

MONIKA BOGDZEVICĀ

THE COGNITIVE PORTRAIT OF LITHUANIAN “GĖDA” IN PROVERBS

Abstract: The article provides a glimpse at wider research on the conceptualization of shame, fear and anger in Lithuanian. In the paper an attempt has been made to present the semantic and axiological substance of GĖDA¹ (Eng. *shame, embarrassment*) encoded in the consciousness of the Lithuanian linguistic-cultural community.

The cognitive portrait² of Lithuanian GĖDA has been construed by applying SAT methodology, proposed by Jerzy Bartmiński. The data have been drawn from dictionaries and proverbs collected from the compendium of Lithuanian proverbs by searching for the conceptual and lexical keys³ of GĖDA. The conceptual key sketches the semantic core of GĖDA, and the lexical key reflects its textual potential, giving an insight into its ethno-conceptualization. Thus, the construal of the mental image of GĖDA illustrated in the Lithuanian proverbs under study draws on the dictionary definitions of the GĖDA lexemes, and on a semantic analysis of the proverbs containing those lexemes. The study focuses on the presentation of the cognitive portrait of Lithuanian GĖDA.

Keywords: cognitive portrait, conceptualization, embarrassment, Lithuanian, proverbs, shame, worldview

Introduction

The semantics of emotion terms and values across different languages and cultures is a widely researched area in contemporary linguistics. A variety of studies into emotions deal with the complexity of human mental structure and its cognitive and cultural components, showing a close interrelationship between language, cognitive processes and culture, as well as suggesting that the structure and semantics of language can be used as a tool to explore the perception and interpretation of the world (cf. Bartmiński, 2007; Geeraerts, 2006, Evans, Green 2006). The connection between language, cognition and culture gains particular importance in the study of the lexicalization of abstract notions, invisible to the naked eye, including emotional states. As Agnieszka

Mikołajczuk argues, “while studying the ‘emotions,’ the linguist seeks to learn how the world of emotions is encompassed in a specific language, what characteristic ways of expressing the emotions are used. Emotions, however, are not a linguistic phenomenon, but constitute a very important component of the psyche (and therefore the non-linguistic world) and, above all, as such are the subject of psychology. In fact, the linguist describes not only the feelings, but what has become accumulated and preserved in the meanings of their names and in the linguistic techniques used by people to express and report their emotions and feelings” (Mikołajczuk, 1999: 19).

One of the methods to explore “what” has been preserved in the names of emotions and what motivates their use, is to provide their “cognitive definition,” i.e. a methodological tool proposed by Prof. Jerzy Bartmiński, the founder of the Lublin ethnolinguistic school, and widely employed by European ethnolinguists. An assumption underlying the “cognitive definition” is that the linguistic and cultural image of the concept should be construed by exploring components of emotional situations (i.e. categorial, characteristic, associated and emotive features), their internal structure and inner invariance⁴ (Bartmiński, 1988: 169-170; Bartmiński, Chlebda, 2013: 73).

The aim of this article is not only to offer the cognitive definition of Lithuanian GĖDA by drawing on lexicographic data and proverbs, but also to show those aspects and elements of the concept that constitute its ethno-cognitive images. The first stage of the analysis involves an overview of the lexicographic characteristics of GĖDA. The second stage provides the semantic analysis of Lithuanian proverbs with particular attention to the aspects of GĖDA.

The lexicographic characteristics of Lithuanian GĖDA

Wojciech Smoczyński links the origin of the Lithuanian lexeme *gėda* ‘shame, disgrace’ with the Old Prussian form *gīdan* Acc.sg. and *nigīdings* ‘shameless’. It is possible that the first meaning of the lexeme is ‘feel disgusted and abhorred’ (ALEW 304), which is reflected in related forms from Slavic languages, cf. Old Church Slavonic *gaditi* ‘revile; blaspheme,’ Sl. *gāditi* obs. ‘disgust, repel,’ srhr. *gāditi* ‘disgust; disgrace; dishonour,’ Rus. *gāditsja* ‘get messy; deteriorate, get spoiled’. The lexeme *gėda*

is also part of such derivatives as *begėdis* ‘shameless,’ *gėdingas* ‘disgraceful, miserable, unkind,’ *gėdiškias* ‘filthy, lewd (about words), shameful’ (Smoczyński, 2016: 306-307).

Definitions of GĖDA in general Lithuanian dictionaries, in accordance with the assumptions of taxonomic semantics, reveal “necessary and sufficient features” distinguishing the feeling of shame. *The Lithuanian Dictionary* (“Lietuvių kalbos žodynas,” LKŽ) provides two definitions of the lexeme *gėda*. The first definition describes *gėda* in terms of related feelings, such as *negarbė* (Eng. *disgrace*) and *sarmata* (Eng. *ignominy, vulva*), while the second definition of *gėda* includes the meaning of ‘external genital organs.’ *The Modern Lithuanian Dictionary* (“Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas,” DLKŽ) defines *gėda* as ‘unpleasant feeling caused by inappropriate behaviour, vulva,’ which is related to the meaning of *sarmata* (Eng. *ignominy, vulva*) found in LKŽ. Another meaning of *sarmata* mentioned in DLKŽ is ‘genital organs,’ which confirms the close relationship between the concepts of GĖDA and SARMATA. In contrast, *General Lithuanian Dictionary* (“Bendrinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas,” BLKŽ) does not offer any definition of *gėda* or *sarmata*.

Dictionary definitions provide a general insight into the semantic content of *gėda* and its concept. Admittedly, these descriptions do not exhaust the semantic potential of the lexical unit and the knowledge, experience and evaluation of the emotional state behind it, but reveal the conceptual elements of GĖDA deeply rooted in the language system, and shed light on the cognitive processes underlying the use of language. The analysis of dictionary definitions, with particular reference to the examples contained therein, allows for distinguishing the following elements of emotional situations involving GĖDA: primary category, subject, causer, judge, cause/reason, tools, characteristics and evaluation, symptoms, or other related emotions. Each element can be further refined. The analysis of the semantic content of the above-mentioned aspects will be presented in the following part of the article.

Aspects of the cognitive portrait of GĖDA in Lithuanian proverbs
[Primary categorization] The proverbs illustrate the feeling of GĖDA in the context of a person’s deeds, behaviour and attitudes. Therefore, it can be assumed that this emotion might be assigned to two superordinate categories, namely to the category of state –

unpleasant feelings of the loss of dignity, or honour due to inappropriate behaviour, attitude or fear (1, 2), and to the category of psychological traits (shyness, modesty) and moral qualities (honour, virtue) (3, 4, 5, 6).

- (1) *Pats gėdijasi, širdis džiaugiasi.* [He feels ashamed, but his heart is happy]⁵
- (2) *Nei svietui bėda, nei žmogui gėda.* [Neither is the world harmed, nor is the human ashamed]
- (3) *Geriau mirti kovoje, kaip pasiduoti gėdoje.* [It is better to die in a fight than give in to shame]
- (4) *Sarmata⁶ užriš akis, ausis ir burną.* [Ignominy binds eyes, ears and mouth]
- (5) *Sarmata gėdos nedaro.* [Modesty does not bring shame]
- (6) *Kurva gėdos neturi.* [A whore might never be ashamed]

[Subject] The subject of GĖDA in the Lithuanian proverbs refers only to a human being, including the collective entity –community. The proverbs serve as the expression of conscience and care for the community’s honour. GĖDA denotes internal experience and entails features attributed solely to a human subject. The proverbs refer to people who experience GĖDA (7), as well as to activities causing GĖDA that can be done only by human beings (8). The proverbs show that the state of being ashamed cannot be attributed to animals (9, 10). The subject of GĖDA might also include shy people, who often become victims of fraud (11). It is worth noting that GĖDA is a feeling or condition attributed only to those alive (12):

- (7) *Pavasariį gaspadoriui tuščių daržinę turėti gėda ir didelė bėda.* [An empty barn in spring brings shame and misfortune for the farmer]
- (8) *Ne tam gėda, kas daug ėda, bet tam, kuris prisipila ir neišėda.* [He who fills the plate full should not be ashamed but he who fills the plate and does not eat everything up should]

- (9) *Kada šuo gėdą turėjęs*. [Has a dog ever been ashamed?]
- (10) *Kiaulė gėdos neturi*. [A pig feels no shame]
- (11) *Sarmatlyvą kožnas durnius apgauna*. [A modest person can be easily fooled]
- (12) *Negyvam nėra gėdos*. [The deceased have nothing to be ashamed of]

[Causer] The role of a causer of GĖDA is assigned, above all, to a human being, the performer of acts causing shame, embarrassment, or carrier of such traits as immodesty or shamelessness, which also give rise to this feeling. The causer of GĖDA does not have any moral principles (13, 14, 15) and usually does well in his or her life (16, 17, 18):

- (13) *Nuo bobų nors gėda bėgti, bet sveika*. [It is a shame to run from women, but it can be healthy]
- (14) *Kur buvai, kai gėdą dalijo*. [Where were you when the ability to feel shame was imparted?]
- (15) *Besarmatė nepamatė, kai begėdė šūdą ėdė*. [Being shameless, she did not see the shameless eating shit]
- (16) *Kas sarmatos nepažįsta, tas badu nemirs* [Whoever feels no shame will not starve to death]
- (17) *Begėdis visur įlįs*. [The shameless get everywhere]
- (18) *Be sarmatos toli matos*. [He who has no shame notices everything]

[Judge] One of the obligatory participants in the situation of GĖDA is a judge, i.e. a person, community or audience “issuing a sentence” about the lack of respect or consideration for the standards of morality, propriety, human decency, and accepted customs. It should be noted that the feeling of GĖDA may be affected by a number of external factors and the system of values. The role of a judge is assigned to people, observers, understood as the public or the world (19, 20, 21). In a number of scenarios, embarrassment turns out to be meaningless and ineffective (22):

- (19) *Nuo motušės bus bėda, nuo susiedų bus gėda.*
[Mother will be angry, and the neighbours will put you to shame]
- (20) *Gėda nuo svieto, griekas nuo pono Dievo.* [Shame comes from the world, sin – from God]
- (21) *Dievo bijok, kad svieto nesigėdiji.* [Be afraid of God, if you are not ashamed of the world]
- (22) *Gėdinti melagį, pajuokti kvailį ir ginčytis su moterimi yra tas pats, ką semti vandenį rėčiu.* [To make a liar ashamed, to make fun of a fool and to argue with a woman is the same as to carry water with a sieve]

[Tools, way of provoking GĖDA] The Lithuanian proverbs also point out the tools of raising the feeling of GĖDA. In most cases, such “tools” can be only presupposed. For instance, words may provoke embarrassment (23) and make the wrongdoer’s actions public, which is not explicitly stated in the Lithuanian proverbs, though.

- (23) *Ta pašnekėjo, ta pridėjo, pagražino, ta šlovę numušino.* [She talked, she added, she embellished, and she destroyed dignity]

[Cause] The causes and reasons for feeling ashamed and embarrassed are one of the apparently certified aspects of this emotional state. They reflect the realities of everyday existence, as well as the attitude of the rural community towards individuals disregarding generally accepted norms, principles, and professed values. The feeling of GĖDA is caused by breaking God’s commandments (in particular theft) (24, 25, 26), and by behaviour contrary to the generally accepted principles of morality and ethics, such as lying, lack of moderation in eating, inappropriate courtship, spying, and inhospitality (26, 27, 28, 29). Unreasonable speech and abandonment of native language are also likely to make a person feel ashamed (30, 31):

- (24) *Griekas nuo Pono Dievo, gėda nuo žmonių.* [Sin comes from God, shame – from people]

- (25) *Vogti gėda, o prašyti ne.* [Stealing brings a shame, not asking]
- (26) *Gėda turtingam vogti, vedusiam merginėti, o senam meluoti.* [Shame on the rich who steal, the married who flirt, and on the old who lie]
- (27) *Bėda, kad daug ėda – namie ir svečiuose gėda.* [It is a pity that they eat a lot. It is shame at home, and it is shame when you pay someone a visit.]
- (28) *Kas už durų klausos, pats savo sarmatą girdi.* [Who eavesdrops behind the door, hears his own shame]
- (29) *Ėda neėda, bile man ne gėda.* [It does not matter if one's guest eats or not. What matters is that I (as a host) am not ashamed]
- (30) *Gėda žmogui durnai kalbėti, bet ne gėda nežinant tylėti.* [Shame on him who talks stupid things, but not on him who keeps silent because of a lack of knowledge]
- (31) *Gerai svetimomis kalbomis kalbėti, bet didelė gėda savos nemokėti.* [It is good to speak foreign languages, but shame on him who cannot speak his mother tongue]

The negligence or improper performance of duties may also cause the feeling of GĖDA (32, 33, 34, 35). Other causes of shame are laziness, and non-resourcefulness (36, 37, 38). The rural community in particular condemns a person's weaknesses, e.g. alcohol addiction (39, 40, 41, 42):

- (32) *Audėjai storas siūlas sarmata.* [A thick thread to a weaver is a shame]
- (33) *Dirbk, kad darbas gėdos nedarytų.* [Work in such a way that you would not feel ashamed]
- (34) *Darbas dėl akių, gėda nuo žmonių.* [If you work to show off, shame on you]
- (35) *Daryk gerai – gėdos neapturėsi.* [Do your work well and you will not feel ashamed]

- (36) *Tinginystė gėda, o ne darbas.* [Laziness is something that brings a shame, not work]
- (37) *Abi begėdės – veltėdės.* [They are both shameless and idle]
- (38) *Susigėdo kaip kumelė vežimą išvertus.* [She was ashamed like a mare that overturned a wagon]
- (39) *Kai užeina akvata, tai šalin ir sarmata.* [Where there is a will, shyness disappears]
- (40) *Pragerti gėdą.* [To lose shame due to heavy drinking]
- (41) *Iš karčemos ne gėda išeiti, bet gėda įeiti.* [It is not a shame to leave the inn, but to enter it]
- (42) *Girtybė malonę, gėdą ir bėdą padaro.* [Drinking brings pleasure, shame and misfortune]

It is worth noting that not all acts, behaviour or situations causing the feeling of shame are considered as shameful by the community. For instance, “dirty work” (43, 44), admission of one’s own mistakes (45), ignorance (46, 47, 48), poverty (49, 50), and caution (51, 52) do not bring disgrace or shame:

- (43) *Ne kiaules ganyti, o nieko neveikti yra gėda.* [The one who is lazy should feel ashamed, not the one who rears pigs]
- (44) *Juodos rankos – ne sarmata.* [Dirty hands should not make you feel embarrassed]
- (45) *Ne gėda klaidą prisipažinti, gėdą jos neištaisyti.* [Do not be ashamed to admit your mistake, feel ashamed not to correct it]
- (46) *Ko nemoki, nesigėdyk iš kito pasimokyti.* [Do not be ashamed to learn from someone something you do not know]
- (47) *Suklydai, nesigėdink ir pasitasyti.* [If you made a mistake, do not be ashamed to correct it]
- (48) *Nesigėdyk saveš ir savų klaidų.* [Do not be ashamed of yourself and your mistakes]

- (49) *Lopas gėdos nedaro, bet skylė.* [No patch causes a shame, but a hole]
 (50) *Bėda gėdos nedaro.* [Poverty is not a shame]
 (51) *Atsarga gėdos nedaro.* [Caution is not a shame]
 (52) *Nesisarmatyk vilktis kailiniais, kol dar medžių lapai nesprogę.* [Do not be ashamed to put on your fur before trees come into buds]

[**Temporal characteristics, intensity, possession**] GĖDA is not homogeneous. This emotional state may last shorter or longer and vary in intensity (53, 54, 55, 56). Moreover, the capacity to feel shame is not given to a person from birth, but acquired (57, 58, 59) throughout life:

- (53) *Paklausti – laikina gėda, nežinoti – amžina gėda.* [To ask is to experience temporary shame, to remain ignorant is to be filled with permanent shame]
 (54) *Pusė gėdos tau, pusė man.* [Half of shame on you, and half of shame on me]
 (55) *Sarmata ant sarmatos.* [A crying shame]
 (56) *Gėda ant gėdos nemokėti tos kalbos.* [Shame on him who cannot speak his mother tongue]
 (57) *Kai (Dievas) gėdą dalijo, manęs namie nebuvo.* [When God gave dignity, I was not at home]
 (58) *Gėdos kaip pas žydą.* [Ashamed like a Jew]
 (59) *Sarmatos kaip žvirbliui lietaus – pasipurtė ir sausas* [Ashamed like a sparrow after rain – it will shake off and get dry].

[**External symptoms**] GĖDA can be recognized by the eyes. In contrast to a shameless person, an embarrassed person avoids eye contact, and tries to hide himself/herself or the reason for feeling ashamed (60, 61, 62). A number of proverbs illustrate the feeling of shame as an eyesore (63). This feeling might also be revealed by blushing and increased body temperature (64, 65, 66, 67):

- (60) *Vagies akys gėdos nebijo.* [The eyes of a thief are fearless of shame]

- (61) *Begédžio akys užpakalyje – nesvyla.* [The eyes of the shameless are in the buttocks; they do not burn with shame]
- (62) *Iš gėdos neturi kur akių dėti.* [He feels so ashamed that he does not know where to turn his eyes]
- (63) *Gėda už dūmus labiau akis graužia.* [The feeling of shame pierces the eyes much more than smoke]
- (64) *Iš sarmatos akys dega.* [The eyes burn with shame]
- (65) *Ko gėdimės, to ir slepiamės.* [We hide what we feel ashamed of]
- (66) *Vėžys ne iš gėdos raudonas.* [The cancer is red not because of being ashamed]
- (67) *Sudegti iš gėdos.* [Burn with shame]

[States and accompanying feelings] GĖDA usually goes hand in hand with misfortune (68) and might also be associated with the fear of God's punishment, defamation, humiliation, dishonor, and judgement pronounced by the "omniscient" community (69, 70, 71):

- (68) *Ir gėda, ir bėda.* [Shame and misfortune]
- (69) *Nuo Dievo griekas, nuo svieto juokas.* [Sin comes from God, the ridiculous – from the world]
- (70) *Kaip tu Dievo nebijai, žmonių nesisarmatiji.* [How come, you are not afraid of God's punishment and people's judgement?]
- (71) *Dėl Dievo baimės, dėl žmonių gėdos.* [For the fear of God, for the shame of people]

[Axiology] The axiological aspect of GĖDA should be considered on a multilevel basis. All acts, behaviour, situations and attitudes that might cause GĖDA are generally condemned by the community (72), and viewed as a loss of dignity. The feeling of GĖDA is compared to the worst experience (73, 74), or even to sin and death (75, 76):

- (72) *Taip sarmata, taip negražu.* [Such a shame and disgrace]
- (73) *Geriau biednam su garbe būti, negu turtingam su gėda pūti.* [It is better to be poor, but with dignity, than to be rich and rot in shame]
- (74) *Veikiaus mirti, nekaip gėdoje gyventi.* [It is better to die than live in shame]
- (75) *Ką mergai be slovos, tai geriau be galvos.* [Having no honour for a maiden is worse than having no head at all]
- (76) *Išėjo su sarmata kaip su terba.* [Full of shame, she left with her bags]⁷

The lexeme *gėda* may also express the speaker’s attitude towards other participants of the situation (77). Thus, in this case, GĖDA reflects the speaker’s assessment. The capacity to feel GĖDA gives hope for improvement (78), becomes a reference point for assessing other people, their behaviour and situation.

- (77) *Čigonui nei skauda, nei gėda.* [Neither does a Romanian care, nor is he ashamed]
- (78) *Jeigu gėda – dar ne bėda.* [If you feel ashamed, it is not bad yet]

[**Associations**] The Lithuanian proverbs illustrate the association of GĖDA with undesirable features, for example with dirt. Through personification the experience of GĖDA may be attributed to a pig or a dog. For instance, a shameless person is called a pig or may be ashamed of himself/herself like a pig, and his/her name, metaphorically speaking, is “covered with dirt” (79, 80). This might also impact the association of GĖDA with a dog personifying “ugly” flaws (81, 82, 83):

- (79) *Kiaulė sarmatos nepažįsta* [A pig does not feel ashamed]
- (80) *Kiaulei ir be marškinių ne sarmata.* [Even without a shirt, a pig does not feel ashamed]

- (81) *Šuniui nei gėdos, nei bėdos.* [A dog does not feel ashamed or experience misfortune]
 (82) *Išgėdino į šuns dienas.* [They made one feel ashamed. Those were the dog days.]
 (83) *Ar šuo tau gėdą suėdęs?* [Has a dog eaten your dignity?]

The definition of Lithuanian GĖDA in the proverbs: A summary

GĖDA is an unpleasant feeling experienced by a person or community as a result of a loss of self-esteem, honour and good name. GĖDA emerges as a consequence of the lack of morality, propriety, ethics, and values adopted by the community. It occurs as a result of breaking God's commandments, especially theft, lying, lack of moderation in eating, lack of respect for privacy, indifference, derision, neglect of native language, improper performance of one's own duties, laziness, helplessness, or addiction. GĖDA is a proof of dignity and honour, and concern about a good name. It might also be considered as an expression of intimidation, fear and modesty.

There are situations and behaviours that a person is naturally ashamed of, but they are not the objective reasons to feel so. These include work, admission of one's own mistakes, ignorance, poverty and caution. However, GĖDA arises in the presence of eyewitnesses of the afore-mentioned situations. The stimulus causing the feeling of GĖDA are words, but not every embarrassment is effective and meaningful.

An embarrassed person blushes, avoids eye contact, wishes to hide himself or herself and the reasons for shame. GĖDA may vary in duration and intensity. It can be experienced only by those who have the capacity to feel shame, and honour, who are aware of the importance of good name, as well as by those who are modest and shy. The capacity to feel GĖDA is not innate, but given (by God).

In the Lithuanian consciousness, GĖDA often goes hand in hand with misfortune and may be both a consequence of misfortune and its reason. GĖDA is often caused by the fear of bad opinion and God's wrath. GĖDA is one of the most undesirable feelings. However, the capacity to feel it gives hope for improvement,

becomes a reference point for assessing other people, their behaviour and situations they might be involved in.

Conclusions

The sketches of the concept of GĖDA presented in the Lithuanian proverbs above are not exhaustive, but a part of its conceptual portrait displaying a complex structure. Unlike in the dictionaries, in the proverbs the concept of GĖDA is not associated only with unpleasant feelings. In a metonymic way, it covers all real and potential causes and effects, taking into account the semantic content of GĖDA as a moral and psychological trait as well.

Most proverbs mirror events and situations occurring in reality and illustrate everyday life scenarios, confrontations and assessment. Such assessment, however, could be made by someone who possesses a moral backbone, honour and cares about his or her good name. Hence understood as the treasury of ethno-wisdom, the proverbs reflect the problems and dilemmas faced by the "naïve" mind exposed to shame and embarrassment and become a manifesto of striving for the dignity and good name of the community. All phenomena posing a threat to the axiological system of the linguistic-cultural community are condemned.

The data from the proverbs confirm that GĖDA becomes identified through a person's relationship with oneself and God (internal sphere) and through interpersonal relations (external sphere). The objective reasons for GĖDA fixed and preserved in the proverbs reflect the hierarchy of values of the community, accepted standards and etiquette, while behaviour and situations causing unfounded GĖDA ("dirty work," poverty, ignorance, etc.) reflect specific patterns and requirements adopted by the rural community. Incongruity threatens with humiliation, abasement and even exclusion.

The analysis shows that some of the characteristics of GĖDA encoded in the Lithuanian proverbs seem to be universal. However, a number of conceptual elements of GĖDA highlight traits specific to Lithuanian culture, which are defined by the viewpoint and hierarchy of values adopted by the Lithuanian linguistic-cultural community. In the Lithuanian consciousness GĖDA is conceived as an unpleasant state or moral and psychological feature. However, the subject of shame, as well as its causes and evaluation seem to be less salient in the scenarios involving this feeling.

The Lithuanian proverbs under study do not emphasize the relations between GĖDA, virtue and honour, and the threat of their loss. Thus, they do not focus on presenting the image of those who are most at risk of defamation and do not raise the issue of desire, nudity and physical aspects of love. In this respect, Lithuanian proverbs are to a lesser extent metaphysical, and as cautionary tales refer, above all, to the experience of GĖDA as a result of ridiculing and humiliation emerging from the neglect of one's own duties, lack of essential skills, and social coexistence. The experience of GĖDA in the sphere of interpersonal relations also reveals culture specific traits. The Lithuanian proverbs highlight this experience in the context of place and an individual's behaviour in a group. Along with this, the proverbs emphasize that GĖDA is given as a virtue (probably by God) and that not all people are likely to experience this feeling to the same extent. The Lithuanian proverbs show that the main cause of GĖDA could be words. Moreover, this emotional state is often caused by fear and misfortune. Associations of GĖDA with a dog and dirt (and directly with a pig) emerge mainly from observation of reality.

It is worth emphasizing that various aspects of the concept of GĖDA, on the one hand, reveal those conditions of rural life that from the point of view of the Lithuanian linguistic-cultural community require some "repair," on the other hand, they expand the potential of semantic and cultural content of lexical units belonging to the class of *gėda*, and thus facilitate the understanding of their content encoded in Lithuanian consciousness.

Notes

¹ The capitalized GĖDA refers to the concept, and the italicized *gėda* stands for a lexeme, i.e. an element of the language system. The English word *shame* is used to refer to an emotional state.

² The adjective "cognitive" is to emphasize the cognitive character of the description, the purpose of which is to indicate a way of understanding shame encoded in Lithuanian proverbs.

³ Empirical data were drawn from 240 Lithuanian proverbs, found mainly in the collection of the proverbs "Lietuvių patarlės" (Eng. *Lithuanian Proverbs*) and "Patarlių paralelės" (Eng. *Parallels of Proverbs*), edited by Kazys Grigas (1976, 1987), and in the online proverb database at www.aruodai.lt.

⁴ It should be noted that in studies into the semantics of emotions, the method of scenarios and scripts modelling the meaning of emotional states is employed (cf. Mikołajczuk, 2011). These scenarios take into account different aspects of emotional situations, such as the subject of emotion, causer, cause, characteristics of emotional state, symptoms, valuation and others. Although in most cases these aspects overlap, different qualitative characteristics or their semantic realizations allow for reconstructing various images, or using J. Bartmiński's terminology - profiles of emotions in several languages or in one language.

⁵ The non-literal translations of the proverbs illustrate the way of thinking and meaning of proverbs. In some cases, English equivalents of the proverbs are provided.

⁶ Unlike dictionary definitions, the Lithuanian proverbs under study often illustrate *sarmata* as a kind of unpleasant feeling (shame, embarrassment), resulting from shyness or lack of courage. In this particular case, the features of character (not feeling), which are a consequence of improper behaviour, are considered.

⁷ The Lithuanian proverb *išeiti su terba* (Eng. lit. *to leave with a bag*) means 'to find it hard to make ends meet'.

References

- Anusiewicz, J., 1990: Językowo-kulturowy obraz kota w polszczyźnie. In: Bartmiński, J., *Etnolingwistyka*, t. 3., 95-141.
- Bartmiński, J., 1988: Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji słowa. In: Bartmiński, J., *Konotacja*. Lublin
- Bartmiński, J., 2007: *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej
- Bartmiński, J., Chlebda, W., 2013: Problem konceptu bazowego i jego profilowania – na przykładzie stereotypu EUROPY. In: *Etnolingwistyka*, t. 25, 69-95
- Bartmiński, J., Żuk, G., 2009: Pojęcie RÓWNOŚCI i jego profilowanie we współczesnym języku polskim. In: Bartmiński, J., *Etnolingwistyka*, t. 21, 47-67.
- Evans, V.; Green, M., 2006: *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*, Edinburgh.
- Geeraerts, D., 2006: *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grigas, K. et al., 1958: *Patarlės ir priežodžiai*. Vilnius: VGLL.
- Grigas, K. et al., 2000: *Lietuvių patarlės ir priežodžiai* (Vol. 1). Vilnius: LLTI.
- Grigas, K., 1976: *Lietuvių patarlės: Lyginamasis tyrinėjimas*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Grigas, K., 1987: *Patarlių paralelės*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Keinys, S. (ed.), 2000: *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [DLKŽ] (T. 1–6). Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų Leidybos Institutas.
- Mikołajczuk A., 1999, *Gniew we współczesnym języku polskim. Analiza semantyczna*, Warszawa: Energeia.
- Mikołajczuk, A., 2011: Ile radości jest w radości? O modelach uczuć „w rodzaju radości” związanych z rzeczownikami radość. In: *Poradnik Językowy*, Nr 4, 57-71.
- Mikołajczuk, A., 2012: Konceptualizacja wstydu w polszczyźnie (na tle porównawczym). In: *Odkrywanie znaczeń w języku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 124-145.
- Naktinienė, G. et al. (ed.), 1941–2002: *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [LKŽ] (T. 1–10). Vilnius.

Smoczyński, W. (ed.), 2007: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [SEJL].
Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński.

The list of abbreviations

DLKŽ – *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, t. 1–6, ed. Stasys Keinys, Vilnius 2000.
LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, t. 1–10, ed. Gertrūda Naktinienė, Vilnius 1941–2002.
SEJL – *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, ed. Wojciech Smoczyński, Vilnius 2007.

Monika Bogdzevič
Kolektyvo g. 1
LT-08314 Vilnius,
Lithuania
E-Mail: monika.bogdzevic@gmail.com