

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.21.05>

UDC: 81'384



Ganna V. Izyumtseva

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,
Kyiv, Ukraine

METAPHORICAL MODEL GOD IS THE NEED IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN BIBLICAL DISCOURSE

Bibliographic Description:

Izyumtseva, G. V. (2021). Metaphorical Model *GOD IS THE NEED* in English and Ukrainian Biblical Discourse. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 21. 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.21.05>.

Abstract

The paper considers the critical problem of contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors underlying the conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia in English and Ukrainian discourse within the cognitive-discursive framework. The complex methodology used in the research is based on the procedures of the contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors developed in works of A. Barcelona, E. V. Budaiev, and A. P. Chudynov. It allowed, first, establishing and systematizing (based on the source-domain) the main shared models of metaphorical conceptualization, namely: anthropomorphic, nature-morphic, phytomorphic, zoomorphic, sociomorphic, artifact, military, temporal, and economic metaphors; second, reconstruction and contrastive cognitive-semantic analysis of the metaphorical model *GOD IS THE NEED* / *БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА* pertinent for the English and Ukrainian, but at the same time not elaborated in the Pentateuch. The heuristic and axiological potential of the model was established. The frame-slot conceptual domain *THE NEED* serves as a source-domain for the target-domain *GOD* thereby uncovering the cognitive meanings related to the most important spheres of experience of English-speaking and Ukrainian respondents.

The obtained results account for some subtle contrasts in metaphorical conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia by present-day representatives of English and Ukrainian linguocultures, and demonstrate the ethnocultural specificity of the national mentality against the background of the universal and shared in the process of the figurative interpretation of the world. In addition, it was found that in contrasted discourses, the concept of *GOD* figuratively represents the collective idea of the highest spiritual value.

Keywords: metaphorical model, conceptual metaphor, Biblical realia, frame, slot, contrastive analysis.

1. Introduction.

Contemporary cognitive linguistics assumes that surface language structures are motivated by cognitive structures undergirding them. In this respect, conceptual metaphors – cognitive formations not only underlying linguistic metaphors but serving as a cognitive

instrument for structuring and comprehending reality – have become a focus of cognitive linguistics investigations. Started with the seminal work “Metaphors we live by” (1980) by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, for almost half a century, there has been unfading interest among linguists in issues connected with different aspects of these cognitive formations. A great deal of present-day research has been conducted to investigate their different significant aspects: a) typology (J. Grady, A. Hardie, G. Lakoff & M. Johnson, E. Semino); b) structural specificity (A. M. Baranov, Z. Kövecses, S. A. Zhabotynska); c) lexico-semantic and grammatical aspect (L. Cameron, A. Deignan, K. Sullivan); d) pragmatics, functioning in discourses of different types: political discourse (A. M. Baranov, E. V. Budaev, A. P. Chudynov, V. A. Maslova, A. Musolff, E. O. Oparynoi, E. Semino, T. H. Skrebtsova, Yu. S. Stepanov), publicistic discourse (Ye. V. Temnova), scientific and professional discourse (D. Hordon, S. L. Myshlanova, N. A. Nikitina, O. S. Zubkova), artistic discourse (L. V. Kravets, Yu. V. Kravtsova, G. Lakoff, M. Turner, L. Iu. Tykha), fideistic (religious) discourse (A. Barcelona, V. I. Karasyk, E. S. Marnytsyna, N. B. Mechkovska, N. N. Oriekhova, N. M. Orlova, M. A. Sadykova, P. M. Shytikov, E. B. Yakovenko); contrastive studies (E. V. Budaiev, A. Barcelona, C. Soriano, N. V. Kabantseva, A. Thabet, W. Al Tohami), and others. Nevertheless, the studies have little to say about the contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors of fideistic discourse; thereby, this aspect becomes a fresh and promising topic of cognitive-discursive research.

2. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of the paper is contrastive analysis of metaphorical model *GOD IS THE NEED* underlying the conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia in English and Ukrainian.

Objectives are as follows:

- to describe methodological foundations of the investigation;
- to analyze the consistent patterns of metaphorical expansion to identify the types of metaphors pertinent to the English and Ukrainian discourse; to consider the similarities and differences of the contrasted types;
- to identify the degree of elaboration of shared by the contrasted languages model *GOD IS THE NEED*, and describe conceptual and lexical metaphors that account for the cognitive meaning of this model in both languages.

3. Methodology.

The research objectives determine the methodological basis of the study. The study is conducted on material collected by means of a questionnaire. The participants of the study are 100 English-speaking and 100 Ukrainian-speaking randomly selected persons. The respondents were asked to share their thoughts on some realia fixed by the metaphors of the Pentateuch. The questionnaire includes open-ended questions that provide respondents with freedom to use their own language, and trigger their figurative thinking, thereby revealing individually-specific analogue and associative conceptions existing in their mind concerning the realia discussed.

Having collected responses, in first place, each language was individually analyzed following G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, A. P. Chudynov’s methodology for semantic-cognitive reconstruction and characterization of conceptual metaphors. The types of metaphors pertinent to the English and Ukrainian discourse were identified and classified by source-domain. Subsequent contrasting of detected types allowed concluding on differences / similarities between types of metaphors in the discourses under consideration. Secondly, for the contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors, we adopted (with some adjustments)

procedures of A. Barcelona's (2012, pp. 117–146), E. V. Budaiev's (Будаєв, 2020), and A. P. Chudynov's (Чудинов, 2003) methodology. Thus, to contrast the conceptual metaphors we employed the following parameters: 1) existence / non-existence of the mapping in the contrasted languages (to compare pertinent for the English and Ukrainian conceptual metaphors but other than found in the Pentateuch); 2) degree of conceptual elaboration; at this stage, having described the shared metaphorical mappings in each language individually, we contrast them and discuss the degree of elaboration of shared mappings in the contrasted languages.

4. Literature review.

According to G. Lakoff, the metaphor is a fundamental cognitive mechanism that organizes human thinking and language with a conceptual metaphor as “a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (1993, p. 203). Its essence consists in experiencing and comprehending one thing in terms of something else. In the process of metaphorization the structures of knowledge the “source-domain” and “target-domain” interact forming a particular schema of relation between these notional domains. These systematic correspondences / mappings are nothing but a metaphorical model. Following A. P. Chudynov's view, it can be represented by the following formula: “X is Y” (Чудинов, 2003, p. 70). For instance, *God is the Person*, *People are Plants*, etc. Importantly, in the mapping not only separate elements of conceptual domains but their whole structures are involved. That is to say, a speaker is selectively mapping significant (from his standpoint) characteristics of an object (conceptual domain)-source upon the object (conceptual domain) that is a target of conceptualization. Consequently, each new source-domain applied to conceptualize the target changes the angle of its seeing and comprehension, and “we see the target-differently than we saw it before” (Kövecses, 2017, p. 17).

Following A. P. Chudynov, we interpret structures of knowledge of a metaphoric model as “fragments of naïve image of the world”, “systems of frames” (slots, concepts) (Чудинов, 2003, p. 71). In such view, a frame is understood as “a unit of knowledge attached to a particular notion. The data it encompasses is something essential, typical and possible for this notion [...]. It structures the holistic conception of the world [...]. The frame is a data-structure for representing stereotyped situations” (Кубрякова, 1996, p. 188). As M. Minsky puts it, “we can think of a frame as a network of nodes and relations. The “‘top levels’ of a frame are fixed, and represent things that are always true about the supposed situation. The lower levels have many terminals – ‘slots’ that must be filled by specific instances or data” (Anonymous, 1975). These are specific lacunas that are supposed to be filled with information about particular parameters or aspects of an object / situation based on previous people's spiritual and practical experience of dealing with the similar situations or objects.

A way how slots are verbalized depends on the communicative situation. It can be said that it is a communicative situation that determines the way how the slots are verbalized (Минский, 1979). At the same time, it is also important to emphasize that the frame is an open-type cognitive structure, and it can expand its boundaries using new information (Fillmore, 1982).

Overall, it is a system of frames (slots, concepts) of a mental source-domain that serves as a foundation to model mental target-sphere in a process of metaphorization. Under this view, a target-sphere not only preserves the structure of the source-domain, but also its emotive potential, thereby enabling the speaker to affect the emotions and will of the addressee (Чудинов, 2003, p. 70).

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's findings show that there are: 1) **orientation metaphors** that reflect an idea of spatial orientation (*the Spirit come down from heaven* in John 1:32 (OSB)); 2) **ontological metaphors**, the "ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc. as entities and substances" (Lakoff, 1980, p. 25) (*The Lord is my Banner* in Exodus 17:15 (OSB)); 3) **structural metaphors** enabling the speaker to use the concepts of one domain of experience to characterize another one. For example, the God-man relations (*God is Father* in Deut. 32:6 (OSB)) can be conceptualized via the earthly father-children relations, a concept of earthly 'fatherhood'. Metaphorical models do not exist in isolation, they interact, (A. M. Baranov, A. P. Chudynov, Yu. M. Karaulov). Given above metaphorical model *God is Father* emerges on the 'crossroad' with a number of metaphorical models. Some of them are: the orientation metaphor *God is UP*, the structural metaphorical model *God is Person*, the ontological metaphor *God is Container*.

Thus, firstly, the conceptual metaphor is a key cognitive operation of the comprehension of the world, and at the same time the product of this operation. Secondly, the structures of knowledge of a metaphoric model are the "fragments of naïve image of the world", "systems of frames" (slots, concepts). Thirdly, the metaphors underpinning discourse form the conceptual net of metaphorical models. That is to say, the analysis of the one presupposes the analysis of another one; this perfectly serves the aim of our research. Contrasting the metaphorical models involves contrasting the metaphorical systems and to some degree contrasting the worldviews that will allow the holistic view of the results of the study.

5. Results and Discussion.

In the course of the analysis the types of metaphors pertinent to the English and Ukrainian discourse were identified and classified by source-domain. Subsequent contrasting of identified types allowed us to consider the similarities and differences of the contrasted types. As a result, no significant differences were established. The common types of the English and Ukrainian metaphors are: anthropomorphic metaphor, military metaphor, nature-morphic metaphor, zoomorphic metaphor, phitomorphic metaphor, artifact metaphor, sociomorphic metaphor, temporal, and economic metaphors.

5.1. The English and Ukrainian metaphors typology.

Contrastive analysis of the identified metaphors showed that the most common types of the metaphor in the English and Ukrainian discourse (based on the questionnaire) are (due to the space constraints, only some examples are given):

I. Anthropomorphic metaphor:

1) spiritual properties of the man: a) traits of character: *God is kind, Gracious, He is gentle; Бог є щедрість; Бог є милосердя; Бог є доброта*; b) feelings: *God loves; Бог є любов*; c) desires, motives: *God wants, the desires of the Lord; Бог має бажання простити, Бог є джерело натхнення; God is the need, He is everything we need; Бог є потреба*;

2) physical properties of the man: a) language / voice: *God spoke; the word of God tells us; так говорить Слово Божє*; b) physical sensation: *the world can be cold*; c) parts of the human body: *God's body, the church; at the right hand ... of God; Все в руках Божих; всевидючим оком, Він спостерігає за кожним з нас*;

3) mental properties of the man (thinking / intellect): *God knows, the mind of Christ, He can decide everything, He understands, Бог знає, Він є істина і знання, Бог є Мудрість; життя є знання; розум Всесвіту*;

4) physiological properties of the man: *God is Life, the bread of life; Бог є життям; Господь... зароджує любов; віра живе.*

II. Military metaphor: *God is Worrier; God is fighter, He fights for me; God is peace; He is my Commander in Chief; God is Victory; He is the peace maker; he has reconciled me to himself; God will win over all evil; God is Shield; The Lord God ... is my warrior in battle; He is the "badge or banner" I wear; Our Lord is our banner; God is Stronghold; God is my defender; He is with us always as we go into battle; He is victorious defeat all of our enemies; He will bless us and raise us up above our adversaries; He has legions of angels and saints at His disposal; людина... є його Воїном світла; Господь дає відвагу і перемогу в різних життєвих битвах; ми – прапорonosці; найсильнішою зброєю є безмежна (інколи навіть фанатична) віра і сила думки; Бог є Захисник; Бог є перемога; Бог є Стратег.*

III. Nature-morphic metaphor:

1) nature (physical /not of physical nature): *God is Nature; God is an angel, God is spirit, a sensational Spirit; Бог є Дух;*

2) the solar system: a) atmosphere (different aspects): *God is Air; God is the Wind; Бог є небо; Бог є погода; b) the Universe: Бог є Зірка; Бог є Всесвіт; Бог є Сонце;*

3) physical objects / phenomena: a) light: *the ray of sun in the darkest days; Бог є світло; світле майбутнє; світлі помисли та вчинки; b) electricity: He is ... insulator; Бог є радіохвиля; c) thermal phenomena: God is Fire; d) water objects: God is water;*

4) landscape: a) relief of location: *God is mountain, God is Rock; b) section (of the land): Jesus is the Way, the rock of our Salvation (Jesus); дерево життя та дерево пізнання – шлях; на дорозгах життя.*

IV. Zoomorphic metaphor (animals / birds) *God is Lamb, God is lion, His wings, we are his sheep; ми Його вівці.*

V. Phitomorphic metaphor (parts of plants / processes):

I need God's Word ... in order to grow my faith, the fruits of the spirit; Слово Боже є зерно.

VI. Artifact metaphor:

1) constructions:

a) buildings: *God is shelter, God is asylum, God is castle, He is my strong tower, construction, the almighty fortress; маяк (Бог); b) parts of buildings: God is ... foundation of my life, He is my stable foundation, He is the cornerstone, the Bible is the foundation; Слово Бога є для нас ... опорою; якщо будуватимемо наше моральне й духовне життя; у світличці серця; двері раю;*

2) mechanisms and their parts / instruments: *God is steadfast anchor; bread (host) and we receive him as the food that fuels our faith, love is the key; люди- приймачі; життя – це бумеранг; ключ (Слово) до істини; акумулятор наших душ;*

3) clothes (outdoor clothes, sign in a way of object): *He is the "badge ..." I wear; the Righteous robe of God; ряса – це хрест;*

4) food and ingredients: *Jesus ... is the bread of life, He is the bread of life, Word of God is nutrition, God's word is food, His word nourishes our soul, eating from the tree of knowledge death, the Word is nourishment for the spiritual life; коли їмо Христа наповнюємося життям; вчинки живлять і годують; дух харчується Словом; пожива для душі; їжа для мого духа; Слово насихує духовний голод;*

5) religious objects: *The tree of Life is the Cross;*

6) printed / handwriting products (signs / sign systems): *He is the Alfa and the Omega; Бог є ... центральна фігура; I have zero idea about that.*

VII. Sociomorphic metaphor (punishment / encouragement): *life and consciousness are the major gifts; Knowing more about God and being closer to him is the ultimate goal and prize in life; Боже Слово є величезним даром; Життя – найбільший дар.*

VIII. Temporal metaphor (time): *He is ... the beginning and the end, God is eternity; Бог є вічність.*

IX. Economic metaphors: *Jesus's sacrifice has paid the price for my sins; Людина, укладаючи угоду з Богом, бере на себе певні зобов'язання і згідно цієї угоди вона отримує благословення.*

Thus, the analysis has shown that the main shared models of metaphorical conceptualization are: anthropomorphic, nature-morphic, phitomorphic, zoomorphic, sociomorphic, artifact, military, temporal, and economic metaphors. Furthermore, in both discourses the most productive are anthropomorphic, artifact, and military metaphors. The least productive are economic and temporal metaphors.

Importantly, against the background of shared models, pertinent to the Ukrainian discourse only, the artifact metaphor sub-model with the source-domain 'religious objects' is single out. It is realized through a single metaphor *The tree of Life is the Cross*. Nevertheless, we believe, this mapping is important and accounts for the meaning "the center of the world" that arises from association between the most central Christian relic and the Tree that is found in the middle of the Biblical Paradise. The sacred centrality of the Cross was pointed out by Christian apologist St. John of Damascus' (c. 645-749) almost 15 centuries ago: "as the four extremities of the Cross are held fast and bound together by the bolt in the middle, so also by God's power the height and the depth, the length and the breadth, that is, every creature visible and invisible, is maintained" [St. John of Damascus, URL: https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/06750749,_Ioannes_Damascenus,_De_Fide_Orthodoxa,_EN.pdf]. Consequently, the Cross is considered to be the embodiment of the center of the world, both spiritual and material. Therefore, it is such understanding of the Cross that may allow viewing the Tree of Life in terms of the pivot and sacred center of the world in the Pentateuch picture of the world. T. A. Pakhareva notes that Biblical Tree of Life is a variant of universal mythological image the "axis mundi" ("axis of the world") that in mythology of different peoples is often embodied in the "world tree" ("arbor mundi"). Thus, the metaphor *The tree of Life is the Cross* realizes the key idea of the center of the world, of course, if this particular aspect of the source-domain is highlighted.

Pertinent for Ukrainian discourse also are the metaphors with the source-domain 'the solar system' demonstrating the association of God with the world above, far beyond the limits of the man and, indeed, out of reach, and natural phenomena which are out of his control (for example, *Бог є Зірка; Бог є Всесвіт; Бог є Сонце; Бог є небо; Бог є погода*).

At the same time, in English discourse zoomorphic metaphor with the source-domain 'animals / birds' has turned to be more productive than in Ukrainian discourse. They underline the character of the object and are characterized by powerful pragmatic potential (*God is Lamb, God is lion, His wings, we are his sheep*). The use of metaphors *lion and lamb*, for example, in relation to the same object is the best way to describe its character. These metaphors invoke the images that in no time, and better than words, reveal the essence of the object described.

Overall, it should be said that the general similarity of identified groups of metaphors proves universality of principles of metaphorical conceptualization that goes far beyond national boundaries preserving, however, some ethnic-cultural peculiarities. In addition, a broad variety of source-domains indicates the complexity of Biblical realia that to some degree lie beyond human comprehension and observation. Only employment of total

experience of dealing with the world ensures the coherence of their (realia) conceptualization.

5.2. *Existence / non-existence of the mappings.*

The semantic-cognitive reconstruction of conceptual metaphors allows revealing a system of mappings underlying the conceptualization of the Pentateuch realia in English and Ukrainian discourse. As our findings have shown, only one mapping shared by English and Ukrainian discourse is not elaborated in the Pentateuch. It is the model *GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА*. Although it has Biblical foundation, it is not evolved in the Pentateuch. However, it also should be added that this model is developed at length in the New Testament.

5.3. *GOD IS THE NEED model: Degree of conceptual elaboration.*

At this stage, we discuss the degree of elaboration of the model *GOD IS THE NEED* in contrasted languages. The Ukrainian and English language-specific metaphorical entailments as well as the model-specific sub-mappings, and their inherent cognitive and pragmatic characteristics are also of our special interest.

As the analysis of metaphors of the respondents' discourse has revealed, the conceptual structure *GOD* is being conceptualized as a basic *NEED* of the man in both languages. In this respect, clarification of the notion 'need' and consideration of classification of human basic needs is necessary. Let us dwell briefly upon these issues.

Following the *Merriam Webster Dictionary* definition, we interpret the notion 'need' as "a physiological or psychological requirement for the well-being of an organism" (2021). The author of the first classification of human needs Abraham Maslow emphasizes that, regardless of the fact that the needs of a man are subjectively determined, and socially and historically conditioned, their basic elements have remained unchanged. In this context Max-Neef points out, "Fundamental human needs are the same in all cultures and in all historical periods. What changes, both over time and through cultures, is the way or the means by which the needs are satisfied" (Max-Neef et al., 1992, p. 18). Importantly, satisfaction of lower-order needs of the imaginary 'pyramid of needs' leads to actualization of higher-order needs; this motivates constant activity toward the need satisfaction, and explains the dynamic nature of human needs.

For the purpose of this study we adopt the classification of basic human needs established by A. Maslow. Hierarchically, they are categorized as: 1) "physiological needs" (everything persons need to survive); 2) "safety needs" (safety and security); 3) "social needs" (fellowship, love and belonging needs); 4) "esteem needs" (self-esteem, recognition); 5) "self-actualization needs" (actualization of potential) (Maslow, 1954).

Consequently, all above said concerning the notion of the 'need' allows us to present the conceptual sphere *NEED* as a coherent structured formation of standardized actual and potential knowledge about human needs, that is to say a frame. Thus, let us consider the frame *NEED* and the conceptual reality it actualizes as the source-domain to construct the target-domain *GOD* in English and Ukrainian.

In this paper the frames are given in square brackets (e.g., [**Physiological need**]), the slots are in capital letters and in single quotes (e.g., '**LIFE**'). In addition, both frames and slots are marked with bold type.

The model GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА

Frame [Physiological needs]

Slot 1. 'LIFE'

Physiological needs are food, water, rest, etc. In other words, everything a human being needs to survive, for LIFE. In course of life every person creates his own conceptual layers of this concept. However, regardless of all peculiarities, the common ground remains unchanged: from existential standpoint, it incorporates important need of a man. In English and Ukrainian, this need is metaphorically conceptualized as one of conceptual attributes of GOD, and it is actualized via linguistic realizations similar in both discourses: *God is Life; God / Jesus is ... the Life; I am... the life; God is my life; He is life; He is life of our lives; He sustains us; Бог є життям, Бог є Життя. It should be added that Ukrainian and English respondents identify the concepts GOD and the WORD OF GOD whereby creating a metonymic connection between two concepts: *Слово Боже – джерело життя; He is the word of life; Jesus is the Bread of Life and the Word; the Son is the true source of life. The concept WORD stands for the concept GOD (otherwise is also true).**

It must be said that Ukrainian and English respondents' metaphors mirrors the dichotomy of their worldviews. That is to say, it shows that respondents differentiate between the material and spiritual world, corporal and inner / spiritual man, inner and outward beauty, light and darkness, physical and spiritual purity, etc. Within such dualistic frame, the "earthly", "underground" world, and "the hell" are set against the "heavens" and the "paradise". This, consequently, entails the opposition between physical / temporary life and spiritual / eternal one in both discourses: *Духовне життя, яке так само необхідне для людини, як їжа для підтримки її фізичного існування; the word of God is the thing that sustains spiritual life, similar to how food sustains physical life and growth.*

In addition, as the examination of terms show, antonymic to the notion of 'life' is a notion of 'death', that is absence of life. The respondents' figurative conscience conceptualizes God as the One who saves from untimely death, terminating physical as well as spiritual existence. He helps a person not to lose the soul and stay spiritually whole and not injured: *Savior that has prepared; The LORD is my salvation; gracious Savior; He wants to rescue our souls from death; The one, who decides when to be born, when to die, etc; Бог є порятуюнок, Спаситель; Він рятує; без Божого слова духовну половину людини очікує духовна смерть, людина помре духовно без Слова Божого; Христос, Хто є серце нашого духовного життя; Боже слово духовне харчування; без якого людина духовно занепадає.*

Slot 2. 'AIR'

Among basic needs of a man that are indispensable in sustaining a human body is *air*. This need is metaphorically conceptualized as *God is Air*. It should be underlined that slot 'AIR' is represented by the only metaphoric mapping *God is Air* detected in English discourse only.

Slot 3. 'WATER'

The *water* is another basic human need. Figurative conscience of English-speaking respondents conceptualizes God as the One who is the WATER himself: *God is water; whoever believes in me shall never thirst*". That is to say, the domain GOD is viewed in terms of WATER thereby highlighting the capacity of God to satisfy this need.

Slot 4. 'FOOD'

Among basic needs of a man, necessary to sustain a human body is also *food*, *nourishment* in a sense of 'providing nutriments', 'feeding' a human body with all 'nutrients'. These concepts are found in the English and Ukrainian respondents'

metaphorics. They figuratively endow God with a conceptual characteristic *the Provider*, who can meet any need.

Such metaphorical conceptualization of God is Biblical. Suffice it to say, that this idea, the idea of God who is able to provide is, hidden in the very Tetragrammaton יהוה – YHWH, the name the Old Testament God uses to reveal Himself to Moses (Ex. 3:14). This word is a derivation of Hebrew root ‘to be’. It has been an object of numerous etymological research (W. F. Albright, J. M. Allegro, G. A. Barton, R. A. Bowman, F. M. Cross, Jr., F. Delitzsch, G. R. Driver, S. D. Goitein, Y. Kaufmann, T. J. Meek, J. A. Montgomery, M. North, N. Walker, J. Wellhausen, and others), philosophical investigations (F. Aleksandriyskiy, Saint Avhustyn, B. Childs, A. Kenterberiykiy, R. Kerni, H. Kokhen, A. Lakok, M. Maimonid, A. O. Olesnytskyi, P. Riker, F. Rozentseih), and others. Although, the issues raised concerning the meaning of the divine name have not yet been answered, as our study has shown, the most recognized interpretations of the Tetragrammaton are: 1) “*I will be what I will be*”, “*I AM who and what, and where and when, and how and even why you will discover I AM. I am what you will discover me to be*” (Davies, 1967); 2) “*I will be whatever I choose*” (Arnold, 1905, p. 128); 3) “*the God of redemption will become, will continuously become, to His Church all that Church needs Him to become*”, according to G. Cameron (as cited in Феофан (Быстров), архим., 1905:56); 4) “*Sustainer, Maintainer, Establisher*” (Oberman, 1949); 5) “*he causes to be*” or “*he is*” (Surls, 2017, p. 114). As above interpretations reveal, the Tetragrammaton asserts God’s existence AND reassures people in the fact that He does see, does hear, and is able to provide for them, whatever they need. As the respondents’ metaphorics reveals, this truth uttered almost 3000 years ago is relevant even now, and grasped via metaphoric mappings *God is Provider, He is my provider, God is Sustainer*, and others.

In English and Ukrainian respondents’ discourse, conceptual closeness between the ‘bread of life’ and ‘the Word’, and God Himself (even to the degree of complete identification) is observed. The respondents use these three linguistic realizations as semantically equal, and consequently interchangeable. We find that the respondents’ figurative consciousness conceptualizes ‘the Word’ as ‘physical bread’; it ‘feeds’, ‘nourishes’, ‘provides nutriment’. Of course, such idea is entirely Biblical, and is reoccurring in different contexts shaped in different lexical items a great number of times. It can be explained by the fact that it constitutes the conceptual framework for the greatest Mystery of Eucharist – Holy Communion. Thus, the aforesaid is illustrated by the following metaphorical realization both in English and Ukrainian: *His word feeds and sustains me, the Word that God is nourishment and sustaining for all things, the Word keeps my soul fed, Jesus is the word become flesh. He is the bread of life, the Word of God gives nutrition to the spiritual body, the Word of God is nutrition for soul, His word sustains believers' souls, Jesus is the Bread of Life and the Word, he became bread to stay with us in spirit until the end of time, the word of God (Jesus) is bread, God provides, God's word is food, the Word of God sustains, We need the word of God to feed our souls, Word of God is the greatest food for a soul, Jesus said to them, “I am the bread of life; whoever comes to me shall not hunger”, the word of God is a meal for our soul, we must also listen to and “eat” the word of God, the Word is nourishment, “Боже Слово є Христос. Хліб є тіло Христа. Коли їмо Христа наповнюємося життям”. “Бути ‘хлібом’ – це дозволити себе з’їсти”. “Хто тіло моє споживає та кров Мою п’є, той в Мені перебуває, а Я в ньому...” (Від Івана 6:56). Боже слово є їжею для душі.*

In this context, it is interesting to see, how the need in food is metaphorically refracted in the dichotomic prism in both discourses. As the examination of metaphorics has shown, not merely the conception of the world but also self-conception of both Ukrainian and

English respondents is strongly influenced by dichotomic view. English respondents conceptualize themselves as *spiritual being*, possessing a *spiritual body* along with a physical one, living *spiritual life*, and, consequently, requiring *spiritual food*. Interestingly, unlike English speaking respondents, Ukrainians concentrate not on their inner *spiritual being* but specifically on their *inner man*. According to Merriam Webster Dictionary, ‘being’ is “something that is conceivable and hence capable of existing”. While ‘man’, according to the same Dictionary, is “an individual human” that is a person (особа, індивід). This *human*, that is to say, in Ukrainian discourse, the *inner man* (внутрішній чоловік) is represented as a living person inside of a physical body of the man. Likewise, a physical man, the inner man needs food that is, according to the examination of the metaphors, the Word of God: *Боже слово є духовна їжа; Слово насичує духовний голод; Боже слово є духовне харчування, без якого людина духовно занепадає*. Taken together, God is conceptualized as the One who is capable of providing the food for both physical and inner man/spiritual being.

Slot 5. 'HEALTH, REST'

Health and rest / recreation is one of the basic needs of people. Especially now in time of the COVID-2019 pandemic, every man, regardless of race and confession, feels it. Findings of Jeanet Bentzen show that “By the end of March 2020, more than half of the world population had prayed to ‘end the coronavirus’” (Bentzen, 2020). It demonstrates that amid pandemic, when, unexpectedly, a little virus has turned to be Achilles’ heel of the science, half of globe’s population have entrusted themselves to God’s hands. It is this or close to it experience that is metaphorically grasped in the Ukrainian and English-speaking respondents’ discourse as: *God is Healer, God can help remedy, God is Comforter, I can rest in His protection, Бог є Лікар, Слово лікує; Бог є чудотворцем, тому що зцілює людей, допомагає здолати недуги*. In addition, God is experienced as *the Comforter*. He provides spiritual *balance, harmony, Бог є втіхою ... , тому що знаходжу спокій у Ньому*. Moreover, ‘His Word’ is also conceptualized as comforting and healing the wounds of a soul that physical means have failed to cure: *Слово втішає, Боже слово несе людям надію на життя вічне, зцілює душевні рани, що не можливо залікувати матеріальними благами. Боже слово є ... джерелом радості, відряди, поради*.

Slot 6. 'LIGHT'

The English and Ukrainian respondents conceptualize realia connected with God and Goodness as those possessing attributes of light. These conceptual characteristics account for God’s nature (*Сам Бог є світло, God is Light*). God Himself is Light, He radiates it. In addition, the light is introduced in the very first chapter of the Bible. It is the very first thing that receives divine approvement in Gen. 1:1-4 (OSB). Therefore, everything that is marked by light is associated with notions of ‘goodness’ (*Бог є світлим образом*), ‘faith’ (*світло віри*), ‘salvation’ (*Бог є моїм світлом і спасінням, чого я маю боятись?*); ‘the dwelling of the Holy Spirit’ (*світличка серця*). Both Ukrainians and English-speaking respondents conceptualize light as ‘cleanness’, absence of ‘uncleanness’ (sin): (*світлі помисли, чисті думки, світла мелодія*). Also in Ukrainian discourse Christians (the followers of Christ) are metaphorically conceptualized as ‘the soldier of light’ (*Воїн світла*).

Ukrainian Explanatory Dictionary defines lexem *svitlo* (light) as glowing energy that is radiated by a body, is perceptible and makes things around visible (Бусел, 2005, p. 1299). Such radiant glowing of light is often a part of theophany. Icon painters communicate this energy using luminous figures of Saints and God Himself. Importantly, one of God’s names is the Light. In Ukrainian and English discourse God is conceptualized as a source of the light (*God is the Lighthouse, Бог є маяк*). In Ukrainian discourse we find metaphorical

mapping *Бог є Сонце (God is the Sun)* that is the source of light and living energy (*Бог є променем світла, the ray of sun in the darkest days*).

Importantly, the light metaphors standing for good / God's phenomena lead to main Biblical duality Good / Evil (God's Kingdom / Kingdom of Satan, etc.) that is evident in the contrasted metaphors (the discussion of such dichotomy is beyond the scope of this article).

Frame [Safety needs]

Slot 1. 'PROTECTION, SECURITY'

'Safety need' is a typical element of the 'pyramid of needs' that integrates human conceptualization of security and confidence in personal protection, and protection of the belovéd ones. In both languages God is the one who ensures protection and security. For example, in English: *He is my protector... because He is sovereign, God is protection for me and my loved ones, My life is under protection of God, He protects me, God is an angel, who protects our planet, our nature and us, He makes me feel protected, He is a protector and insulator against the foes that attack and the general weathering of the storm, God is my defender*. In Ukrainian: *Бог це той, на кого ми можемо покластися та бути під його захистом, Хранитель, Захисник, охорона та захист, мир*. One of Ukrainian respondents conceptualizes God as 'oberih' (оберіг) – amulet. In ancient times, such amulets were ascribed a magic power to protect its holder from unclean spirits, and bring good luck.

Slot 2. 'SHELTER'

In contrasted languages God is conceptualized as the need to have 'a secure shelter', the place where a person can find 'rest' and 'hide' himself from the troubles of the world: *God is shelter, God is asylum, God is castle, He is my strong tower, the almighty fortress; Бог є Притулком для людської душі*. The metaphorical expressions manifest the conceptualized spiritual experience about the nearness of God that ensures protection and defense: *He is near, guarding and protecting the faithful, He is the secure place. The faith in Him is salvation*.

Slot 3. 'STABILITY, LAW, AND ORDER'

Along with the security, the need in safeness integrates need in stability, law, and order. In his time, Simeon Novyi Bohoslov wrote that "God is God of order. Disorder is an attribute of a fallen man; it is a consequence of his fall" (as cited in Лосский & Успенский, 2014, p. 59). Stability, law, and order are conceptualized in God's appellatives. He is conceptualized as the King, King of Kings, Lord, Lord of Lords, Judge, Shepherd. Importantly, one metaphor enhances the sense of another one, makes it sense clearer. For instance, a king can be unjust sometimes (from a human standpoint) but the metaphor GOD IS JUDGE highlights the idea of God as the just King. He always has everything under His control; He always cares about His "subjects": *God is Lord of all, Sovereign over everything seen and unseen, He ...owns everything, God is Judge, He is righteous Judge, He is ...the final authority, Keeper of all things, I know that God always ...leads us through the toughest times, He is control, He is a good and mighty King, God is the King, of the throne of God, He created and owns everything*. Він є Цар, Господь, Пастор, Стратег.

God's appellative 'Shepherd' positions the Ukrainians and English-speaking people along with the rest of the Christian world as 'sheep': *we are his sheep*. The relationships between Shepherd and his sheep are to some degree archaic and vague for contemporary people, especially urban residents. However, it is via a prism of this appellative that actions of shepherd toward his flock, the assurance in a constant care, protection, and leadership has been modeled: *God is Shepherd*.

Frame [Social needs]

Slot 1. 'FAMILY RELATIONS'

The need of belonging to a family, having the family is one of the basic social needs. English-speaking and Ukrainian-speaking respondents in unison conceptualize this need by using the model GOD IS FATHER. At the same time, the role of the father is a role of a dominating person, person in charge. Such role assumes not only parental unconditional love, but also the right to discipline, and punish children (His daughters and sons). Importantly, as the analysis has shown, such role of the father is acceptable: *Father eternal, loving Father, he has made me his child, loves me as His daughter and helps in every need, he has made me his child, No one comes to the Father except through me, He loves all of us as His children, God's child, Even though my circumstances are not always happy there is a contentment that comes with being His child that makes me joyful, God is perfect and we as His sons and daughters, we are God's children, as a Father He gives the best to his children, He lovingly cares but also disciplines His children.*

In the discourse of the Ukrainian speakers, this slot is especially elaborated on the basis of national traditions. God is metaphorically conceptualized as FAMILY, FATHER, MOTHER, CHILDREN.

In his foreword to "Ukrainian Family Pedagogy" (1996), famous Ukrainian ethno-pedagog M. H. Stelmakhovych points out that family is a holy knot to bind people in a society. It is a life-spot that gives to God's world the highest values – children (Стельмахович, 1996, с. 3). Such appreciation of a family is rooted in the distant past of Ukrainians, when the cult of the family existed, and people didn't have an idea of how to live a happy life without family hearth. In Ukrainian discourse, God is metaphorically conceptualized as FAMILY (*Бог є сім'я*). In addition, the respondent includes himself to God's family circle (*Вірю, що Бог хоче, щоб Його діти прожили щасливе повне життя*). As *Etymology Dictionary* gives, cognates to the lexems *simia* ('сім'я') / family is Lettish *saimē* 'family members', Old German *heim* 'motherland', Greek 'settlement' (Фасмер, 1987, р. 600), Thus, it is logical that respondents metaphorically conceptualize God in the home, that is in the family home where the family members are always loved and desired (*У Бога є дім як люблячий батько він завжди готовий мене приймати у своєму домі. Мабуть, для віруючих людей Господь – це щось рідне, це їх духовний дім*). In the homelike atmosphere God is addressed intimately but with respect as *Batko* (Father), who cares, also solemnly and at the same time respectfully *Otets* (Father), *Otets Nebesnyi* (Heavenly Father), or the Holy Trinity (*Father, Son and the Holy Spirit*). As Ukrainian respondents rightly noticed, such family harmony is fairly reflected in an old Ukrainian saying "There is no happiness on the earth without family". And even today, regardless of many facts that may testify the opposite, deep down in their hearts Ukrainians remain family-people. This truth is revealed by metaphorical models: GOD IS FATHER, GOD IS MOTHER, GOD IS FAMILY, GOD IS CHILDREN AND FAMILY. As our investigation has shown, the slot 'FAMILY RELATIONS' is more elaborated in the Ukrainian respondents' discourse, where the concept of GOD figuratively represents the collective idea of the highest spiritual value, that is the FAMILY.

Slot 2. 'HELP AND CARE'

Social needs include needs for support, help, caring for someone and expecting support and caring for yourself. Both English and Ukrainian endow GOD with attributes the 'helper' and 'support'. His help ascertains solution of any situation to the good of a petitioner: *God is support, God helps, Caring Savior, He [...] cares for me in his divine providence, He is the fulfillment of our every desire. Бог завжди піклувався про мене; втішає мене в години*

смутку; Він підкується про мене, наставник, помічник, завжди мене оберігає і підтримує.

Slot 3. 'LOVE, FRIENDSHIP'

'Love' and 'friendship' (*liubov* and *druzhba* in Ukrainian) are fundamental human needs. 'Love' is a feeling of a deep hearty affection. Love ensures the development and evolvement of potential of an object of affection (Бусел, 2005, р. 631). 'Friendship' is a kind of relationships based on mutual adherence, trust, devotion, friendly solidarity, spiritual closeness, mutual interests, goals, etc. (Бусел, 2005, р. 329). The English and Ukrainian respondents metaphorically conceptualize God as perfect embodiment of the response to these needs: *Бог є любов, Бог є друг, Бог 'любить' і Його любов 'безумовна', він 'любить кожного', Бог є другом, найважливішим в моєму житті; Бог є втіленням любові; God is Love, God loves us despite our sins, God is a friend.*

Peculiar to the Ukrainian discourse is metaphorical collocation *Бог є Віра, Надія і Любов* that echoes with the names of Orthodox martyrs Vira, Nadiia, and Liubov (*Віра, Надія і Любов*) who together with their mother Sofia (Софія) are sainted and hold in reverence by all Orthodox faithful.

Frame [Esteem needs]

Slot. 'SELF-ESTEEM, RECOGNITION'

Modern society often underevaluates human values and even devalue a human being himself. Often the measure of a human value is the material status. Nevertheless, every man remains to be a Man with the need to have self-esteem and recognition by other people. As the metaphors of English and Ukrainian respondents reflect, people find 'self-esteem' and 'recognition' in God. Based on God-Man relationships, they position themselves as:

a) God's creation: *God created me. God made me, God is my Creator, creator of my faith; Our creator; Бог є творець; Бог є творцем життя на землі, тому що Він створює Всесвіт, і нашою появою ми також зобов'язані Господу;*

b) God's children: *I am a child of God, we as His sons and daughters, we are God's children, He created me, God is our creator, Бог хоче, щоб Його діти прожили щасливе повне життя, ми Його діти;*

c) under God's authority: *He is my Commander in Chief, His is the 'badge or banner' I wear, the Lord is my banner, who my king is and who my allegiance is to; Я громадянин Божого царства. Людина, яка вірувала стає божою людиною, носіями носії Царства Божого, ми – прапороносці цього царства.*

d) His servants: *He is pleased with us and in the end says, "Well done my good and faithful servant"; Бог є Господь;*

e) chosen and valuable: *Jesus's sacrifice has paid the price for my sins. God's chosen people who will one day be with Him in heaven; Бог є Відкупитель;*

The above Ukrainian and English-speaking respondents' metaphors nests dichotomy of the worldview of people conceptualizing themselves as belonging to material and spiritual world at the same time. The metaphors that realize this dichotomy of the world (material / spiritual), a man (physical (corporeal) man / inner (spiritual) man), beauty (outward / inward), cleanness (physical / spiritual) provide the base for the conceptual metaphor SPIRITUAL MAN IS A PHYSICAL MAN. However, the analysis of this mapping is beyond the scope of this paper.

Frame [Self-actualization needs]

Slot. 'ACTUALIZATION OF POTENTIAL'

The need of self-actualization is the need of a personal development. It is a typical element that integrates the ideas of a man about actualization laid within a man potential. The mappings of the model convey the confidence that it is in God who is the source of any

knowledge, the Creator of the Universe and a man, who is Beauty Himself that the need in knowledge, art, beauty and moral are being met: *Lord who is the source of the knowledge; He is the fulfillment of our every desire; Бог є [...] пізнанням; Бог є той, хто все знає; Розум Всесвіту; Бог є істина; Бог – це абсолютно знання всього; Бог є справедливість; Бог є сумління, тому що це найвищий закон; моральний принцип і моральний канон, творчість; Бог є доброта, а доброта – це завжди краса; Бог це краса і гармонія; Краса є творчість. Бог є “художник”, “архітектор”, “науковець”.*

Thus, as above metaphoric realizations show, God is conceptualized as the source of all human abilities, as the Creator who knows strong and weak sides of every human being, and is able to empower every person, and develop his or her potential.

6. Conclusions.

The findings of the contrastive research account for a high degree of similarity of the metaphorical conceptualization of the Pentateuch realia in present-day English and Ukrainian discourse. The main shared models of metaphorical conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia in the English and Ukrainian discourse (based on the questionnaire) are as follows: anthropomorphic, naturemorphic, phytomorphic, zoomorphic, sociomorphic, artifact, military, temporal, and economic metaphors. Identified metaphors were classified by source-domain. Such broad variety of source-domains indicates the complexity of Biblical realia that to some degree lie beyond human comprehension and observation. Only employment of entire experience of dealing with the world ensures the coherence of their conceptualization.

Against the background of prevailing similarities of the contrasted types of metaphorical expansion, some differences can be pointed out. For example, artifact metaphoric sub-model with the source-domain ‘religious objects’ is Ukrainian-specific projection. It is realized through a single metaphor *The tree of Life is the Cross*. As the examination has shown, this mapping accounts for the meaning “the center of the world” that arises from association between the most central Christian relic and the Tree that is found in the middle of the Biblical Paradise.

Pertinent for Ukrainian discourse also are the metaphors with the source-domain ‘the solar system’ demonstrating the association of God with the world above, far beyond the limits of the man and, indeed, out of reach, and out of his control.

At the same time, in English discourse zoomorphic metaphor with the source domain ‘animals / birds’ has turned to be more productive than in Ukrainian discourse. Zoomorphic metaphors underline the character of the object that is being metaphorically conceptualized, and are characterized by powerful pragmatic potential.

Furthermore, in both discourses the most productive are anthropomorphic, artifact, and military metaphors. The least productive are economic and temporal metaphors.

Taken together, it should be said that the general similarity of identified groups of metaphors proves universality of principles of metaphorical conceptualization that goes far beyond national boundaries.

Moreover, in the course of the contrastive analysis, the conceptual metaphor GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА was reconstructed. This metaphorical model is pertinent for the English and Ukrainian discourse but, at the same time, is not elaborated in the Pentateuch (it is developed at length in the New Testament).

In the course of the contrastive study, the analysis of the model GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА was carried out. It was established that the model can be represented by the following frames and slots:

- Frame [**Physiological needs**]: Slot 1. '**LIFE**'; slot 2. '**AIR**'; slot 3. '**WATER**'; slot 4. '**FOOD**'; slot 5. '**HEALTH, REST**'; slot 4. '**LIGHT**'.
- Frame [**Safety needs**]: Slot 1. '**PROTECTION, SECURITY**'; slot 2. '**SHELTER**'; slot 3. '**STABILITY, LAW, AND ORDER**'.
- Frame [**Social needs**]: Slot 1. '**FAMILY RELATIONS**'; slot 2. '**HELP AND CARE**'; slot 3. '**LOVE, FRIENDSHIP**'.
- Frame [**Esteem needs**]: Slot '**SELF-ESTEEM, RECOGNITION**'.
- Frame [**Self-actualization needs**]: Slot '**ACTUALIZATION OF POTENTIAL**'.

As far as the frame-slot-arrangement of the model, it should be pointed out that the values for the slots '**AIR**' and '**WATER**' were found only in the discourse of the English-speaking respondents.

In both discourses, the most productive slots of the model are the slot '**FOOD**' of the frame [**Physiological need**] and the slot '**SELF-ESTEEM, RECOGNITION**' of the frame [**Esteem needs**]. In Ukrainian respondents' discourse, in addition to the aforelisted slots, the productive slot is the slot '**FAMILY RELATIONS**' of the frame [**Social needs**].

The subsequent examination of the slots' value of the model has allowed unveiling the ethnocultural specificity of the national mentality that is not obvious at first sight. As a result, it was found, first, that for both Ukrainian and English respondents the concept of GOD figuratively represents the collective idea of the highest spiritual values, for example, the FAMILY (interestingly, it is much more elaborated in Ukrainian discourse than in English). Secondly, the metaphorical conceptualization of the Pentateuch realia by Ukrainian-speaking respondents is influenced by Orthodox setting and national traditions. This becomes especially apparent against the English-speaking respondents' account for the Pentateuch realia that is rooted in the pure Evangelical tradition. (Here, we believe, historical factors come into play).

In general, the model GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА accounts for the motives of the behavior, uncovers the reasons of peoples' preferences, and constant human leaning toward spiritual realia regardless of a great deal of scientific evidence against the existence of God. In understanding of both Ukrainian- and English-speaking respondents the concept GOD collects the universal GOOD and MORAL.

In addition, as the contrastive examination of metaphors has shown, not merely the conception of the world but also self-conception of both Ukrainian and English respondents is strongly influenced by dichotomic view. It brings forward the idea of spiritual world, inner / spiritual man, and afterlife.

Thus, although obtained results testify a high degree of similarity of the metaphorical conceptualization of the Pentateuch realia in present-day English and Ukrainian discourse, the identified in a process of the contrastive analysis metaphorical model GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА allows uncovering the ethnoculture-specific values related to the most important spheres of a human experience that is not obvious at first sight. It reveals subtle contrasts in metaphorical conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia by present-day representatives of English and Ukrainian linguocultures, and provides the conceptual foundation for evaluation of human values and behavior.

Further contrastive research of conceptual metaphors underlying the conceptualization of Biblical (the Pentateuch) realia in languages other than the English and Ukrainian seems to be a promising vector of investigation.

Abbreviations

Gen. – Genesis

Dt. – Deuteronomy

Ex. – Exodus

OSB – Orthodox Study Bible

References

- Будаев, Е. В. (2020) *Сопоставительная политическая метафорология* [Contrastive Political Metaphorology]. [Электронный ресурс] : монография. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Электрон. текстовые дан. (4,4 Мб). СПб. : Научное издание. 464 с. 1 электрон. опт. диск (ЦД-РОМ). (In Russian).
- Кубрякова, Е. С., Демьянков, В. З., Панкратс, Ю. Г., Лузина, Л. Г. (1997). *Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов* [A Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms]. М. : МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова. 248 с. (In Russian).
- Лосский, В. Н. & Успенский Л. А. (2014). *Смысл икон* [Sense of the icons]. М. : Православный Свято-Тихоновский гуманитарный университет : Эксмо. 336 с. (In Russian).
- Минский, М. (1979). *Фреймы для представления знаний* [A Framework for Representing Knowledge] / пер. с англ. О. Н. Гринбаума ; под ред. Ф. М. Кулакова. Москва : Энергия. 151 с. (In Russian).
- Стельмахович, М. Г. (1996). *Українська родина педагогіка* [Ukrainian family pedagogy]. Kyiv : ІСДО. 288 с. (In Ukrainian).
- Феофан (Быстров), архим. (1905). *Тетраграмма, или Ветхозаветное божественное имя* [Tetragrammaton or Old Testament divine name]. Санкт-Петербург. (In Russian).
- Чудинов, А. П. (2003). *Метафорическая мозаика в современной политической коммуникации* [Metaphorical Mosaic in Modern Political Communication]. Монография / Урал. гос. пед. ун-т. Екатеринбург. 248 с. (In Russian).
- Arnold, W. R. (1905). The Divine Name in Exodus iii : 14. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 24 (2), 107–165. The Society of Biblical Literature. Retrieved May 5, 2021, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3260218>
- Barcelona, A. (2012). On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors : case studies and proposed methodology. *II Language Pedagogy*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts, René Dirven, John R. Taylor and Ronald W. Langacker, Berlin, Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 117–146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110866254.117>.
- Bentzen, J. (09 June 2020). Rising religiosity as a global response to COVID-19 fear. Retrieved May 6, 2021, from <https://voxeu.org/article/rising-religiosity-global-response-covid-19-fear>
- Davies, G. H. *Exodus. Torch Bible Commentaries*. London : S.C.M. Press, 1967.
- Fillmore, Ch. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, ed. by The Linguistic Society of Korea, 111-137. Seoul : Hanshin.
- Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. In Elena Semino and Zsófia Demjén (Eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Metaphor and Language*, 13–27. London : Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (2018). Metaphor in media language and cognition : A perspective from conceptual metaphor theory. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw : De Gruyter Open, 2018, III (1), June 2018, p. 124–141. DOI : 10.2478/lart-2018-0004 ISSN 2453-8035
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (second edition), 202–251. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York : Harpaer& Row.
- Max-Neef, M. A., Elizalde, A., & Hopenhayn, M. (1991). *Human scale development : Conception, application and further reflections*. New York : The Apex Press.
- Minsky's Frame System Theory*. (1975). Proceedings of the 1975 Workshop on Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing : TINLAP '75. Stroudsburg, PA, USA : Association for Computational Linguistics, 104–116. DOI : 10.3115/980190.980222.
- Obermann, J. (1949). The Divine Name YHWH in the Light of Recent Discoveries *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68 (4), 301–323. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3262100>. Retrieved May 5, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3262097>.
- Surls, Austin. (2017). *Making Sense of the Divine Name in the Book of Exodus : From Etymology to Literary Onomastics*. Penn State University Press, Eisenbrauns.

Sources of Illustrative Material

- Бусел В. (ред.). (2005). *Англійсько-український словник. Українсько-англійський словник : 250 000 + 250 000 : два в одному томі : 500 000 одиниць перекладу* [English-Ukrainian dictionary. Ukrainian-English

dictionary : 250 000 + 250 000 : two in one volume : 500 000 translation units]. Київ; Ірпінь : ВТФ "Перун". [In Ukrainian].

Фасмер. М. (1987). *Этимологический словарь русского языка* [The Russian language etymological dictionary] : В 4-х т. : Пер. с нем. 2-е изд., стереотип. (р. 600). М. : Прогресс. Т. 3. [In Russian].

Merriam-WebsterDictionary. Retrieved May 5, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/need>

The Orthodox Study Bible. The St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology (2008). Nashville, TN : Thomas Nelson.

Бібліографічний опис:

Ізюмцева, Г. В. (2021). Метафорична модель GOD IS THE NEED у англо- та українськомовному біблійному дискурсі. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 21. 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.21.05>.

Анотація

У статті розглядається актуальна проблема зіставного аналізу концептуальних метафор, які уможливають концептуалізацію біблійних (текстів П'ятикнижжя) реалій у сучасному англійському та українськомовному дискурсах. У рамках когнітивно-дискурсивного підходу запропоновано комплексну методик, яка базується на процедурах синхронічного зіставного аналізу метафоричних моделей, розроблених у працях А. Барселони, Е. В. Будаєва та А. П. Чудинова. Така методика дала змогу, по-перше, здійснити класифікацію концептуальних метафор за сферою-джерелом метафоричної експансії на матеріалі англійської та української мов, і виявити наступні групи метафор: антропоморфні, природоморфні, фітоморфні, зооморфні, соціоморфні, артефактні, мілітарні, темпоральні та економічні метафори; по-друге, реконструювати специфічну для обох дискурсів, однак, нерозгорнуту в текстах П'ятикнижжя, метафоричну модель GOD IS THE NEED / БОГ Є ПОТРЕБА. У ході дослідження визначено та схарактеризовано фрейми даної моделі та слоти у зіставному плані. З'ясовано національні особливості моделі, акцентовано її евристичний та аксіологічний потенціал. Встановлена фреймово-слотова система концептуального домена-джерела THE NEED дозволила структурування домена-цілі GOD, а відтак його витлумачення на базі найважливіших сфер життєдіяльності українських та англійських респондентів.

Отримані результати свідчать про наявність відмінностей у способах метафоричної концептуалізації біблійних (текстів П'ятикнижжя) реалій сучасними представниками української та англійської лінгвокультур; демонструють етнокультурну специфіку національного менталітету на тлі універсального та спільного в процесах образної інтерпретації світу. При цьому, встановлено, що концепт GOD є збірним поняттям, образним втіленням найвищих загальнолюдських цінностей.

Ключові слова: метафорична модель, концептуальна метафора, біблійні реалії, фрейм, слот, зіставний аналіз.