

## KEY WORDS OF THE UKRAINIAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ASPECT

Yaremko Ya. P., Matskiv P. V.

### INTRODUCTION

National features of conceptosphere is considered by means history of words called key words. “When a learner masters a language and particularly meaning of the words they accept the world conceptualization typical of certain culture. Thus, the words that contain linguospecific concepts both “reflect” and “establish” the natives’ way of thinking<sup>1</sup>. The headline of monography by A. Vezhbytska “Culture Comprehension through the Key Words” renders the cumulative potency of these words<sup>2</sup>. According to the researcher, “the culture analysis cannot ignore the importance of the semantic consideration of culture. The relevance of semantics is never restricted by the lexical semantics but it is unlikely to reveal with the same intensity in any other sphere<sup>3</sup>”.

**State as one of the key words in a political culture.** The internal (implicit) structure of the word *state* defined as “the territory characterized as integrity from the point of view of history, people and political order<sup>4</sup>” etymologically related to Proto-Slavic *\*drĥati* “to hold; to own”<sup>5</sup>. The idea of *state* in this meaning is widened by the synonyms *krayina* (country), *zemlia* (land), *tsarstvo* (kingdom), *papstvo* (popedom), *krai* (land), *storona* (land). Syntagmatically the last two components can combine with the words *nash* (our), *ridnyi* (native). In this case it is necessary to find out when these associative attributes could have combined with the word *state*. The relation *nasha derzhava* (our state), *ridna derzhava* (native state)

---

<sup>1</sup> Шмелев А. Ф. Могут ли слова языка быть ключем к пониманию культуры. *Вежбицкая Анна. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов* / пер. с англ. А. Ф. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. С. 7–11.

<sup>2</sup> Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов / пер. с англ. А. Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. 288 с.

<sup>3</sup> Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов / пер. с англ. А. Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. 288 с.

<sup>4</sup> Словник синонімів української мови : у 2 т. / А. А. Бурячок, Г. М. Гнатюк, С. І. Головащук та ін. Київ : Наукова думка, 1999. Т. 1. 1020 с.; 2000. Т. 2. 954 с.

<sup>5</sup> Етимологічний словник української мови : в 7 т. / гол. ред. О. С. Мельничук. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982. Т. 1. 631 с.; 1985. Т. 2. 570 с.; 1989. Т. 3. 549 с.; 2001. Т. 4. 653 с.; 2006. Т. 5. 703 с.

inevitably have an impact on the internal image of “we”, the national character, political and communicative behavior. Thus, the context of the concept *state* should be considered regarding the history of the word *derzhava* (state) which appears to some extent the demonstrative language reflection of the historical development of the Ukrainian state formation.

*State* originated from Old Rus period. This is evidenced by “Materials for the Dictionary of the Old Russian Language”. By I. I. Sreznevsky that may be considered as “certain contribution to the investigation of the history of the Ukrainian lexicology”. The semantic structure of the word consists of the following lexico-semantic variants: 1) “support, basis”; 2) “power, strength”; 3) “government, rule”; 4) “possession, state”; 5) “subservient, people<sup>6</sup>”. Although “our Kyiv Medieval state, “this empire that did not succeed” according to Ye. Malaniuk never existed long<sup>7</sup>” it served the basis for the Ukrainian statehood.

When the South-West Rus territory belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (this period was hardly ever the point of studies), the old Kyevan state practice was of growing relevance: “the Lithuanian political system was built according to the system of Kyev Rus, old Ukrainian law system became the state system of the Grand Duchy, even customs and traditions were taken from Ukraine<sup>8</sup>”. Taking into account the political statement that “state is a fundamental, basic, organizing structure in the political and social system<sup>9</sup>”. Let us consider the relation between the concept *state* and another key concept *pravo* (right, law).

Language traditions of the formal style of Old Kyevan language were preserved in the official documents of the Lithuanian Duche: the language gained the official status. Subsequently, the word *law* obtained the following meanings: 1) (the right, freedom, ability to act, to perform, to control something ensured by the state) law; 2) law order; legal proof; 3) justice; 4) (state law authorities) court; verdict<sup>10</sup> [sl XIV]. Dictionary of the Old Rus Language by Sreznevsky defines the word *law* as: 1) freedom of act; power; 2) laws; [srezn], in Old Ukrainian the semantic meaning of

---

<sup>6</sup> Срезневский И. И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка. СПб., 1893–1912. Т. 1–3.

<sup>7</sup> Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 80 с.

<sup>8</sup> Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Львів : Видання Івана Титора, 1936. 288 с.

<sup>9</sup> Політологія : підручник / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с.

<sup>10</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

*law* and related *state* has considerably extended. The key word status is proved by the number of set expressions with the component *pravo* (law right): *ymaty pravo* (to have a right), *lyshyty na pravo* (to preserve the right of somebody); *prava zhadaty* (to stand up for the right); *bez prava* (illegally); *ys pravom* (legally); *pravom yskaty* (to prosecute); *vydaty s prava* (to hand in by law); *v pravo vstupyty* (to initiate criminal proceedings), *pravo daty* (to bring to justice) *pravo mayet byty* (somebody must be tried), *k pravu pryvodyty* (to initiate criminal proceedings) *pravom yty* (to initiate criminal proceedings), *staty na pravo* (to appear before the court), *vydaty vo pravo* (to bring somebody to justice), *zazvaty na pravo* (to be subpoenaed) *stoyaty na pravo* (to litigate), *daty svoye pravo* (to assure)<sup>11</sup>. The semantic peculiarities of the notions related to law and order in the medieval Ukraine are illustrated by generic hierarchy of terms-politonyms with the basic component *law* and specific attributes: *pravo pospolytoye* “public law”, *pravo tsiesarskoye* “Roman law”, *voloskoye pravo* “parish law”, *ziemskoye pravo* “zemsk law”, *khrystyiyanskoye pravo* “Christian law”, *polskoye pravo* “Polish feudal law”, *ruskoye pravo* (Russian law), *holopskoye pravo* “feudal law<sup>12</sup>”. Axiological units (axiologemes – Gr *axios* “the one being valuable”; logos “science, theory”) denoting values play the important role in organization of political communication. In Ukraine in XIV – XV c the notion *law* settled in the people’s consciousness and became axiologeme.

Nowadays modern political discourse often refers to those values which should be followed by politician in the state development processes. Thus, another medieval axiologeme appears – *knight’s code*. The reason is that due to the military conditions of social life in Ukraine in XIV – XV c the knight’s code acquired considerable importance. It supported the functioning of military-hierarchical system of Rus and Lithuanian Duchy and established the ideals of bravery and dignity. Despite the obvious differentiation among the representatives – princes, lords, and ordinary boyars, among the nobility being “higher” and “lower” – these were mostly warriors who created the only people called “*narod-shliakhta*” (noble people). The only way to become a member of the lower layer was to pay the “blood tax” states the author of the monograph “Ukrainian Nobility of

---

<sup>11</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

<sup>12</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

the end of XIV to the mid XVII c, Natalia Yakovenko<sup>13</sup>. The lifestyle of the “nobleborn” as well as their outlook promoted the establishment of personality cult as a phenomenon of the western world.

The notion *noble dignity* became dominant in the system of worldview values in the Middle Ages. The first Lithuanian statute considering the part about nobleman’s ethics states: “a feudal landowner who unseasonably leaves the battle loses his estate, the one who never possesses land “loses their dignity while they fled the battle<sup>14</sup>”. The social status obliged to certain moral norms tabooing not only dishonorable actions but also some occupations for example trade. The famous researcher of the medieval times, Ya. Hurevych admitted that “dignity, military bravery and generosity were the essential features of a nobleman being worthy of their great ancestors not because the representatives of lower layers did not have them. The reason was that those features never were the inborn ones<sup>15</sup>”.

In those times called Dark Ages a nobleman oath was not only axiological category but also served as legal evidence in a court. Thus one of the meanings of the lexeme word is “obligation, oath<sup>16</sup>”. The inherited synonymic expressions *slovo chesti* (a word of dignity), *slovo honoru* (a word of honor) (borrowed from Polish honor, originated from Lat. honor “honor<sup>17</sup>”, “the word formula to assure honesty and genuineness” prove the importance of a word, its influence on the gradation of the social values. Let us refer to the set expressions in Old Ukraine: *„подъ честію; подъ честію и в□рою; при честі и в□ру*, (oath formula) “honestly”. Modern national language picture of the world is likely to owe the whole layer of phrazemes with the component *chest*: *vystupaty* (postoyaty, borotysia) *za chest* “to protect one’s dignity”, *z chesti* (vykonaty, vytrymaty) “to perform successfully”, *robyty* (zrobyty) *chest* (to show respect for something or somebody), *chesti ne maty* “to be ashamed”; *chest chesti* “honestly”, *klasty* (*poklasty*) *na sobi chest* “not want to be humiliated”;

---

<sup>13</sup> Яковенко Н. Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь і Центральна Україна). Київ, 1993. 416 с.

<sup>14</sup> Яковенко Н. Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь і Центральна Україна). Київ, 1993. 416 с.

<sup>15</sup> Гуревич А. Я. Проблемы генезиса феодализма в Западной Европе. Москва : Высшая школа, 1970. 224 с.

<sup>16</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

<sup>17</sup> Етимологічний словник української мови : в 7 т. / гол. ред. О. С. Мельничук. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982. Т. 1. 631 с.; 1985. Т. 2. 570 с.; 1989. Т. 3. 549 с.; 2001. Т. 4. 653 с.; 2006. Т. 5. 703 с.

*kliastysia svoeyu chestiu* “swear by your honor” ; *pole chesti* “battleground”<sup>18</sup>.

Whereas the characteristic feature of phraseological units is the image reasonability related to the people’s outlook so these secondary signs of nomination imply the peculiarities of its mentality, national and culture experience, and traditions. Precisely the process of formation new frasesemes relates to the Ukrainian world and state creation. The leading role belongs to the elite that tended to harmonize the knight’s code, that is: to justify the words by real actions or activity. The genetic succession of the Old Rus *state* was being established thanks to the boyar-prince elite (first of all to Ostrozki Princes – “uncrowned princes of Rus”. The knight’s ideals of duty, bravery and dignity developed in the elite environment establishing the primitive psychological features of the national character<sup>19</sup>.

On this stage the Ukrainian character revealed the specific features of the personality that according to the prince Konstantin Vyshnevetsky, the younger brother of Zaporizhian Sich foudator Dmytro Vyshnevetsky (Baida), at the Lublin Sejm declared: “We are highly honorable people, we will never yield to any people in the world”.

Analyzing the concept *state* in cognitive and communicative-pragmatic aspects it is necessary to take into account the knowledge of the communicators about the world (academic knowledge), the social and cultural environment where the communication takes place, the historical context. In linguistic pragmatics this knowledge is qualified as background. It produces the notional words which develop new meanings in the process of communication. The semantic transformations are regular and permanent. They support immanent language ability to function as a means of cognition.

If to consider the lexicographic work according to the characteristic of V. Rusanivsky as “dictionary of the collective memory<sup>20</sup>”, than referring to “Dictionary of XVI – first half of XVII c” the semantic structure of the word *state* is expanding by means of attaching the political, statecentric meanings: except the inherited sememes from XIV – XV c “power, rule” “(*independent state with its government*) state, there were also the new ones: “(country, land) state”; “statehood”; “the place, territory where a person feels being a lord, owner of the land”; “the right to dispose of

---

<sup>18</sup> Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

<sup>19</sup> Яковенко Н. Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь і Центральна Україна). Київ, 1993. 416 с.

<sup>20</sup> Русанівський В. М. Структура лексичної і граматичної семантики. Київ : Наукова думка, 1988. 238 с.

something or somebody) “strength, power”; “support”; (*golden sphere with the cross on it to show the power*) “state”<sup>21</sup>.

Semantic evolution of the word *state* connected with the emergence and establishment of Cossacks being nation and state creation factor. To realize the nature of the Cossack state it is necessary to consider “historically” the geocultural conditions of its establishing that is to become aware of the relations between political history and culture durability, between spirituality and “human existence on the territory”<sup>22</sup>. The second aspect according to Ye. Malaniuk, is far more closely and harmoniously connected to culture than politics. Geography, climate, religion and life close to borderline where the constant struggle with Tatars took place, when “sometimes peace sometimes war” with the enemies, and you never leave the saber had effected the way of thinking, behavior, lifestyle, had formed the brave, assertive, freedom loving characters that supported the emergence of the new social stratum called Cossacks. However it was a long way to go through anarchy, assault, otamanstvo for “Cossacks to obtain that meaning of honorable leaders revealed only in XVII c”<sup>23</sup>. Thus, the Cossack lifestyle, Cossack rights and outlook acquired the new meaning as well. The word related to the creator of the Cossack state, Cossack gained the notional synergetics.

This word has distinct historical and cultural biography. Cossack (Turk. Kazak – “free, independent person”) first mentioned in the historical documents of XV c to denote the free settlers going hunting and other doing other crafts in hardly inhabited areas of the South Kyiv and East Podillia<sup>24</sup>. Together with the evolution of the Cossack movement the word also acquired new context. Thus in the first half of XVI the word gained the military meaning “a representative of Zaporizhian army” as a representative of the Cossack Ukraine and later – “the participant of the national-liberation movement against foreign conquerors”<sup>25</sup>.

Since Cossacks became defenders of the people, the creators of a nation and Ukrainian state, the word *Cossack* deepened its linguistic context and acquired ethno-cultural one with the distinct symbolic meaning. The background information (national and cultural context) in

---

<sup>21</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

<sup>22</sup> Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 80 с.

<sup>23</sup> Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 80 с.

<sup>24</sup> Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія / відп. ред. В. М. Русанівський. Київ : Наукова думка, 1983. 743 с.

<sup>25</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

words-symbols usually prevails over the denotative one (objective). It results in the difficulty to comprehend the meaning of a symbol in intercultural communication. Intercultural asymmetry can cause cognitive dissonance between the participants of communication and their discomfort and psychological tension can lead to a communicative crash – the so called communicative deviations.

In the Ukrainian language the word-symbol *Cossack*, according to the famous investigator of Ukrainian symbols V. Kononenko, defined at last as love of freedom, firmness, bravery, soul dignity, sincerity. Although the life conditions changed, the notion *Cossack* remains in people's consciousness as the shade of the heroic past<sup>26</sup>. It is reasonable to state the necessity to preserve live cognitive image that according to our concept certification forms the basis for this psychomental configuration. This image emerged due to the metaphoric reflection that determines the complicated psychological processes taking place on the pre-language level and related to the so called archetypal semantics. Cognitive image aims at positive perception of *Cossack*. In modern communicative-pragmatic sphere the esteem associations are permanently stable and deep for both the addressee and sender. It can be illustrated by the following consituation: “Even though we live in Kyiv not in Cossack environment we take it positive when a woman is told that she gave birth to a *Cossack*. However it is clear that the birth of a baby boy is meant. The word Cossack delights and never bewilders Ukrainians. That never happens in case we are told of giving birth to a plumber or Pioneer. So don't you think that myths sometimes help us to survive and not to get insane in the cruel world?<sup>27</sup>” The above mentioned consituation contains the interaction of communicators' presuppositions having common knowledge, information particularly on myths about *Cossack state* and the subject of this state – *Cossacks*. If to consider myth as a symbolic reveal of certain events, old historical notions, initial world perception<sup>28</sup>, then according to Mukhailyna Kotsiubynska “the spirit and image of Cossacks always lives in the consciousness of a modern Ukrainians. This is one of the distinguishing features of their mentality<sup>29</sup>”.

While the modern political discourse often refers to “Euro benchmarks” as: “European values”, “Euroinegration”, “European vector of Ukraine” it is necessary to mention the efforts of Cossacks intellectuals

---

<sup>26</sup>Кононенко В. Символи української мови. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, 1996. 272 с.

<sup>27</sup>Грабовська І. Жіночі історії від Людмили Таран. *Сучасність*. 2007. № 8. С. 145–148.

<sup>28</sup>Кононенко В. Символи української мови. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, 1996. 272 с.

<sup>29</sup>Коцюбинська М. Мої обрії : у 2-х т. Київ : Дух і літера, 2004. 386 с.

(P. Mohyla, L. Zyzaniya, M. Smotrytsky, S. Kosov, P. Berynda, K. Sakovych, K. Sravrovetsky and others. Thanks to their activity the west European educational programs on the basis of Latin knowledge were implemented, the concept of synthesis of west European culture and culture formed on the ethnic basis was worked out. In the context of this synthesis appeared the Ukrainian or “Cossack” baroque (late XVII – early XVIII c that left its track in various areas of the national and cultural artistic activity: literature, architecture, painting, and carving. It means that the Ukrainian baroque culture distinctly revealed in state building times of Mazepa, became the integral part of the Ukrainian spiritual development, its deep connection with the European cultural space. It modernized the cognitive picture of the world of conscious layer of the Ukrainian society having enriched Ukrainian political thinking with the nation forming concepts. It was definitely reflected in Ukrainian national outlook. The researchers of the Ukrainian culture maintain that the phenomenon of baroque consciousness appeared at that time. Its analysis “gives the opportunity to trace the connection of the Ukrainian baroque with the Ukrainian mentality<sup>30</sup>”. Subsequently the leading role in Ivan Mazepa’s state project was given to the creation of new military and cultural imperatives – “at arte et marte” (“by art and war”). These priorities he implemented in his poetry: “Nehai vichna bude slava, zhe prez shabliu mayem prava” (may the glory stay eternal; we protect it with the saber). The law system established by the political culture of Old Kyevan state was legitimate on the territory of Zaporizhian Sich and since XVI – XVII on the rest of Ukraine. “Cossack law” – set of norms. It reflects the value system typical of that society. If to reflect on the statement of axiologists and psychologists that values exist on the subconscious level and belong to inherited archetypes, “automatic” knowledge, it is reasonable to admit the word-axiologeme “law” to denote one of the fundamental concepts of the Ukrainian political picture of the world of those days.

This statement does not contradict the idea of modern cognitologists that the cognition of the conceptual meaning of value character is supported by the analysis of not only linguistic reveal of a concept synchronically but also by the consideration of its development related to the old picture of the world<sup>31</sup>. The cultural basis ensuring the emergence of new concepts in this case is vital. The formation dynamics of the concept

---

<sup>30</sup> Кримський С. Під сигнатурою Софії. Київ : Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2008. 367 с.

<sup>31</sup> Скаб М. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакрального сфери. Чернівці : Рута, 2008. 560 с.



*state* its context during the period of establishing the Ukrainian baroque implied the existence of national and cultural Renaissance spirit in the Ukrainian culture. Mazepian Ukraine having renewed after Ruina was being transformed into modern European state with typical priorities like programmed by “the republic project” Kyiv-Mohyla academy, erecting and reconstruction of some monumental buildings, church building and what was of special importance – “Pacta et Constitutiones” known as Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. Modern politologists agree that the constitution contains “innovative democratic fundamentals of state and social life<sup>32</sup>”. Thus, the word denoting the concept *state* on the same level dialectically related to the word constitution defined as “the main law of a state regulating state and social order, electoral system, principles of arrangement and function of state authorities as well as citizen’s duties<sup>33</sup>”. The branched same characteristics of the denotative meaning of the word *constitution* genetically refer to its own definition in “Dictionary of XVI – first half XVII c”: *constitution* 1) legislation that regulates law on a certain territory), law, decree; 2) government resolution; decision<sup>34</sup>.

However, the accurate dictionary definition is not able to render the deep sense that the denotative unit acquired in the process of reality conceptualization. The concept is meant to be rooted not only into cognitive-interpretational dimension in a certain communicative situation but also into the structure implying the relation between history and national culture and language, that is into consciousness dimension. Consciousness provides the cognitive matrix to percept the world and self being in this world. Claude Levi-Strause mentioned “We are unaware of the fact that language and culture appear to be two parallel types of activity related to the deeper layer. [...]. This is a human spirit. Politologists use the cognitive category *spirit* to figure out the significance of Pylyp Orlyk’s Constitution in the history of the Ukrainian (and not only) state building: “The constitution filled with liberal and democratic spirit became one of the most interesting creations of the European political thought of the time<sup>35</sup>”. While a concept is a mental unit, element of consciousness, the

---

<sup>32</sup> Політологія : підручник / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с.

<sup>33</sup> Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

<sup>34</sup> Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.

<sup>35</sup> Політологія : підручник / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с

reconstructed diachronically concept *state* assumes mature, Eurocentric character of the Ukrainian political thinking. The Cossack age contributed much to the establishment of modern political (law) thinking with its developed system of notions.

The distinguishing feature of *state* is its conceptualization by state creators' names. When these names imply high spiritual values they acquire the symbolic meaning. During the Soviet period the names were often deliberately ignored by the power or given negative characteristics. Such manipulative discourse aimed at depreciation of the native history and those who created it, changing or fixing the people's political beliefs according to ideological matrix to control their behavior (particularly the political one). It was a way of creation of the so called man being only a part of a big mechanism of the Soviet state.

**Concept *history*.** On the contrary, the concept *history* extends the context of the concept *state*. Without knowledge of history the concept is deprived of its basis, the connection to its source. O. Dovzhenko commented on the fact of history substitution carried out by the political propaganda: "Ukraine is the only country in the world where the history of this country was not taught and moreover was considered as something forbidden, alien and counterrevolutionary. There is no another country in the world like that". However the issue of adequate conceptual approach to interpret the history remains relevant even today. According to the researchers "over a decade the new history courses are being taught in education system but what impresses a lot is diversity of attitudes to the historical events and phenomena of the Ukrainian history<sup>36</sup>".

Mazepa is in the center of the division into heroes and antiheroes. In communicative-pragmatic aspect the esteem depends on the estimator's perception. The historical truth tends to restore in the political discourse. It implies not the connotation shift of a name but the rehabilitation on the level it was fixed in national consciousness. People associate Mazepa with the proverb: "Vid Bohdana do Ivana ne bulo hetmana" (only Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Ivan Mazepa deserved to be called Hetmans. It is noticeable than in the proverb there are no surnames. Their decoding is carried out by means of common presuppositions of communicators. Mykola Gogol found Ivan Mzepa to be a state creator. This idea he disclosed in the article "Razmyshleniya Mazepy" (Mazepa's Reflection): "the freedom loving nation possessed its own *state* with democratic Cossack system and wanted to continue living in their independent *state*

---

<sup>36</sup> Яременко В. Свої діти розпинають... *День*. 13 червня 2009 р. С. 7.

“what a striking resemblance of the ideas between generations through centuries! Every soldier of UPA would definitely agree with the writer<sup>37</sup>”.

The Ukrainian concept state could have been far more stable and Ukraine-centric if some historical events had never happened. These events were caused by the problem of national bifurcation highlighted in the literary discourse (“Taras Bulba” by Mykola Gogol, “Vershnyky” by Yu. Yanovsky, “Sad Getsymansky” by Yu. Bahriany. Cognitively the problem of national identity rooted in consciousness of Ukrainians. Ethologists maintain it to be of labial character. It was caused by objective factors: geographical and civilizational location of Ukraine on the bordering area influenced by both West and East and the subjective factors implying the lack of integrity during the fatal stages of history. Genuinely Ukrainian proverb says: “Moya khata skrayu” (my house is on the edge – I do not want to be involved). However this house is always burnt the first...

Thus one part of the nation was being annihilated while another was being bought. Subsequently it lost its integrity and the feeling of responsibility for the national future. So not the river Dnipro divides Ukraine but the lack of national integrity<sup>38</sup>”.

In modern political reality the issue of Ukrainian identity remains urgent. Politologists, culturologists, historians, cognitologists, and state figures think that preserving of the national identity promotes the preserving of the *Ukrainian statehood*. “I strongly believe that the Ukrainian integrity can be achieved by means of national self-consciousness and identity. That is we need to realize who we are, what our civilizational values are, how different we are from the other countries and peoples”. It is of crucial importance to refer to historical knowledge. It will give the opportunity to realize the connection between generations. This historical tendency binds all the components of the concept *state*. Thus history turns out to be the most powerful source of the Ukrainian identity. [...] If we cannot accept our own history, we are doomed to study alien interpretations<sup>39</sup>”.

The denotative meaning of the lexeme *state* in the Russian language is wider than in Ukrainian. The reason consists in the preserving social

---

<sup>37</sup>Лосєв І. Чому Гоголя треба перекладати українською? *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 19.

<sup>38</sup>Івшина Л. Слово до читачів // Сила м'якого знака, або Повернення Руської правди / за заг. ред. Лариси Івшиної. 1-е вид. Київ : ПрАТ Українська прес-група, 2011. 800 с.

<sup>39</sup>Івшина Л. Слово до читачів // Сила м'якого знака, або Повернення Руської правди / за заг. ред. Лариси Івшиної. 1-е вид. Київ : ПрАТ Українська прес-група, 2011. 800 с.

relevant denotatum in the first case and its loss in another. Due to the interrupted state building tradition the semantic history of the word was interrupted as well. Fixed definition in “Dictionary of XVI – the first half of XVII c” of “state” denoting “statehood; “place, territory, land where somebody feels being a lord” gradually declined. The lexeme state is not fixed in “Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” by P. Biletsky-Nosenko, who “presented the Ukrainian language in early XIX c<sup>40</sup>”. “Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” by Grinchenko it has peripheral position of the semantic structure as the equivalent of the Russian “gosudarstvo” [Gr]. The secondary definitions fixed in Cossack age disappeared completely. In Modern Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language the word state splits into homonyms: *dyrzhbva* with double stress (on the first and second syllables) inherits two former meanings: a) “estate, household”; 2) “toughness”; the lexeme state with stressed second syllable acquired due to the soviet political discourse the meaning of “power mechanism in society” with the semantic shade “country with this power mechanism<sup>41</sup>”. The stratum approach in definition of state is evidenced by V. Lenin’s quotations with the corresponding set of word combinations like diversion of society into rich and poor, proletarian state, proletariat dictatorship, diminished bourgeoisie, revolution achievements, socialist society<sup>42</sup>. Thus the inclusion of the word state in various notional rows resulted in the appearance of homonymy. The stress shift fixed the semantic split of the lexeme.

On the contrary in Modern Russian the meaning “independent state conducting its own politics” is fixed as the main and widely used in modern political discourse as well as its secondary meanings: “obsolete supreme power” and “historical golden sphere with the cross on top served as symbol of monarch power<sup>43</sup>”. In Russian the synonym of the word state is *gosudarstvo*. Politology considers its interpretation being related to the Marx-Lenin conception about class society<sup>44</sup>: “political arrangement of

---

<sup>40</sup> Німчук В. Перший великий словник української мови Павла Білецького-Носенка. *П. П. Білецький-Носенко. Словник української мови* / підготував до друку В. В. Німчук. Київ : Наукова думка, 1966. С. 5–37.

<sup>41</sup> Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

<sup>42</sup> Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

<sup>43</sup> *Малый академический словарь* / ред.: А. П. Евгеньева, М., 1957–1960 (АН СССР, Ин-т рус. яз. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва: Русский язык, 1981–1984.

<sup>44</sup> *Політологія : підручник* / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с.

society headed by government and its departments with the help of which the ruling class implements its power, provides order and suppresses class enemies and also the state with this mechanism<sup>45</sup>”.

Modern language conceptualization of the political reality is getting rid of the dogmas of the past and aims at “civilized standards of constitutional and social state based on democratic ground<sup>46</sup>”.

Word building relations of language units denoting the concept can explain more precisely the notional meaning of the concept state. In the Russian language *state*, *gosudarstvo* produce the derivatives *derzhavnyi*, *gosudarstvennyi*, *gisudarstvivat*<sup>47</sup> that relate to according V. Rusanivsky “the lexicon of optimism; the derivatives in the Ukrainian language relate to both “lexicon of optimism” (*derzhavny*, *derzhavnist*, *derzhavets*<sup>48</sup> [sum; *derzhavnyk* “*gosudarstvennyi chelovek*” fixed in the Dictionary by B. Grinchenko [gr] and “lexicon of pessimism” (*bezderzhavny* “stateless (about people, nation) *bezderzhavnist*). The last derivative is not fixed in DUL. It functions as a component of the figurative expression *nich bezderzhavnosty* (night without state) created by Ye. Malaniuk. “However the night without state came not once of a sudden. [...] “night” means that Ukraine ceased being political subject<sup>49</sup>”.

Malaniuk interpretation gives a clue to the comprehension of cognitive metaphor. The most common theory in the cognitive linguistics is the activity theory represented by the linguists G. Lakoff and M. Johnson. According to the theory cognitive metaphor is the impose of a sign from one conceptual sphere of knowledge – the source-sphere (source-domain) or donor zone containing the information about an object or notion on the denotation of another sphere of knowledge – recipient sphere (target domain) or recipient zone. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson provided the following examples: “wasting time”, “attacking position”, “world is a theatre” related to the new abstract meanings. These metaphors are typical

---

<sup>45</sup> Малый академический словарь / ред.: А. П. Евгеньева, М., 1957–1960 (АН СССР, Ин-т рус. яз. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва: Русский язык, 1981–1984.

<sup>46</sup> Політологія : підручник / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с.

<sup>47</sup> Малый академический словарь / ред.: А. П. Евгеньева, М., 1957–1960 (АН СССР, Ин-т рус. яз. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва: Русский язык, 1981–1984.

<sup>48</sup> Словник української мови: в 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

<sup>49</sup> Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 80 с.

of human every day thinking and communication, “these are metaphors according to which we live<sup>50</sup>”.

The founder of the notion “cognitive metaphor”, the representative of the psychological approach of interaction theory M. Black stated that “the creation mechanism of a metaphor consists in implementation of the system of associative implications related to the secondary object having the main meaning to define the main object marked as metaphorical<sup>51</sup>. Live cognitive metaphor aims at actualization of image and associative perception of the expression because the absence of metaphorical denotations makes the thought not only boring but completely unable to render new notions. The main function of cognitive is to create new notions<sup>52</sup>.

Cognitive metaphor possesses powerful pragmatic potency if to consider pragmatics as speaker’s attitude towards signs they choose with the aim of establishing certain influence on addressee. In the communicative-pragmatic area the characteristic features of metaphors are revealed to disclose its antropometrism: imagery, the selection of features in the process of communicative interaction being relevant for the formation of gnosological image recognizable fragment of reality, orientation on sender’s factor, on his ability to define metaphor not only intellectually basing on the background knowledge but also axiologically by means of esteem notions “good”, “bad” determined by national and cultural associations<sup>53</sup>.

The use of metaphors appears to be the productive means in the political discourse. Political metaphors specify the context of abstract language units like politics, justice, law, freedom, statehood draw attention to the essential. They form counterbalance to the words-simulacra that are attached with the conjuncture meaning by conjuncture politics. Lexicographic fixation of political metaphor preceded its productive use in the sphere of the political discourse. Thus context plays the important role in the process of metaphorization. What imaginary-associative perception does the concept state create in the Ukrainian communicative-pragmatic area? It may be rendered by the following metaphors:

---

<sup>50</sup> Lakoff G. and Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, London : University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.

<sup>51</sup> Gibbs R. *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge University Press, 1999. 527 p.

<sup>52</sup> Телия В. И. *Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира*. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 173–178.

<sup>53</sup> Телия В. И. *Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира*. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 173–178.

State as *history of the world*:

“This is Kyiv Rus – the history of our land, our fundamental historical past. But we choose to ignore that...<sup>54</sup>”

State as *a big family*:

“History of family, parents, grandparents, great-grandparents are constituents of great history of a state<sup>55</sup>”

State as *a heavy burden*:

“The whole nation illness is inability to retain the state<sup>56</sup>”

State as *a living human body*:

“The Ukrainian state in early XX c on the contrary of its neighbors failed but not irrevocably<sup>57</sup>”

State as *genealogic tree*:

“Ask: who were your grandfather, great-grandfather? Some fragments will answer. To explain how these surnames were born and developed how they were established and how they grew up and reached the tops – nobody knows and never wished to know<sup>58</sup>”

State as *superstructure*:

“These ordinary people serve the basis for the state. They inspire other people<sup>59</sup>”

State as *a building process*:

“The unique state building experience of the independent state Ukraine gain by meant of getting over the deep economic crisis, social tension and political instability<sup>60</sup>”

## CONCLUSIONS

The provided examples show that the basis of cognitive metaphor contains modus of a fake that prevents the name meaning to perform its nominative function. Thus the living image in this nomination fades out while the meaning tends to generalization. Subsequently the faded cognitive metaphor transforms into the expression with the direct meaning. R. Gibbs reasonably distinguishes the following types of metaphors: imagery (original) spontaneously formed expressions with figurative

---

<sup>54</sup> Кравчук Л. «Нам бракує свого «Я». *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.

<sup>55</sup> Кравчук Л. «Нам бракує свого «Я». *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.

<sup>56</sup> Грицяк Є. «Ми не вміємо утримати державу» *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.

<sup>57</sup> Бойко В. Націоналізація міст. *День*. 27–28 січня 2012 р. С. 10.

<sup>58</sup> Кравчук Л. «Нам бракує свого «Я». *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.

<sup>59</sup> Лосєв І. Чому Гоголя треба перекладати українською? *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 19.

<sup>60</sup> Лосєв І. Чому Гоголя треба перекладати українською? *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 19.

meaning and fixed the ones that due to the constant use perceived as expressions with the direct meaning<sup>61</sup>. Other cognitivists (F. Ungerer, H. Schmid) call fixed metaphors conventionalized or (G. Lakoff) dead metaphors.

### SUMMARY

The article deals with the concept “state” as a versatile mental formation, its conceptual and axiological content is researched, the semantic associations are characterized on the basis of the cognitive-discursive approach, connected with concept.

### REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н. Ф. Языковая метафора: (Синтаксис и лексика). *Лингвистика и поэтика*. Москва : Наука, 1979. С. 147–173.
2. Бойко В. Націоналізація міст. *День*. 27–28 січня 2012 р. С. 10.
3. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов / пер. с англ. А. Д. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. 288 с.
4. Воркачев С. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 192 с.
5. Герасименко О. В. Функціонування правил і законів мовленнєвої комунікації (на прикладі текстів французьких модерністів). *Вісник Запорізького державного університету*. 2000. Вип. 1. С. 44–48.
6. Грабовська І. Жіночі історії від Людмили Таран. *Сучасність*. 2007. № 8. С. 145–148.
7. Грицяк Є. «Ми не вміємо утримати державу» *День*. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.
8. Гузар Л. «Ми хочемо дати людям трошки світла в сьогоднішній темряві». *День*. 15 квітня 2009 р. С. 6.
9. Гуревич А. Я. Проблемы генезиса феодализма в Западной Европе. Москва : Высшая школа, 1970. 224 с.
10. Дзюба І. Вимирання слова // 3 криниці літ : у 3 т. Київ: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. Т. 1. С. 780–789.
11. Етимологічний словник української мови : в 7 т. / гол. ред. О. С. Мельничук. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982. Т. 1. 631 с.; 1985. Т. 2. 570 с.; 1989. Т. 3. 549 с.; 2001. Т. 4. 653 с.; 2006. Т. 5. 703 с.

---

<sup>61</sup> Gibbs R. The poetics of mind: Figutative thought, language and understanding. Cambridge University Press, 1999. 527 p.



12. Жайворонок В. Знаки української етнокультури. Словник-довідник. Київ : Довіра, 2006. 703 с.

13. Жулинський М. «Коли жито вже вижали, а картоплі ще не вибирали» // День. 22 серпня 2008 р. С. 6.

14. Іванишин П. Націоналістичний тип герменевтичного мислення в Івана Франка. *Нагуєвицькі читання – 2009: Іван Франко і парадигми соціально-гуманітарних наук початку ХХІ століття* : матеріали Всеукраїнської наукової конференції / ред. кол. П. Іванишин, Я. Радевич-Винницький та ін. Дрогобич : Посвіт, 2010. 392 с.

15. Івшина Л. Слово до читачів // Сила м'якого знака, або Повернення Руської правди / за заг. ред. Лариси Івшиної. 1-е вид. Київ : ПрАТ Українська прес-група, 2011. 800 с.

16. Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія / відп. ред. В. М. Русанівський. Київ : Наукова думка, 1983. 743 с.

17. Кононенко В. Символи української мови. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, 1996. 272 с.

18. Коцюбинська М. Мої обрії : у 2-х т. Київ : Дух і літера, 2004. 386 с.

19. Кравчук Л. «Нам бракує свого «Я». День. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 5.

20. Кримський С. Під сигнатурою Софії. Київ : Видавничий дім „Києво-Могилянська академія”, 2008. 367 с.

21. Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Львів : Видання Івана Титора, 1936. 288 с.

22. Лосєв І. Про «державницький» темперамент. День. 9–10 грудня 2011 р. С. 19.

23. Лосєв І. Чому Гоголя треба перекладати українською? День. 13–14 січня 2012 р. С. 19.

24. Мазепа – архітектор європейської України. День. 29 серпня 2009 р. С. 7.

25. Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 80с.

26. Малый академический словарь / ред.: А. П. Евгеньева, М., 1957–1960 (АН СССР, Ин-т рус. яз. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва: Русский язык, 1981–1984.

27. Німчук В. Перший великий словник української мови Павла Білецького-Носенка. П. П. Білецький-Носенко. Словник української мови / підготував до друку В. В. Німчук. Київ : Наукова думка, 1966. С. 5–37.

28. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Москва : Восток-Запад, 2003. 315 с.
29. Політологія : підручник / І. С. Дзюбка, К. М. Левківський, В. П. Андрущенко та ін. / за заг. ред. І. С. Дзюбка, Н. М. Левківського. 2-ге вид. випр. і допов. Київ : Вища школа, 2001. 415 с.
30. Принципи побудови «Словника староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст.» // Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст.: в 2-х т. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977–1978. Т. 1.
31. Русанівський В. М. Історія української літературної мови. 2-е вид., доп. і переробл. Київ : АртЕк, 2002. 392 с.
32. Русанівський В. М. Структура лексичної і граматичної семантики. Київ : Наукова думка, 1988. 238 с.
33. Себайн Джордж Г., Торсон Томас Л. Історія політичного думки / пер. с англ. Київ : Основи, 1997. 838 с.
34. Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля. К., 2010. 844 с.
35. Скаб М. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакрального сфери. Чернівці : Рута, 2008. 560 с.
36. Словник синонімів української мови : у 2 т. / А. А. Бурячок, Г. М. Гнатюк, С. І. Головащук та ін. Київ : Наукова думка, 1999. Т. 1. 1020 с.; 2000. Т. 2. 954 с.
37. Словник староукраїнської мови XIV – XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1. 630 с.; 1978. Т. 2. 591 с.
38. Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970–1980.
39. Словник української мови XVI – першої половини XVII ст. Львів, Вип. 1. 1994–2010.
40. Словарь української мови / за ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.
41. Словарь русского языка : в 4 т. / гл. ред. А. П. Евгеньева. Москва : Русский язык, 1985–1988. Т. 1–4.
42. Срезневский И. И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка. СПб., 1893–1912. Т. 1–3.
43. Супрун А. Є. Передмова. *Бутенко Н. Л. Словник асоціативних означень іменників в українській мові.* Львів : Вища школа, 1989. С. 3–9.
44. Телия В. И. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 173–178.
45. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка / пер. с нем. и доп. О. Н. Трубачева. Москва : Прогресс, 1964. Т. 1. 562 с.; 1967. Т. 2. 671 с.; 1971. Т. 3. 827 с.; 1973. Т. 4. 855 с.

46. Франко І. Не пора, не пора, не пора... *Франко І. Мозаїка : Із творів, що не ввійшли до Зібр. тв. у 50 т. / упоряд. З. Т. Франко, М. П. Василенко. Львів : Каменяр, 2002. С. 23.*
47. Франко І. Гей, Січ іде. *Франко І. Мозаїка : Із творів, що не ввійшли до Зібр. тв. у 50 т. / упоряд. З. Т. Франко, М. П. Василенко. Львів : Каменяр, 2002. С. 46.*
48. Франко І. Мойсей. *Франко І. Зібрання творів : у 50 т. Київ, 1976. Т. 5.*
49. Шевченко Т. Повне зібрання творів : у 12 т. / редкол. М. Г. Жулинський (голова) та ін. – Київ : Наукова думка, 2001. Т. 1. 784 с.
50. Широкоград Є. Х. Срезневський Ізмаїл Іванович // Українська мова : Енциклопедія / редкол.: В. М. Русанівський (співголова), О. О. Тараненко (співголова), М. П. Зяблюк та ін. 2-ге вид., випр. і доп. Київ : Вид-во «Укр. енцикл.» ім. М. П. Бажана, 2004. С. 638.
51. Шмелев А. Могут ли слова языка быть ключем к пониманию культуры. *Вежбицкая Анна. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов / пер. с англ. А. Ф. Шмелева. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. С. 7–11.*
52. Яковенко Н. Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь і Центральна Україна). Київ, 1993. 416 с.
53. Яременко В. Свої діти розпинають... *День. 13 червня 2009 р. С. 7.*
54. Gibbs R. The poetics of mind: Figutantive thought, language and understanding. Cambridge University Press, 1999. 527 p.
55. Lakoff G. and Johnson M. Metaphons we live by. Chicago, London : University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.

**Information about the author:**

**Yaremko Ya. P.,**

Doctor of Philology,

Professor at the Ukrainian Language Department,

Dean of the Faculty of Philology,

Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University

24, Shevchenko str., Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine

**Matskiv P. V.,**

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,

Head of the Department of the Ukrainian Language,

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University

22, U. Kravchenko str., Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine