Concept «Holy Fool» in the Linguistic World-Image of the Russian-Speaking Population of Ukraine

Концепт «юродивый» в языковой картине мира русскоязычного населения жителей Украины

Iia Gordiienko-Mytrofanova

Dr. in Psychology,
Professor

Ия Гордиенко-Митрофанова

доктор психологических наук,
профессор

E-mail: ikavgm@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0001-5332-0663

Iuliia Kobzieva
Post-graduate student

Юлия Кобзева
аспирант

E-mail: yu.kobzeva88@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0001-8483-9695

*Hrihorii Skovoroda Kharkiv
National Pedagogical University,
Department of Practical Psychology
✉ 3, Faninsky lane, Kharkiv,
Ukraine, 61166*

*Харьковский национальный
педагогический университет
имени Г.С. Сковороды, кафедра
практической психологии
✉ пер. Фанинский, 3в, г. Харьков,
Украина, 61166*

*Original manuscript received February 06, 2018
Revised manuscript accepted September 15, 2018*

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to identify and analyze the semantic components of the verbalized concept «holy fool» in the linguistic world-image of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine. The main method of the conducted research was the psycholinguistic experiment. The sample comprised 204 respondents aged 18–35, males and females being equally represented. The results of the conducted experiment allowed us to make a conclusion that in terms of

the everyday linguistic consciousness of the Russian-speaking population of the eastern part of Ukraine the concept «holy fool» is reflected in three core (more than 10%) semantic clusters: 1) «**behavior**» (46.57%); 2) «**appearance, looks**» (21.57%); 3) «**cognitive disorders**» (16.67%).

Therefore, holy fool is mainly represented by lexemes with behavioral semantics, lexemes referring to personal appearance, and lexemes semantically connected with deficient mental abilities of a person. The first cluster is represented by such core semes as «**STRANGE**» (20.59%) and «**BLESSED**» (8.82%). The second is represented by «**UGLY**» (17.64%) and the third cluster is represented by the core seme «**FOOLISH**» (16.67%). Theological associates are mainly represented by associates that describe a certain type of holiness («**BLESSED**»).

The stimulus word «holy fool» is generally evaluated in three different ways: positively, negatively, and neutrally. 41% of respondents display repulsion to this stimulus, which is reflected in the following reactions: ugly 11, foolish, plain 7, insane, sick, ugly creature 4, fool, crazy, crippled 3, mentally challenged, abnormal, wrong, fearful 2 etc.

The comparative analysis of the verbalized concept «holy fool» in the linguistic world-image of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine and Russia leads to the following conclusions: 1) the semantic charge of the word «holy fool» is bigger in the linguistic consciousness of the Russian-speaking respondents from the eastern part of Ukraine; 2) the core of the verbalized concept «holy fool» have different components («**HUMAN BEING**» – «**STRANGE**»). Most Ukrainian and Russian respondents tend to treat the concept «holy fool» as something negative or neutral, which testifies to the ambivalence of this concept; theological associates are represented in the periphery; emotive associates are only reflected in singular reactions.

Key words: ludic competence, playfulness, ludic position, holy fool, psycholinguistic experiment, free association experiment, linguistic consciousness.

Introduction

The present article continues a series of articles devoted to *ludic competence* (Gordienko-Mytrofanova, 2015; Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Sauta, 2016; Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Kobzieva, 2017a, 2017b; Gordienko-Mytrofanova et al., 2018) which is an integral part of the professional competence of would-be psychologists.

We define ludic competence as a system of inner resources, resorted to by a person in order to balance their personality against outer conditions of social environment on the basis of positive emotions,

i.e. interest and joy, which are frequently expressed in a very emotional way, accompanied by tension or excitement.

Ludic competence is formed alongside with the development of playfulness, which is a stable personality trait in the modern world of gamification (Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Kobzieva, 2017a, 2017b). Understanding the nature of playfulness with the help of the psycholinguistic experiment happens via reconstructing its essential characteristics as semantic components that are actualized in the linguistic consciousness of the native speakers, both core and peripheral reactions.

We have undertaken the most extensive free association experiment that has ever been conducted with the stimulus word «playfulness» (4,795 respondents). 19 psycholinguistic meanings of playfulness were described as a result of the psycholinguistic experiment with a sample of 1,600 respondents (Gordienko-Mytrofanova, 2015; Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Kobzieva, 2017a, 2017b; Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Sauta, 2016).

Relying on the previous theoretical and empirical research into playfulness as a personality trait (Barnett, 2007; Guitard et al., 2005; Staempfli, 2007; Proyer, 2012; Proyer & Ruch, 2011; Yarnal & Qian, 2011; Yue et al., 2016), as well as on the analysis of the outlined components-scales of playfulness (Glynn & Webster, 1992; Tsuji et al., 1996; Schaefer & Greenberg, 1997; Yarnal & Qian, 2011; Proyer, 2012; Shen et al., 2014; Proyer, 2017), high-frequency reactions of the biggest sample of 4,795 respondents, and the established psycholinguistic meanings, we managed to single out the following components of playfulness (Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Kobzieva, 2017a, 2017b; Gordienko-Mytrofanova et al., 2018): «*sensitivity*», «*imagination*», «*sense of humor*», «*ease*», «*flirting*», «*mischievousness*», «*fugue*».

The components of playfulness as an integral personality trait are also the components of ludic competence. These are defined as «motivated abilities» (Raven, 2001), that help individuals to achieve personally meaningful goals. In this case, the goal is to develop individual identity to the extent which ensures successful socialization, i.e. successful psychological functioning (Gordienko-Mytrofanova & Kobzieva, 2017a).

These components lie at the basis of ludic positions as an effective way of creative adaptation to the reality of one's «Self» and to the reality of the «Other»: «sensitiveness» – «Esthete»; «imagination» –

«Sculptor»; «ease» – «Balance-master»; «flirting» – «Diplomat»; «mischievousness» – «Frolicsome Fellow»; «humor» – «Real Humorist»; «fugue» – «Wacky».

Ludic positions are manifestations of ludic competence in various standard and nonstandard situations, i.e. the behavioral aspect. Thus, mastering ludic positions involves mastering particular behavioral patterns.

As it can be seen from here, fugue is one of the components of ludic competence. In the coaching session devoted to ludic competence we considered «fugue» as the *ability to «deliberately pretending to be stupid or insane» which is considered by the players themselves and observed by the other participants of the interaction in order to enhance the feeling of identity*. This component corresponds to the ludic position «holy fool». One of the objectives of our research is to provide the description the behavioral patterns of various ludic positions, including the ludic position «holy fool», taking into considerations the meanings that reflect the reality of the linguistic consciousness of Russian native speakers.

For the time being, we are aware of only one questionnaire of playfulness where fugue is present as one of the scales of playfulness. This is Five-Factor Personality Questionnaire (FFPQ) developed by Heijiro Tsuji and his colleagues in 1996 (Tsuji et al., 1996). «Playfulness» factor consists of the following facets: curiosity, fantasy, sentiment, sensitivity to internal experience, and fugue.

As far as the free association experiment with the stimulus word «holy fool» is concerned, we are not aware of any scientific works that were accomplished on the basis of the Ukrainian or English languages. However, we are also aware of the studies conducted by Russian scholars, particularly. Yu.N. Karaulov, G.A. Cherkasova, N.V. Ufimtseva, Yu.A. Sorokin, Ye.F. Tarasov (Karaulov et al., 2002a, 2002b) who presented the results of the free association experiment with the stimulus word «holy fool», and N.L. Chulkina and V.B. Gomes Dias (Chulkina & Gomes Dias, 2016) who explored and described the ambivalent nature of the concept foolishness for Christ/holy fool with the help of free association experiment and the method of test associative field.

The article presents the results of the collaborative research (2015–2018) into the stimulus «holy fool» conducted by

I. Gordiienko-Mytrofanova, S. Sauta, A. Silina, Iu. Kobzieva, at the Department of Practical Psychology, H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University.

Aim and tasks

The goal of the present paper is to use the method of applied psycholinguistic experiment in order to determine semantic components of the stimulus word «holy fool» in the linguistic world-image of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine.

As it was mentioned above, the results will be applied later to describe the behavioral pattern of the ludic position «holy fool», into considerations the meanings that reflect the reality of the linguistic consciousness of Russian native speakers. The ludic position corresponds to «fugue» which is one of the components of ludic competence.

Research methods

The main method of the conducted research is a psycholinguistic experiment, whose main goal is to single out the semantic components of the stimulus word «holy fool» as the component of ludic competence. The main stage of the research was the free association experiment with the word-stimulus «holy fool» as the most elaborated technique of semantic analysis.

As additional methods, the surveys have been applied (in order to refine the results of the free association experiment); questioning (in order to specify the characteristics of the sample). As a mathematical-statistical method to analyze the results of the research, we used frequency and cluster analysis, which allowed us to identify tendencies in the distribution of associations produced by the experimental group.

The free association experiment with the stimulus word «holy fool» was conducted in the written form.

According to the instruction, the respondents were supposed to state their gender, age, education/specialization, occupation/position, marital status, and write down first five words that came to their minds and that were somehow associated with «юродивый».

The total number of respondents who took part in the experiments was 204 young people (18–35), males and females being equally represented. As far as the education criterion is concerned, *51.5% had not fully completed their university education, 36.7% of the respondents had a university degree; 9.3% – secondary education, 2.5% – did not*

indicate their educational background. As far as the marital status is concerned, 19% of the respondents were married, 77.6% were single, 7% were in some sort of relationship, 1% were divorced, 1% were engaged; 3.4% did not indicate their marital status.

Research results

The results of the free association experiment with the stimulus word «holly fool» yielded 204 associations. 108 reactions out of these were unique reactions, including 11 word combinations or complete sentences, 33 reactions with the frequency higher than 1, 75 individual reactions, and 0 refusals.

The results of the frequency analysis of the free association experiment with the stimulus word «holly fool» enabled us to build the associative field for the first reaction. All the reactions are arranged in the decreasing order of their frequency, which is marked by a corresponding figure: *strange* 18 (8,82%); *ugly* 11 (5,39%); *blessed* 8 (3,92%); *foolish, plain* 7 (3,43%); *insane, sick, funny, ugly creature, cunning, lawyer* 4 (1,96%); *fool, not like all the others, peculiar, crazy, crippled, crank, cranky, legal* 3 (1,47%); *joyful, amazing, amusing, beautiful, mentally challenged, abnormal, unclear, wrong, fellow, Ancient Rus, saint, fearful, weird, miraculous* 2 (0,98%); *asocial, poor man, insane people, inhumanity, white crow, possessed, fearless, Bible, God, godlike, desman, stupid illiterate thug, simple-minded, stupidity, dirty, Dostoevsky, Old Russian, ancient, half-wit, playful, devious, refined, different, Judas, horse, cross, wry, curly, false, small, a boy born to a poor family, Mark, cute, not beautiful, spacey, unlike others, inadequate, loony, ludicrous, unusual, unpredictable, uncustomary, careless, educated, original, insult, sincere, outsider, broken leg, Orthodox Christianity, attractive, enlightenment, Russian, secretive, crooked, feeble-minded, weak, dictionary, courage, Middle Ages, Old man, peculiarity, creepy, restroom, stupid, hard, shitty, lame, dorky, Ceasar, church, gypsy, circus, devil, jester* 1 (0,49%).

Afterwards, we conducted partial semic interpretation of the results of the frequency analysis within the framework of free association experiment with the stimulus word «holly fool» according to the first reaction. Partial semic interpretation of associative reactions involves uniting cognate words and nominations of the same semantic component expressed with the help of different parts of speech, singular and plural

forms of the same word. Partial semic interpretation allows us to receive more objective data on 1) high frequency associates, 2) the quantity of different sememes that were revealed during the experiment. For example, *crank* (чудак) 8 [*crank* (чудак) 3, *cranky* (чудаковатый) 3, *weird* (чудной) 2]; *insane* (безумный) 5 [*insane* (безумный) 4, *insane people* (безумные) 1].

The analysis of the data received in the course of partial semic interpretation resulted in the change of the sequence of some high frequency associates in comparison with the reactions. However, the composition and the nature of associations remained the same (see table 1).

Table 1. The results of the frequency analysis and the partial semic interpretation of the reactions

Associations	frequency, (%) 204 resp.	Combined associates	frequency, (%) 204 resp.
strange	18 (8,82%)	strange	19 (9,31%)
ugly	11 (5,39%)	ugly	15 (7,35%)
blessed	8 (3,92%)	crank	10 (4,9%)
foolish	7 (3,43%)	foolish	9 (4,41%)
plain	7 (3,43%)	blessed	8 (3,92%)
insane	4 (1,96%)	plain	8 (3,92%)
sick	4 (1,96%)	lawyer	7 (3,43%)
funny	4 (1,96%)	insane	5 (2,45%)
ugly creature	4 (1,96%)	sick	4 (1,96%)
cunning	4 (1,96%)	funny	4 (1,96%)
lawyer	4 (1,96%)	cunning	4 (1,96%)
fool	3 (1,47%)	fool	4 (1,96%)
not like all the other	3 (1,47%)	not like all the other	3 (1,47%)
peculiar	3 (1,47%)	peculiar	3 (1,47%)
crazy	3 (1,47%)	Ancient Rus	3 (1,47%)
crippled	3 (1,47%)	crazy	3 (1,47%)
crank	3 (1,47%)	crippled	3 (1,47%)
cranky	3 (1,47%)	God	2 (0,98%)
legal	3 (1,47%)	joyful	2 (0,98%)
joyful	2 (0,98%)	amazing	2 (0,98%)
amazing	2 (0,98%)	amusing	2 (0,98%)
amusing	2 (0,98%)	beautiful	2 (0,98%)
beautiful	2 (0,98%)	mentally challenged	2 (0,98%)
mentally challenged	2 (0,98%)	abnormal	2 (0,98%)
abnormal	2 (0,98%)	unclear	2 (0,98%)

unclear	2 (0,98%)	wrong	2 (0,98%)
wrong	2 (0,98%)	fellow	2 (0,98%)
fellow	2 (0,98%)	saint	2 (0,98%)
Ancient Rus	2 (0,98%)	fearful	2 (0,98%)
saint	2 (0,98%)		
fearful	2 (0,98%)		
weird	2 (0,98%)		
miraculous	2 (0,98%)		

As a result of the conducted research, 204 reactions were distributed among the following semantic groups/clusters:

1) **BEHAVIORAL ASSOCIATES** – 95 (46.57%), f. 56 (27.45%), m. 39 (19.12%). This cluster includes the following semantic groups:

1.1 **STRANGE**: *strange* 19 [*strange* 18, *peculiarity*], *crank* 10 [*crank* 3, *cranky* 3, *weird* 2, *miraculous* 2], *not like all the others* 3, *unclear* 2, *white crow*, *different*, *ludicrous*, *spacey*, *unusual*, *unpredictable*, *uncustomary*, *unlike others* 1 – 42 (20.59%), f. 29 (14.21%), m. 13 (6.37%);

1.2 **BLESSED**: *blessed* 8, *God* 2 [*God*, *godlike* 1], *saint* 2, *Bible*, *cross*, *Orthodox Christianity*, *enlightenment*, *church*, *devil* 1 – 18 (8.82%), f. 7 (3.43%), m. 11 (5.39%). This subgroup is mainly represented by associates that describe a certain type of holiness;

1.3 **FUNNY**: *funny* 4, *joyful*, *amusing* 2, *playful*, *circus*, *jester* 1 – 11 (5.39%), f. 7 (3.43%), m. 4 (1.96%);

1.4 **CUNNING**: *cunning* 4, *devious*, *false*, *secretive*, *gypsy* 1 – 8 (3.92%), f. 2 (0.98%), m. 6 (2.94%);

1.5 **PECULIAR**: *peculiar* 3, *amazing* 2, *refined*, *original* 1 – 7 (3.43%), f. 5 (2.45%), m. 2 (0.98%);

1.6 **WRONG**: *wrong* 2, *asocial*, *inadequate* 1 – 4 (1.96%), f. 2 (0.98%), m. 2 (0.98%) .

1.7 **FEARLESS**: *fearless*, *courage* 1 – 2 (0.98%), f.;

1.8 **EDUCATED**: *educated* 1 (0.49%), m.;

1.9 **SINCERE**: *sincere* 1 (0.49%), f.;

2) **associates that describe APPEARANCE, LOOKS** – 44 (21.57%), f. 23 (11.27%), m. 21 (10.29%). This cluster includes the following semantic groups:

2.1 **UGLY (ugly appearance, physical deformity)**: *ugly* 15 [*ugly* 11, *ugly creature* 4], *plain* 8 [*plain* 7, *not beautiful* 1], *crippled* 3, *fearful* 2, *wry*, *small*, *broken leg*, *crooked*, *weak*, *creepy*, *lame*, *shitty* 1 – 36 (17.64%), f. 17 (8.33%), m. 19 (9.31%);

2.2 **BEAUTIFUL (beautiful appearance):** *beautiful* 2, *curly, cute, attractive* 1 – 5 (2.45%), *f. 4* (1.96%), *m. 1* (0.49%);

2.3 **POOR MAN (financial situation of a person):** *poor man, a boy born to a poor family* 1 – 2 (0.98%), *f. The financial situation of the holy fool is only reflected in female associates;*

2.4 **DIRTY (unkempt appearance):** *dirty* 1 – (0.49%), *m.*

3) **COGNITIVE ASSOCIATES (associates that refer to limited mental abilities, deficient intellectual activity):**

FOOLISH: *foolish* 10 [*foolish* 7, *simple-minded, foolish (masculine form), foolish (feminine form), stupid illiterate thug* 1], *insane* 5 [*insane* 4, *insane people* 1], *sick* 4, *fool* 4 [*fool* 3, *half-wit* 1], *crazy* 3, *mentally challenged, abnormal* 2, *possessed, loony, feeble-minded, stupid* 1 – 34 (16.67%), *f. 13* (6.37%), *m. 21* (10.29%);

4) **associates connected with PROFESSION:**

LAWYER 7 [*lawyer* 4, *legal* 3] – 7 (3.43%), *f. 1* (0.49%), *m. 6* (2.94%). This small cluster is represented by respondents with different professional backgrounds: culture researcher, applied mathematician, programmer, videographer, social scientist, electrical engineer, photographer;

5) **associates referring to TERRITORIAL ORIGIN AND TIME OF APPEARANCE:** *Ancient Rus* 3 [*Ancient Rus* 2, *Russian*], *Old Russian* 1, *ancient* 1, *Middle Ages* 1 – 6 (2.9%), *f. 3* (1.47%), *m. 3* (1.47%);

6) **PERSONIFIED ASSOCIATES:** *Dostoevsky, Ceasar, Judas, Mark* 1 – 4 (1.96%), *f. 2* (0.98%), *m. 2* (0.98%). Only 1.96% of respondents verbalize the word «holy fool» by means of personification;

7) **AGE-RELATED ASSOCIATES:** *fellow* 2, *old man* 1 – 3 (1.47%), *f. 1* (0.49%), *m. 2* (0.98%). This cluster is not numerous. However, it gives evidence that female and male respondents associate holy fool with different age groups;

8) **EVALUATIVE ASSOCIATES:** *insult (the stimulus is associated with an offensive word), inhumanity* 1 – 2 (0.98%), *m.*

9) **EMOTIVE ASSOCIATES: HARD** 1 (0.49%), *m.;*

10) **associates that describe the outer world (animals, things):**
animals-associates: *desman, horse* 1 – 2 (0.98%), *f. 1* (0.49%), *m. 1* (0.49%); **things-associates:** *restroom, dictionary* 1 – 2 (0.98%), *m.;*

11) **echo-reactive associates 1:** *dorky* – 1 (0.49%), *m.*

It should be noted that 41% of respondents react negatively to the word «holy fool»: *ugly 11, foolish, plain 7, insane, sick, ugly creature 4, fool, crazy, crippled 3, mentally challenged, abnormal, wrong, fearful 2, asocial, poor man, insane people, inhumanity, possessed, stupid illiterate thug, simple-minded, stupidity, dirty, half-wit, devious, Judas, wry, false, inadequate, loony, ludicrous, careless, insult, broken leg, crooked, feeble-minded, weal, creepy, stupid, hard, shitty, lame, dorky, devil 1.*

Discussion

«Behavior» cluster is rather numerous (46.57%) and diverse as far as the scope of reactions is concerned. The core semes are represented by lexemes «STRANGE» and «BLESSED», whereas peripheral semes are reflected in the lexemes «FUNNY», «CUNNING», «PECULIAR», «WRONG», «FEARLESS», «EDUCATED», «SINCERE». A possible explanation to this can be the fact that the general attitude to this notion is rather ambiguous. The ambivalent nature of the verbalized concept «holy fool» is also confirmed in the works of Russian scholars – Yu.N. Karaulov, G.A. Cherkasova, N.V. Ufimtseva, Yu.A. Sorokin, Ye.F. Tarasov (Karaulov et al., 2002a, 2002b), N.L. Chulкина and V.B. Gomes Dias (Chulкина & Gomes Dias, 2016).

First of all, let us present all the results of the associative field of the stimulus word «holy fool» provided by the Associative Thesaurus of Russian (Karaulov et al., 2002a, 2002b).

HOLY FOOL: *human being 11; boy, pauper, ancient 4; blessed, sick 3; half-wit, pity, cripple, literature, opera, saint, crippled, ugly creature 2; hippopotamus, pious, twin, big, Boris Godunov, Boriska, Basil the Blessed, Vasya, master, dirty, kind, friend, fool, bridegroom, Zosima, name, physically-impaired, goat, small coin, wry, chap, to implore, bloke, on the square, in Ancient Rus, in the street, boss, abnormal, unhappy, not an ugly creature, monkey, to offend, disadvantaged, shouts, calling to order, fellow, fella, buffoon, parrot, prophesy, jackass, empty, feeble-minded, sufferer, fearful, happy, son, sobbed quietly, the Cathedral of Saint Basil the Blessed, church, crank, youngster 1; 102+67+4+53.* The reactions are listed in the decreasing order of their frequency. The final figures are given in the end: the first figure (102) refers to the total number of respondents; the second one (67) summarizes the number of different responses to this stimulus; the

third one (4) shows the number of «refusals»; and the final figure (53) indicates the number of singular reactions (Karaulov et al., 2002a: 744).

Let us also provide some examples from the associative field of the reverse dictionary (from the reaction to the stimulus):

BELONGING TO HOLY FOOL ← *chains*; *HOLY FOOL* ← *crippled* 6; *blessed, divine* 2; *cripple, psycho* 1; 5+12 (Karaulov et al., 2002b: 972).

Similarly to direct dictionary, the figures after the stimulus indicate the number of representations of this particular word form in the entry devoted to this stimulus. Two final figures separated by a slash at the end of the entry of the reverse dictionary (5+12) refer to the overall number of its appearance in the dictionary (5) and the number of stimuli (or entries from the direct dictionary) where this word form is present (12).

As it can be seen, unlike the Russian linguistic world-image where «HUMAN BEING» (2.94%) is the most frequent reaction, which actually refers to the generic term and actualizes the archiseme of *subject* (*лицо*), the associates produced by the Russian-speaking respondents of Ukraine tend to describe the behavior of the holy fool as «STRANGE».

Russian-speaking respondents from Ukraine and Russia evaluate this notion in a similar way. Having analyzed the associative fields of the stimulus word «holy fool» from the direct and reverse Associative Thesaurus of Russian by Yu.N. Karaulov et al., N.L. Chulkina and V.B. Gomes Dias came to the conclusion that «holy fool» is generally evaluated in three different ways: positively, negatively, and neutrally. Their percentage (12%, 32% and 44.5% respectively) shows the dominance of negative and neutral reactions (Chulkina & Gomes Dias, 2016: 299). The results of our research testify to the dominance of neutral and negative reactions (41% account for negative reactions).

Theological associates are represented in the periphery both in our research and in that of our Russian counterparts. Emotive associates are only reflected in one singular reaction (hard, pity) in our associative field and the one built by Yu.N. Karaulov respectively.

Conclusions

The main goal of the conducted psycholinguistic research was to identify the major semantic components of the word «holy fool» in the linguistic world-image of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine. This is expected to facilitate the further description of the behavioral

pattern of the ludic position «holy fool» that would reflect the reality of the linguistic consciousness of Russian native speakers.

The results of the conducted experiment allowed us to make a conclusion that in terms of the everyday linguistic consciousness of the Russian-speaking population of the eastern part of Ukraine the concept «*holy fool*» is reflected in three core (more than 10%) semantic clusters: 1) «**behavior**» (46.57%); 2) «**appearance, looks**» (21.57%); 3) «**cognitive disorders**» (16.67%).

Therefore, *holy fool* is mainly represented by lexemes with behavioral semantics, lexemes referring to personal appearance, and lexemes semantically connected with deficient mental abilities of a person.

The first cluster is represented by such core semes as «**STRANGE**» (20.59%) and «**BLESSED**» (8.82%). The second is represented by «**UGLY**» (17.64%) and the third cluster is represented by the core seme «**FOOLISH**» (16.67%).

The stimulus word «holy fool» is generally evaluated in three different ways: positively, negatively, and neutrally. 41% of respondents display repulsion to this stimulus, which is reflected in the following reactions: *ugly 11, foolish, plain 7, insane, sick, ugly creature 4, fool, crazy, crippled 3, mentally challenged, abnormal, wrong, fearful 2* etc.

The comparative analysis of the verbalized concept «holy fool» in the linguistic world-image of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine and Russia, leads to the following conclusions: 1) the semantic charge of the word «holy fool» is bigger in the linguistic consciousness of the Russian-speaking respondents from the eastern part of Ukraine; 2) the core of the verbalized concept «holy fool» have different components. Most Ukrainian and Russian respondents tend to treat concept «*holy fool*» as something negative or neutral, which testifies to the ambivalence of this concept; theological associates are represented in the periphery; emotive associates are only reflected in singular reactions.

References

- Barnett, L.A. (2007). The nature of playfulness in young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 949–958. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.02.018>
- Chulkina, Nina L., & Gomes Dias, V.B. (2016). Ambivalentnost kontsepta yurodstvo / yurodivyy v russkoi yazykovoï kartine mira [The Ambivalence of the Concept of Yurodstvo / Yurodivyi within the Russian Linguistic World – Image]. *Voprosy psikholingvistiki – Journal of Psycholinguistic*, 2(28), 291–301. Retrieved from

- <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ambivalentnost-kontsepta-yurodstvo-yurodivyy-v-russkoy-yazykovoy-kartine-mira> [in Russian].
- Glynn, M.A., & Webster, J. (1992). The adult playfulness scale: An initial assessment. *Psychological Reports*, 71(1), 83–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/PRO.71.5.83-103>
- Gordienko-Mytrofanova, I.V. (2015). Znacheniiia igrivosti v aktualnom yazykovom soznanii nositelei russkogo yazyka [The meanings of playfulness in the actual linguistic consciousness of Russian speakers]. *Visnyk of the H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University. Psychology – Bulletin of the Grigory Skovoroda Kharkov National Pedagogical University. Psychology series*, 51, 44–53 [in Russian].
- Gordienko-Mytrofanova, I.V., & Sauta, S.L. (2016). Playfulness as a peculiar expression of sexual relationships (semantic interpretation of the results of the psycholinguistic experiment). *European Humanities Studies: State and Society*. Slupsk, Poland : The Faculty of Social Sciences ; Kyiv, Ukraine : East European Institute of Psychology, 1, 46–62. URL: <http://ehs-ss.pl/czasopismo/EHS-SS-01-2016.pdf>
- Gordienko-Mytrofanova, I., & Kobzieva, Iu. (2017a). Humor as a component of ludic competence. *Visnyk of the H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University. Psychology – Bulletin of the Grigory Skovoroda Kharkov National Pedagogical University. Psychology series*, 57, 40–56.
- Gordienko-Mytrofanova, I., & Kobzieva, Iu. (2017b). Playful Competence: the Access Code to the Inner Resources. Proceedings from the 15th European Congress of Psychology, July 11–14, 2017 (p. 19). Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Gordienko-Mytrofanova, I., Pidchasov, Ye., Sauta, S., & Kobzieva, Iu. (2018). The problem of sample representativeness for conducting experimental and broad psychological research. *Psycholinguistics*, 23(1), 11–46. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1212360
- Guitard, P., Ferland, F., & Dutil, É. (2005). Toward a better understanding of playfulness in adults. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 25(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153944920502500103>
- Karaulov, Yu.N., Cherkasova, G.A., Ufimtseva, N.V., Sorokin, Yu.A., & Tarasov, Ye.F. (2002a). *Russkii Assotsiativnyi Slovar [Russian Associative Vocabulary], Vol. 1. Ot reaktsii k stimulu [From Reaction to Stimulus], ca. 100000 reactions*. Moscow, LLC Astrel Publishers; LLC AST Publishers [in Russian].
- Karaulov, Yu.N., Cherkasova, G.A., Ufimtseva, N.V., Sorokin, Yu.A., & Tarasov, Ye.F. (2002b). *Russkii Assotsiativnyi Slovar [Russian Associative Vocabulary], Vol. 2. Ot stimula k reaktsii [From Stimulus to Reaction], ca. 7000 stimuli*. Moscow, LLC Astrel Publishers; LLC AST Publishers [in Russian].
- Proyer, R.T., & Ruch, W. (2011). The virtuousness of adult playfulness: The relation of playfulness with strengths of character. *Psychology of Well-Being: Theory, Research and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2211-1522-1-4>
- Proyer, R.T. (2012). Development and initial assessment of a short measure for adult playfulness: The SMAP. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(8), 989–994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.018>
- Proyer, R.T. (2017). A new structural model for the study of adult playfulness: Assessment and exploration of an understudied individual differences variable. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 108, 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.12.011>

- Raven, John (2001). The Conceptualisation of Competence. In John Raven & John Stephenson (Eds.), *Competence in the Learning Society* (pp. 253–274). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238793092_The_Conceptualisation_of_Competence
- Schaefer, C., & Greenberg, R. (1997). Measurement of Playfulness: A Neglected Therapist Variable. *International Journal of Play Therapy*, 6(2), 21–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0089406>
- Shen, X.S., Chick, G., & Zinn, H. (2014). Playfulness in Adulthood as a Personality Trait: A Reconceptualization and a New Measurement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 46(1), 58–83. doi: 10.1080/00222216.2014.11950313
- Staempfli, M.B. (2005). Adolescent playfulness, leisure and well-being. *Dissertation Abstract International-A*, 66(06). (Publication No. AAT NR02952).
- Tsuji, Hit., Tsuji, Hei., Yamada, S., Natsuno, Y., Morita, Y., Mukoyama, Y., Hata, K., & Fujishima, Y. (1996). Standardization of the Five Factor Personality Questionnaire: Factor structure. *International Journal of Psychology*, 31. (pp. 103–217). Proceedings from the XXVI International Congress of Psychology. August 16–21, 1996, Montreal, Canada.
- Yarnal, C., & Qian, X. (2011). Older-adult Playfulness: An innovative construct and measurement for healthy aging research. *American Journal of Play*, 4(1), 52–79. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ985548.pdf>
- Yue, X.D., Leung, C.L., & Hiranandani, N.A. (2016). Adult Playfulness, Humor Styles, and Subjective Happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 119(3), 630–640. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033294116662842>

АННОТАЦИЯ

Статья посвящена выявлению и анализу семантических компонентов вербализованного концепта «юродивый» в языковой картине мира русскоязычного населения жителей Украины. Основным методом проведенного исследования был психолингвистический эксперимент. Выборку составили 204 человека молодого возраста (18–35) в равном соотношении мужского и женского пола. В результате проведенного эксперимента можно сделать вывод о том, что концепт «юродивый» в обыденном языковом сознании русскоязычного населения восточной Украины нашел свое отражение в трех ядерных (больше 10%) семантических кластерах: 1) **«поведение»** (46,57%); 2) **«внешний облик, наружность»** (21,57%); 3) **«когнитивные нарушения»** (16,67%). Соответственно основными репрезентантами юродивого являются лексемы, поведенческой семантики, семантика единиц лексико-тематической группы внешнего облика и лексемы семантики ограниченных интеллектуальных возможностей человека. Первый кластер представлен такими ядерными семами как **«СТРАННЫЙ»** (20,59%) и **«БЛАЖЕННЫЙ»** (8,82%). Второй – **«УРОДЛИВЫЙ»** (17,64%) и третий – **«ГЛУПЫЙ»** (16,67%). Большая часть теологических ассоциатов на стимул «юродивый» отражает тип святости (**«БЛАЖЕННЫЙ»**).

Для информантов характерны положительные, нейтральные и негативные оценки стимула. У 41% респондентов «юродивий» вызывает отторжение, что нашло свое отражение в следующих реакциях – уродливый 11, глупый, некрасивый 7, безумный, больной, урод 4, дурак, сумасшедший, убогий 3, недоразвитый, ненормальный, неправильный, страшный 2 и т. п.

Сравнительный анализ вербализованного концепта «юродивий» в языковой картине мира русскоязычного населения жителей Украины и жителей России позволяет утверждать, что, во-первых, семантическое наполнение слова «юродивий» шире в языковом сознании русскоязычных респондентов восточной Украины; во-вторых, ядро вербализованного концепта «юродивий» представлено разными семантическими компонентами («ЧЕЛОВЕК» – «СТРАННЫЙ»). У большинства респондентов, как Украины, так и России, концепт «юродивий» вызывает либо негативное, либо нейтральное отношение, что говорит об амбивалентности концепта «юродивий»; теологические ассоциаты представлены периферией; эмотивные – единичными реакциями.

Ключевые слова: игровая компетентность, игривость, игровая позиция, юродивый, психолингвистический эксперимент, свободный ассоциативный эксперимент, языковое сознание.

Гордієнко-Митрофанова Ія, Кобзєва Юлія. Концепт «юродивий» у мовній картині світу російськомовного населення жителів України

АНОТАЦІЯ

Статтю присвячено виявленню та аналізу семантичних компонентів вербалізованого концепту «юродивий» у мовній картині світу російськомовного населення жителів України. Основним методом проведеного дослідження був психолінгвістичний експеримент. Вибірку склали 204 людини молодого віку (18–35) у рівному співвідношенні чоловічої та жіночої статі. У результаті проведеного експерименту можна зробити висновок про те, що концепт «юродивий» у повсякденній мовній свідомості російськомовного населення східної України знайшов своє відображення у трьох ядерних (більше 10%) семантичних кластерах: **«поведінка»** (46,57%); **«зовнішній вигляд, зовнішність»** (21,57%); **«когнітивні порушення»** (16,67%). Перший кластер представлено такими ядерними семами як **«ДИВНИЙ»** (20,59%) і **«БЛАЖЕННИЙ»** (8,82%). Другий – **«ПОТВОРНИЙ»** (17,64%) і третій – **«ДУРНИЙ»** (16,67%). Більша частина теологічних асоціатів на стимул «юродивий» відображає тип святості (**«БЛАЖЕННИЙ»**).

Семантичне наповнення ядра слова «юродивий», у цілому, не залежить від статевої ідентифікації. Для інформантів характерні

позитивні, нейтральні та негативні оцінки стимулу. У 41% респондентів «юродивий» викликає відторгнення, що знайшло своє відображення у наступних реакціях – потворний 11, дурний, негарний 7, шалений, хворий, урод 4, дурень, божевільний, убогий 3, недорозвинений, ненормальний, неправильний, страшний 2 і т. п.

Порівняльний аналіз вербалізований концепту «юродивий» в мовній картині світу російськомовного населення жителів України і жителів Росії дозволяє стверджувати, що, по-перше, семантичне наповнення слова «юродивий» ширше в мовній свідомості російськомовних респондентів східної України; по-друге, ядро вербалізованого концепту «юродивий» представлено різними семантичними компонентами («ЛЮДИНА» – «ДИВНИЙ»); по-третє, оцінки даного явища російськомовними респондентами України в їх відсотковому співвідношенні характеризуються «перевагою» на користь нейтральних і позитивних реакцій. У більшості респондентів, як України, так і Росії, концепт «юродивий» викликає або негативне, або нейтральне ставлення, що говорить про амбівалентність концепту «юродивий»; теологічні асоціації представлені периферією; емотивні – одиничними реакціями.

Ключові слова: ігрова компетентність, грайливість, ігрова позиція, юродивий, психолінгвістичний експеримент, вільний асоціативний експеримент, мовна свідомість.