DOI: 10.15587/978-617-7319-60-2.6

3 CONCEPT OF ENGL. *COURAGE* / UKR. *ХОРОБРІСТЬ* AS STEREOTYPE OF ETHNOCULTURAL MENTALITY OF UKRAINIANS AND ENGLISH

Mariia Shutova

ABSTRACT

The chapter offers a multidisciplinary approach to the reconstruction of ethnic and cultural stereotypes which has provided the insight into their cultural, symbolic and linguistic contents. To analyse idiomatic ethnic and cultural idea of the Ukrainians and English about the concept of COURAGE the reconstructed etymons have been suggested. The cultural and semantic connections of these etymons to idiomatic nominations of ethnocultural stereotypes of the Ukrainians and English have been established. Ethnocultural stereotypes are the part of national language world-view. The techniques developed in cultural semiotics, cognitive onomasiology, frame semantics and idiomatic semiotics have been involved. It has been stated that in the English language, COURAGE is stereotyped in idioms with the man component – man as a real example of human will and power. A courageous man is stereotyped in the minds of Ukrainians as an ideal example. COURAGE is the basis of the chivalry of the English that is formed in the minds of native English speakers as the uniqueness of the Nordic character trait. Ukrainians formed a chivalry-Cossack type of man, adherent to the ideal of defence, honour, will and faith, defending their native land.

KEYWORDS

Reconstruction of ethnic and cultural stereotypes, ethnic stereotype, cultural idea, national world view, idiomatic nomination, linguistic reconstruction.

3.1 FUNDAMENTAL ONTOLOGICAL PARADIGM BETWEEN "MAN - LANGUAGE - CULTURE - WORLD"

Contempo rary linguistics expands its scope by attracting the achievements of various spheres of scientific knowledge, one of which is linguistic axiological ethnic semiometry. The basis of such approach is fundamental ontological paradigm between "MAN – LANGUAGE – CULTURE – WORLD" that provides deep assessment into cognitive and semantic reconstruction and epistemic comprehension of such substances as "collective and individual consciousness", "people's mentality", "world-view", i.e. all national culture with its types and forms: actions (rituals, ceremonials, behaviour), mentality (beliefs, ideas, prejudices) and verbalisation (at the level of vocabulary and phraseology).

The phenomena mentioned above can be fixed in stereotypes formed in each culture. The very process of stereotyping began with the famous work of the Lippman, W., the American journalist and sociologist [1]. He considers *the stereotype* as the perception of the outside world, which

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

affects the sphere of the senses at the level of the subconscious. Recently, the stereotypes that reflect mostly their ontological connections with culture, consciousness, thinking and language, are ethnic and cultural stereotypes, have been in the focus of scientific attention.

3.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ON ETHNOCULTURAL STEREOTYPES

The main conclusion made by the researchers [2, 3] is the indisputable fact that ethnic and cultural stereotypes can mostly be detected and described by linguistic methods and techniques, although they are not purely linguistic concepts. They believe that stereotypical representations of ethno-communities are reflected in phraseological systems of languages, which record general reactions of people on the nature phenomena, social life, history, mentality, etc.

This hypothesis gave the reason to formulate a new scientific idea. The investigation of ethnic and cultural stereotypes is possible via the reconstruction of the phrasal signs that are their verbalizers, and thus, to reveal the mechanism of transformation of the behavioural and mental structures into linguistic forms.

The claiming centrality of the work is cognitive-linguistic-comparative reconstruction of Ethnocultural stereotypes in three projections: the action – as signs of traditional and everyday culture, the mental – as signs of consciousness and thinking and verbal – as linguistic signs, as well as their identification according to the types – stereotypes of representations and stereotypes of behaviour of native speakers of the English and Ukrainian languages.

Ethnocultural stereotypes are determined by culture [4], because human perceptions of the world are stereotyped under the influence of cultural identification – the national consciousness of the ethnic group – the expression of the mentality of the nation. That is why the stereotype is a part of national and linguistic world view that contains objective and subjective assessment of reality; the objective (invariant) part is the standard of the Ethnocultural stereotype – the cultural code of the ethnos as a carrier of mentality, the subjective (optional) is the verbalization of these standards in the form of linguistic signs [5].

On the one hand, being a simplistic and schematic representation that characterizes reality in its simplest form, stereotypes, nevertheless, fulfil an extremely important function: they are the basis of the people mentality and help to navigate the world [6]. The worldview is captured by the linguistic worldview, which becomes the basis of all cultural stereotypes for a certain ethnic group [7].

3.3 METHODOLOGY ON RECONSTRUCTION OF ETHNOCULTURAL STEREOTYPES

The task of reconstructing the linguistic worldview in connection with the cultural and ethnic identity of its speakers requires a search for sources of ethnic and cultural information. The logic of such scientific and methodological search is predetermined not so much by gradual deepening of

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

actual analytical procedures, but by involvement to the analysis of those theoretical and methodological concepts, thanks to which it is possible to reveal deep intra-systemic indicators of ethnic and cultural diversity of meanings. The main thing in this study is the investigation of the specific configuration of components, which are key words-symbols of each culture, and the analysis of their internal and external forms.

It is here that the procedure of cognitive and onomasiological reconstruction, based on semantic and motivational analysis, contributes to the discovery of all possible meanings. Studying the manifestations of cultural idiomaticity, it is worth moving towards the reconstruction of the motivational basis of the imagery of the components of a certain utterance. The stability of such utterances is fixed and reflected in the consciousness of native speakers, which is transmitted to the next generation.

Complex research methodology is based on the anthropocentric approach, principles of cultural determinism, historicism and ethnocentrism. The unifying in this case is the principle of synergistic systematicity that ensured the effective reconstruction of ethnocultural stereotypes and stereotypes of the behaviour of the English and Ukrainians.

This approach led to the choice of relevant methods and techniques: cultural semiotics with *its structural, functional and semiotic methods* – for the analysis of ethnocultural stereotypes as signs of culture; for the reconstruction of iconic and symbolic components of stereotypes, restoration of their literal meaning as the signs of traditional culture. Methods of cognitive linguistic comparative studies (according to Korolyova, A.) provided interpretation of internal and external reconstruction of etymons – key word-components of ethnic and cultural stereotypes: *semantic and motivational method* – for the reconstruction of the archetypal basis of the English and Ukrainian onomasiological portraits; *method of conceptual profiling* (according to Batminski, J.) – for the reconstruction of Ethnocultural stereotypes as mental formations in the minds of native speakers by presenting different profiles of traditional portraits. *Component analysis* as the method of structural linguistics was used to identify the seme structure of key idiomatic word-components and to explicit the mechanism of stereotyping. *The distributive analysis* served to detect the combining potentials of these words as parts of different grammatical and syntactic idiomatic models.

The comparative-typological method accompanied all stages of the reconstruction of ethnic and cultural stereotypes of the English and Ukrainians and provided the following procedures: designation of *tertium comparationis* (the basis for comparison of phraseological nominations of stereotypes); comparative interpretation of stereotypes as signs of culture, mind and language; determination of regularities and national-cultural differences in their origin (motivation), form, content and functions.

With the help of linguistic and semiotic reconstruction procedures it's possible to identify the source of the imagery and the external form of motivation of language signs that led to the formation of ethnic and cultural stereotypes depicted in the English and Ukrainian idioms. Reconstruction will be the subject to portrait features of British and Ukrainian people. Therefore, we can say that this characteristic is selected to be *tertium comparationis*, the degree of expression which

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

is the main task of the work, which involves disclosure of mechanisms of stereotyping the Ukrainian and British mentality and the choice of language resources to its explication.

The most significant properties of ethnic stereotypes include their emotional and evaluative character; the stability (though relative) and the rigidity of new information; the high degree of unity of the group members' perceptions of their own ethnic group and other ethnic groups. These linguistic and cultural signs are characterized by the highest degree of connotation, since they do not involve an individual user with a sign, but rather a linguistic collective. Thus, the speaker, using a token with certain connotations, does not express in this way his personal appreciation of the object, as he / she does in case of the lexical meaning of the word at the pragmatic layer (meaning emotional and pragmatic elements of meaning) [8], and reflects the collective opinion of native speakers.

3.4 STEREOTYPING PROCESS OF THE CONCEPT ENGL. *COURAGE* / UKR. *ХОРОБРІСТЬ* (LIT. *COURAGE*)

The above-mentioned idea should be supported with the help pf different examples of English and Ukrainian phraseological units, particularly with the reference to the process of stereotyping of the concept COURAGE / ХОРОБРІСТЬ.

To begin with, the basic concept, which forms the inner world of a man, is SOUL. Deep (linguosemiotic and culturological) reconstruction of Engl. *soul* / Ukr. *душа* (lit. *soul*) and their motivators Eng. *heart* / Ukr. *серце* (lit. *heart*) makes it possible to explain the ideographic "linguistic image of the soul" as a component of the autostereotypes of the English and Ukrainians: Eng. *a good soul* / Ukr. *добра душа* (lit. *good soul*), Eng. *honest* / *kind* / *simple soul* / Ukr. *м'який серцем* (lit. *soft hearted*).

We assume that the formation of these stereotypical images of the English and Ukrainian inner world took place gradually, based on the mythological and religious origins of the concepts of soul, spirit and so on.

The typological characteristic of sociability is reflected in the idiomatic and stereotyped formulas Adjective + Substantive with the substantive component *soul* and motivator *heart*:

Good / *Kind* / *Honest* / *Simple Soul;*

Big / *Kind Heart*.

And idiomatic formulas Verb+Substantive:

Heart Bleeds / *Melts* / *Is Breaking*.

According to observations of Hnapovska, L., the Ukrainian linguist, the ideology of Celtic Druids is connected to the belief in the immortality of the soul and its endless migration. According to ethnographers and historians, the Celts also believed in the possibility of man reborn in other bodies under one and the same or a different name without saving the memories of it. The Celts also felt that another substance that prolongs the life after physical death is breathing, whiff, breath [9]. Therefore, synonymous to the word soul is the word spirit.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

The analysis has shown that the formation of these stereotypical images of British occurred gradually on the basis of mythology and religious origins of the concepts of soul, spirit and so on.

These examples give reasonable grounds to disbelieve the idea that the British have no concept of the soul, and there is the concept of Understatement, reticence, distance [10]. On the other hand, Western soul is more streamlined, rationalized, organized.

Prudence and moderation are standard for a typical Englishman, as the English body is opposed not to the soul but mind, reflecting rational principle in man inherent to Western culture.

One of the main meanings of the word *душа* (lit. *soul*) in the Ukrainian language is also religious. Dictionaries present it as a seme, a component of the meaning 'the inner mental state of a person, with his mood, experiences and feelings'. The token *душа* (lit. *soul*) is actively used not only in special religious literature, but also in folklore, especially in demonological myths, legends, in fiction depicting heaven or hell, in depicting the circumstances surrounding the death of man.

Typical Englishman is characterized by prudence, moderation, so English *body* is opposed not to the *soul*, but to the *mind*, which reflects the inherent in Western culture emphasis on rational principle in man – restraint and practicality, in contrast to the Ukrainian, for whom spirituality plays an important role in the national value system: soul as place localization of the mental world of man, whose feelings are also concentrated in his soul. In the Ukrainian tradition, the soul is opposed to the body (ideal – material). The famous Ukrainian proverbs *душа і тіло* (lit. *soul and body*); *душа з тілом прощається* (*розлучається*) (lit. *the soul says goodbye* (*separates*) *to the body*); *ледве душа в тілі тримається* (lit. *the soul barely stays in the body*); *душа вилітає з тіла* (lit. *the soul flies out of the body*); *душа пішла з тіла* (lit. *the soul left the body*); *душа тримається в тілі* (lit. *the soul stays in the body*), that have no equivalent idioms in the English, can prove this.

An even deeper onomasiological analysis of other phrases of this group shows differences in the stereotypical perception of their national character by the English and Ukrainians, i.e. it confirms the restraint of the English and the sincerity and emotionality of the Ukrainians. Even among the meanings of the word *good* in the English-Ukrainian dictionary there are no meanings of "sincere, frank, open", but such as "good, kind, pleasant, good" are given, emphasizing kindness, not openness. Meanwhile, in the Ukrainian language, the stereotype of "Ukrainian sincerity" is revealed through the component of openness of soul.

At the cultural and symbolic level, we find confirmation of the previous assumption that the formation of stereotypical images of the English and Ukrainians about their kindness and benevolence took place gradually, based on mythological and religious ideas about the soul. This assumption can be made on the basis of versions given in the Etymological dictionary of Klein, E., which states that the token soul in English dates back to English (oe. Sāwol) and is reconstructed from the Old Teutonic (Proto-Germanic) progenitor *saiwalō "that is related to a lake or sea", as well as from *saiwa-z "lake, sea" [11]. According to ancient Teutonic concepts, lakes were seen as places for souls to live after death.

However, it should be noted that the etymology of the word *soul* in English has not been fully explored.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

In the Ukrainian culture, Ukr. *душа* (lit. *soul*) is a symbol of the inner mental world of man, a place of localization of his emotions and "high" desires associated with the satisfaction of spiritual needs. Phraseology stereotyped the idea of Ukrainians about themselves in a state of joy, satisfaction: Ukr. *душа радіє*, *тішиться*, *болить*, *обривається*, *тривожиться*, *не приймає* (lit. *the soul rejoices*, *hurts*, *breaks*, *worries*, *does not accept*). The soul knows not only emotions, but also thoughts, desires, inclinations and preferences of the person: Ukr. *душа не лежить до кого / чого* (lit. *the soul does not lie to someone / somewhat* – "there is no affection, sympathy to someone, it is not pleasant"); Ukr. *скільки душа забажає* (lit. *as much as the soul desires* – "many, without any restrictions"); Ukr. *як душа забажає* (lit. *as the soul desires* – "as one deems necessary, by one's own choice").

For the Ukrainian people, spirituality is in the first place, soul is the main, core concept, which prevails over the rational, mental. In Ukrainian linguistic culture, the SOUL is the "alter ego" of man, the main regulator of his mental and emotional life, as stated by Skovoroda, G., the Ukrainian philosopher. The emotionality (even sentimentality), sensitivity and lyricism are inherent in the mental composition of Ukrainians. English society, on the other hand, bases its existence on common sense, practicality, which is generally considered to be the basis of the Western mentality.

The meaning of the word emotional, which together with its synonyms – *effusive*, *demonstrative* (*unrestrained*), *excitable* (*easily excitable*) has negative connotations in English, and the word *emotionalism* (*emotionality*) generally mean excessive expression of emotions, state, in which a person loses control over him (by the way, to characterize a drunk person in English there is a funny idiom "tired and emotional"). At the same time, the adjective *dispassionate* (calm, cold-blooded, dispassionate) is evaluated positively [12].

Wierzbicka, A. [12] notes in this regard that the token *emotional*, which has a negative connotation, has a hidden ideology, according to which to show uncontrolled emotions is a deviation from the norms of behaviour, and even when it is used in a tolerant tone, there is still an indication that for the manifestation of emotions, loss of control over them, it is necessary to apologize.

Ukrainians are more inclined to communicate openly than people of the Western world. Probably, that is why the English equivalent of the Ukrainian phrase *широка душа / серце* (lit. *broad soul / heart*) is not recorded in dictionaries.

Stereotypical ideas of the English about the state of sadness, anger, audacity, cheerfulness, indifference, shame as a manifestation of emotions are marked by idioms of all syntactic models. For example:

– Adjective+Substantive: *hard nail, good soul, a deep card, kind heart*;

– Adjective-Pronoun+Substantive: *dead to all feelings, true to one's word, soft in brain*;

– Adjective+Conjunction+Adjective: *high and mighty*;

– Substantive+Preposition+Substantive: *man of feelings, heart of gold, lump of clay, sheep among wolves*;

– Comparative Patterns: *cool as cucumber, feel like fighting cock, chatter like a magpie, hard as iron*.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

The most quantitative are the idioms that stereotype the British idea of their emotions in a state of anger and sadness. This can be partly explained by the fact that Puritanism in the broadest sense (where anger is seen as "sanctity, asceticism, and the desire to level the sense of joy") was unnecessarily imposed on the working class by small traders and producers. There was an unconscious economic motive behind this. Convincing the worker that any entertainment was sinful could force him to work for less. In the early nineteenth century, there was even a theory that workers could not marry [13]. We can also agree with Clark, J. [14], who notes that the Reformation of the church played a significant role in shaping the English national character. The main concepts for the British were related to the Puritan worldview – frugality, diligence, restraint, modesty, common sense and adherence to the "golden mean" [15].

The English have a favourite proverb: "Every cloud has its linen", using it they try to resolve various disputes and differences. This demonstrates the ambivalence of the English national character.

At first glance, the English seem unemotional and unmoved. With their "button-fastened emotions", they seem reliable and consistent for themselves and for others. But these are, in fact, stereotypes that are difficult to break, because in the depths of the soul of every Englishman boils unbridled primitive passions, which no one has yet managed to curb. The British try not to notice such a "hidden" side of their national character and hide it from prying eyes in every possible way.

Considering the contradictions of the English national character, it is worth mentioning the fact that the English of Shakespeare's time were very aggressive people. It is amazing how a nation of pirates in three or four hundred years has become a society of friendly and law-abiding citizens, for whom the word *gentle* has become an important stereotypical characteristic of their behaviour. The national character of the British has not fundamentally changed, but aggression has found a kind of channel for exit: sports, conscientiousness (self-criticism) and humour [16]. In addition, socially acceptable restrictions were imposed on aggression: legislation (relevant laws were specifically enacted and social institutions were established, such as the Royal Society for the Prevention of Animal Cruelty, established in 1824, while the National Union for Prevention of Child Abuse was founded 65 years later!), respected by the police and economic incentives for the development of the middle class, which became the guarantor of stability in the country [16]. In English culture, the ability to control one's behaviour indicates emotional maturity.

In Ukrainian culture, on the contrary, the free expression of emotions, especially positive ones, is a normal phenomenon. Such character traits as fun, wit are evaluated positively. Such differences from time-to-time complicate communication between British and Ukrainians.

The idiomatic formulas Adj+Subst show that the English are good-hearted, kind and sociable.

On the other hand, English national feature is the "social complexity". Famous British sociologist and co-director of Social Issue Research Centre Kate Fox [17] expressed the idea the British are quite closed, socially restrained, they have no spontaneous and direct manner of communication that is natural for other nations. They are very difficult at the warm and frank contact with other people.

The etymology of the word "soul" in English has not been investigated to the end. Synonymous is "spirit", derived from Latin, means "breath" and can be interpreted as a mystical

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

substance that prolongs life after the death of the body. The other synonyms such as "psyche, spirit", demonstrate the link with the Latin spiritus – "breathing" (Lat. *spirare* "blow, breathe"). "Spiritual" and "respiratory" in the English language have the same root. The first known use of the word spirit dates back to the thirteenth century. It is believed that it reaches the Anglo-French tokens espirit, spirit [18].

Zindler, F., the Dutch biologist, observes that, comparing Bibles translated in Greek and Hebrew, we find many interpretations of the concept of soul, literally translated as "breath" and "wind" [19]. For the ancient interpreters of The Bible, he says, the decision was simple: alive people breathe and dead – no. At first, only animals (from the Latin *anime*, which means "breath" or "wind") were considered to be alive. In Genesis the animation power of breath is clearly seen. Lord once created Adam from the dust, and had to breathe life into it, that he became a living soul. Breathing – this is life. When a person dies (Eng. breathe out – "exhaled"), its spirit (Eng. breathe) leaves the body. When a person sneezes, his spirit forcibly banished from the body, and the English ritual tradition is to say: "Bless you! – God bless you" until evil spirits are not penetrated into the body.

One of the synonyms of the word "spirit" Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English shows the token *courage*, confirming the motivational connection of spirit as a part of soul and its personification in such English traits of character as firmness, courage and endurance.

Continuing the reconstruction of stereotypical ideas of Ukrainians about the soul, we recall that the etymology of the token *душа* (*soul*) is associated primarily with the spirit, breath, divine inspiration. ДУША – psl. *duša* (<*dux-ja <*dhousjā), related to lit. *dvasià* – "spirit, breath"; the development of meaning is similar to the Latin *anima* "wind, breath" [11].

It is known that theology clearly distinguishes between human body, soul and spirit. The Bible tells that when the breath of God entered a person, it became a spirit in him, and when the spirit began to interact with the body, the soul appeared. It is the spirit that is the part of man through which he communicates with God. The etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language confirms the connection of the token spirit with breath, air, as well as English spirit, reaching Latin *spirare* "to blow, to breathe".

It is necessary to analyse the verb models, where the tokens Engl. *spirit* / Ukr. *дух* (lit. *spirit*) are used as part of idioms, denoting human actions related to the emotional state of the national spirit of speakers of both languages. Stereotypical phrase models to denote ***the spirit as courage*** of Ukrainians, in English have other figurative components.

Among the noun models Substantive + Substantive to denote the 'strength of spirit and mind' of the British and Ukrainians, one example is recorded: in English it is *strength of mind*, and in Ukrainian it is a phrase that completely repeats this seme: *сила духу* (lit. *strength of spirit*). In English phraseology strength of mind, the physical characteristic of strength is inherent in the mind as a bodily, physical substance. Obviously, this is why behavioural stereotypes related to the *goodness*, *courage*, *resilience* of the English spirit is reflected in phrase formulas, the components of which are abstract nouns, though, however, they denote real behavioural concepts – MIND

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

(intellect), COURAGE (gentleness), NERVE (nerves, maturity – emotional state) (to have courage – to be inspired; to have nerve – to have courage). For example, we can observe such idioms as *man of courage / nerve / decision; strength of mind; pluck up (build up / screw up) one's courage; to have the nerve*.

At the same time, Ukr. *дух* (lit. *spirit*) is connected with the sphere of the soul – a non-material substance that can leave the body, actualized through their essentially emotional sphere, which has created a different understanding of courage, goodness and strength of the spirit of the nation.

It is necessary to investigate more connection of *spirit* and *courage*. Before analysing these characteristics of stereotypes that are depicted in the phraseology of English language are to be reconstructed.

First of all, the main idiom denoting *courage* observed in the English language is *hot blood*.

Blood is the universal symbol for all nations as intangible, life-giving force, similar to the soul (in the Bible the soul is identified with blood (Lev. 17). Obviously, the symbols of blood in the English ethnic culture are universal.

On the other hand, the motivational component in such idiom is HOT – the quality inherent to the fire. Fire is one of the main elements, a symbol of the spirit of God. The last, the third baptisation should be in fire. It is a symbol of life and victory of light over darkness and death, symbol of general cleaning.

Courage means the state or quality of the mind or spirit that enables one to face danger, fear. The synonym is *bravery*.

The lexeme *courage* originates from Old French *corage* "heart, temper", from Latin *cor* "heart", from PIE root **kerd-* "heart" [11]. As we see in the English language tokens courage, bravery and heart are etymologically related.

Typical Englishmen are known to be stripped down and cold-blooded. Certainly, this social stereotype about the character of the English was formed on the basis of their behaviour and attitude to life in general. However, as for Ethnocultural stereotypes, the reference to the phraseology immediately makes adjustments to these social stereotypes. Thus, the examples given below, show that the English can also be emotional and passionate: *hot blood, hot as pepper, hotter than a pistol, in a hot blood, hot head* [18]. Thus, a particular opposition to the cold-bloodedness of the English, which is stereotyped by other ethnic groups and which they themselves identify as such, is their hot blood, that means passion. This includes phrase with the close meaning: *a hot head* meaning a passionate and hot person.

Based on the conclusions of Chizhevsky, D., among the main features of the psychological structure of Ukrainians we consider emotionalism [20], which is supported by a stereotypical phrase in Ukrainian language: Ukr. *гаряча кров* (lit. *hot blood*) speaking about hot and passionate person [21], which is equivalent to the English phrase *hot blood*.

Chizhevsky, D. also mentioned individualism and desire for freedom, restlessness and crumbliness. One of the factors in the formation of the latter trait he names nature, in particular the Ukrainian steppe, which was a source of constant threat and caused in Ukrainians a peculiar "rest-

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

lessness" during the time of the nomadic invasion [20]. Thus, about the unquiet and unrestrained person Ukrainians used to speak as about *гаряча голова* (*натура*) (lit. *the hot head* (*nature*)) [21].

The concept of male COURAGE is marked in English by the noun *courage*, in Ukrainian – *мужність* (lit. *masculinity*) – that encode, in most cases, English and Ukrainian stereotypes about manhood and manliness.

The meaning of the lexeme *courage* in English is: "the quality of mind and spirit that allows a person to endure hardship, insecurity, pain without fear, to be good" [22].

Courage is similar to ME *corage* < Old French (Old French) *cuer*, which is a derivative of *heart*, which, in turn, is similar to Latin *cor* [23]. As we can see, in the English the lexemes *courage*, *goodness*, *masculinity and heart* are etymologically contiguous. However, in the etymological vocabulary of the Ukrainian language the lexeme *мужність* (lit. *courage*, *manliness*) is related to man: *Муж* – (lit. *man*) means "healthy, strong man, hero", "man", "courage", "courage, bravery". In the same dictionary, the token *муж* is reconstructed as related to PIE *mánuh* "man, human"; Goth. *manna* "man", Old Germanic *man*; **manu-s* or **monu-s*, possibly related to **men-* "to think" [24]. Machek proposes to interpret *muž as "man", which has PIE root **manysuà* [25], which, according to Fassmer, M., is related to PIE **manu-s* "man". In the dictionary of Machek, V., there is a version of Proto Slavic forms **mož* as **moньšь* "man", having PIE root **manysuà* [25].

Thus, we admit that the notion of ***courage*** and ***bravery*** of the English is associated with the ***quality of mind and spirit***, which comes from the heart (we confirm the rational and emotional characteristics of the English); of the Ukrainians – with an essentially ***masculine characteristic*** – a healthy, strong man, a rich man, which, as it was reconstructed in the Indo-European language, is also connected with *thinking*, that is, it is not deprived of *rationality*.

The qualities of the character of the typical Englishman are reflected in stereotypical phrase-formulas, i.e: *Man of courage*; *Man of honour*; *Man of decision*; *Man of few words*; *Man of principle*; *Man of character*; *Man of iron* [26].

In English, such stereotypical phrases have the structure of a substantive word formation with the formula Subst+Subst. In the Ukrainian language, partial equivalents of such phrases also have the formula of substantive word formation, but with the formula Subst+Adj. In fact, the motivational component in both languages is the same: *man*.

In the Ukrainian language with the motivational component "man" (Ukr. *людина*) there is an idiom *стати людиною* (lit. *to become a man*), which means "to grow spiritually, to develop better character and behaviour".

It is worth mentioning the differences in the cultural and symbolic portrait characteristics of courage in each of the languages. In English, *courage* is stereotyped in the idioms with the "man" component – man as a real image of the strength and will – the feeling that comes from the heart (*man of courage, man of honour, man of decision*). In Ukrainian language the stereotype of *courage* is about masculinity.

So, a courageous and brave man is stereotyped in the mind of Ukrainians as an ideal image – a man should strive to be like that.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

In contrast to the preceding models of courage, there are antonymic stereotypical formulas with the figurative component *spirit*. But while in the Ukrainian language the lexeme *spirit* (Ukr. *дух*) is a motivator of the phrases, in the English language we see quite different components.

In English, these units have the structure of a word combination, the figurative components of which are abstract nouns *nerve*, *heart*, *courage* for the nomination of *courage*. The grammatical structure of the Ukrainian phrases matches the English ones, but in the Ukrainian language it is *spirit* (Ukr. *дух*) that is a synonym for *courage* and *boldness*.

One stereotypical formula for *courage* is common to both languages: *Bold / brave as a lion / хоробрий як лев* (lit. *brave as a lion*). In both languages these stereotypical phrases have the structure of the substantive word combination Adj + Subst, in which the nominative is the head member + the adjunctive- (as). In both cases, the main motivational meaning is the noun *lion / лев* (*lion*).

The lion is not typical animal for England and Ukraine. The mythology of the lion is traditionally based on the history of Hercules and the Nemean Lion. Therefore, we can speak about the joint threads of the concept LION in both languages – Greek mythology. In addition, the point of the Sun is located in the Leo Constellation, which is also common to the European peoples.

Traditional culture of the Ukrainians is based, on the totality of their ethnic and cultural stereotypes with the inherent nature of ethnic codes and symbols. The way of life of the Ukrainian people was created by the deepest spheres of people's conscience, archaic beliefs and the specific worldview. We can identify two types of Ukrainian mentality: agricultural and Cossack. The first type is chronologically old and dates back to the ancient Indo-European culture of the cattlemen. The second one is formed in the era of the early Middle Ages on the ground of the original ethnosocial formation – the Cossacks.

For a reason, Ukrainian phraseology has stereotyped the Ukrainian Cossack in many of its idioms, mainly in the form of speech constructions: *Де козак, там і слава* (lit. *Where the Cossack, there is the glory*); *Козак не боїться ні тучі, ні грому* (lit. *A Cossack is not afraid of either clouds or thunder*); *Козацькому роду нема переводу* (lit. *There is no end for the Cossacks*); *Козак в біді не заплаче* (lit. *Cossack does not cry in trouble*); *Степ та воля козацька доля* (lit. *Steppe and will is a Cossack's lot*); *Хоробрий козак ззаду не нападає* (lit. *A brave Cossack does not attack from behind*) [27]. These idioms characterize a typical Ukrainian – a Cossack as sincere, brave, shrewd, and brave. They are ideal examples motivated by the characteristics of a Cossack in the imagination of Ukrainians. According to Bartminski, J., the characteristics determining the sample are understood as necessary for the subject from the point of view of native speakers, which can be combined into the meta-textual formula "the way it should be" [2].

The English idioms: *A man of courage never wants weapons*; *Courage is the father (mother) of success*; *None but the brave deserve the fair*; *Good courage breaks ill luck*; *Fortune favours the brave / bold* [26] have motivational components in their external form, which are the lexemes *courage*, *brave*, and *bold*, which, although may be considered synonymous, have significant semantic connotations, as shown by the etymology.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

The etymological sources give interesting versions of the semantic development of the lexeme *brave* and its possible descent: *brave* begins to be used in the XV century. It was borrowed from the French language; it comes from the Italian *bravo* "bold", or Spanish *bravo* "manly, unpretentious, savage"; which, in its turn, comes from the Latin *barbarus*, "barbarous, wild, cruel" [23].

The next image-motivational and cultural-symbolic component of English idioms is *bold*, which is semantized as one "that demands strength of will, spirit; it does not mean trouble; it risks; male, brave, energetic, confident, strong", derived from the Old English lexeme *beald*, *bald* "brave, confident, strong", the Proto-Germanic word *balthaz* (disputed with the Old Germanic word *bald* "valiant, quick-witted, quick-witted, bold", and remained in the Proper names as Archibald, Leopold, Theobald. Gothic *balþei* "boldness"; Old Norse *ballr* "frightful, dangerous", come, perhaps from PIE *bhol-to- suffixed form of root *bhel- "to blow, swell" [23].

One of the meanings of *bold* may be translated in Ukrainian as *сміти*, *насмілитися*, *сміли*й "to dare, to be bold".

In the Ukrainian Dictionary of Etymology, the words *сміти* (lit. *to dare*) – have the following versions of their origin: R. *сметь*, *смелый*; Br. *смець*, old-r. "to be bold, to have the right"; P. *śmieć*, *śmiały*; h. *směti*, (*smíti*), *směly*; Sl. *smiet'*, *smelý*; Bulgarian *сме́я*, *смел*. The common etymology of this lexeme is not entirely clear; it is associated with the Gothic *mōps* (coll. mōdis) "wrath, anger", the Old Germanic *muot* "spirit", the Greek muot "spirit", the Greek μαίομαι "strive", Latin *mōs* "will"; also considered as a related from the hypothetical pronoun **sъtě̄ja* (**sъtja*), which is related to the PIE *śimi* "diligence, determination, engagement", *śamati* "toil, work", Gr. ηάμυω "toil"; derived from **sŭmē-*, disputed with Lith. *sumdyti* "to chase, persecute" [22].

Semantically, the word *съмѣлъ* "courageous" has a connection with *хоробрий* (lit. *brave*), which means "courageous, brave, who does not give in to fear"; The Old Slavic **xorbъ* is influenced by additives of the -гъ type (eg. dobrъ, bystrъ, ostrъ) denoting "good, fast, sharp"; Lit. śkerbs "sharp", Old Ic. skarpr "sharp", Germ. scharf "sharp", PIE *(s)ker "cut, shear, swish" [23] with the change of consonants in Slavic languages.

Thus, we can make an assumption that in the English language courage and boldness are real images, while in the Ukrainian language they are ideal images, that is, a person must aspire to such a characteristic. The English concept BRAVE – courageous is associated with sharpness, speed and gusto; BOLD – with determination, will and spirit.

Therefore, it should be assumed that the concept of courage and bravery Englishmen associate with the quality of mind and spirit that comes from the heart and hence confirm rational and emotional characteristics of British.

The formation of the Ukrainian soul, besides geopolitical factors, was and is influenced by historical, cultural and ideological factors. Kulchytsky, O. calls it "the solidarity of historical duty", which depends on the geopolitical position of the country. The position of the country is a geopolitical "boundary", which is understood as the constant presence of people on the "limits of possibility of existence", on the boundaries of "struggle, accident, guilt, suffering, threat of death" [28].

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

Thus, historically Ukrainian "borderland" was not protected, appealing at the same time with its extravagant richness and inexhaustible space the warlike West and the steppe-chivalrous East, thus inexorably increasing the pressure of "borderland situations" of every Ukrainian person. Ukraine was constantly being attacked, intimidated and harassed.

For this reason, the retinue type, and later – the chivalrous Cossack type of people – was formed. They were adherent to the ideals of defence, honour, will and faith, geographical forms of life. Specific for the Cossack type was the fact that under the influence of historical factors the centre of their life was transferred from the anxiety about life itself to the preservation of personal honour, to the task of defence of their land. Such Cossacks as Bogdan Khmelnitsky, Petro Sagaidachnyi, Cossack Mamai can be regarded as the examples of Cossack idealism.

The fact that formerly the name "Cossack nation" was used to mean "Ukrainian nation" is the best indicator of the influence of the Cossack way of life on the Ukrainian mentality [28].

CONCLUSION

Nation, national character – these are the phenomena that the human mind is able to cognize, and we are still on the way to penetrating into their deep essence. Cognitive-semiotic linguistics as well as comparative ethnical linguistics develops their own methods for revealing these phenomena. Since the national character is associated with self-consciousness, the linguistic reflection of the latter, its interpretation through linguistic phenomena is one of the tasks of cognitive and semiotic linguistics. The reconstruction of linguistic phenomena with an ethnocultural component of semantics, first of all, those that mark different national feelings, is the scope of investigation of ethnical linguistics.

National character is a people's idea of themselves (their autostereotypes), an important element of people's self-consciousness, their social ethnic "I", the study of which should be carried out not by identifying specific features of the psyche of a person and contrasting them with other ones, but by reconstructing the degree of universal values in different national cultures and traditions, in this case English and Ukrainian. Such values have been formed for millennia, and therefore have deep roots, ontologically related to the racial differentiation of peoples.

Cultural, symbolic and semiotic reconstruction of the archetypal basis of the national characters of the English and Ukrainians requires the reconstruction of the motivational basis of components – special features of these characters – mental, emotional, and volitional. Since these components of national characters are unevenly distributed among the representatives of nations, the article explores the most expressive portrait characteristics of both nations, which were stereotyped in the minds of their representatives and recorded as Ethnocultural stereotypes expressed in phrase-semiotic formulas (idioms and phraseological units).

In the process of analysing idioms with *soul* and *heart* components, their motivational connection with the concept of *spirit* as markers of the national character of the speakers of both

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

languages has been reconstructed. The *soul* of Ukrainians is associated exclusively with the sphere of the soul, actualized through their purely emotional sphere. However, a deeper onomasiological reconstruction of these ethnocultural stereotypes on the basis of phrase formulas gives grounds to assume that the British are also emotional and unrestrained.

In the process of analysing idioms with soul and heart components, their motivational connection with the concept of spirit as markers of the national character of the speakers of both languages has been reconstructed. The English associate spirit with mind as a physical substance, and therefore their COURAGE and ENDURANCE are rational and emotional, as well as kindness – restrained and cold-blooded.

Meanwhile, the spirit of Ukrainians is associated exclusively with the sphere of the soul, actualized through their purely emotional sphere. However, a deeper onomasiological reconstruction of these ethnocultural stereotypes on the basis of phrase formulas gives grounds to assume that the British are also emotional and unrestrained.

In the English language, COURAGE is stereotyped in idioms with the *man* component – man as a real example of human will and power. A courageous man is stereotyped in the minds of Ukrainians as an ideal example. Courage is the basis of the chivalry of the English, formed in the minds of native English speakers as the uniqueness of the Nordic character trait.

Ukrainians first formed a squad, and later a Chivalry-Cossack type of man, adherent to the ideal of defence, honour, will and faith. Characteristic of the Cossack type was under the influence of historical factors, the centre of gravity of their lives shifted from concern for life itself to the preservation of chivalric honour and to the task of defending their native land.

Reconstruction of both cultural and historical sources and linguistic phenomena makes it possible to identify the original basis, i.e. the archetypal basis of the mechanisms of forming ethnocultural stereotypes of the English and Ukrainians about themselves and to find out the motives that are firmly rooted in their national characters.

In the difficult times of the twenty-first century, one might suggest that personal courage is not the absence of fear; rather, it is the ability to put it aside and do what is necessary. It takes two forms – physical and moral. Physical courage is the courage that allows a soldier to take risks in combat despite fear of injury or death. Physical courage is what allows a soldier to go forward and save his comrades.

In contrast, moral courage allows leaders to stand up for what they believe is right, regardless of circumstances or consequences. A leader, who takes responsibility for his or her decisions and actions, even when things go wrong, exhibits moral courage. Courageous leaders are willing to look critically inside themselves, consider new ideas, and change what needs to be changed. Moral courage is needed to live the values of honesty and honour every day.

Language and written memorials are the central artefacts of culture and the medium for establishing the structural typology of languages. The process of cultural cognition and human perception of existence can be defined and interpreted from the perspective of the cognitive-discursive approach proposed in this monograph.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

REFERENCES

1. Lippman, W. (1950). Public Opinion. Macmillan.
2. Bartminski, J. (2012). Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics. Equinox, 256.
3. Tcivian, T. V. (2009). Model mira i ee lingvisticheskie osnovy. Moscow: Librokom, 278.
4. Grigoryev, D., Fiske, S. T., Batkhina, A. (2019). Mapping Ethnic Stereotypes and Their Antecedents in Russia: The Stereotype Content Model. Frontiers in Psychology, 10. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01643
5. Shutova, M., Mudrynych, S. (2020). The Concept of "New Life" as a Powerful Psycholinguistic Element in the Inaugural Addresses of the U.S. Presidents. Revista Amazonia Investiga, 9 (33), 8–16. doi: https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2020.33.09.1
6. Croizet, J. C. (2001). Stereotype Threat, Social Class, Gender, and Academic Under-Achievement: When Our Reputation Catches Up to Us and Takes Over. Social Psycology of Education, 4 (3), 295–310. doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011336821053
7. Schmalor, A., Cheung, B. Y., Heine, S. J. (2021). Exploring people's thoughts about the causes of ethnic stereotypes. PLOS ONE, 16 (1), e0245517. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245517
8. Apresian, Iu. D. (1995). Izbrannye trudy. Shkola "lazyki russkoi kultury".
9. Hnapovska, L. V. (2011). Tekst imeni v teksti kultury: antroponimichni etiudy. Naukovyi visnyk kafedry YuNESKO KNLU. Seriia Filolohiia. Pedahohika. Psykholohiia, 22, 10–19.
10. Mikes, G. (1946/1973). How to Be an Alien. A Handbook for Beginners and More Advanced Pupils. Wingate. Available at: http://f2.org/humour/howalien.html
11. Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. (1966). Elsevier publishing company, 844.
12. Wierzbicka, A. (1991). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Mouton de Gruyter. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112329764
13. Orwell, G. (1947) The English People. Collins.
14. Clark, J. C. D. (2000). Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity, 1660–1832. The Historical Journal, 43 (1), 249–276. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0018246x99008997
15. Wolf, F. (2001). The Emergence of National Identity in Early Modern England. Causes and Ideological Representations. Writing the Early Modern English Nation. Brill, 149–172. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004489332_009
16. Karasik, V. I. (2000). O tipakh diskursa. Iazykovaia lichnost: institutcionalnyi i personalnyi diskurs. Volgograd: Peremena, 5–20.
17. Fox, K. (2004). Watching the English. The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour. Hodder and Soughton Ltd.
18. Cowie, A. P., Mackin, R., McCaig, I. R. (1996). ODEI – Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms. Oxford University Press.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254

19. Zindler, F. R. Spirit, Soul and Mind. Available at: http://www.positief-atheisme.nl/atheisten/frank_r_zindler/spirit_soul_and_mind.html
20. Chyzhevskyi, D. (1992). Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini. Kyiv: Orii, 230.
21. Bilonozhenko, V. (1993). Frazeolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy. Naukova dumka, 980.
22. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2014). Pearson, 493.
23. Harper, D. Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: http://www.etymonline.com/
24. Bilodid, I., Kolomiiets V. (1982–2012). Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
25. Machek, V. (1957). Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského. Čsav, 865.
26. Chambers Dictionary of Idioms (1996). Chambers.
27. Nomys, M. (2004). Ukrainski prykazky, prysliv'ia, i take inshe. Kyiv: Lybid, 352.
28. Kulchytskyi, O. (1995). Osnovy filosofii i filosofichnykh nauk. Lviv: Ukrainskyi vilnyi universytet.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4336254