Abstract: The article is devoted to outlining the peculiarities of objectification of the concept of БАГАТСВО (WEALTH) in paremias, witnessed in the “Halytsьko-rusьski narodni prypovidky” (“Galicia-Ruthenian Folk Tales”) by Ivan Franko, in the context of the study of Ukrainian paremia units on the basis of linguo-cognitive approach. The focus of the research is on the role of paremias in transmitting human experience, people’s culture, traditions, realities of society, they are increasingly seen as a means of objectifying certain concepts. Recently, given the ability of paremias to most clearly reflect the diversity of the study of paremias, which, in turn, determines a basis of common features of stability, integrity, reproducibility, beginning with the traditional, according to which paremias are such a collective consciousness, paremias claim the leading consciousness, in which universal notions coexist with the components which denote the social sphere of human life were studied by T. Moroz, who singled out thematic subgroups “Wealthy vs poor”, “Wealth vs poverty”, “Lord vs peasant” and analyzed the paremias in these subgroups, namely the subject of characterization of the social status of man, as well as the relationship between wealthy and poor [20]. The linguistic and cultural concept of WEALTH in the context of its objectification by innovative units in the American language picture of the world (based on the journalistic discourse of the United States) became the object of the study by H. Cheremysinsa [5]. I. Holubovska [11] devoted her studies to the analysis of the concepts of wealth and poverty in national pictures of the world, including the Ukrainian one, with the distinction of the national peculiarities of a certain ethnic community, which were formed under the influence of historical and social factors.

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

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

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

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

2 Materials and Methods

The view of paremias as a cognitive model is determined by its very nature (tropological expression of logical relations) and functioning. Cognitive linguistics connects the problems of the study of forms representing knowledge and the very structure of knowledge enclosed in human consciousness into a single node. Proverbial mini-texts as typical and reproducible utterances are
part of the general system of information processing in the space of language as a cognitive system. Given the chosen perspective of the study of paremias, the most adequate means of organizing the selected factual material, in our opinion, is the frame. This systematizing unit makes it possible to identify the mechanisms of conceptualization of the phenomena of the surrounding reality related to the concept of wealth within the paremia body, to establish the internal hierarchy of the concept and accordingly build a frame model of it.

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

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

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

Speaking about the role of the frame in the formation of the presupposition, it should be emphasized that the language unit receives reference not directly, but always through the frame inclusion, which is an intermediary between the meaning of the language unit and its symbolic function. Another important concept related to the frame is normativeness. The frame is a priori set as the norm (behavioral, cognitive). In this sense, it conceptualizes, evaluates, and explains the world” [1, p. 11; 25]. The essence of the cognitive theory of metaphor, developed by American scientists G. Lakoff and M. Johnson in the monograph “Metaphors we live by”, lies in the fact that “…at the heart of metaphorical processes, there are procedures for processing knowledge structures – frames and scenarios. The knowledge realized in frames and scenarios is a generalized experience of human interaction with the world around us – both with the world of objects and society” [18, p. 157] (Lakoff says that “according to the theory of conceptual metaphor, metaphorization is based on the process of interaction of two structures of knowledge (frames and scenarios) of two conceptual domains – sphere-source (source domain) and sphere-target (target domain)” [18].

Following Y. Stepanov, we consider the concept as an operational semantic unit of thinking, a quantum of structured knowledge. On the one hand, it includes what is the meaning of the concept, on the other hand – what makes the concept a cultural phenomenon: etymology, associative series, evaluations and connotations (additional semantic or stylistic nuances that overlap with the basic meaning of the word and serve to express emotionally expressive coloring. It is obvious that the layer of vocabulary meanings, which are fixed by the analyzed lexemes, has the greatest cognitive significance and priority from the functional and cognitive point of view, which determines in our case the separation of wealth as a basic level of categorization.

3 Results and Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

Let us note that, according to the Greek lexicon of Strong, the very mentioned word χρημα is contained in the Greek text of the quoted Gospel, which is translated in the memo with the lexeme of богатство (wealth) [9]. If we compare modern Ukrainian translations of the Bible by I. Ohienko, or I. Khomenko, or R. Turkonyak, none of them accurately reproduces the Greek text: Як Бог богатий, що той засумував, то промовляє: Як тяжко богатим увійти в Царство Боже!..) Instead, the translations made in the nineteenth century are closer to the original: Побагатий ж його Ісус, що вельми сумнів став, рече: Як: Як...
якщо багатства маючи увійти в царство Боже! (When Jesus saw him, he was very sad, and said, “How hard it is for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God!”). The Greek words πλούτος, ροζκіш, πишність translated into Ukrainian, as we have tried to prove, should be translated with different lexemes, respectively багатство и багатець (wealthy and wealth) [9]. The sources of the illustrated material of Sreznevskyi's dictionary allow speaking about the functioning of the following meanings of the lexeme багатцево (wealth in the Ukrainian language of the 11th-14th centuries: 1. Material values, money. 2. High moral qualities. The development of the latter meaning is connected first of all with the active spread of Christianity, with the translations of Christian literature into the Old Slavonic language.

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

The time period of 16th - the first half of the 17th century significantly expanded the semantic palette of meanings of this word:
1. Large property, valuables, money;
2. Abundance of everything, luxury;
3. The set of material values;
4. Large number, diversity;
5. Indirect: something very important, valuable, significant [3, p. 134-135].

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

According to linguists, “the vocabulary of the 18th - late 19th century in Ukrainian lexicography is represented mainly by translated dictionaries, the explanatory aspect of which is presented only sporadically, which makes it difficult to fix lexical and semantic features of words” [19, p. 113-114]. That is why we will study this period on the basis of the sources of the illustrated material from the Little Russian-German dictionary of Ye. Zhelekhivskiy and S. Nedilskyi, the dictionary of the Russian-Ukrainian illustrative material from the Little Russian-German dictionary, it corresponds to the words rich “wealthy” and reich (Zhelek., p. 35). The latter word in German is polysemantic. Only in one of the meanings (“багатий, розкішний” which means “rich, luxurious”) can it be the semantic equivalent of the Ukrainian variant. Its other meanings — “rich” as well as “poхідний, синький” (abundant as well as nutritious, nourishing) do not correlate with the idea of wealth. The Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of M. Umanets and A. Spilka records the following meanings of the Russian word багатий: “richness, abundance” (Srez., 127-128). It is typical to use the analyzed lexeme in the sense of adjective and noun. Interestingly, the same functioning of the lexeme багатство (wealth) is the basis for the conceptual analysis of paremia units, which objectifies the outlined concept based on frame modeling.

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

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

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

Being manifested as typical and distinctive features of a person, character traits can serve as a basis for reflecting the conceptual understanding of багатство (wealth) in the paremiolog segment of the naive picture of the world of Ukrainians in the diachronic dimension. There is an asymmetry in the expression of positive / negative traits of a rich person (which is generally typical for this type of units), the verbalizers of which are cognate lexemes (Srez., 127-128).
The peculiarity of the considered frame is its single conceptual characteristic based on the metaphorization of the zoomorphic donor sphere: як би не був свідомий, то би не був богатий. (If he weren't piggish, he wouldn’t be wealthy.) Negative characterization of the rich is objectified with the help of such areas of donors as boastfulness, laziness, thriftiness. (Compare: Богатого з хвастливим не розпинай (You can’t tell apart a rich man and a boastful one); Без лайфбоксів нема богатиці (Without laziness there is no wealth); Хто не злодійкував, то не буде богатий (He who is not a thief will not be rich).)

The frame WEALTH AS MONEY is based on a metaphor, the format of which involves the opposition of these concepts within a single parememic unit. This is, two situations are objectified and compared. These differences (obviously, it is more correct to say), in many cases are based on rich ignoring the poor, on avoiding company with him, meetings (Богатий бідного в знати не хоче... не пізнає (The rich do not want to know the poor)). He is not interested in material deprivation, needs, his family: Богач не відяг, що бідний обідає (The rich man does not know that the poor man eats); Богач не знає, що бідному доляє (The rich man does not know what both of them burn); Богач не знає, що бідному ся вбогай годину (The rich man watches as the poor man feeds); Богач видає, чим убогій дітя годує (The rich man wonders what the poor man feeds his children with). Своєрідність семантичного наповнення відзначається паремією The peculiarity of the semantic content is present in the paremia Куди журию до пасці! (It won’t do to be sad at Easter!) In it, the source of the goal and the donor sphere are expressed in abstract terms: sorrow and Easter. These conceptual metaphors express, on the one hand, the Christian interpretation of this proverb, which consists in joy, the glorification of Christ's Resurrection against the background of sorrow (where there is sorrow, there is no God). Then, apparently, there is desacralization of these meanings. Joy and sorrow begin to objectify the rich and the poor, respectively (the poor are saddened by their material needs, the rich rejoice in sufficient or large fortunes).

Rich people are very often lucky, and even unfavorable circumstances often turn out well for them, while the poor cannot take advantage of the most useful ones. When a rich man does something stupid or behaves badly, he is forgiven in front of people (Богачеві вітер грошей несе, а бідному поздовжньо очи засипає (The wind brings money to the rich, and scatters the eyes of the poor with chaff); Богатого і сер серий, а вбогого і бритня не хоче (The sickle shaves the rich, but the razor won’t shave the poor); Богаті не можна й чорта з'їсти, а бідному засіє (A rich man is allowed to do anything while a poor man is not); Богатому все вівде (A rich man can get away with anything)).

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

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

The frame WEALTH FROM EVIL demonstrates the mythological parememic segment of the naive picture of the world.
of Ukrainians. Demonology as a component of mythology occupies an important place in the worldview of Ukrainians. According to V. Halachuk’s observations, there is every reason to believe that this mythological level, based mainly on the belief in the afterlife and the so-called “cult of ancestors”, was more significant than ideas about higher deities also in pre-Christian times [10, p. 88]. One of the central characters of demonological discourse is the devil (demon), whose idea still exists today, objectifying the generalized concept of “evil force”, gathering under the umbrella of almost all other demonic beings. Paremiya unit Богатий, кій чорт, богатстве, богатство (Rich as the devil) refers us to Ukrainian legends, according to which, according to I. Franko, the devil is considered the lord and ruler of earthly riches, one of the most common negative characters of Christian times [10, p. 88]. One of the central characters of demonological discourse is the devil (demon), whose idea still exists today, objectifying the generalized concept of “evil force”, gathering under the umbrella of almost all other demonic beings. There are close good relations between the devil and the wicked, according to which the devil takes it away. There are also plots among Ukrainians where the devil resembles the poor man: Богач гроші складає, а дідько мошонку шиє… чорт калитку. (The rich man saves up the money, while the devil takes away his money), there are close good relations between the rich and the wicked, according to which Богатому й чорт діти колише, а бідному і нянька не хоче (The devil even rocks the rich man’s children in the cradle). Such relationships are not typical of other groups (Богатому чорт діти колише, а бідному і нянька не хоче (The devil even rocks the rich man’s children in the cradle while even a nanny refuses to do that for the poor man’s kids)).

4 Conclusion
Lexicographic research is considered to be the basis for explicating the concept, because in its process the defining meaningful indicators of the concept are revealed in the minds of native speakers of the conceptual sphere, thanks to which the concept receives vocabulary objectification in each token, representing the corresponding levels of abstraction. Semantic space of a lexeme богатство (wealth) is formed around the conceptual core formed by the meanings of lexemes богатство (wealth), богатый (wealthy). As the material shows, the nuclear zone of this concept is represented by the meanings “large numbers, diversity” (figurative: “Something very important, valuable, significant”), characteristic of both tokens. In the peripheral zone, we find the meaning of “spiritually higher”, which is not typical for all periods of functioning of the Ukrainian language.

A comprehensive frame description of the paremias of the Ukrainian language, attested in Ivan Franko’s “Halytsko-ruski narodni paremiyts”, showed that the most frequent frameworks were: WEALTH AS PERSONIFICATION OF PERSONALITY; WEALTH IS MONEY; WEALTH FROM EVIL. The frame generally generates an internal form of paremia, acting as a metalanguage tool for the direct facts of speech and speech. In most paremias, verbal activity is described along a correlation with another frame, known and acceptable within the same cultural model, based on customs and traditions. However, there are a small number of proverbs and sayings that postulate the frame itself, actually introducing it through paremia.
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