
© ALLA V. RYABKOVA

Institute of History and Political Sciences
ariabkova@mail.ru

UDC 811.161.1

**RUSSIAN-GERMAN LINGUISTIC MENTALITY
OF THE FRAMES "JOY-GRIEF" IN PRAGMATIC
AND COGNITIVE ASPECTS**

SUMMARY. The national consciousness attracts interest of investigators; techniques and approaches to the language mentality description are developed. This article focuses on linguistic and culturological study of lexical-semantic space of the frame joy-grief as reflected in cognitive pragmatics, because the particularities of the opposition of the specified lexemes have not been examined in the national language consciousness, and semantic lexemes in terms of cognitive frames have not been considered. Application in this paper of such methods as descriptive, component, comparative and cognitive methods allowed conceptual lexemes, structured in frames, to penetrate into the sphere of thought of a specific linguistic and cultural social medium and to carry out a comparative study, due to which universal and national peculiarities are revealed at the level of the Russian and German languages in the lexical-semantic space joy-grief and at the level of mentality of both social media in the frame space joy-grief. The undertaken study has demonstrated practicability of the notion "frame" developed in cognitive science for representing mental structure. As a result of the framing method when interpreting the frames joy-grief mental specificity and understanding of cognitive processes of certain ethnic groups was distinguished. Expressive characteristics of German mentality, namely, economy, rationality, pragmatism are opposed to Russian mentality; to Russian open-mind, well-wishing character and accordingly, to the great, figurative Russian language. The national trait of German people becomes apparent in the language as well. The phenomenon of conciseness relates to both morphology and syntax of the German language, whereas accurate succession and order covers grammatical categories. The presence of compound words in the language also testifies to German mentality peculiarities as concentration of a considerable idea fragment in one unit.

Mental specificity of the Russian language is evident if compared with the German language mentality, the roots of which stretch into unlikeness of national consciousness of the above-mentioned ethnic groups.

The present paper may find practical use when translating literary texts, and in theoretical courses on cultural studies and linguistics.

KEY WORDS. *Linguistic mentality, cognitive frames, self-consciousness, specificity and universality of the language, comparison, culturology.*

As it is known, the outside world is reflected in the human consciousness through language. However, the brain of an individual does not register the whole world but

only its parts, fragments, in other words, frames, that is, those components of the world which seem the most relevant ones.

The language consciousness is considered as a linguistic mode of thinking, since the world perception, its reasoning, interpretation that are performed through language, also exist in the form of a language. Interrelation between different parts of the world and language may be defined as linguistic mentality, which means not only the world around a human being, but the world created by a person. The linguistic world is perceived as a uniform and global notion, which is at the same time of “continuum nature”, because it is divided into pieces. The world division through language is carried out by “imposing the conceptual network (selection of concepts) and situational network (selection of situations) on the world” [1; 112]. The language view on the world is incomplete as the human linguistic brainwork reflects the level of knowledge both as an individual and as a representative of some social medium.

The history of mentality formation, in our opinion, is similar to the history of establishing the nationwide language; in the sense that the conceptual system of ethnos is inseparable from the conceptual system of the language spoken by this very ethnos. This is the subject both for the synchronistic level of the language and consciousness, and the diachronic one; since the language conceptual system reflects the mentality of people, the previous language state imprints. And the history of the language represents the scan of different stages of mentality development [2; 55].

Every historically established nation eventually realizes all-national interests, particularities, traditions and culture of its own. Culture represents a kind of historical memory. “The language due to its cumulative function preserves it, thus sustaining a dialogue of generations not only from past to present but from present to future” [3; 217]. Comparing linguistic mentalities, it is possible to identify their universal individual characteristics. The differences may come down to the fact what parts of the world are conceptualized, i.e., what discrepancies as regards size, conceptual composition and variables, degree of specificity in different languages can be identified.

E.g.: *Andererseits war Erika Grünlich nun 20-jährig: ein grobes erbluhtes Mädchen, frischfarbig und hübsch vor Gesundheit und Kraft* [4; 481].

On the other hand, Erika Grünlich has reached the age of twenty. She is a tall girl, in the full bloom of youth, milk and roses.

German lexemes and word groups depicting the young girl’s appearance create a positively joyful image; *frischfarbig* (a fresh colour of the face), *hübsch von Gesundheit und Kraft* (beautiful with health and strength) may be translated into Russian by the following phrase: *blood with milk* (a literal translation of the Russian idiom), laconically, figuratively and vividly. This expression fully reflects the whole sense of the German lexemes and is smaller in size. This reveals the distinction between the lexeme set, the represented frame size, whereas the concept *appearance of the girl* remains similar in terms of frame structuring both in the Russian and German languages. Nevertheless, this phenomenon is not typical of the Russian language. On the contrary, Russian sentences translated from German are more spacious.

E.g.: *Die Konsulin dagegen, ermattet von Trauerformalitäten und den Begräbnisfeierlichkeiten, sah leidend aus* [4; 250].

The consul's wife, quite the reverse, worn-out by the loss, heartache, endless funeral formalities, and obituary ceremonies, looked absolutely exhausted.

Comparing, the sentences in Russian and German versions, one may find a slight similarity in distinguishing the emotional concept of grief and the difference in its conceptual composition and verbal arrangement. For the purpose of conveying a more exact meaning, the Russian version uses cognitive criteria, represented by lexemes, and this extends the conceptual set and makes the sentence more spacious. This is typical of the Russian language. In German adequacy is sometimes observed in relation to the semantic potential of lexemes; and cognitive criteria are observed due to word-formation processes.

Let us try to determine the similarity and difference in formation of the Russian and German mentality, as well as the level of its influence on the linguistic sphere. Regardless of the distinctiveness of the Russians' life perception, one cannot ignore the fact that social and public life in the territory occupied by Russians was formed at the crossroads between Europe and Asia, being influenced simultaneously by European culture, including the German one.

More than that, the climate and geographical factors affected Russian mentality: "the immense territory, different from Europe, divided the ethnos; a communicative barrier appeared, an individual was lost, and a variety of peoples and languages aggravated the island effect of Russian mentality, but on the other hand, they formed such traits of character as hospitality, cordiality and love for freedom" [5; 53].

Germany, having mountain and lowland landscapes, river waterways, large centers, nurtured a sense of coherence. Germans felt themselves managers of the situation in their country; their communication with other peoples and cultures established a diversified worldview.

The influence of Christianity on the development of the Russian mind is also huge. A particular factor is excessive compassion of the eastern orthodox view of the world, a special role of kindness, understood as forgiveness, which, as opposed to a similar notion in the Western Christian tradition, is impossible to buy for money. It may only be prayed for.

The image of Germany in Russian mentality was associated with the temple of learnedness and German pedantry, strict discipline, law-abidance and rationality. "The image of Russia in German mentality is related to love for freedom, benevolence, openness and vast expanses". From the mentality viewpoint, a German may be characterized as follows: intellectually gifted, and in this connection, arrogant, supercilious, whereas a resident of Russia is more humane than that of the West. "The warm-hearted nature in Russia is more active: in Russia there is a considerable human potential", than in staid Europe [6; 101]. The difference in social foundations of a personality is also undeniable. "Russians perceive the state as a clumsy machine, inefficient with respect to an individual. It is impossible to obtain from this machine what it must give. Germans regard the state as a child of their proper brain, the product of a human treaty. From

birth they have assimilated the idea that the state is a mechanism built up by people. And they are ready to improve and modify this mechanism” [2; 40].

The difference between a position to be taken and a role to be played by a Russian and a German in social life is also evident. Therefore, in our opinion, there is a crucial incompatibility of Russian and German cultures on specific issues: “in the Russian deliberativeness, developed from the German rationalism”. For a German, who got used to follow the laws and regulations, this is not clear. A German understands “individualism as introversion, concentration, exceptionalism”. The reason of a German is in his rationality whereas the intelligence of a Russian — in his deliberativeness. The will of a German seeks for the world spaces, and the will of a Russian is expressed in some proneness to a “spontaneous rebellion” [7; 192].

The originality of a language is rooted in the national soul/spirit”, embodied in the distinctive national form of the language. This is what Humboldt highlighted. He called the language “the soul in all the totality” and in this connection considered that the language developed according to the laws of spirit. This means that each language has its own view on the world. “Since perception and activities of a human being depend on ideas”, wrote Humboldt, “the attitude of an individual toward objects is totally determined by the language. The very action that a human being uses for creating a language results in the following: an individual falls under the sway of language. Every language forms around people who speak it a circle from whose limits they can come out only when entering another circle” [8; 81].

Thus, a human being lives in the world, reflects it in his consciousness in the form of frames, and relying on his experience and knowledge, he interprets this world and improves it. Depending on the fact where and in what way it happens, some peculiarities related to peoples’ tradition and culture come to the fore. This is what is called mentality or specificity that leaves a mark on all spheres of human activity and language.

S.G. Shafikov pointed out that “the semantic field of any natural language is characterized by a certain taxonomic depth reflecting the differentiating peculiarity of the language” [9; 17]. Languages differ according to the ability to select in one and the same sense other senses, more specific ones. The taxonomic depth is calculated by a number of differential semes. For example, the lexeme *melancholy* implies several differential semes: *anguish of body and mind, boredom, mental burden*; the lexeme *grief* has only one seme *sorrowful state* in connection with loss. The German lexeme *die Kummernis* implies a number of differential semes: *concern, sorrow, grief*. Comparing the taxonomic depth of the Russian and German languages, we can trace a certain difference. Separate lexemes of both languages have a different number of differential semes. This means that the taxonomic depth is not similar. For instance, the lexeme *die Kummernis* and the Russian lexeme *melancholy* have several differential semes. At the same time, the Russian lexeme *grief* has a meaning connected only with the seme *loss*.

More than that, languages differ by a number of common meanings, combining the same adjacent meanings common to them. In this case we deal with a “taxonomic

width”, which presupposes a number of supplementary integral semes in languages. Integral semes become actual under neutralization of differential semes. Integration of the differential seme components creates a more general meaning, combining adjacent elements [9; 17]. Such a phenomenon is encountered in the Russian and German languages; however, it is typical neither of Russian, nor of German.

The following example validates this phenomenon.

E.g.: [...] *und je seit dieser Zeit der ewige Kummer begleitet ihn [4;378];*
[...] *and since that time a perennial lack has always accompanied him.*

The denotative meaning of the lexeme *Kummer* is smoothed over in this example. The meaning *grief, sorrow, sadness* is concentrated in the seme *concern about lack of means due to bankruptcy* and shifts into another semantic area.

On the basis of the analysis of the material under study, we believe that the semantic field of the Russian and German languages is characterized by the presence of sememes having a various type of relevance: the most relevant sememes are indicated by simple signs and the less relevant ones — by derivatives. For example, goodness/politeness derives from the words goodness and love, which is a relevant seme in the lexeme *goodness*, nevertheless, the denotation of this lexeme is human qualification, the courtesy and amiability of a human being.

The German lexeme *Liebenswürdigkeit* consists of two roots *Liebe* and *Wurde* and gives the similar denotative meaning: *goodness* — a human quality. There is no discrepancy observed in the definition of sememe relevance in the Russian and German languages. There is a difference just in the derivational structures of the lexemes. The German lexeme consists of two equivalent lexemes (*die Liebe = die Würdigkeit*), and the Russian lexeme is formed by analogy with: root + suffix.

This very example brings evidence to the characteristic of the German mentality in the language, namely, economy. And in the German language this is a standard, because it is fusional, i.e. the phenomenon of syncretism is widely spread in the language. This phenomenon is also related to parts of speech and grammar categories.

The difference between the Russian and German languages turns obvious in the process of identifying meanings that fill the lexeme and are marked with the same sign. Definition of the meaning is complicated by doubling it in the identification of another meaning; such “doubling or intrafield polysemy occurs in the Russian and the German languages, that is, as opposed to intrafield polysemy, which captures various semantic fields, does not create new meanings outside the integral seme of the given field and is included into its structure” [9; 20]. For example, *festivity* is an internal joyous state of being, event; *Finsternis* — darkness, a sorrowful internal state.

The structural semantic analysis brings us closer to the analysis of national and cultural characteristics of the two languages — Russian and German — and people speaking them within the space of perceiving the joyous and sorrowful, in conceptualization of the world in general and emotional sphere in particular. As it was already mentioned, consciousness is connected with reflection and cognition, which are formed on as mental structures and manifested in the language, because the results of reflection, thinking and emotional experiences are fixed verbally. Human consciousness

builds up on the previous social, mental experience in the form of generalized structures, which are different as regards the type, volume and level of abstraction. That is why an emphasis is placed on the fact that an individual has some cognitive schemes, which make a person accept definite units of information, notably, frames. Everybody is able to form the frames; however, filling them depends on the subject and that mental and ethnic environment where an individual lives in. Focusing on the investigation of Russian and German mentalities, based on the history, culture, and national traditions, we can state that Russians are sociable, more compassionate, open-minded, kind; thus, a range of extensive feelings is broad and the structured emotional concept *joy-grief* practically has no limits.

Germans, as noted above, are thrifty, economical, reserved, and somewhat conservative. It becomes obvious while perceiving and reflecting the social sphere. It is the ethnic specificity of a Russian and a German that explains the usage of the lexeme **joy** 62 times and the lexeme **Freude** 49 times in the text under analysis. The semanteme **joy** has 45 variants and the semanteme **Freude** — 28; the semanteme **grief** has 37 variants and the semanteme **Trauer** — 32. It indicates the diversity and width of emotional perception Russians are characteristic of; testifies to the vastness of the lexical and semantic field and a greater degree of the differential seme variation and in this connection of the variation in producing semantic frames.

A set of potential frames is rooted into typical social contexts. These frames, in turn, preset a number of positions, functions, properties and relations for communicators in society. Production of frames does not depreciate potential neither of the Russian nor the German languages; nevertheless, the variation of verbal frame structuring in Russian is wider, as we consider the lexical-semantic aspect to be wider.

There is no ethnic specificity in the cognitive process; however, it is not universal since the semantic and structural selection is determined by national essentiality. Where a Russian expresses a wild delight, a German demonstrates stiff reserve; where a Russian suffers, a German introduces pragmatism; where a Russian runs the risk, a German resorts to law.

Nevertheless, Russians and Germans have a number of common features. The latter one, regarding perception and realization of the emotional concept in the space frame *joy-grief* is adequate. On a global scale, Germans and Russians perceive joyous and sad occasions similarly: when something joyous happens, they rejoice; if something bad happens they mourn. This is what Humboldt pointed out: “People understand each other not because they deliver signs of subjects to an interlocutor [...], but because they mutually touch in each other one and the same link in a chain of sensuous views, i.e., species and elements of inner notions” [8; 165].

This very idea is originally postulated by L. Chafe who wrote that “The language enables the speaker to take notions being in his own consciousness and evoke these concepts in the consciousness of the listener. Sounds do not generate new conceptual items in the consciousness of the latter. They activate notions already existing there; notions, which are common both for the speaker and the listener” [10; 93].

Conceptualization of an emotion in the space *joy-grief* gives us an opportunity to compare two languages' mentalities, two linguistic and cultural generalities, and two remotely related peoples.

Application of the structural-semantic and cognitive modelling method in relation to the lexical material of the Russian and German languages allowed looking at the conventional idea of the linguistic and culturological analysis of the object in question in a different way. The communicative competency of a native speaker, including both linguistic and cognitive constituents, becomes the object of such an analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Pochepcov, G.G. /ml. Language mentality: the way to represent the world. *Voprosy jazykoznanija — Issues on linguistics*. 1990. № 6 . Pp. 110-122. (in Russian).
2. Golovanivskaja, M.K. *Mental'nost' v zerkale jazyka. Nekotorye bazovye koncepty v predstavlenii francuzov i russkih* [Mentality in the mirror of the language. The vision of certain basic concepts the way the French and the Russians see them]. Moscow, 2009. 376 p. (in Russian).
3. Telija, V.N. *Russkaja frazeologija* [Russian Phraseology]. Moscow, 290 p. (in Russian).
4. Mann, Th. *Buddenbrooks*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1989. 609 p.
5. Ruge, G. *Sibirisches Tagebuch*. Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1998. 288 p.
6. *Nemcy o russkih* [Germans about Russians]. Moscow, 1995. 192 p. (in Russian).
7. Helm, G. *Deutschland — Russland*. Hamburg: Rasch und Röhring Verlag, 1990. 650 p.
8. Humboldt, W. On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and Its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species // W. Humboldt. *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju* [Selected works on Linguistics]. Moscow, 1984. (in Russian).
9. Shafikov, S.G. *Jazykovye universalii i problemy leksicheskoj semantiki* [Linguistic Universals and Lexical Semantics Issues]. Ufa, 1998. 251 p. (in Russian).
10. Chafe, W.L. *Znachenie i struktura jazyka* [Meaning and the Structure of Language]. Moscow, 1975. (in Russian).