations; typologically similar spatial symbolic representations of CONTAINER, BOTTOM, chthonic symbols of Pit, Gap, Snake, symbols of colour and smell.

The profile “adultery” is directly related to the frame “domestic is better than alien” and is represented by structural semiotic model that includes variable optional components united by a certain subframe.

Some ethnic, cultural and psychological notions, Envy as an example, are projected to the facts of folk calendar (compare the Russian *Касьян завистник*) and traditional Christian beliefs about positive or negative functions of certain Patrons from Slavic folk calendar: one more circle of notions is linked to the stereotypes of ominous, sinister, ill-boding eye in Slavonic magical apotropaic actions or objects and their functioning. This phenomenon, thus, has brought forward numerous somatic phraseological units in Russian dialects and in other languages.

SUMMARY

“Language modeling of cultural values” includes the sociocultural vocabulary formation, which reflects the basic culture categories, person’s spiritual and practical experience regulatives, his emotions and estimations. In the certain culture type formation and development process, cultural and value meanings formed in language (“the clots of culture in language”) harmonize cultural memory, form ideas about cultural identity and continuity, moral and ethical, philosophical, ideological, religious and life values of a certain linguistic community.

This chapter presents a figurative and metaphoric component of the conceptual spheres of Envy, Betrayal and Slander in Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech linguistic and conceptual picture of the world in their interrelation and interpenetration. It reveals cognitive semantic and pragmatic laws and principles of their content representation by indirect derivational means of secondary nomination – phrases, idioms, stable comparisons, proverbs, allusions in compared linguistic cultures; their regional, ethnic and cultural specificity in certain dialects, as well as bilingual and special dictionaries. It has been analyzed the cognitive metaphors of BETRAYAL and TREACHERY in Polish fiction discourse (in J. Kokhanowsky’s, J. Slovacky’s, G. Senkevich’s works,) and means of their expression correlated with the corresponding cultural codes –

anthropomorphic, subject, artifact, spatial, colour and others, cognitive models: "ENVY AND BETRAYAL – DISEASE, PASSION, PIT, LIVING CREATURE, CAPACITY OF EMOTIONS, TABLEWARE, LIQUID SUBSTANCE, etc. The chapter represents linguistic culturological analysis of relevant conceptual spheres correlated with socio-evaluative, ethical, axiological, calendar-ritual and other ideas (deception, hypocrisy, revenge, infidelity, betrayal in the Christian tradition and ideology, for example, some notions of time and Bible notions associated with betrayal and envy) in their intertextual and national-cultural aspects.

REFERENCES

1. Danielewiczowa M. Główne problemy opisu i podziału czasownikowych predykatów mentalnych / Studia z semantyki porównawczej. Nazwy barw. Nazwy wymiarów. Predykaty mentalne; pod red. R. Grzegorzczkovej i K. Waszakowej. Cz 1. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2000. S. 227–248.
2. Dereń E., Nowak T., Polański E. Słownik języka polskiego z frazeologizmami i zysłowiami. Warszawa, 2008. 526 s.
3. Dunaj B. Słownik języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2005. 902 s.
4. Гельмут Шёк. Зависть: теория социального поведения / пер. с англ. В. Кошкина; под ред. Ю. Кузнецова. Москва: ИРИСЭН, 2008. 544 с.
5. Lurker M. Słownik obrazów i symboli biblijnych; tł., red. bp K. Romaniuk. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1989. 306 s.
6. Mokienko V., Wurm A. Česko-ruski frazeologický slovník. Olomouc, 2002. 660 s.
7. Muldner-Nieckowski S. Carofano-Bugajska Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2003. 1088 s.
8. Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1–4 / red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978.
9. Wierzbicka A. Semantyka. Jednostki elementarne i uniwersalne. Lublin, 2006. 535 s.
10. Wilkinson P.R. A thesaurus of traditional English metaphors. London; New York, 1993. 490 p.
11. Алексеенко М.А., Белоусова Т.П., Литвинникова О.И. Человек в русской диалектной фразеологии. Словарь. Москва, 2004. 238 с.

12. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Лингвокультурология. Ценностно-смысловое пространство языка: учебное пособие. Москва, 2010. 288 с.

13. Арутюнова Н.Д. Ментальные действия: Сборник статей / Логический анализ языка. Избранное 1988-1995; под общ. ред. Н.Д.Арутюновой. Москва: Индрик, 2003. 454 с.

14. Вархол Н., Івченко А. Фразеологічний словник лемківських говірок Східної Словаччини. Пряшев, 1990.160 с.

15. Даль В.И. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка: в 4-х т. Москва, 1989–1991. Т. 1. 538 с.

16. Запольская Н.Н. Спасение, любовь, милосердие: К вопросу о языковом моделировании культурных ценностей / Эволюция ценностей в языках и культурах; ответ.ред. И.А.Седакова. Москва: Пробел, 2000. 240 с.

17. Максимов С. Крылатые слова по толкованию С.В. Максимова; послесл. и коммент. Ю.М. Медведева. Москва: Астрель, 2000. 400 с.

18. Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва, 2010. 1024 с.

19. Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Словарь псковских пословиц и поговорок. Санкт-Петербург, 2001. 174 с.

20. Мокиенко В.М, Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва, 2007. 784 с.

21. Моргунова О.В., Кривошапова Ю.А., Осипова К.В. Русский народный календарь. / Этнолингвистический словарь; науч. ред. Е.Л. Березович. Москва: Аст-пресс книга, 2015. 544 с.

22. Номис М. Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Київ, 2004. 768 с.

23. Плав'юк С. Приповідки, або українсько-народня філософія. / Зібрав, підготував до друку та опублікував Володимир С. Плав'юк. Едмонтон, 1998. 354 с.

24. Прокошева К.Н. Фразеологический словарь пермских говоров. Пермь, 2002. 432 с.

25. Санько С., Валодзіна Т., Василевич У. і інш. Беларуска міфалогія. Энцыклапедычны слоўнік. Мінск, 2004.582 с.

26. Словарь русских народных говоров. Вып. 1–36. Москва–Ленинград (СПб.): Наука, 1965–2002.

27. Толстой Н.И. Этнографический комментарий к древним славяно-русским текстам. 1. Сеть (мрежа) / Литература и искусство в

системе культуры; отв.ред. акад. Пиотровский. Москва: Наука, 1988. С. 122–129.

28. Ужченко В., Ужченко Д. Фразеологічний словник східнослобожанських і степових говірок Донбасу. Луганськ, 2000. 336 с.

29. Фразеологический словарь русских говоров Сибири / ред. А.И. Федоров. Новосибирск: Наука, 1983. 232 с.

Information about the author:

Tyshchenko O. V.

Doctor of Philology,

Professor at the Department

of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies,

Lviv State University of Life Safety

35, Kleparivska str., Lviv, Ukraine

Professor at the Department of Russian Studies,

University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava

Trnava, nam. Herdu 2, Slovak Republic