

Usporedba i kulturološka analiza frazeoloških ekvivalenata idiomatskih izraza sa sastavnicom novac u engleskom, ruskom i hrvatskom jeziku

Zobel, Sara

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:023921>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International/Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-09-04**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



University of Zagreb

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Department of Russian Language and Literature

Sara Zobel

**A COMPARISON AND CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL
EQUIVALENTS OF IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS CONTAINING THE LEXICAL
COMPONENT *MONEY* IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, AND CROATIAN**

Master's thesis

Supervisors: Ivana Bašić, PhD, Senior Lecturer

Branka Barčot, PhD Assistant Professor

Zagreb, May 2023

1. Introduction	1
2. Cultural attitudes to money and the related concepts of work, wealth, poverty etc. in the cultures analyzed	3
a) Cultural attitudes to money in British culture	3
b) Cultural attitudes to money in US culture.....	7
c) Cultural attitudes to money in Russian culture.....	11
d) Cultural attitudes to money in Croatian culture.....	15
3. Phraseological units from the point of view of linguistics and translation studies ..	20
4. Methodology	29
5. Research questions and hypotheses	31
6. The corpus.....	32
7. Analysis and discussion.....	43
a) Cultural analysis.....	43
b) Linguistic analysis.....	59
8. Conclusion.....	66
9. Bibliography	70
10. Abstract	73
11. Biography	76

1. Introduction

Every group of people has its own “values and worldview that came about as a result of all their immaterial pursuits, day-to-day activities, material creations and achievements” (Шкатова 2012: 209)¹. These values and worldview are shared by all members of a group and are commonly referred to as that group's *picture of the world*. A group's picture of the world is reflected in its language, especially its *phraseological units*, which “record and transmit cultural notions, standards and stereotypes from one generation to another” (Шкатова 2012: 209)². This expression of a group's picture of the world in the *phraseological units* of that group's language is called the *phraseological picture of the world*.

Money is “one of the oldest and most widespread of human institutions” (Davies 2002: 17). Indeed, many civilizations, from ancient times to the modern era, used some form of money, however often that form might have changed throughout history. There have at times existed sophisticated civilizations that did not use money, such as the Inca Empire, but neither the Russian, Croatian nor the most prominent Anglophone cultures (US, UK) were in any way based on or connected with these.

Because of the aforementioned importance of money in most human societies, including those analyzed here, it is not surprising that money and the relationship to it are considered core concepts in the Russian, Croatian and most prominent Anglophone (US, UK) cultures, and that they have, as will be illustrated later, affected these cultures' history, development and outlook.

All this information leads to the conclusion that money plays an important role in the phraseological picture of the world present in many languages, including those analyzed here. It is precisely the role of the concept of money (and the related concepts of work, wealth, poverty etc.) in the phraseological picture of the world present in the cultures analyzed that will be looked at in this thesis. The ways in which these phraseological pictures of the world

¹Unless otherwise indicated all of the translations quoted in the text are mine (S. Z.)

«целостный, глобальный образ мира, выступающий результатом всей духовной деятельности человека, всех его контактов с миром – бытовых контактов, предметно-практической деятельности, созерцания, умопостижения мира.»

² «Фразеологические единицы (...) фиксируют и передают от поколения к поколению культурные установки и стереотипы, эталоны и архетипы.»

can be transferred from one language to another through the process of translation will also be examined.

This thesis has several goals:

- 1) To identify the various cultural notions that members of the Russian, Croatian and most prominent Anglophone (US, UK) cultures have historically formed and still associate with money and the related concepts of work, wealth, poverty etc.
- 2) To find whether these cultural notions are reflected in the three languages, specifically in their *phraseological units* related to money, wealth, poverty, work and so on.
- 3) To provide and analyze translation solutions in the three languages for *phraseological units* related to money, work, poverty, wealth etc. while keeping in mind their often-divergent cultural notions about the role, use etc. of money and the aforementioned related concepts.

The first part of the thesis deals with the theoretical framework concerning the topic – it provides a brief historical background of the relationship with and meaning of money, and the related concepts of work, poverty, wealth etc., in the cultures analyzed, in addition to explaining how these historical processes affected the conceptualizations of money in these cultures. Furthermore, the first part looks at *phraseological units* from the point of view of linguistics and translation studies. This includes providing a definition of *phraseological units* and listing their main traits, enumerating *phraseological equivalents* found in dictionaries used for all three languages, and listing the translation strategies as part of which each type of *phraseological equivalent* could most appropriately be used.

In the second part, the methodology used in the thesis is explained, hypotheses and research questions are set and posed, and the corpus of *phraseological units* that were collected for the thesis from several English, Croatian and Russian dictionaries is presented. *Phraseological units* common to either or all of the three languages that have both a similar form and meaning are also enumerated.

In the final part, the compiled *phraseological units* are analyzed in detail, both from the cultural perspective and from the perspectives of linguistics and translation studies, in order to answer the previously posed research questions, confirm or debunk the previously made

hypotheses, and compare the data from the dictionaries and corpora with the historical (and current) overview from the first part.

2. Cultural attitudes to money and the related concepts of work, wealth, poverty etc. in the cultures analyzed

As has been mentioned, the thesis first gives a historical background of the role of money and the related concepts of work, wealth, poverty etc. in the cultures analyzed. The primary Anglophone (UK, US) cultures are dealt with first due to the wealth of information found about them. English/British culture is analyzed first, as it is historically older.

a) Cultural attitudes to money in British culture

Like all Western cultures, British culture was historically greatly influenced by Greek culture. The first coins were minted in the small Anatolian kingdom of Lydia, which at one point conquered several Greek cities in the area. Even though the kingdom was later destroyed, its mercantile influence and coinage system spread to Greece, which from then on became known as “a nation based on trade” (Weatherford 1997: 54). It could be said that Greek civilization became prominent due to the introduction of money, trade, markets and retail. Money enabled the creation of a more complex society. It also democratized the political process, destroyed the aristocracy (voting power became based on wealth, not birth), and led to the flourishing of Greek culture. When the Greek city-states were later conquered by the Macedonians, Alexander the Great went on to spread the commercial culture of Greece throughout the world.

The next great influence on the development of Western culture as a whole and British culture in particular was the Roman Empire. Rome was “the world’s first empire organized around money” (Weatherford 1997: 69). It “promoted the use of money and organized all of its affairs around the new commodity” (ibid.) In addition to commerce, financial speculation and the buying and selling of land also first appeared in Rome.

Though it can be assumed that similar systems existed in Roman Britain, as “Julius Caesar and his followers extended the uniform Graeco- Roman monetary system over all of Gaul and most of Britain (Davies 2002: 132), events surrounding the fall of Rome would put a stop to this.

Invasions of Britain by the Angles, Jutes, Saxons and Frisians caused great instability in the country. This period of instability caused the ethnic and cultural makeup of the country to change to a point that it almost became unrecognizable. The invading peoples brought their own customs, religion and lifestyle to Britain, displacing the native population. The country changed from Celtic to Germanic (Anglo-Saxon), from Christian to pagan and from urbanized to rural. As there were few cities left, there were not many places where coins could be minted. Therefore, coins first became scarce, and then disappeared from the economy completely. The British would later have to re-acquire all the money-related knowledge and skills that were lost with the fall of Rome. (Davies 2002)

Because of the setback of constant invasions and the need to establish a strong state after the Norman Conquest, England lagged behind the monetary development of Europe and was considered backward and primitive for much of the Middle Ages. This became more obvious as trade on the European continent became more vibrant towards the end of the period. (Davies 2002).

The most important money-related innovation in the Late Middle Ages – banking – occurred in Italy, France and southern Germany, while “England relied mainly on foreigners to conduct most of its early foreign exchange and other quasi-banking activities” (Davies 2002: 176). While Italian banks did do business in London, the city could not be considered a financial “hub” as of yet. (Davies 2002).

England, and Britain as a whole, gained more importance in financial matters in the 16th and 17th centuries, alongside several other Northern European nations, such as Sweden and the Netherlands. This shift could have had several causes:

- 1) The arrival of mercantilism to England in the mid-16th century. Mercantilism was “a phase in the history of economic policy occurring between the Middle Ages and the age of laissez-faire in which the state was both the subject and the object of economic policy” (Davies 2002: 247). Its primary tenets were the need to increase the money supply of each nation, the balancing of trade, the minimization of imports and the maximization of exports. Mercantilism led to the British banking system becoming more independent, no longer reliant on foreigners, and might have provided the impetus for the creation of the British Empire.

- 2) The Protestant Reformation, which also began in the 16th century, and affected Britain around that time as well (it is notable that the other nations who took over primacy in matters of money from Italy – Sweden and the Netherlands – were also influenced by Protestantism).

The role of Protestantism as an influence on a culture (in this case, British, but later also US culture)'s relationship to money is considered important enough in this thesis to warrant closer attention before moving on.

The apparent religious basis of a people and culture's attitude to money, work and acquisition, wealth and poverty, was most strikingly portrayed by the German sociologist Max Weber in his essay *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. In it, Weber claims that Catholics in the primarily Protestant Germany, unlike other religious minorities, never could rise to the top of the business world. He explains this claim in the following way: "The Catholic is quieter, having less of the acquisitive impulse; he prefers a life of the greatest possible security, even with a smaller income, to a life of risk and excitement, even though it may bring the chance of gaining honor and riches" (Weber 2005: 51). According to Weber, Protestants, by contrast, had much more of a drive to succeed and accumulate wealth. Weber gives several reasons for this.

- 1) According to Weber, one of the key concepts of Protestantism, which did not exist in Catholic theology, was the concept of the calling. The calling is the idea that "the highest form of moral obligation of the individual is to fulfil his duty in worldly affairs. This projects religious behavior into the day-to-day world." (Weber 2005: 8). This is contrasted with the Catholic highest idea of the monastic life, which transcends the demands of worldly existence. The calling was developed as an idea by Martin Luther, but was far more prominent in Calvinism, Puritanism, and the other Protestant sects that followed.

- 2) Another theological idea that shaped Protestantism's relation to money is the specifically Calvinist idea of predestination – the idea that a person's place in Heaven or Hell is predetermined from the moment of their birth – either the person is of the elect, or of the damned. Since no one could be completely sure of their place among the elect, a person's entire life had to conform to the Calvinist ideal if they were going

to prove that they have a place among the saved. The acquisition of wealth was no small part of this – “the accumulation of wealth was morally sanctioned in so far as it was combined with a sober, industrious career; wealth was condemned only if employed to support a life of idle luxury or self-indulgence” (Weber 2005: 14). Even though predestination originated in Calvinism, Puritanism and Methodism also embraced it.

The new Christian denominations of Calvinism, Puritanism and (later) Methodism spread quickly across the northwestern parts of Europe and into Britain. Scotland in particular embraced Calvinism, while Puritanism found fertile ground in England. An elaboration on the shared Puritan and Calvinist view of wealth, money and work can be found in the writings of the English Puritan writer Richard Baxter. For instance, Baxter claimed that it is sinful to choose to make less money if God shows you a way to make more without cost to your soul. According to Baxter, refusing to acquire wealth means that you are betraying your calling, which makes you a poor steward of God’s gifts. He concludes that the acquisition of wealth is only sinful when the wealth is used for hedonistic purposes, rather than as a tribute to God. From this view, it follows logically that the Puritans considered poverty and begging on the same ethical level as “wishing to be unhealthy” (Weber 2005: 152). Poverty and begging were considered by the Puritans to be an affront to the glory of God and His love, especially when a person was otherwise able to work.

The Puritans also had several other novel ethical ideas in areas unrelated to money, wealth, labor and poverty – they scorned emotionalism and sensuality in religion and culture, as well as the friendship of other men, preferring to place their trust in God alone. They were also anti-authoritarian, believing that achieving moral perfection was the task of the individual, not the state or the Church. These ideas had an influence on English (and later US) culture – they formed “one of the roots of that disillusioned and pessimistically inclined individualism which can even today be identified in the national characters and the institutions of the peoples with a Puritan past...” (Weber 2005: 105). They also had a great influence on the British concepts of the role of money, work, poverty and wealth in society. However, their principles, especially the anti-authoritarianism and the scorn of enjoyment, brought the Puritans into conflict with the Crown, as well as the “merry old England” aspect of English

culture. Many Puritans, Methodists and members of similar denominations therefore left for America. (Weber 2005).

The combined forces of mercantilism, the Reformation and the Enlightenment could be said to have led to the Industrial Revolution in Britain at the end of the 18th century, which was when Britain became the most powerful and influential country and empire in the world. At the height of the British Empire, from about 1850 to 1914. British banks were the most respectable banks in the world, London was the world's financial center, and the British gold standard was the international gold standard. The Puritan ideas on wealth and poverty greatly influenced the thinking of Britons at the time of the Empire; Still, the beginnings of the welfare state (compulsory health and unemployment insurance) were introduced by Lloyd George in 1911. Britain's dominance over the rest of the world in the financial, economic, cultural and many other spheres was shaken during World War I and could be said to have fully ended after World War II, where Britain suffered massive damage and the US finally emerged as a world superpower and leader of the Western world. The post-WWII consensus on Keynesian economics was replaced in the 1980s by Margaret Thatcher's neoliberalism and monetarism, which was paired with a similar movement in the US under Ronald Reagan. In the UK as in the US, the neoliberal paradigm was dominant in the 1990s and 2000s as well.

Based on this review of the historical development of the view and role of money in British culture, it could be said that the British conceptualization of money was indeed influenced by the Puritan and Calvinist views of it, as well as by the fact that Britain spent quite a long time as the financial center of the world. However, the Puritan and Calvinist view of money was always countered by a more laid-back view of money stemming partially from the people that opposed the Puritans during their time. This tension between the two views on money prevented the Puritan view from gaining as strong a foothold in British culture as it gained in US culture.

b) Cultural attitudes to money in US culture

The first European settlers to the territory of the modern United States of America were the so-called Pilgrims, a group of English Puritans who separated themselves from the Church of England and left the country in order to be able to worship as they saw fit. They

considered America to be the Promised Land where they could freely worship in their own way. This view drove them to establish colonies on the newly discovered North American continent. These Puritans, naturally, held to the previously discussed Puritan beliefs that differentiated them from Catholics and Anglicans alike. They primarily settled the area that is today called New England, in the Northeast of the modern United States, and it is there that they had the freest rein to spread their views about the acquisition of wealth, which were influenced by their religion. The influence that religion has on economic development is further illustrated by the fact that capitalism developed far faster in the North of the US than it did in the South, even though the Southern colonies were established by (non-Protestant) plantation-owning businessmen, while the New England colonies were settled by Puritan craftsmen and preachers. The New England state of Massachusetts also happened to be the birthplace of the American Founding Father Benjamin Franklin, who could be said to have been the first person to formulate the US American attitude to money. (Weber 2005).

Benjamin Franklin's views on money, work and the moral basis behind the acquisition of wealth were dubbed "the confession of faith of the Yankee" (Weber 2005: 59), due to both their strong religious basis and their importance for the later development of US culture. They are as follows:

- 1) Time is money – wasting time is the ultimate sin.
- 2) Credit is money – a large credit can yield a large interest rate from the debtor.
- 3) Money can beget money – money can be used to create still more money, and wasting money is therefore foolish, as one cannot make more money from spent money
- 4) The good paymaster is lord of another man's purse – a person that pays their debts on time and reliably can ask their friends for a larger amount of money more often.
- 5) Beware of thinking you own all that you possess – do not live beyond your means
- 6) Honesty and prudence are important in business dealings. (Weber 2005: 59).

All these "commandments" are based on the principle of utilitarianism – what is useful is good, all these principles are good because they will lead to acquisition of more wealth. Therefore, Benjamin Franklin's ethic can be summed up the following way:

The acquisition of wealth is an end in itself, pleasing to God, the ultimate purpose of every person's life, and should be viewed as completely separate from any kind of pleasure or enjoyment that wealth usually brings. (Weber 2005).

Other features of the typical US view of money were the hatred of taxation, as overtaxing was the cause of the American Revolution, and a strong mistrust of centralized authority in general and central banking in particular. Some Americans even thought that all banks were evil, as failures of banks and bankruptcies were common. However, on the whole, this economic liveliness allowed the US economy to grow at a very fast pace – “More goods were produced for more people than ever before, and this culminated in the Gilded Age, an era of great excess and conspicuous consumption” (Weatherford 1997: 161). “The end of the 19th century in the UK and US, the newly emerged class of bankers and industrialists lived a life of privilege and luxury that probably no monarch in history has ever enjoyed” (Weatherford 1997: 181). However, this hitherto unheard-of accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few caused the general public to resent the capitalist class. The industrialists, in turn, attempted to assuage this resentment through generous charitable projects.

This fast accumulation of wealth by a select group of people in the 19th century US was possible because the federal government had little control over the economy at the time; most initiatives and projects were private, and the social climate was of the “anything goes”, laissez-faire flavor. This continued until World War I, when a massive war caused governments, in the US as elsewhere, to take control over the economy for the purposes of waging a war. Countries were also temporarily taken off the gold standard at the time. The US went through another period of laissez-faire economic growth in the 1920s, as it suffered the least amount of damage in World War I, before the Great Depression hit in the 1930s.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt who was President of the United States during the greater part of the Great Depression, sought to ameliorate the effects of massive bank failures through a program called the New Deal, by way of which the government was permitted to play a much larger role in the economy than it had done before. Through the New Deal, the US government demonstrated a “Keynesian willingness (...) to involve itself more directly than ever before in the country's business affairs” (Davies 2002: 535).

Even though the government measures were welcomed by many, they also faced strong opposition from those corners of American society that were strongly opposed to government interference in the economy and were more inclined to blame the Federal Reserve for the Great Depression. Despite such opposition, Keynesianism won out in the 1930s US – “Despite such powerful opposition, Keynesianism triumphed, becoming initially more enthusiastically welcomed in the United States than in Britain” (Davies 2002: 537). Its influence continued during World War II, at which time Roosevelt was still President, as well as immediately after, when the US granted aid to Western Europe under the Marshall Plan to help the European countries regain their wealth and strength. “Out of such devastation, the rebuilding of Europe’s economies was a triumph of the human spirit – assisted by Keynesian economics and American wealth skillfully combined and generously distributed.” (Davies 2002: 539). In this way, the US was able to strengthen its ties to its allies in Western Europe, forming the Western Bloc.

However, the US gained an Eastern, Communist rival in the USSR, which caused the country to become more “aware” of its role as the “guardian” and embodiment of capitalism. US anti-Communism was felt both in the political and the economic spheres, and came to a head in the 1980s, with the “monetarist”, “neoliberal” Presidency of Ronald Reagan in the US and Premiership of Margaret Thatcher in the UK. The influence of neoliberal economics in US politics and culture could be said to have continued under subsequent Republican administrations in the 1990s and 2000s, and some claim it is still ongoing, long after the fall of the Eastern Bloc.

It could therefore be concluded that the course of US history made it easy for “the spirit of capitalism” to have even more of an influence on US culture than it did on British culture; this was practically the primary way in which US citizens conceived of economics and money until World War I, and any attempts by the government to interfere in the economy were met by strong opposition. Even though the US went through a more “Keynesian”, government-influenced phase of its economy and relationship to money, and even though it experienced its share of class resentment, the US very often saw itself as “the apex of capitalism”, its defender from enemies such as the USSR – a conception which had an enormous effect on the people’s relationship to money, wealth, and poverty.

c) Cultural attitudes to money in Russian culture

Sociological studies and polls conducted in the Russian Federation in recent times have shown that Russians on the one hand are ambivalent to money, thinking that there are more important things and values in life. Alternatively, they may even consider it important but evil, or at least insufficient for true happiness and life satisfaction. (Ощепкова 2014)

Russians do think about money a lot, but only as a means to have their daily needs met, not as a value in and of itself. Poverty, meanwhile, is considered a misfortune and poor people are pitied which is the mainstream view in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy, unlike Protestantism. Wealth, meanwhile, is associated with miserliness, injustice and thought to cause problems, while also being related to intelligence (a rich person is always considered intelligent to their face, whether they actually are or not) and popularity in society (everyone wants to be their friend). Class resentment in modern Russia is decreasing, and people mostly feel apathy towards the rich. (Ощепкова 2014). The reasons for all of these attitudes to money, wealth and poverty can be traced throughout the history of Russia.

The history of Russia could be said to have started with Kievan Rus, a large medieval East Slavic country that comprised the territory of the modern-day Ukraine, Belarus and the European part of Russia. The state as such existed from the 9th until the 13th centuries, when most of its territory was conquered by the Mongols. Kievan Rus was an important state on the medieval political landscape, trading with the Scandinavians, Byzantines and Muslims among others. Its monetary development was not much different than those of other medieval states. The first forms of currency to be used in Kievan Rus were shell currency and the pelts of small mammals, such as sables. Evidence of this can be found in the etymology of the word *сорок*, which means 'forty' in the modern Russian language. In Old East Slavic, the language of Kievan Rus, *сорокъ* meant “a sack of forty sable pelts”. After animal furs and shells, Kievan Rus started using various foreign coins as currency, as well as those minted by its own rulers. In general, it could be said that the development of Kievan Rus was mostly in step with the development of other medieval European states.

The Mongol conquest of Rus completely changed the trajectory of the development of Russian culture. Because of the Mongol invasion, and the subordination of the Rus people to the Mongols, Russia was facing a time of trouble and was therefore unable to evaluate or

copy the financial innovations of Europe in the Late Middle Ages (banking, etc.). Instead, Russia was busy fighting the Mongols and, later, trying to establish itself as an independent and important country again. (The entire territory of the former Kievan Rus was not immediately recovered by the new Russian state, however – the western parts of the former Kievan Rus became part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the center of the new state moved to Moscow).

The Muscovite Prince Ivan III defeated the Mongols in 1480, which is usually seen as the end of Mongol rule of Russia. He made the first moves towards the centralization of Russian lands under the rule of Moscow. His work was continued by his son, Vasili III, whose wife, Elena Glinskaya, carried out a Russian currency reform after she became regent for her 3-year-old son. This reform was very significant for the further course of Russian history, as Glinskaya abolished all of the various currencies that were in use during the feudal period of Kievan Rus and introduced a centralized national currency. In this way, not only was the state centralized, but the currency as well. Both the political and the currency centralization of Russia would be completed under Elena Glinskaya's son, Ivan IV "the Terrible". (Мельникова 1989).

Despite these advancements, the Russian state was once again plunged into troubles after the death of Ivan IV – this time, the troubles were of a dynastic nature.

All these troubled times might have, according to some, caused the Russian state to "miss out" on the cultural and financial changes that happened in Europe during the time of the Renaissance. While Russia was affected by the myriad innovations that happened in Europe during the Renaissance period, the "medieval" period lasted much longer in Russia than it did in Europe; Renaissance changes came to Russia somewhat later and had a different course. (Видова, Карпухин 2008). This meant, among other things, that the European cultural changes that co-occurred with the financial changes as well as made them easier, such as an anthropocentric worldview and the philosophy of humanism, also appeared only later in Russia. Because of this, many European monarchs considered Russia "a backwards country" (Weatherford 1997: 142).

As mentioned, the Renaissance finally came to Russia in the 18th and 19th centuries, during and sometime after the reforms of Peter I, known as Peter the Great. Peter I visited many

Western European countries, and wanted to introduce Western standards, ideas and ways of living into Russia. Therefore, he introduced many reforms that completely changed the way Russians lived, and even thought. (Калашникова, Горшкова 2021). Many of these were seen as highly disruptive and aggressive by the Russian people, as Peter wanted to change everything, down to the banning of beards and forcing people to wear Western, rather than traditional Russian, clothing.

Peter the Great reformed most spheres of Russian life, such as politics, the Church, the military etc. Some of the most important changes happened in the economic sphere. In this sphere, Peter introduced several Western concepts into Russia. Some of these were:

- 1) Mercantilism – an idea according to which, as mentioned, a country needs to have more exports than imports.
- 2) Protectionism – the policy of protecting domestic products from foreign competition.
(Калашникова, Горшкова 2021)

New branches of industry also appeared under Peter the Great, as did new industrial regions in St. Petersburg, the new capital, as well as the Ural region. However, even after these reforms, Russia's economy was still not entirely in step with the West, as serfdom was only abolished in Russia in 1861, and the Russian middle class was never as large or as wealthy as it was in the West. Also, there was always the idea that these Western standards of living did not develop organically in Russia but were forcibly introduced into a country that did not want them; therefore, many people in 19th century Russia (called Slavophiles) insisted that Russia should follow its own path instead.

The next revolutionary change in the Russian view of and relationship to money was the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. The Bolshevik revolution was motivated by the Marxist view of money and wealth, which posited that money is merely the labor of the working class commoditized, turned into an instrument of exploitation which seeks to replace all natural human relationships with itself. In this way, the capitalist seeks to satisfy his greed at the expense of the demoralized working class. (Ferguson 2007). The intention of the Communist revolution was to free the working class from the yoke of the capitalists and end poverty. However, this was not very successful in practice. The Revolution did indeed destroy the wealthy classes. However, it, as well as the chaotic events that followed (The Russian Civil

War, the Holdomor, etc.) also impoverished the lower classes, which the official Soviet ideology attempted to deny – the poor were referred to as “economically disadvantaged” in the USSR, as poverty was thought to have been eliminated by the Revolution.

Still, the situation in the Soviet Union improved somewhat by the 1960s (even though it was never as good as in the West, despite the fact that the USSR official ideology wanted to become better than the West). Wealthier people did appear, but they were disliked. “For the longest time, the word ‘wealth’ was almost an insult on the official level in the USSR”. (Ощепкова 2014: 113)³.

The majority of people, meanwhile, did not think about money much, considering other values more important. Not thinking about money was made possible because the state provided most amenities, such as housing and healthcare. In order to improve the quality of life, family and connections to higher-level officials were more important than money.

The first “capitalists proper” in the USSR appeared during the time of the *perestroika*, a time of reforms introduced by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. These first capitalists made money by importing foreign goods into the USSR, and were disliked by the majority of the people, as the prices of their goods were too high for the people to afford. These capitalists were therefore considered deceptive and shrewd.

In the 1990s, during the transition to capitalism, a genuine gap between the rich and the poor appeared. The new capitalists were even richer than the old ones, and were even more disliked, as they were thought to have come by their wealth through dishonest means. It was also believed that the state protected these “oligarchs” from the consequences of their illegal deeds. Furthermore, these people stereotypically flaunted their wealth and were completely tasteless. These people could be considered to be the reason for the negative attitudes to the rich and money in modern Russia, even though, as mentioned, this dislike has waned somewhat in modern times.

In conclusion, it could be said that the Russian attitude to money was always negative – there were a lot of times when Russia, for historical reasons, could not follow the financial innovations of Europe, and even when it did, these innovations were often seen as forced or

³ «Долгое время «богатый» было в нашей стране чуть ли не ругательством на официальном уровне.»

unfit for Russia. The Russian attitude to money was also strongly shaped by the Bolshevik revolution and its ideology, as well as the trauma of the transition to capitalism: both of these factors could only contribute to a negative attitude to money. In addition, the Russians have, under the influence of Orthodoxy, always had a positive, and often idealized, view of the poor (in Russian fairytales, for instance, justice is always on the side of the poor).

d) Cultural attitudes to money in Croatian culture

Croatia's geographic position placed it at a crossroads between East and West, as well as between the Mediterranean and Central Europe. This has affected every aspect of the nation's culture, including its relationship to money: An important factor in the development of the Croatian attitude to money was the fact that Croatia spent the better part of its history as a constituent state of various kingdoms, empires and federations. Since the minting of money had always been inexorably tied to the political power and independence of a state, this meant that Croatian territories saw the use of many different currencies, often at the same time and in the same place. These currencies could broadly be grouped as Eastern (Serbian, Byzantine), Central European (Hungarian, Austrian) and Mediterranean (Venetian, Italian). However, other kinds of money were used as well. The aforementioned intersecting influences that East and West had on Croatia are therefore reflected as well. (Kolar-Dimitrijević 2013: 8)

Greece and Rome were the first major powers to mint coins on the territory of modern Croatia, which brought their ideas about the importance of money to the area. The Greeks minted money on the islands of Korčula and Hvar, while the Romans did it in the area of today's town of Sisak. These major powers minted their foreign coins in Croatian lands before the arrival of the Croats, but this practice would continue long after it.

Croats began using money in the ninth century, approximately two hundred years after their arrival at the territory of modern Croatia. Until the ninth century, sable fur was used as a means of exchange. Even though Croats started using money, they did not mint their own coins. Instead, they used Byzantine and Venetian money. This ended up splitting Croatia into a Byzantine and Venetian sphere of influence. The Crusades brought many varieties of money from the German lands into Croatia as well, which were also used. This was the first iteration of the currency diversity that was a staple of Croatian history.

Such a state continued when Croatia became part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Even though Croatia was given several privileges in that union, being allowed to mint its own money and collect its own taxes, the royal currency was still preferred. The situation was made even more complex by the fact that Venetian money was used in the south of the country. This made trade difficult. “The great diversity of money, especially silver coins, made safe trade difficult. Knowledge, luck and experience were all needed for the merchant to come home wealthy and alive”. (Kolar-Dimitrijević 2013: 17)⁴.

Still, the monetary development of Croatia at this time was in line with European trends.

The economic development of Croatian lands was slowed greatly by the Ottoman invasions, which started when Croatia was still in a personal union with Hungary but forced a change of the ruling dynasty in 1527. Since vast swaths of the country were conquered by the Ottomans and Venetians, the Croatian name and center of power moved northwards. The remaining Croatian nobles elected the Habsburgs as their ruling dynasty after some struggle, hoping that they would protect them from the Ottomans.

The new dynasty brought with it its own currency – the thaler. While Croatia minted its own money in Zagreb as well as on lands owned by the powerful Zrinski noble family, this caused a conflict with the Habsburgs, who eventually destroyed the Zrinski family after they rebelled against them. In addition to Habsburg money, Dubrovnik, Turkish and Venetian money was also in use in Croatian lands. Mercantilism and banking were introduced in areas under Venetian control (the first bank in Dalmatia was founded in 1642 in Šibenik).

Generally, the whole territory of the Croatian lands was politically unstable and only rarely knew peace. The economic situation in Croatia was complicated even further by the Napoleonic Wars. “The Napoleonic Wars upset the hitherto established monetary and economic system. The old rules were no longer in force, which also caused the royal currency

⁴ „Velika raznolikost novca, osobito srebrnog, otežavala je sigurno trgovanje i trebalo je imati i znanja i sreće i iskustva da se trgovac s puta vrati obogaćen i živ.“

to lose value, especially after the fall of the Holy Roman Empire. Gold and silver became highly sought after goods in such circumstances.” (Kolar-Dimitrijević 2013: 57)⁵

The disruption of the free market at the time was taken advantage of by smugglers. Many wealthier peasants started to sell and supply food to soldiers on both sides of the conflict. These peasants and their families, who made their fortune selling food, became the first wealthy people in Croatia. One of the first and most prominent of these wealthy families was the Gavrilović family, which hailed from the central Croatian town of Petrinja. As Petrinja part of the Military Frontier (a militarized zone the Austrians set up to defend their lands in Croatia from Turkish incursions), the Gavrilović family became one of the largest suppliers of Napoleon's troops on the territory of the Frontier in 1809. (Kolar-Dimitrijević 2013).

Austria's wars against Napoleon caused economic hardship. Many Austrian banks failed, which, naturally harmed people who used paper money, bonds and securities. More generally, all people who were not familiar with various forms of financial malfeasance were impoverished at this time. Economic hardship continued even after the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Vienna Congress. In addition, the emperors were forced to raise taxes and prices in order to make more money. The fact that the Congress did not bring about a unification of Croatian lands further aggravated the Croatian position. The bad economic situation in the entire Empire spilled over into Croatia as well. Because of the aforementioned bank failures, many people in Croatia were distrustful of paper money. Therefore, it became common for people to keep their coins in their own homes instead. However, things would soon start to improve.

In 1832, the Croatian nobleman Janko Drašković published his *Dissertation*, which was the first economic program in Croatia. In it, he proposed that Croatia should tackle unfair Hungarian business practices towards Croatian wheat exporters, among other things. Soon after, entrepreneurs from the Croatian capital of Zagreb used their accumulated resources to create the first savings bank in Croatia, the First Croatian Savings Bank.

⁵ „Tijekom napoleonskih ratova poremetio se cijeli dotad važeći monetarni sustav zajedno s gospodarskim sustavom. Stara pravila više nisu vrijedila, pa je i carsko-kraljevski novac gubio na vrijednosti, osobito nakon raspada Svetoga Rimskog Carstva. U takvim uvjetima zlato i srebro postaju traženom robom.“

This led to the accumulation of even more capital in Zagreb, increasing the city's importance. This all ultimately led to the unification of the two constituent parts of today's Zagreb – Gradec (secular authorities) and Kaptol (church authorities) into a single city. Despite these advancements, the Croatian economy still faced problems, as it was subordinate to Hungary under the terms of the Croatian-Hungarian settlement of 1868, which stipulated that financial policies were under Hungarian control.

Still, there were more financial and industrial advancements to come in Croatia. This time, they came from the politician Eugen Kvaternik, who, after visiting Paris and learning the workings of the stock exchange there, attempted to transplant that knowledge into Croatia to modernize its economy. "Kvaternik was the first person to attempt to transform Croatian society and adapt it to the achievements of the far more advanced modern world by teaching Croatian citizens about money, stocks and capital." (Kolar-Dimitrijević 2013: 107)⁶. He believed that a Croatian Stock Exchange should be founded, and that credit should be available to common people as well, not just landowners. The Croatian Stock Exchange was eventually created in 1907. Several prominent industrialists and wealthy families appeared in Croatia at this time. One of the most important of these was Guido Pongratz, a construction magnate. Industrialization was further encouraged, as was the development of the food and timber industries. These developments increased the importance of Croatia-Slavonia in the eyes of the central government in Vienna.

Still, these developments did not "trickle down" to many people, who were forced to emigrate from the country. This situation continued until World War I, which destroyed Austria-Hungary.

Soon after the war, Croatia joined the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later Kingdom of Yugoslavia). The new state was made up of territories which had hitherto used different currencies, which made trade (and economic development in general) more difficult. It was also plagued by political instability, chiefly through conflict between the Croats and Serbs. Furthermore, many economic policies at the beginning of the country's existence were aimed at the recovery of its eastern constituents, Serbia and Montenegro,

⁶ „Kvaternik je prvi pokušao modernizacijom i radom na novcu i kapitalu započeti preobrazbu hrvatskog društva i prilagođivanje dostignućima suvremenog svijeta, koji je bio znatno napredniji.“

which embittered those parts of the country which had been part of Austria-Hungary and were more economically developed. The country managed to stabilize its currency in the 1930s but was then faced with international pressure from an increasingly belligerent Germany, as well as the West. The country finally cracked under all the pressure in 1941, ceasing to exist.

Yugoslavia was restored after World War II, but this time under a Communist system. What had started as an “orthodox” Communism in the 1940s and 1950s became somewhat different later. Yugoslav leader Josip Broz Tito and the rest of the Yugoslav Communists split with Joseph Stalin in 1948, in contrast to the other Communist countries, who later went on to make up the Eastern Bloc. The Yugoslavs initially attempted to implement an even more orthodox form of Communism in the 1950s to spite Stalin. However, they relented in the 1960s, and sought closer ties with the Western Bloc. This allowed the Yugoslav Communists to create a Socialist/Communist economic system with heavy Western influences, both cultural and economic, as well as the political Non-Aligned Movement, a movement of mostly post-colonial nations that refused to join either the Western or the Eastern Bloc.

However, the system failed in the 1980s, and Croatia was engulfed in a bloody war for independence, accompanied by a failure of many former socialist factories, banks etc. Many people made money through underhanded means at this time. Since it happened within living memory, this traumatic transition period could have had a great influence on the view of money in Croatia, as it did in Russia.

From this overview, it could be concluded that Croatia has found itself at the periphery of the Western world throughout its history. It was also a highly unstable area, with many competing states trying to rule it and bringing their own currencies and economic systems with them. This instability greatly slowed the economic development of Croatia. However, most ruling powers in Croatia, especially in the Habsburg era, did at least attempt to implement and introduce modern economic policies, even if they came to Croatia later than they appeared in the West. Also, the Croatian people in general seem to have rarely benefited from economic progress, and emigration from the country was common. There was furthermore a traditional distrust of financial institutions and an expectation of instability among a large part of the Croatian people.

Croatia could be viewed as similar to Russia in that both countries had a Communist system, but there are several differences. One of them is certainly that Communism lasted a shorter time in Yugoslavia than it did in the Soviet Union. Secondly, and more importantly, Soviet communism was much more isolationist and “orthodox”, as the USSR wanted to distance itself from the West and build its own empire. Yugoslav Communism, meanwhile, was under great economic and cultural influence from the West, and Yugoslavia belonged to no bloc.

The two countries are similar in their traumatic experience of the transition to capitalism. Therefore, the Croatian attitude to money was shaped by the facts of frequent political instability, changing currencies, the later adoption of Western trends, Socialism/Communism and transition to capitalism in the 1990s. These facts would contribute to a negative view of money – a view of the rich as people who take advantage of a crisis, of financial institutions as breakable, of money as a corrupting influence etc. However, Croatia still did take part in the processes of the Western world, and some wealth was accumulated in the country, even in Communist times – this would dampen the negative role of money in the culture at least somewhat.

Also, the influence of religion cannot be discounted. Croatia is a country with a Catholic heritage. Therefore, going by Weber’s classification, the Croatian attitude to money, work and poverty could be likened to the Italian and French, rather than the Protestant, one. Furthermore, Catholicism shares its compassionate view of the poor with Orthodoxy, considering the poor to be victims rather than lazy or offensive to God.

3. Phraseological units from the point of view of linguistics and translation studies

Phraseology can be defined as “an independent linguistic discipline that studies linguistic units within one or more languages that are characterized by a fixed structure” (Vidović Bolt, 2011, *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 72).⁷ In addition to their fixed structure, the linguistic units studied by phraseology are characterized by several other features as well:

- 1) Their EXPRESIVENESS (the ability to reflect the speaker’s emotions, attitudes and value judgments towards an aspect of reality)

⁷ „Samostalna jezikoslovna disciplina koja unutar jednog ili više jezika proučava jezične jedinice koje karakterizira čvrsta struktura...“

- 2) An extension of the meaning(s) of the linguistic unit's component(s). These meaning extensions can be based on METAPHOR (*to pull wool over someone's eyes* – 'to lie to, deceive someone' or METONYMY (*to be a skirt-chaser* – 'to be a seducer, lover of women')
- 3) Their INTEGRITY OF MEANING (IDIOMATICITY) – The meaning(s) of these linguistic units is distinct from the meaning(s) of their individual components
- 4) Their REPRODUCIBILITY – because of their fixed structure, these linguistic units are used in a very similar form by all speakers and are “stored” in the speakers’ memory in this form
- 5) Their syntactic and semantic correspondence to words and phrases. This means that these linguistic units must necessarily be shorter than a sentence. Therefore, they do not encompass proverbs and sayings. (Алефиренко, Семеновко 2009, Kovačević 2006. *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 82).

Even though English-language sources sometimes consider proverbs an object of study of phraseology, most of them still claim that phraseology studies *phraseological units*, or multi-word phrases, while proverbs are considered to be full sentences. Therefore, proverbs will not be looked at in this thesis.

The linguistic units studied by phraseology could therefore be defined the following way: “a relatively fixed, reproducible, expressive combination of words that usually has an integrated meaning “(Мокиенко 1980: 4, *as cited in* Бирик, Волхов, Никитина 1993:89)⁸

Finding a precise name for these linguistic units has proven to be a complex task, however. Therefore, several definitions and terms offered in Croatian, Russian and English-language sources will be examined in order to find an appropriate solution to this terminological problem.

Antica Menac, an eminent Croatian linguist, defines phraseology's object of study the following way: “The phraseology of a language consists of expressions with a fixed structure which came about in various ways and from various sources, and which reflect and illustrate

⁸ «Относительно устойчивое, воспроизводимое, экспрессивное сочетание слов, обладающее, как правило, целостным значением.»

a linguistic community's ways of thinking, attitudes, historical reminiscences, and connections to the outside world in a specific way." (Menac 1978: 219)⁹. Later on, she expanded this definition by making a distinction between *phraseology in the broader sense*¹⁰ and *phraseology in the narrow sense*¹¹. Phraseology in the narrow sense consists of groups of words that have a fixed form which is known and used by all speakers of the language. The individual meanings of their constituent words are distinct from the meaning of the expression as a whole. (Menac 1980: V as cited in Novoselec 2022: 72) Phraseology in the broader sense, according to Menac, consists of expressions whose meanings are dependent on the meanings of their individual constituents (Menac 1980: VII-VIII as cited in Novoselec 2022: 72)

Željka Fink-Arsovski also makes a distinction between phraseology in the narrow sense, which consists of expressions whose meaning is distinct from the meanings of their individual components, and phraseology in the broader sense, whose meanings are dependent on the meanings of their constituents. However, Fink does not believe phraseology encompasses discourse connectors, such as *on one hand*, *on the whole*, *in place of*, while considering collocations (*make a decision*, *nervous Nellie*) to be encompassed by phraseology. (Fink 2014:8 as cited in Novoselec 2022: 72)

Josip Matešić, another important Croatian linguist, initially claimed that phraseology's object of study was limited to expressions consisting of two lexical words (Matešić 1982: VI as cited in Novoselec 2022: 72). Later, however, he added expressions consisting of a lexical and a grammatical word to the definition. (Matešić 1988: V as cited in Novoselec 2022: 72)

Croatian-language source also mention the term *phraseological unit*. Jernej (1992/1993) and Kovačević (2006:7) consider the term to be synonymous with the term *idiom*, even though Kovačević admits that an all-encompassing term is needed. (Kovačević 2006: 5-6 as cited in (Novoselec 2022: 73). Jerolimov (2001: 88) also claims that the terms *phraseological unit*

⁹ „Frazеологiju једног језика творе изрази чврсто везане структуре, настали на различите начине и прidoшли из различитих извора, који сви заједно на специфичан начин одражавају и илустрирају тип мишљења, однос према стварима, повјесне реминисценције, везу с околним свијетом и још много тога, карактеристичног за једну језичну заједницу.“

¹⁰ frazeologija u širem smislu

¹¹ frazeologija u užem smislu

and *idiom* are synonymous and does not suggest a possible all-encompassing term (*as cited in Novoselec 2022: 73*).

From this overview, it is obvious that Croatian-language sources alone cannot be used in order to find a satisfactory term to encompass all possible variants of linguistic units with a fixed structure, as no consistent term has been agreed upon.

A more precise definition of the term *phraseological* unit, which can serve as an all-encompassing term for all possible variations of linguistic units with a fixed structure, can be found in the Russian-language sources used. In 1947, the Russian linguist Viktor Vladimirovich Vinogradov wrote an article in which he suggests the term *phraseological unit*¹² for phraseology's object of study. He further divided his phraseological units into three types.

1) *Phraseological fusions*¹³ - expressions whose meaning is completely independent of the meanings of their individual constituents; the meaning of the expression is not in any way influenced by the expression's structure.

Собаку съест в чѐм – 'to be very good at something', literally 'to eat a dog at something' (Виноградов 1947).

2) *Phraseological unities*¹⁴ – indivisible expressions that have a distinct meaning. However, this meaning is to some extent influenced by the meanings of the expression's individual constituents.

Плыть по течению – 'to fit in, do what everyone else does, swim with the tide', literally 'to swim with the current' (Виноградов 1947).

3) *Phraseological collocations*¹⁵ - expressions in which the constituents are seen as independent, one of the constituents has a metaphorical meaning, the other its literal one – the meaning of the expression is entirely dependent on the meanings of its constituents

¹² фразеологическая единица

¹³ Фразеологические сращения

¹⁴ фразеологические единства

¹⁵ фразеологические сочетания

Чёрная работа – 'hard, grueling physical labor' literally 'black labor' (Виноградов 1947).

As can be gathered from this overview, Vinogradov does indeed suggest that the term *phraseological unit* can be used to encompass all of the three types of expressions enumerated under one term. However, in order to ascertain that this meaning of the term can indeed be used cross-culturally, English-language sources are also examined.

The term *phraseological unit* is also used in English-language phraseology. The term was first used in 1969 by Weinreich: "A phraseological unit that involves at least two polysemous constituents, and in which there is a reciprocal contextual selection of subsenses, will be called an idiom. Thus, some phraseological units are idioms; others are not. "(Weinreich, 1969: 42). As is obvious from the definition, Weinreich also believes that "phraseological unit" is a term which encompasses idioms (*as cited in Novoselec 2022: 77*).

Gläser defined phraseological units as "(a) lexicalized, reproducible bilexemic or polylexemic word group in common use, which has relative syntactic and semantic stability, may be idiomatized, may carry connotations, and may have an emphatic or intensifying function in a text. "(Gläser 1998: 24 *as cited in Novoselec 2022: 77*).

Meanwhile, she defines idioms as "(...) dominant subtype within this all-embracing category, an idiom is a lexicalized, reproducible word group in common use, which has syntactic and semantic stability, and may carry connotations, but whose meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of its constituents. "(Gläser, 1998; 124). It can therefore be said that she also defines phraseological units as encompassing idioms. (*As cited in Novoselec 2022: 77*).

Since the term *phraseological unit* is used to encompass all possible types of metaphoric expressions with a fixed structure (as well as the other aspects mentioned above) both in English and in Russian phraseology, it can indeed be used cross-culturally in this meaning. The meaning of the Croatian term *frazološka jedinica* should also be expanded to include all possible variations of linguistic units with a fixed structure (as well as the other aspects mentioned above), as this would resolve the persistent problem of what these units should be named. For the purposes of this thesis, the term will be used to refer to said linguistic units in all three languages, both in order to, as mentioned, provide a solution to the problem of naming phraseology's object of study, and because that is the only term which could

encompass all the linguistic units found in the Russian, Croatian and English dictionaries used.

After phraseology's object of study has been defined and explained, it is now time to further explain some of their aforementioned primary traits.

As mentioned, phraseological extensions of meaning are based primarily on metaphor and metonymy.

Aristotle defines metaphor as a transfer of a name and meaning from one thing to another based on the principle of similarity – one should only use metaphor to refer to things that are in some way similar to each other (Aristotle 1997).

Metonymy, meanwhile, has three primary features.

- 1) It is a CONCEPTUAL PHENOMENON
- 2) It is a COGNITIVE PROCESS
- 3) It is based on an IDEALIZED COGNITIVE MODEL (Radden, Kövecses 2007: 335).

The first feature can be explained the following way:

Metonymy is “part of our everyday way of thinking, is grounded in our experience, is subject to general and systematic principles, and structures our thoughts and actions.” (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 8 *as cited in* Radden, Kövecses 2007: 335). Categories are an especially good example of this – an example of a category can stand in for the whole category if it considered prototypical enough. For instance, the housewife often stands in for the whole category of mothers. (Lakoff 1987: 79-80 *as cited in ibid.*: 336).

The second feature has the following explanation:

“Following Langacker (1993: 30), we will think of metonymy as a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity is mentally accessed via another entity” (*as cited in ibid.*). In a typical metonymic expression, the metonymic entity serves as a *vehicle* that helps us conceive of the entity referred to, or the *target*. (*ibid.*). For instance, using “Banski dvori”, the seat of the Croatian government, as a metonymy for the government itself, helps us picture the abstract idea of government ministers as a group by making us imagine the building.

Lastly, Lakoff explains *idealized cognitive models* by referring to our idea of Tuesday. Our concept of Tuesday depends on a division of the week into seven days, the number of workdays in that week, and the proximity of Tuesday to the weekend, as well as its relationship to Wednesday. All these concepts are social constructs and influenced by our culture - there is no such thing as a “weekend” or “Wednesday” in nature, and other cultures may divide time differently; In some cultures, a week could have more than seven days. Therefore, idealized cognitive models are views we have of the world that do not correspond to reality, but are shaped by our culture (Lakoff, 1987: 68-69 *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 50).

Taking all these factors into consideration, metonymy can be defined the following way:

“Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model.” (Radden, Kövecses 2007: 337).

Metonymies most often come in two types: 1) PART FOR WHOLE (*England* for the United Kingdom), (Radden, Kövecses 2007) or WHOLE FOR PART (*America* for the US) (Radden, Kövecses 1999: 31 *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 42).

2) PART FOR PART – PRODUCT FOR PRODUCER – I’ve got a Miele – I’ve got a washing machine (*ibid.*: 39 *as cited in ibid.*).

The last primary trait of phraseological units that needs to be further explained is IDIOMATICITY. Idiomaticity is a term that describes a particular trait of phraseological units – the fact that their meanings are at least partially distinct from the meanings of their constituents. (Makkai 1972 *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 78). Matešić defines it as “a change of meaning of at least one component of a linguistic unit”¹⁶ (Matešić 1978: 213 *as cited in* Novoselec 2022: 79).

¹⁶ „Idiomatičnost znači značenjsku promjenu, značenjsko preinačenje bar jednoga člana jezične jedinice.“

Now that phraseological units and their primary traits have been explained, it is time to explain the notion of *phraseological equivalence*, as well as enumerate the translation strategies as part of which each type of *phraseological equivalent* could best be used.

A *phraseological equivalent* is a phraseological unit in one language that has the same meaning and/or form as a phraseological unit in another language. Equivalents can be *total* and *partial*. *Total equivalents* are identical or similar in meaning, internal form, and register. *Partial equivalents*, meanwhile, have the same or similar meanings, but are different in terms of internal form or register. (Andreici 2016:154).

Translation can be defined as “the expression in the target language of what has been expressed in the source language, preserving stylistic and semantic equivalences” (Bell 1991: 5). All kinds of words and expressions can change their structure or connotations in the process of translation, as languages are distinct systems with their own rules. This is doubly true for phraseological units, as they especially reflect the cultural notions of a language’s speakers due to their aforementioned primary traits. Therefore, the translation of phraseological units is often a troublesome process and the strategies for doing so are, like the aforementioned phraseological equivalents, varied and complex.

It is also important to note that translation strategies are a cognitive process, decisions taken on the part of the translator during the process of translation itself, and can thus be applied in full only to texts, not individual (in this case) phraseological units that may be equivalent.

The first translation strategy as part of which translation equivalents can be used is translating a text in which a phraseological unit in the source language is replaced with a phraseological unit in the target language with a similar meaning and form. “This (strategy would include) using a (phraseological unit) in the target language which conveys roughly the same meaning and consists of equivalent lexical items” (Baker 1992: 72).

Some examples of this strategy in use would be:

1) Translating a text in which the translator made the choice to translate the Croatian phraseological unit *jedva spajati kraj s krajem* – ‘to be very poor’ with its English total equivalent *to barely make ends meet* – ‘to be very poor’.

2) Translating a text in which the translator made the choice to translate the Croatian phraseological unit *prati/oprati novce* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money' with its Russian total equivalent *отмыть/отмывать деньги* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money'.

As can be seen from the examples, this strategy uses primarily total phraseological equivalents. Because of this, it is used relatively rarely in texts where phraseological units are present. However, some things need to be kept in mind even with this approach.

- 1) The first of these is the register in which the phraseological units are commonly used in the two languages – a formal phraseological unit in one language could potentially be considered vulgar in another.
- 2) The associative meanings of the phraseological unit's constituent words.
- 3) The frequency of the phraseological unit in question in the two languages (Pavlović 2015: 90).

The second available translation strategy is translating a text in which a phraseological unit in the source language is replaced with a phraseological unit in the target language that has a similar meaning but a different form (Baker:1992). “This strategy (would encompass) using (a phraseological unit) in the TL that conveys a similar meaning as the SL (phraseological unit) but consists of different lexical items” (Baker 1992: 74).

An example of this would be translating a text in which the translator made the choice to replace the English phraseological unit *to want to have your cake and eat it, too* – ‘to want everything without exception’ with its Croatian partial equivalent *htjeti i ovce i novce* – 'to want everything without exception'. As can be seen from the example given, this strategy uses primarily partial phraseological equivalents in texts where phraseological units are present.

The next strategy available to translators is paraphrasing. This is used in texts where “there are no equivalents in the TL, or they are stylistically inappropriate” (Baker 1992: 74).

To use Nataša Pavlović's example, the technique of paraphrasing would be used in a text in which the translator made the choice to translate the English phraseological unit *couch potato*

– ‘a physically inactive person who constantly sits in front of the television’ as *Stalno sjedi pred televizorom*, as Croatian has no equivalent phraseological unit. (Pavlović 2015: 91)

The strategy of omission is also available to translators. This strategy is used in texts where the translator simply made the choice to omit a difficult lexical or phraseological unit that has no equivalent in the source language. However, this strategy is not recommended, as it could show a lack of skill or effort on the part of the translator.

Furthermore, the strategy of literal translation can be used. This is used in texts where the translator made the choice to literally translate a source text lexical or phraseological unit into their own language. This requires a lot of skill, and cooperation on the part of the other speakers of the language, who need to accept the new lexical or phraseological unit, and is therefore not advised. However, it has historically been used to “transfer” concepts from one culture to another. An example of this process are the Russian and Croatian translations of Winston Churchill’s “Iron Curtain speech”, as part of which the English phraseological unit *Iron Curtain* arrived into both Russian and Croatian – *Iron Curtain* – *Željezna zavjesa* – *Железный занавес*.

Lastly, the strategy of compensation could be used. This means that, while translating a text, the translator can decide to omit a lexical or phraseological unit that was present in the source text, and thereafter use a phraseological or unique lexical unit at a later part of the text where no phraseological or unique lexical unit existed in the original.

After this short overview of the theoretical framework, it is now time to move on to the next part, consisting of the methodology of the thesis, the research questions, hypotheses, and the corpus of the phraseological units themselves.

4. Methodology

Before the research questions are posed, the hypotheses are set and the corpus of the phraseological units presented, the full methodology of the thesis is explained.

Firstly, the analyzed phraseological units in the tables are collected from several Croatian, English-Croatian and Croatian-Russian dictionaries. These are:

- 1) *Rusko-hrvatski frazeološki rječnik (Русско-хорватский фразеологический словарь)*, published in 2019 and compiled by Željka Fink-Arsovski, Valery Mokienko, Anita Hrnjak and Branka Barčot
- 2) *Hrvatsko-ruski frazeološki rječnik (Хорватско-русский фразеологический словарь)*, published in 2011 and compiled by Antica Menac. Željka Fink-Arsovski, Irina Mironova Blažina and Radomir Venturin
- 3) *Frazeološki rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskog jezika*, published in 1982 and compiled by Josip Matešić
- 4) *Hrvatski frazeološki rječnik*, published in 2003 and compiled by Antica Menac. Željka Fink-Arsovski and Radomir Venturin
- 5) *Фразеологический словарь современного русского литературного языка*, published in 2004 and compiled by A. V. Korol'kova, A. G. Lomov and A. N. Tihonova
- 6) *Englesko-hrvatski frazeološki rječnik*, published in 2006 and compiled by Ivana Bendow
- 7) *Hrvatsko-engleski frazeološki rječnik*, published in 2008 and compiled by Dalibor Vrgoč and Željka Fink-Arsovski

These are the only dictionaries from which the phraseological units in the tables were compiled and the entire thesis relies exclusively on phraseological units found therein. The phraseological units from the aforementioned dictionaries are first written down, and then checked in English, Croatian and Russian corpora found through Sketch Engine. The corpus hrWaC is used for Croatian, English Web 2018 (enTenTen18) and English Web 2015 were used for English, and Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17) was used for Russian. The corpora provide data on the frequency of the compiled phraseological units in actual texts, as well as information related to the context of their use.

The phraseological units to be analyzed are primarily chosen according to the so-called structural principle. This principle is at work when “the criterion according to which (phraseological units) are chosen to be analyzed is the presence of components in the

(phraseological unit)'s structure that point to a certain concept “(Zykova 2019: 97)¹⁷. This means that the phraseological units chosen for analysis mostly contain either the component *money/novac /деньги* or related ones (*lipa, penny, dollars, bucks, копейка, копеечка*). The similar and related components *fortune, riches, zlato* appear occasionally as well. The principle is only deviated from in cases where a phraseological unit in one language has the component *money, копеечка* etc. while its equivalent in another language does not (*htjeti i ovce i novce* – Croatian – *to want to have your cake and eat it, too* – English, *влетело в копеечку*, Russian – *koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana* – Croatian).

The linguistic part of the analysis is conducted in the following way. As mentioned, the concept and types of phraseological equivalence, as well as the various strategies as part of which these phraseological equivalents could be used, are explained above, in the theoretical framework part of the thesis. The phraseological equivalents belonging to each type of equivalence (total, partial) and that could most easily be used as part of a particular translation strategy are listed under that type and strategy and then counted. From this, a conclusion is reached on what types of phraseological equivalents could best be used as part of which translation strategy, as well as which types of equivalents are most common between each language pair.

5. Research questions and hypotheses

Based on rather extensive analyses of the Croatian, Russian and primary Anglosphere (US; UK) cultures, the collected phraseological units from various Russian, Croatian and English dictionaries and the overview of the translation of phraseological units and its associated problems, the following research questions may be posed:

- 1) Are the described features of and differences between the Russian, Croatian and Anglosphere cultural attitudes to money, work, wealth, poverty etc. reflected in and by the phraseological units collected? If so, in what ways and to what extent?
- 2) Do the collected phraseological units reflect a difference in the UK and US cultural attitudes to money?

¹⁷ „kriterij odabira (frazema za analizu) je prisutnost u strukturi frazema onih sastavnica koje označavaju neku pojavu.“

- 3) Which types of phraseological equivalents are most common between each language pair?
- 4) Which types of translation strategies can each type of phraseological equivalent best be used within?
- 5) Will there be any difference in the types of phraseological equivalents that are most common between each language pair, as well as the translation strategies these are best used within?

Additionally, several hypotheses can be made in relation to the posed research questions:

- 1) The cultural attitudes to money in Croatia, Russia, and the primary Anglosphere countries (US, UK) that were described in the theoretical framework are reflected in the phraseological units of the language – for example, wealth is viewed more positively in English phraseological units than in Russian or Croatian ones. Meanwhile, poverty is viewed more positively in Russian and Croatian.
- 2) The difference in the US and UK conceptualizations of money is small enough to not be reflected in the collected phraseological units; the two cultures' attitudes to money can be grouped under the "Anglosphere" cultural attitude.
- 3) There are more total phraseological equivalents, and therefore more equivalents that could best be used as part of the most convenient translation strategy (translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has both a similar form and meaning) between Croatian and Russian than between either language and English, due to Croatian and Russian's common origins. Meanwhile, partial translation equivalents, that can be best be used as part of the translation strategy of translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has a similar form, but a different meaning are more common between genetically unrelated languages.

6. The corpus

The analyzed corpus of phraseological units is first grouped into semantic fields according to the aspect of the analyzed cultures' attitudes to money (and related concepts) that they refer to. The phraseological units found in the dictionaries used are grouped into the following semantic fields: 1) EXTRAVAGANCE 2) SPENDING A LOT OF MONEY IN VAIN 3) ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED TO MONEY 4) A LARGE AMOUNT OF

MONEY 5) SAVING MONEY 6) EXPENSIVENESS 7) CHEAPNESS 8) WORTHLESSNESS 9) MISERLINESS 10) MAKING MONEY 11) POVERTY and 12) WEALTH. Additionally, several phraseological units found in the dictionaries used have the component *money* in their structure, but their meanings are unrelated to money, or any other concept connected to it. These are grouped together, despite their disparate meanings.

In the tables, the Russian phraseological units are enumerated in the first column, the Croatian phraseological units in the middle one, and the English phraseological units in the last one. Russian is therefore considered to be the “source” language, and the phraseological units of the other two languages are considered translation equivalents of the Russian ones. This is done because of the hypothesis that the phraseological units collected reflect structural and cultural differences between English and Russian. as well as the positioning of the Croatian culture and language between English and Russian. The languages are also ordered from the attitude to money that is assumed to be the most negative, to the one that is assumed to be the most positive.

The phraseological units in each semantic field are organized in alphabetical order. Since Russian is considered the “source” language, the Russian phraseological units are organized alphabetically, while the phraseological units of the other two languages are organized according to which Russian phraseological unit is their closest equivalent.

Furthermore, phraseological units that can be considered to be total equivalents are pointed out by means of a comment printed in italic.

Phraseological units that consist of the same (or almost the same) individual constituents as well as synonymous meanings are considered to have both a similar form and meaning, that is, to be total equivalents. The prototypical examples of this category would be phraseological units that correspond to the principle shown by Nataša Pavlović’s examples – *to play a role – igrati ulogu, to play with fire – igrati se vatrom* (Pavlović 2015: 90). From the tables, the translation equivalents *бросать деньги на ветер – bacati novac u vjetar* are a clear example. Because total equivalents have both a **similar** form and meaning, equivalents such

as *ne vrijediti ni prebijene pare – гроша медного (ломанного) не стоит* and *за большими деньгами ехать (знаться) – ganjati novce*, are also considered to be part of this category for the purposes of this thesis, as they have identical structures and use the same lexical items in at least one variant (*ломанный and prebijeni* both mean “beaten”, *знаться* and *ganjati* both mean “to chase”). The only differences between the phraseological units are slight syntactic ones (such as the presence of the preposition *за* – ‘after’ in Russian, which is not present in Croatian).

When nothing of the sort is pointed out, it is assumed that the phraseological units are partial equivalents.

1) EXTRAVAGANCE

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
бросаться (швыряться) деньгами - -to be spendthrift, to save no money at all	razbacivati se novcem – to be spendthrift, to save no money at all <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to throw <your> money around (about) - to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly, to be extravagant (spendthrift), to throw money around, to spend money pointlessly, recklessly. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
сорить (сыпать) деньгами - to be spendthrift, to save no money at all	prosipati/prosuti (rasipati) novac – 1) to spend a lot of money recklessly	to throw <your> money around (about) - to be spendthrift, to waste money
до <последней> копейки (копеечки) [истратить, отдать] – to spend, give away all your money has the meaning of “extravagance” only in some contexts.	do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati] – to spend, give away all your money has the meaning of “extravagance” only in some contexts. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to spend up to the hilt - to spend, give away all your money. has the meaning of “extravagance” only in some contexts.

<p>издержать, (истратить) последний грош – to spend the last of one's money has the meaning of “extravagance” only in some contexts</p>	<p>do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati] - to spend the last of one's money has the meaning of “extravagance” only in some contexts.</p>	<p>to spend up to the hilt - to spend the last of one's money.</p> <p>to spend up to the hilt is only equivalent to do posljednje pare/до последней копейки in collocations with the verbs <i>to spend, to give</i></p>
	<p>žuljaju novci koga - to love spending money, to be incapable of saving it</p> <p>svrbe novci koga - to love spending money, to be incapable of saving it</p>	
		<p>to blow your money –to spend all of one’s money on unneeded things</p>
		<p>throw money at someone, something ‘to spend too much money on someone, something’</p>

2) SPENDING A LOT OF MONEY IN VAIN

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
<p>бросать деньги на ветер - -to spend large amounts of money pointlessly</p>	<p>bacati novac u vjetar -to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly</p> <p><i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i></p>	
	<p>bacati novac – to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly, to be extravagant (spendthrift), to</p>	

	throw money around, to spend money recklessly	
--	---	--

3) ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
грязные деньги – illegally acquired money.	prljavi novac – illegally acquired money. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	
отмыть/отмывать деньги – the process of legalizing illegally acquired money.	prati novac - the process of legalizing illegally acquired money. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to launder money - - the process of legalizing illegally acquired money. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
	krvavi novac - money made through murder or mafia dealings	blood money - money made through murder or mafia dealings. <i>Total equivalent to the Croatian phraseological units</i>
	Judine škude - money gained as a bribe in exchange for betrayal	

4) A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
бешенные деньги [отдать, платить, заплатить, стоять] – a lot of money, a large amount of money	masne pare [dati, zarađivati, dobivati, koštati, prodati kupiti] – a lot of money, a large amount of money	good money – a lot of money, a large amount of money
	lova do krova – a lot of money, a large amount of money	

большая (шальная) деньга – a lot of money	krupan (velik) novac – a lot of money <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	a pile (mint) of money – a lot of moneyx
хорошие деньги – a lot of money	lijepi novci – a lot of money	a pretty penny – a lot of money <i>Total equivalent to the Croatian phraseological unit</i>
хорошие деньги – a lot of money	lijepi novci – a lot of money	good money – a lot of money, a large amount of money <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>
	krupan (velik) novac – a lot of money	serious money – a lot of money
лишняя деньга – more money than necessary		

5) SAVING MONEY

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
беречь (откладывать) <деньги> на (про) чёрный день – to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble	čuvati (ostavljati) bijele novce za crne dane - to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to save (keep) money for a rainy day - to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
держатъ деньги в чулке – to keep one's money at home, not to save at a bank	držati novce u čarapi - to keep one's money at home, not to save at a bank <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	

6) EXPENSIVENESS

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
		to cost a pretty penny – something is expensive.
влетело (влетает) в копеечку (копейку) кому, чему - something is expensive, has a high price	koštati kao suho zlato – something is expensive, has a high price	to cost a fortune – something is very expensive
влетело (влетает) в копеечку (копейку) кому, чему – something is expensive, has a high price	koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana - something is expensive, has a high price	to cost a fortune – something is very expensive

7) CHEAPNESS

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
за гроши [купить, продать] – to buy, sell very cheaply	za bagatelu [kupiti, prodati] – to buy, sell very cheaply	
за небольшие деньги – cheap	za male novce – cheap <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	
ни копейки – a negligible amount of money	ni lipe – a negligible amount of money <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	
за копейку [уступить, отдать] –prodati, dati – to sell, to give – very cheaply		

8) WORTHLESNESS

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
---------	----------	---------

грош цена <в базарный день> кому, чему - something is worthless, has no value	ne vrijediti ni pet para – something is worthless, has no value	not to be worth a red cent – to be utterly worthless, useless
гроша медного (ломанного, железного) не стоит – something is worthless, has no value	ne vrijediti ni prebijene pare - something is worthless, has no value <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	not to be worth a red cent – to be utterly worthless, useless <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
<ни> в грош не ставить кого, что – to not consider something important, to devalue something	ne dati za koga, što ni pet para - to not consider something important, to devalue something	
ни за грош [пропадать, погибать, губить] – for no reason, needlessly, in vain [to fail, to die]		

9) MISERLINESS

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
дорожить (дрожать) <над> каждой копеей – to be miserly, overly obsessed with saving money		
за копейку удавится кто - someone is miserly	imati zmiju (kobru) u džepu (novčaniku) – someone is miserly	
	biti tvrd na novcu – miserliness	to be penny wise and pound foolish – miserliness

10) MAKING MONEY

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
гнать, (грести, заколачивать, зашибать)	mlatiti/namlatiti (zgrtati) pare (lovu) – to make a lot of money	to make a killing – to make a lot of money.

деньгу – to make a lot of money		
грести (загребать) деньги лопатой – <i>прост.</i> – to make a lot of money without effort	dizati (silne) novce – to make a lot of money easily	to make a quick buck - - to make money quickly and easily
заведётся <лишний> грош в кармане – to make enough money with a lot of effort	skucati pare – 'to make barely enough money with a lot of effort'	
		to make money hand over fist –to make a lot of money, to get rich
за большими деньгами [ехать, гнаться] – to want to make a lot of money	ganjati novce - to want to make a lot of money <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to chase money – to want to make a lot of money. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
кровные деньги – money made with great effort through hard work		

11) POVERTY

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
ни гроша <за душой> нет у кого – one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably	nemati ni prebijene pare - one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to not have a penny (cent) to your name - to have no money at all <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i>
без гроша <в кармане> [быть, оставаться] – to be completely without money, to lose all your money	biti (ostati) bez prebijene pare – to be completely without money, to lose all your money <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to be flat broke - to have no money at all
с копейки (гроша) на копейку [перебиваться скакать, перепрыгивать] – to be very poor		

	izgubiti cijelo bogatstvo – to lose a lot of money, to be impoverished	to lose money hand over fist - to lose a lot of money, to be impoverished
		to not have a red cent to <your> name – to have no money at all
		to not have a bean - one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably
		to not have two pennies to rub together - one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably
		to be down to your bottom dollar – one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably.

12) WEALTH

RUSSIAN	CROATIAN	ENGLISH
быть при деньгах – to have the means needed to do, buy something	biti pri novcu (lovi, parama) – to have money, to be well-to-do, to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment <i>Total equivalent to the Russian phraseological unit</i>	to be in the money - to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment. <i>Total equivalent to the Russian and Croatian phraseological units</i> . to be in funds - to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment. to have money to spend - to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment.

денег куры не клюют у кого – someone has a lot of money. Someone who never lacks for money	<p>ležati (spavati, sjediti) na novcu (parama) – to be very rich, to have a lot of money</p> <p>plivati (valjati se) u novcu (parama) – to be very rich, to have a lot of money.</p> <p>biti pun para –to be very rich</p>	<p>to be rolling in money - biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca.</p> <p>.</p> <p>to wallow in riches - to be very rich, to have a lot of money</p>
лишняя денъга - to have more money than necessary	imati para kao blata (pljeve) - to have more money than necessary	to have money to burn - to have more money than necessary.
	imati para na bacanje - to have more money than necessary	to be filthy rich – have a lot of money, more than necessary

ENGLISH AND CROATIAN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS (OR THEIR EQUIVALENTS) THAT CONTAIN THE COMPONENT “MONEY”, BUT WHOSE MEANING IS UNRELATED TO ANY OF THE AFOREMENTIONED ASPECTS OF THAT CONCEPT

ENGLISH	CROATIAN
to want to have your cake and eat it, too – wanting everything without exception	htjeti (željeti) i ovce i novce - wanting everything without exception
to be right on the money – to say or do just the right thing, to be right	pogoditi u sridu - to say or do just the right thing, to be right
to put your money where your mouth is – to live in accordance with one’s principles	prijeći s riječi na djela - to live in accordance to one’s principles
smart money - a safe bet	sigurna oklada - a safe bet
dollars do doughnuts - to be completely certain of something	kladiti se u zadnju paru - to be completely certain of something
to be two a penny - something is not rare	mali milijun čega - something is not rare
to pass the buck - to switch responsibility for one’s own mistakes to someone else	

7. Analysis and discussion

In this part of the thesis, the veracity of the hypotheses is determined. The first two hypotheses (that the collected phraseological units reflect the cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework, and that the collected phraseological units will reflect a shared “Anglosphere” attitude to money and related concepts) are examined first, as they relate to the cultural analysis of the phraseological units collected. The third hypothesis, that simple translation strategies are used more often between Croatian and Russian, is examined later, in the linguistic part of the analysis.

a) Cultural analysis

The hypothesis that the cultural attitudes to money will be reflected in the phraseological units is confirmed only partially. The cultural attitudes to money and related concepts described in the theoretical framework are indeed reflected in some of the semantic fields. Yet, in others, the cultural attitudes are either reflected partially, or not at all. This can be seen in the following examples.

1) EXTRAVAGANCE

The hypothesis that the collected phraseological units reflect the cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework is confirmed in the semantic field of EXTRAVAGANCE.

As can be expected, extravagance is connotated negatively in all three languages. This is confirmed by the fact that the meanings and definitions of most of the phraseological units grouped under this semantic field contain the words and expressions ‘recklessly’, ‘pointlessly’, ‘spendthrift’, and ‘give away all your money’.

This negative attitude towards extravagance can be said to come from Catholicism and Orthodoxy in Croatian and Russian, respectively. Both of these Christian denominations command people to help the poor, which would be hindered by spending too much money. Catholicism and Orthodoxy also condemn greed, or the acquisition of money purely for one’s own hedonistic purposes. The negative attitudes towards extravagance in the Croatian and Russian phraseological units grouped under this semantic field is also motivated by the money troubles the two countries had throughout their history, which caused the middle classes in the two countries to be smaller than it was in the English-speaking countries.

Meanwhile, the negative attitude towards extravagance in the English-language phraseological units is motivated by Protestantism, which commands its adherents to acquire money, but for the purpose of glorifying God, which would be impossible if one spent a lot of money for one's own pleasure.

Four phraseological units relating to the semantic field of extravagance were found in the Russian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *бросаться (швыряться) деньгами* – 'to be spendthrift, to save no money at all', 2) *сорить (сыпать) деньгами* – 'to be spendthrift, to save no money at all', 3) *до последней копейки (копеечки) [истратить, отдать]* – 'to spend, give away all your money', 4) *издержать (истратить) последний грош* – 'to spend, give away all your money'.

Five phraseological units relating to the semantic field of extravagance are found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *razbacivati se novcem* – 'to be spendthrift, to save no money at all', 2) *prosipati/prosuti (rasipati) novac* – 'to spend a lot of money recklessly', 3) *do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati]* – 'to spend, give away all your money' 4) *žuljaju novci koga* – 'to love spending money, to be incapable of saving it', 5) *svrbe novci koga* – 'to love spending money, to be incapable of saving it'

Four phraseological relating to the semantic field of extravagance are also found in the English dictionaries used. These are: 1) *to throw <your> money around (about)* – 'to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly' 2) *to spend up to the hilt* – 'to spend the last of one's money' 3) *to blow your money* – 'to spend all of one's money on unneeded things' 4) *to throw money at someone/something* – 'to spend too much money on someone, something'

The second hypothesis is also confirmed by the phraseological units grouped under the semantic field of extravagance, as the English phraseological units do not show a difference in the US and UK attitudes towards the concept.

2) SPENDING A LOT OF MONEY IN VAIN

The hypothesis that the collected phraseological units reflect the cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework is confirmed in the semantic field of SPENDING A LOT OF MONEY IN VAIN.

One phraseological unit with the meaning of ‘spending a lot of money in vain’ is found in Russian dictionaries used. This is *бросать деньги на ветер* – ‘to spend large amounts of money pointlessly’. Meanwhile, in Croatian, two phraseological units relating to this semantic field are found in the dictionaries used. These are *bacati novce u vjetar* – ‘to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly’ and *bacati novac* - ‘to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly’. As can be seen from the meanings of the phraseological units, this semantic field is connotated negatively in both Russian and Croatian. Phraseological units related to this semantic field were not found in the English dictionaries used, which seems to indicate that this concept was not as significant in US and UK culture as it was in the Croatian and Russian ones. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

The presence of these phraseological units in Croatian and Russian, as well as their inherent negative bent, can be explained by the fact that, as mentioned above, the middle class was much smaller in both countries than it was in either the US and UK, and poverty was much more widespread. This would cause greater class resentment among the less well-off parts of the population. This resentment would be conducive to the development of the idea that the wealthy had to be spendthrift and wasteful with their money. The condemnation of the capitalist class’s greed and wastefulness was also an integral part of Marxist ideology, which for a long time was the official ideology of both countries.

During both countries’ transition to capitalism in the 1990s, a wealthy class did appear which was stereotyped as having acquired their money through dishonest means, wasting their money and having no class. These behaviors additionally strengthened the concept expressed in this semantic field in the minds of the Croatian and Russian populations.

As to the second hypothesis, no phraseological units relating to the semantic field of SPENDING A LOT OF MONEY IN VAIN are found in the English dictionaries used, either for American English, or for British English. This seems to indicate the concept is less significant than in Croatian and Russian both in American English and in British English. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

3) ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY

This is another semantic field in which the conclusions from the theoretical framework are confirmed. As can be expected, illegal actions connected with money are connotated extremely negatively in all three languages.

Both of the Russian phraseological units grouped under this semantic field (*грязные деньги* – 'illegally acquired money', and *отмыть/отмывать деньги* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money') are primarily be used in the language of the newspapers. This is related to the fact that illegal actions connected to money became especially prominent in the 1990s, which was both a time of increased press freedom under the *perestroika* policy and a time of transition from communism to capitalism. Because the press was freer, the newspapers reported on illegal actions connected to money, a large problem in society at the time, very often. "Still, in the 1990s, the word 'money', and related words were used in the language of the media very often." (Ощепкова 2014:103).¹⁸

HrWaC, the Croatian corpus used, shows that the Croatian equivalents of these phraseological units (*prljavi novac* – 'illegally acquired money' and *prati/oprati novac* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money') are also most often used in newspapers. This is connected to the fact that similar processes of transition from capitalism to communism and increased press liberalization also took place in Croatia in the 1990s. Two further phraseological relating to the semantic field of "illegal actions connected to money" were found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *krvavi novac* – 'money made through murder or mafia dealings', 2) *Judine škude* – 'money gained as a bribe in exchange for betrayal' Both of these also have extremely negative connotations. The phraseological unit *Judine škude* refers to the Biblical story of Judas, who betrayed Jesus Christ for thirty pieces of silver (this also relates to Croatia's Catholic heritage). The meaning of the phraseological unit *krvavi novac* can be connected to the period of increased organized criminal activity in the 1990s, during the chaotic period of war and transition.

Of the two English phraseological units found that relate to the semantic field of 'illegal actions connected with money' (*launder money* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired

¹⁸ «Однако в СМИ в целом слово 'деньги' и связанные с ним в 90-е годы стали употребляться чрезвычайно часто».

money' and *blood money* – 'money made through murder or mafia dealings'), no evidence was found that would limit their usage to a certain type of text – these phraseological units are used in all types of text in English. This could be connected to the fact that English-speaking countries have been capitalist for a very long and, more importantly, uninterrupted, period of time. Therefore, talk of financial malfeasance had the time to spread to all types of text. The meaning of the phraseological unit *blood money* relates to the presence of the Italian Mafia in US cities.

The greater number of phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “illegal actions connected with money” found in the Croatian dictionaries used in comparison to the English and Russian ones seems to indicate a higher awareness of these phenomena existed in Croatian culture. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

The phraseological units related to the semantic field “illegal actions connected with money” show a difference in the US and UK conceptualizations of money, as the meaning of the phraseological unit *blood money* relates to US culture – the mafia was not nearly as prominent in British culture as it was in US culture.

4) A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY

This is a semantic field in which it cannot be said if the conclusions from the theoretical framework are not reflected, as there is not enough evidence. A clear positive or negative attitude towards the concept is not reflected in the phraseological units. There is corpus evidence, for instance, that the Russian phraseological unit *хорошие деньги* – 'a lot of money' is connotated somewhat positively, or that the Croatian phraseological unit *masne pare* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money' is connotated negatively. However, most of the phraseological units have examples of both positive and negative usage in the corpora, and evidence for the emotional bent of any phraseological unit in this semantic field is not firm.

The number of phraseological units found cannot help us reach a conclusion about whether the phraseological units reflect the cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework or not either. There are four phraseological units each found in the dictionaries used for the English, Russian and Croatian. These are:

1) *бешенные деньги* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money' 2) *большая (шальная) денюга* – 'a lot of money' 3) *хорошие деньги* – 'a lot of money' 4) *лишняя денюга* – 'more money than necessary' for Russian

1) *good money* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money' 2) *a pile (mint) of money* – 'a lot of money' 3) *a pretty penny* – 'a lot of money' 4) *serious money* – 'lot of money' in English

1) *masne pare* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money' 2) *lova do krova* – 'a large amount of money, a lot of money' 3) *krupan (velik) novac* – 'a lot of money' 4) *lijepi novci* – 'a lot of money' in Croatian. This, combined with the lack of evidence on the emotional bent of the phraseological units is not enough evidence to come to a conclusion on whether they reflect the cultural attitudes from the theoretical framework or not.

It can, however, be said that the phraseological units reflect no difference between the US and UK attitudes towards money.

5) SAVING MONEY

This is a semantic field in which the hypothesis that the collected phraseological units reflect the conclusions made in the theoretical framework is confirmed.

The Russian phraseological unit *беречь (откладывать) <деньги> на (про) чёрный день* – 'to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble' has direct equivalents in both Croatian and English - *čuvati bijele novce za crne dane, save (keep) money for a rainy day*. All three phraseological units are also positively connotated. This points to the fact that saving money was considered important in all the cultures analyzed, for different reasons. In Croatian and Russian culture, saving money is considered important because most Croatian and Russian people did not have a lot of money for most of their nations' histories, due to the frequent political changes and economic troubles that their countries went through.

In US and British culture, saving money is considered important because of Protestant ideals, according to which money needed to be earned as much as possible and spent as little as possible, as mentioned before.

Directly equivalent phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “saving money” were found in the Russian and Croatian dictionaries used that were not found in the English ones. These direct equivalents are the phraseological units *držati novce u čarapi – держать деньги в чулке* – ‘to keep one's money at home, not to save at a bank’. This is connected to the mistrust of banks that existed in Russian and Croatian culture, but not in Anglosphere ones (to such a large extent). The Croatian mistrust of banks comes from the period of transition to capitalism in the 1990s, when a lot of financial malfeasance took place, including in the sphere of banking. However, the Croatian mistrust of banks did not originate in the 1990s – it can be traced as far back as the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, when a lot of Austrian banks failed and people, having lost all their paper money, began keeping their coins at home.

The Russian mistrust of banks can be traced back to the time of Peter the Great. Banking was one of the Western innovations introduced by Peter into Russia and was perceived by many people as foreign and unfit for Russia. The dislike of banks is also connected to the transition from communism to capitalism that took place in Russia in the 1990s, much as it did in Croatia.

The second hypothesis is also confirmed – the English phraseological unit found does not show any difference between the US and UK attitudes to money.

6) EXPENSIVENESS

This is another semantic field in which it cannot be said if the conclusions from the theoretical framework are not reflected, as there is not enough evidence. The meanings of the phraseological units collected do not reflect the cultural attitudes from the theoretical framework, or indeed much else – all the phraseological units grouped under this semantic field have a neutral emotional bent. The one notable fact connected to the structures and meanings of the phraseological units is the etymology behind the Croatian phraseological unit *koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana* – ‘something is expensive, has a high price’.

The number of phraseological units collected from the dictionaries used seems to reflect the cultural attitudes from the theoretical framework. Only one phraseological unit was found in

the Russian dictionaries used (*влетело в копеечку* –'something is very expensive'), while two were found in Croatian and English each. These are:

1) *koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana* –'something is expensive, has a high price' and 2) *koštati kao suho zlato* –'something is expensive, has a high price' for Croatian

1) *to cost a pretty penny* –'something is expensive and 2) *to cost a fortune* – 'something is very expensive' in English.

This equal number of phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “expensiveness” in Croatian and English seems to indicate that the Croatian attitude towards money is closer to the US and UK attitude towards money than the Russian one is. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

The etymology of the Croatian phraseological unit *košta kao svetog Petra kajgana* is interesting enough to be analyzed more closely. There are two primary theories about where this phraseological unit comes from. One of them is that the phraseological unit is derived from a legend of Saint George. According to this legend, a young man made scrambled eggs for Saint George to honor him and left the scrambled eggs in a church. Four tradesmen later came to the church in order to thank God, and being tired and hungry, they ate the scrambled eggs. Saint George was enraged that the tradesmen took something that did not belong to them and would not let them leave the church until they paid for their freedom. The tradesmen then exclaimed that saint George’s scrambled eggs are too expensive. Over the course of history, the name of Saint George was replaced in this expression with that of Saint Peter. (Šipka 2010: 96-98).

According to another, more widely known story, Jesus and Saint Peter spent the night in a village woman’s house one time. She took them in and made them scrambled eggs but warned them that her husband was a drunk who would hurt them when he came home. When the husband indeed came home, he saw two strangers in his house and, assuming them to be thieves, he beat one of them, Saint Peter, with a stick. Peter then asked Jesus to switch places with him in the bed they were sleeping in. The husband then came back, remembering he had forgotten to beat the other thief, and beat Saint Peter again. After two beatings, Saint Peter decided the scrambled eggs were too expensive and not worth it. (Kovačević 2017)

Both of these theories reflect the Christian/Catholic heritage of Croatia.

One of the phraseological units found in the English dictionaries used (*to cost a pretty penny*) contains a British coin in its form. Still, adds no nuance to the phraseological unit's meaning that would make it different than the other one (*to cost a fortune* – 'to be too expensive'). Therefore, it can be said that the phraseological units reflect no difference between the US and UK attitudes to expensiveness, reflecting a shared "Anglosphere" attitude towards it instead.

7) CHEAPNESS

This is yet another semantic field in which it cannot be determined whether the cultural attitudes explained in the theoretical framework are reflected or not for lack of evidence. There are four phraseological units relating to the semantic field of "cheapness" that are found in the Russian dictionaries used - *за гроши [купить, продать]* – 'to buy, sell very cheaply', *за небольшие деньги* – 'cheaply', *ни копейки* – 'a negligible amount of money' and *за копейку [уступить, отдать]* – 'to sell, give very cheaply'). Only *за гроши* is negatively connotated according to data from the Russian corpus used – ruTenTen17. The rest have no emotional bent.

In the Croatian dictionaries used, three phraseological units were found. These are 1) *за bagatelu [kupiti, prodati]* - 'to buy, sell very cheaply', *за male novce* – 'cheaply' and *ni lipe* – 'a negligible amount of money'. Only *за bagatelu [kupiti, prodati]* is negatively connotated, according to data from the Croatian corpus used – hrWaC. The rest have a neutral emotional bent. All this is not enough evidence to come to a conclusion on whether the phraseological units reflect the cultural attitudes from the theoretical framework or not.

The fact that phraseological units that can be grouped under the semantic field of "cheapness" were only found in the Croatian and Russian dictionaries used, while none were found in English, could potentially be significant. It seems to indicate that cheapness as a concept is much more significant in Russian and Croatian cultures than it is in US and UK culture. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

8) WORTHLESSNESS

This is also a semantic field in which it is difficult to ascertain whether the conclusions described in the theoretical framework are confirmed or not. All of the phraseological units in this semantic field are negatively connotated in all three languages. This is connected to the idea that “one of the oldest and most widespread of human institutions “(Davies 2002: 17). Most civilizations in human history, including all the cultures analyzed, used some form of currency to calculate value and acquire resources, and a lack of monetary value was therefore seen as negative.

Four phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “worthlessness” were found in the Russian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *грош цена <в базарный день> кому, чему* – ‘something is worthless, has no value’, 2) *гроша медного (ломанного, железного) не стоит* – ‘something is worthless, has no value’ 3) *<ни> в грош не ставит* кого, что – ‘to not consider something important, to devalue something’ 4) *ни за грош* – ‘for no reason, needlessly, in vain’. All of them have the component *грош* – a medieval name for a coin.

Three phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “worthlessness” were found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *ne vrijediti ni pet para* – ‘something is worthless, has no value’ 2) *ne vrijediti ni prebijene pare* – ‘something is worthless, has no value’ 3) *ne dati za koga, što ni pet para* – ‘to not consider something important, to devalue something’. All of the Croatian phraseological units have the component *para*, which was the 10th part of a Yugoslav dinar.

Only one phraseological unit relating to the semantic field of “worthlessness” were found in the English dictionaries used. This is the phraseological unit *to not be worth a red cent* – ‘to be utterly worthless, useless.’ The term for a coin – *cent*, the hundredth part of a dollar, is used in the English phraseological unit as well. This shows that coins, having little value, are associated with worthlessness in all three languages.

The fact that four and three phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “worthlessness” were found in the Russian and Croatian dictionaries used, respectively, while only one was found in the English dictionaries used, seems to indicate that the idea that the concept of worthlessness is more important in Russian and Croatian culture than in the US and UK culture. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

Even though the phraseological unit found in the English dictionaries used contains the US currency (cent), this does not affect its meaning or connotations – the phraseological unit is used in British as well as American English. Therefore, this semantic field also confirms the hypothesis that the collected phraseological units will reflect a shared Anglosphere attitude towards worthlessness.

9) MISERLINESS

This is a semantic field in which the conclusions described in the theoretical framework are confirmed. The concept of miserliness is connotated extremely negatively in all three languages. The Russian phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “miserliness” (*дорожить (дрожать) <над> каждой копейкой*, - 'to be miserly, overly obsessed with saving money', *за копейку удавится кто* – 'someone is miserly') contain the components '*дорожить* – 'to tremble', *копейка* – 'penny, coin' and *удавиться* – 'to choke'. All of these meanings underscore the pettiness and foolishness of a miserly person, who is terrified of losing money, and would die for a penny. The Croatian phraseological units relating to the concept of 'miserliness' are also connotated extremely negatively.

One of them, *biti tvrd na novcu* –'to be miserly', contains the component *tvrd*. This component is also present in the Croatian word „tvrdica“, meaning ‘a miser’ (Skok 1971: 531). The component has the meaning of ‘hard’, both in the lexical and the phraseological unit, which refers to the stubbornness and hardness of heart of the miserly person. The other, *imati zmiju (kobru) u novčaniku* contains the components *zmija (kobra)* – 'snake, cobra'. This can be connected to the image of the Devil as a snake in the Bible and refers to the negative connotation of miserliness.

The one phraseological unit found in the English dictionaries used (*to be penny wise and pound foolish* – 'to be miserly'), explicitly refers to miserliness as foolish.

The negative connotations of miserliness in Russian and Croatian are related to the Orthodox and Catholic (respectively) commands to give money to the poor, as well as to the condemnation of greed. Protestantism also condemns miserliness. In Protestantism, money is supposed to be acquired to glorify God, which cannot be done if one is overly attached to it.

Even though the English phraseological unit found, *to be penny wise and pound foolish*, this does not affect the meaning, and the phraseological unit can be used both in British and American English, Therefore, this semantic field reflects a shared “Anglosphere” view of miserliness.

10) MAKING MONEY

This is a semantic field in which the conclusions described in the theoretical framework are confirmed partially. All the phraseological units found in all three languages have a neutral emotional bent. No specific conclusions can be made based on the number of phraseological units either.

Five phraseological units relating to the semantic field of making money” were found in the Russian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *знать, (грести, заколачивать, зашибать) деньги* – ‘to make a lot of money’ 2) *грести (загрести) деньги лопатой* – ‘to make a lot of money without effort’ 3) *заведётся <лишний> грош в кармане* – ‘to make money with a lot of effort’ 4) *за большими деньгами [ехать, знаться]* – ‘to want to make a lot of money’ 5) *кровные деньги* – ‘money made with great effort through hard work’.

Four phraseological units relating to the semantic field of making money” were found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *mлатити/namlatiti (zgrtati) pare (lovu)* – ‘to make a lot of money’ 2) *dizati (silne) novce* – ‘to make a lot of money easily’ 3) *skucati pare* – ‘to make enough money with a lot of effort’ 4) *ganjati novce* – ‘to want to make a lot of money’

Four phraseological units relating to the semantic field of making money” were also found in the English dictionaries used. These are: 1) *to make a killing* – ‘to make a lot of money’ 2) *to make a quick buck* - ‘to make money quickly and easily’ 3) *to make money hand over fist* – ‘to make a lot of money, to get rich’ 4) *to chase money* – ‘to want to make a lot of money’. These numbers reflect no difference in the analyzed cultures’ attitudes towards making money.

Some differences are reflected in the meanings of the phraseological units found in the dictionaries used. Two phraseological units with the meaning of ‘to make barely enough money with a lot of effort’ are found in the Russian dictionaries used (*кровные деньги, заведётся <лишний> грош в кармане*). One phraseological unit with this meaning was

found in the Croatian dictionaries used (*skucati pare*), and none in English. This points to the idea that making money was considered much more difficult in Russian and Croatian culture than in the US and UK ones; furthermore, less money was made through harder work by the average Russian and Croatian, according to the phraseological units found.

All three languages also have phraseological units with the meaning of 'wanting to make money' – [*ganjati novce, chase money, гнаться (ехать) за большими деньгами*]. This indicates that, the concept of a desire to make money was familiar to all analyzed cultures, which is to be expected, seeing as how money is “one of the oldest and most widespread of human institutions” (Davies 2002: 17). In the Russian dictionaries used, an additional variant is found (*ехать за большими деньгами*), which, according to data from the Russian corpus ruTenTen17, signifies moving to another city on search of money.

The English phraseological units relating to the semantic field of ‘making money’ reflect no difference in the US and UK attitudes to making money, reflecting instead a shared “Anglosphere” attitude towards the concept.

11) POVERTY

Even though this is a semantic field in which the differences in cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework are so great, they are not reflected in the phraseological units collected. All of the phraseological units found in the dictionaries used for all three languages are negatively connotated. The Orthodox and Catholic idealization of poverty as virtuous does not seem to be reflected in the phraseological units reflected.

Three phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “poverty” are found in the Russian dictionaries used. These are 1) *ни гроша <за душой> нет у кого* – ‘one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably’ 2) *без гроша <в кармане> [быть, оставаться]* – ‘to be completely without money, to lose all your money’ 3) *с копейки (гроша) на копейку [перебиваться скакать, перепрыгивать]* – ‘to be very poor’.

Three phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “poverty” are also found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are 1) *nemati ni prebijene pare* – ‘one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably’ 2) *biti (ostati) bez prebijene pare* – ‘to be

completely without money, to lose all your money' 3) *izgubiti cijelo bogatstvo* - 'to lose a lot of money, to be impoverished'.

Seven phraseological units relating to the semantic field of "poverty" are also found in the English dictionaries used. These are 1) *to not have a penny (cent) to your name* – 'to have no money at all' 2) *to be flat broke* – 'to have no money at all' 3) *to lose money hand over fist* – 'to lose a lot of money, to be impoverished' 4) *to not have a red cent to your name* – 'to have no money at all' 5) *to not have a bean* – 'one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably' 6) *to not have two pennies to rub together* – 'one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably' 7) *to be down to your bottom dollar* – 'one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably'

There are not many differences in the meanings of the phraseological units collected – all of them only refer to the fact of being poor, without expressing a value judgement about this fact.

Even though there are several phraseological units found in the English dictionaries used that contain various different currencies (penny, dollar), these do not affect the meaning of the phraseological units. Therefore, it can be said that there is no difference reflected in the phraseological units between the US and UK attitudes towards poverty.

12) WEALTH

This is another semantic field in which the conclusions described in the theoretical framework are barely reflected. All the phraseological units found in any of the dictionaries used reflect a neutral emotional bent.

Three phraseological units relating to the semantic field of "wealth" are found in the Russian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *быть при деньгах* – 'to have the means needed to do, buy something' 2) *денег куры не клюют у кого* – 'someone has a lot of money, someone who never lacks for money' 3) *лишняя денюга* – 'to have more money than necessary'

Six phraseological units relating to the semantic field of "wealth" are found in the Croatian dictionaries used. These are: 1) *biti pri novcu (lovi, parama)* – 'to have money, to be well-to-do, to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment' 2) *ležati (spavati, sjediti) na novcu (parama)* – 'to be very rich, to have a lot of money' 3) *plivati (valjati se)*

u novcu (parama) – ‘to be very rich, to have a lot of money’ 4) *biti pun para* – ‘to be very rich’ 5) *imati para kao blata (pljeve)*- ‘to have more money than necessary’ 6) *imati para na bacanje* – ‘to have more money than necessary’

Seven phraseological units relating to the semantic field of “wealth” are found in the English dictionaries used. These are: 1) *to be in the money* – ‘to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment’ 2) *to be in funds* – ‘to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment’ 3) *to have money to spend* – ‘to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment’ 4) *to be rolling in money* – ‘biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca’ 5) *to wallow in riches* ‘to be very rich, to have a lot of money’ 6) *to have money to burn* – ‘to have more money than necessary’ and 7) *to be filthy rich* – ‘have a lot of money, more than necessary’. This seems to indicate that wealth is of greatest importance in US and UK culture, followed by Croatian and then Russian. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

The phraseological units found in the English-language dictionaries used do not reflect a difference in the US and UK conceptualizations of money.

13) PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE COMPONENT “MONEY” IN THEIR STRUCTURE, BUT WITH UNRELATED MEANINGS

Several phraseological units are found in the Croatian and English dictionaries used (though not in the Russian ones) that have the component “money” in their structure, but whose meanings are unrelated to money or any of the aforementioned related concepts. Most, but not all, of these phraseological units have the component “money” in their structure only in English. These are:

1) *to want to have your cake and eat it, too* – ‘wanting everything without exception’ - *htjeti (željeti) i ovce i novce* – ‘wanting everything without exception’

2) *to be right on the money* – ‘to say or do just the right thing, to be right’ - *pogoditi u sridu* – ‘to say or do just the right thing, to be right’

3) *to put your money where your mouth is* – ‘to live in accordance with one’s principles’ - *prijeći s riječi na djela* – ‘to live in accordance to one’s principles’

4) *smart money* – *sigurna oklada* - ‘a safe bet’

5) *dollars do doughnuts* – *kladiti se u zadnju paru* – ‘to be completely certain of something’

6) *to be two a penny* – *mali milijun čega* – ‘something is not rare’

The fact that these English phraseological units, whose meanings are (for the most part) not connected with money or any of the aforementioned related concepts, contain the component *money* in their structure, seems to indicate that the concept of money is very important in the US and UK cultures, as it is used very often as a metaphor.

Only two Croatian equivalents of these phraseological units (*htjeti [željeti] i ovce i novce*, *kladiti se u zadnju paru*) contain the component 'money'. No such phraseological units are found in the Russian dictionaries used. This seems to indicate that Croatian uses money as a metaphor in phraseological units more often than Russian, but less often than English. However, this cannot be fully ascertained.

The English phraseological units of this group show no difference between the US and UK conceptualizations of money, instead reflecting a shared “Anglosphere” conceptualization.

In conclusion, the first hypothesis is confirmed partially. The cultural attitudes towards money and related concepts that are described in the theoretical framework are confirmed in some semantic fields (i.e., ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY, SAVING MONEY, MISERLINESS). However, in some semantic fields, the conclusions are confirmed partially (i.e., MAKING MONEY), or not at all (i.e., POVERTY).

In several of the semantic fields enumerated (i.e., CHEAPNESS, EXPENSIVENESS, WORTHLESSNESS) no conclusions could be reached on whether the collected phraseological units reflected the cultural attitudes that are described in the theoretical framework or not because of a lack of evidence.

While it can indeed be said that that Croatian and Russian culture are shown to have a more negative attitude towards money than US/UK culture (most of the negative attitudes to money described in the theoretical framework as being part of Croatian and Russian culture, such as a distrust of banks, a perception of the rich as inherently wasteful with their money, are indeed reflected by the phraseological units collected from the dictionaries

used), it is very difficult to place Croatian culture between Russian and US/UK culture when it comes to the attitudes to money.

This is due to the fact that not enough evidence can be found in most of the semantic fields that seem to indicate a closeness between the Croatian and US/UK attitudes to money, Suppositions regarding such a closeness may still be made, especially with respect to the fact that several phraseological units were found that used money-related metaphors despite the fact that their meanings were unrelated to money. However, these must remain suppositions.

Meanwhile, the second hypothesis, that the phraseological units will reflect a shared “Anglosphere” attitude towards money and related concepts, was confirmed in all semantic fields but one (ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY).

b) Linguistic analysis

In this part of the analysis, the veracity of the third hypothesis will be tested.

The total equivalents, that can best be used as part of the strategy in which phraseological units in the source language are replaced with their total equivalent in the target language in texts where they are present, are the following:

CROATIAN - RUSSIAN

1) *бросаться (швыряться) деньгами – razbacivati se novcem* - ‘to be spendthrift, to save no money at all’

2) *до <последней> копейки (копеечки) [истратить, отдать] – do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati]* ‘to spend, give away all your money’

3) *бросать деньги на ветер – bacati novac u vjetar* - ‘to spend large amounts of money pointlessly’

4) *грязные деньги – prljavi novac* – ‘illegally acquired money’

5) *отмыть/отмывать деньги – oprati/prati novac* – ‘the process of legalizing illegally acquired money’

6) *большая (шальная) деньги - velik (krupan) novac* – ‘a lot of money’

7) *беречь (откладывать) <деньги> на (про) чёрный день - čuvati (ostavljati) bijele novce za crne dane* – 'to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble'

8) *держат деньги в чулке - držati novce u čarapi* – 'to keep one's money at home, not to save at a bank'

9) *за небольшие деньги - za male novce* – 'cheap'

10) *ни копейки - ni lipre* – 'a negligible amount of money'

11) *гроша медного (ломанного, железного) не стоит - ne vrijediti ni prebijene pare* – 'something is worthless, has no value'

12) *за большими деньгами [ехать, гнаться] - ganjati novce* – 'to want to make a lot of money'

13) *ни гроша <за душой> нет у кого - nemati ni prebijene pare* – 'one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably'

14) *без гроша <в кармане> [быть, оставаться] - biti (ostati) bez prebijene pare* – 'to be completely without money, to lose all your money'

15) *быть при деньгах - biti pri novcu [lovi, parama]* – 'to have money, to be well-to-do, to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment'

CROATIAN - ENGLISH

1) *razbacivati se novcem* – *to throw <your> money around (about)* – 'to be spendthrift, to save no money at all'

2) *prati novac* – *to launder money* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money'

3) *krvavi novac* – *blood money* – 'money made through murder or mafia dealings'

4) *lijepi novci* – *a pretty penny* – 'a lot of money'

5) *čuvati bijele novce za crne dane* – *to save (keep) money for a rainy day* – 'to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble'

6) *ne vrijediti ni prebijene pare* – *not to be worth a red cent* – 'something is worthless, has no value'

7) *ganjati novce* – *to chase money* – 'to want to make a lot of money'

8) *nemati ni prebijene pare* – *not have a penny (cent) to your name* – 'to have no money at all'

9) *biti pri novcu (lovi, parama)* – *to be in the money* – 'to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment'

RUSSIAN – ENGLISH

1) *бросаться (швыряться) деньгами* – *to throw <your> money around (about)* – 'to spend money unnecessarily, senselessly'

2) *отмыть/отмывать деньги* – *to launder money* – 'the process of legalizing illegally acquired money'

3) *хорошие деньги* – *good money* – 'a lot of money'

4) *беречь (откладывать) <деньги> на (про) чёрный день* – *to save (keep) money for a rainy day* – 'to save money for an emergency, to set money aside in case of trouble'

5) *гроша медного (ломанного, железного) не стоит* – *not to be worth a red cent* – 'something is worthless, has no value'

6) *за большими деньгами [гнаться, ехать]* – *to chase money* – 'to want to make a lot of money'

7) *ни гроша <за душой> нет у кого* – *to not have a red cent to <your> name* – 'one is without money, does not have the means to live comfortably'

8) *быть при деньгах* – *to be in the money* – 'to have money, to be well-to-do, to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment'

This overview shows that there are indeed more total equivalents, and therefore more phraseological equivalents that could best be used as part of the most convenient translation strategy (translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language that has

both a similar form and meaning, and is therefore a total equivalent, in texts where phraseological units are present) between Russian and Croatian (15) than between either Croatian and English (9) or English and Russian (8).

The number of partial phraseological equivalents, that could primarily be used as part of the translation strategy in which a source language phraseological unit is replaced by a target language one that has a similar meaning, but a different form in texts where phraseological units are present, is the following:

CROATIAN – RUSSIAN

- 1) *сорить (сыпать) деньгами – prosipati/prosuti (rasipati) novac* - 'to be spendthrift, to save no money at all'
- 2) *издержать (исстратить) последний грош - do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati]* – 'to spend the last of one's money'
- 3) *бешеные деньги – masne pare* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'
- 4) *бешеные деньги – lova do krova* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'
- 5) *хорошие деньги – lijepi novci* – 'a lot of money'
- 6) *влетело (влетает) в копеечку (копейку) кому, чему – koštati kao suho zlato* – 'something is expensive, has a high price'
- 7) *влетело (влетает) в копеечку (копейку) кому, чему – koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana* – 'something is expensive, has a high price'
- 8) *за гроши [купить, продать] – za bagatelu [kupiti, prodati]* – 'to buy, sell very cheaply'
- 9) *грош цена <в базарный день> кому, чему - ne vrijediti ni pet para* – 'something is worthless, has no value'
- 10) *<ни> в грош не ставит кого, что - ne dati za koga, što ni pet para* – 'to not consider something important, to devalue something'
- 11) *за копейку удавиться – imati zmiju (kobru) u novčaniku* – 'to be miserly'

12) *знать (грести, заколачивать, зашибать) деньги – mlatiti/namlatiti (zgrtati) pare (lovu)* - 'to make a lot of money'

13) *грести (загрести) деньги лопатой - dizati (silne) novce* – 'to make a lot of money easily'

14) *заведётся <лишний> грош в кармане – skucati pare* – 'to make enough money with a lot of effort'

15) *денег куры не клюют у кого – ležati (spavati, sjediti) na novcu (parama)* – 'to be very rich, to have a lot of money'

16) *денег куры не клюют у кого - plivati (valjati se) u novcu (parama)* – 'to be very rich, to have a lot of money'

17) *денег куры не клюют у кого – biti pun para* – 'to be very rich'

18) *лишняя деньги – imati para kao blata (pljeve)* – 'to have more money than necessary'

CROATIAN – ENGLISH

1) *prosipati/prosuti novac - to throw <your> money around (about)* – 'to be spendthrift, to waste money'

2) *do zadnje (posljednje) pare [potrošiti, dati] – to spend up to the hilt* – 'to spend, give away all your money'

3) *masne pare – good money* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'

4) *lova do krova – good money* - 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'

5) *krupan (velik) novac – a pile (mint) of money* – 'a lot of money'

6) *lijepi novci – good money* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'

7) *krupan (velik) novac – serious money* – 'a lot of money'

8) *koštati kao suho zlato – to cost a fortune* – 'to be very expensive'

9) *koštati kao svetog Petra kajgana – to cost a fortune* – 'something is very expensive'

10) *ne vrijediti ni pet para – to not be worth a red cent* – 'to be utterly worthless, useless'

- 11) *biti tvrd na novcu – to be penny wise and pound foolish* – ‘someone is miserly’
- 12) *mlatiti/namlatiti (zgrtati) pare (lovu) - to make a killing* – ‘to make a lot of money’
- 13) *dizati (silne) novce – to make a quick buck* – ‘to make money quickly and easily’
- 14) *biti (ostati) bez prebijene pare – to be flat broke* – ‘to be completely without money, to lose all your money’
- 15) *izgubiti cijelo bogatstvo –to lose money hand over fist* – ‘to lose a lot of money, to be impoverished’
- 16) *biti pri novcu (lovi, parama) –to be in funds* – ‘to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment.
- 17) *biti pri novcu (lovi, parama) -to have money to spend* – ‘to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment’
- 18) *ležati (spavati, sjediti) na novcu (parama) - to be rolling in money* – ‘biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca’
- 19) *ležati (spavati, sjediti) na novcu (parama – to wallow in riches - 'biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca'*
- 20) *plivati (valjati se) u novcu (parama) – to be rolling in money* –‘biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca’
- 21) *plivati (valjati se) u novcu (parama) - to wallow in riches* – ‘biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca’
- 22) *biti pun para - to be rolling in money* – ‘biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca’
- 23) *biti pun para - to wallow in riches - 'biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca'*
- 24) *imati para kao blata (pljeve)- to have money to burn* – ‘to have more money than necessary’
- 25) *imati para na bacanje – to be filthy rich* – ‘have a lot of money, more than necessary’

26) *to want to have your cake and eat it, too – htjeti (željeti) i ovce i novce* – 'to want everything without exception'

27) *to be right on the money – pogoditi u sridu* – 'to say or do just the right thing, to be right'

28) *to put your money where your mouth is - prijeći s riječi na djela* – 'to live in accordance with one's principles'

29) *smart money – sigurna oklada* – 'a safe bet'

30) *dollars do doughnuts – kladiti se u zadnju paru* – 'to be completely certain of something'

31) *to be two a penny - mali milijun čega* – 'something is not rare'

ENGLISH – RUSSIAN

1) *сорить (сыпать) деньгами - to throw <your> money around (about)* – 'to be spendthrift, to waste money'

2) *до <последней> копейки (копеечки) [исстратить, отдать]* – *to spend up to the hilt* – 'to spend, give away all your money'

3) *издержать (исстратить) последний грош - to spend up to the hilt* – 'to spend, give away all your money'

4) *бешенные деньги - good money* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'

5) *большая (шальная) деньга - a pile (mint) of money* – 'a lot of money, a large amount of money'

6) *хорошие деньги – a pretty penny* – 'a lot of money'

7) *влетело (влетает) в копеечку – to cost a fortune* – 'something is very expensive'

8) *грош цена <в базарный день> - not to be worth a red cent* – 'to be utterly worthless, useless'

9) *знать, (грести, заколачивать, зашибать) деньги – to make a killing* – 'to make a lot of money'

10) *грести (загрести) деньги лопатой – to make a quick buck* – 'to make money quickly and easily'

11) *без гроша <в кармане> [быть, оставаться] – to be flat broke* – 'to have no money at all'

12) *быть при деньгах – to be in funds* – 'to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment'

13) *быть при деньгах – to have money to spend* – 'to have enough money to live comfortably at a given moment'

14) *денег куры не клюют у кого – to be rolling in money* – 'biti jako bogat, imati mnogo novaca'

15) *денег куры не клюют у кого – to wallow in riches* – 'to be very rich, to have a lot of money'

16) *лишняя денюга – to have money to burn* – 'to have more money than necessary'

The number of partial phraseological equivalents, that could primarily be used as part of the translation strategy in which a source language phraseological unit is replaced by a target language one that has a similar meaning, but a different form in texts where phraseological units are present, is therefore shown to be greater between Croatian and English (31) than between either Croatian and Russian (18) or Russian and English (16).

As for the other strategies, paraphrasing can be used in texts where the phraseological unit(s) present in the source text have no phraseological equivalents in the target text (i.e., in texts where the phraseological units *кровные деньги* – money made through hard physical labor', *Judine škude* – money made through betrayal and *to pass the buck* – lay the responsibility for one's own mistakes onto someone else' are present).

It can therefore be concluded that the third hypothesis, that there are more total phraseological equivalents, and therefore more equivalents that could best be used as part of the most

convenient translation strategy (translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has both a similar form and meaning) between Croatian and Russian than between either language and English, due to Croatian and Russian's common origins, while partial translation equivalents that can be best be used as part of the translation strategy of translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has a similar form, but a different meaning are more common between genetically unrelated languages, is confirmed.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, the first hypothesis is confirmed partially. The cultural attitudes towards money and related concepts that are described in the theoretical framework are confirmed in some semantic fields (i.e., ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY, SAVING MONEY, MISERLINESS) However, in some semantic fields, the conclusions are confirmed partially (i.e., MAKING MONEY), or not at all (i.e., POVERTY, A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY). For other semantic fields, no evidence was found on whether the cultural attitudes described in the theoretical framework are confirmed or not (CHEAPNESS, WORTHLESSNESS). Croatian and Russian culture are indeed shown to have more negative attitudes towards money than US/UK culture, and a lot of the aforementioned Protestant-influenced attitudes towards money are reflected in the phraseological units found in the English-language dictionaries used. However, it is difficult to position Croatian culture between the more negative Russian attitude towards money and the more positive US/UK one due to a lack of firm evidence (even though suppositions regarding such can be made).

The second hypothesis, that the phraseological units will reflect a shared "Anglosphere" attitude towards money and related concepts, was confirmed in all semantic fields but one (ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED WITH MONEY), The phraseological units collected from the English dictionaries used do indeed reflect a shared "Anglosphere" attitude towards money.

The third hypothesis, that there are more total phraseological equivalents, and therefore more equivalents that could best be used as part of the most convenient translation strategy (translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has both a

similar form and meaning) between Croatian and Russian than between either language and English, due to Croatian and Russian's common origins, while the number of partial translation equivalents, that can be used as part of other translation strategies is more varied between languages, is confirmed. Total phraseological equivalents that could best be used as part of most convenient strategy, translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has both a similar form and meaning, are indeed found more often between Russian and Croatian (15) than between either Croatian and English (9) or English and Russian (8).

Meanwhile, partial phraseological equivalents, that could primarily be used as part of the translation strategy of translating a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has a similar meaning, but a different form in texts where phraseological units are present, are found more often between Croatian and English (31) than between either Croatian and Russian (18) or Russian and English (16).

To sum up, of the three set hypotheses, two are unambiguously confirmed (even though for one, that the phraseological units found reflect a shared Anglosphere attitude to money, an exception exist in the form of the semantic field ILLEGAL ACTIONS CONNECTED TO MONEY), while one is confirmed partially. This means that the phraseological picture of the world does indeed reflect the analyzed cultures' prevalent attitudes towards money, but not to the degree that would be expected. Furthermore, total equivalents that could best be used as part of the most convenient translation strategy, are indeed most common between genetically related languages, while partial translation equivalents, that could best be used as part of the translation strategy of replacing a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has a similar meaning, but a different form in texts where phraseological units are present, are more common between genetically unrelated ones.

9. Bibliography

- Andreici, M. T. (2016) "Translation of phrasemes. Equivalence and non-equivalence" *Professional Communication and Translation Studies* 9. Timisoara: Editura Politehnica pp. 153-166
- Aristotle. (1997). *Poetics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Baker, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London, New York; Routledge.
- Bell, R. (1991) *Translation and Translating*. London, New York: Longman.
- Bendow, I. (2006) *Englesko-hrvatski frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Davies, G. (2002) *The History of Money: From Ancient Times to the Present Day* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Ferguson, N. (2008) *The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Fink-Arsovski, Ž., Mokienko, V., Hrnjak, A., Barčot, B. (2019) *Rusko-hrvatski frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb: Knjigra.
- Gläser, R. (1988). "The grading of idiomaticity as a presupposition for a taxonomy of idioms."
- Hüllen, Werner, R. Schulze (ed.). *Understanding the lexicon. Meaning, sense and world knowledge in lexical semantics*. New Jersey: Hillsdale. str. 264-279
- Jernej, J.(1992/1993). "O klasifikaciji frazema," *Filologija*, 20–21.Zagreb: HAZU, Razred za filološke znanosti. p.p.. 191–197
- Jerolimov, I. (2001). "Frazemi sa somatskom sastavnicom na primjeru talijansko-hrvatske frazeologije". *Suvremena lingvistika* 51–52. p.p... 87–99.
- Kolar-Dimitrijević, M. (2013). *Povijest novca u Hrvatskoj od 1527. do 1941*. Zagreb: Hrvatska narodna banka.
- Kovačević, B. (2006). *Hrvatska somatska frazeologija*. Doktorska disertacija (rukopis). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet
- Kovačević, B. (2017) "Sveti Petar i kajgana" *Hrvatski jezik* 1 str. 27-28
- Lakoff, G. (1987a). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press
- Lakoff, G. i M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press
- Langacker, R. (1993). „Reference-Point Constructions. " *Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (1). pp. 1-38.
- Makkai, A. (1972). *Idiom structure in English*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Matešić, J. (1978). "O poredbenom frazemu u hrvatskom jeziku". *Filologija* 8. Zagreb: HAZU. p.p.. 211-218.
- Matešić, J. (1982) *Frazeološki rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Matešić, J. (1988). *Hrvatsko-njemački frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb – München: Nakladni zavod MH – Verlag Otto Sagner
- Menac, A. (1978). „Neka pitanja u vezi s klasifikacijom frazeologije.“ *Filologija* 8. Zagreb: HAZU. pp. 219-226
- Menac, A. (1980.) *Rusko-hrvatski ili srpski frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Menac, A., Fink-Arsovski, Ž. Venturin, R. (2003) *Hrvatski frazeološki rječnik*, Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak.
- Menac, A., Fink-Arsovski, Ž., Mironova, I. B., Venturin, R. (2011) *Hrvatsko-ruski frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb: Knjigra.
- Novoselec, Z. (2022) *Frazeološke jedinice sa sastavnicom srce u hrvatskom i švedskom. Kulturni modeli i motivacija*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Pavlović, N. (2015) *Uvod u teorije prevodenja*. Zagreb: Leykam International d.o.o.
- Radden, G, Z. Kövecses (1999). „Towards a theory of metonymy.“ In: K.-U. Panther, G. Radden (ed.) *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. p. 17-59.
- Radden, G., Kovecses, Z. (2007). “Towards a theory of metonymy.” V. Evans, B. Bergen, J. Zinken (ed.) *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader*. London: Equinox pp. 335-359
- Skok, P. (1971) *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Šipka, M. (2010) *Zašto se kaže?* Prometej: Novi Sad.
- Vidović Bolt, I. (2011). *Životinjski svijet u hrvatskoj i poljskoj frazeologiji*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Vrgoč, D., Fink-Arsovski, Ž. (2008) *Hrvatsko-engleski frazeološki rječnik*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak
- Weatherford, J. (1997) *The History of Money*. New York: Crown Publishers Inc.
- Weber, M. (2005). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Routledge
- Weinreich, U. (1969). *On Semantics*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Pennsylvania.
- Zykova, I. (2019) *Konceptosfera kulture i frazeologija*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Алефиренко, Н. Ф., Семенов, Н. Н. (2009) *Фраzeология и паремология. Учебное пособие*. Москва: Флинта, Наука.

- Виноградов, В. В. (1947) «Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке» *Выбранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография*. Москва: Наука.
- Видова, О. И., Карпухин, И. (2008). «Русский ренессанс» *Из истории общественно-политической мысли* стр. 1–27.
- Калашникова, Е. В., Горшкова, Н. Д. (2021) «Реформы Петра I – Содержание и их влияние на развитие России». *Международный журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук*. стр. 1–3.
- Королькова, А. В., Ломов, А. Г., Тихонов, А. Н. (2004) *фразеологический словарь современного русского литературного языка*. Москва: Флинта
- Мельникова, А. С. (1989) “Русские монеты от Ивана Грозного до Петра Первого (история русской денежной системы с 1533 по 1692 год) *Финансы и статистика*. стр. 318
- Ощепкова, Е. С. (2014) «Ценности «богатство» и «бедность» в языковом сознании русских». *Вопросы психолингвистики* 81–83. стр. 102–117.
- Шкатова, В. В. (2012) «Фразеологическая картина мира как объект лингвистического изучения». *Вестник Ленинградского государственного университета им. А. С. Пушкина*. стр. 208–215.

10. Abstract

In this thesis, the cultural attitudes towards money and several related concepts (work, wealth, poverty etc.) were examined. The term *phraseological unit* was decided on as the best term to encompass all the expressions found in the dictionaries used. The question of whether the phraseological units related to money, work, wealth, poverty etc. found in the Russian, Croatian and English dictionaries used reflect these attitudes or not was answered. Types of phraseological equivalence and the translation strategies as part of which they could best be used were listed and explained.

It was found that the Russian cultural attitudes towards money (and the related concepts of money, work, wealth, poverty etc.) was mostly negative. This is based on several factors: the Orthodox Christian religion, which considers poverty virtuous and condemns greed, the economic troubles that Russia often faced throughout its history, making its middle class relatively small, the relatively late and forced arrival of Western financial innovations, such as banking, into Russia, the Communist ideology. And the traumatic transition to capitalism that happened in the 1990s.

The US and UK attitudes towards money (and the related concepts of work, wealth etc.,) are positive. This is caused by the influence of Protestantism, in which the acquisition of wealth was considered to be the Lord's work and poverty was condemned, as it meant one was a poor steward of God's gifts. Additionally, the US and UK spent a lot of their history being the financial centers of the world, their middle classes were historically large, and financial innovations and capitalism developed early and organically in these countries.

The Croatian attitude towards money is positioned between the Russian and Croatian ones. Croatia, like Russia, faced economic difficulties often in its history, went through a Communist period and a difficult transition to capitalism, and was influenced by Catholicism, which, like Orthodoxy, condemned greed and considered poverty virtuous. However, Croatia

was influenced strongly by Western culture, and its political position often allowed it to adopt Western financial innovations more easily.

These views were found to be only partially reflected in the phraseological units found in the dictionaries used. In some of them, they are reflected completely. In some, however, they are reflected partially, or not at all. Croatian and Russian culture are indeed shown to have a more negative attitude towards money than US/UK culture. However, the positioning of Croatian culture between the more negative Russian attitude and the more positive US/UK one is not reflected due to a lack of evidence. The phraseological units collected do not reflect a difference in the US and UK conceptualizations of money, instead reflecting a shared “Anglosphere” conceptualization of money and related concepts.

More total phraseological equivalents, and therefore more equivalents that could best be used as part of the most convenient translation strategy of replacing the source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has both a similar form and meaning in texts where phraseological units are present, were found between genetically close languages (Croatian and Russian). Meanwhile, more partial phraseological equivalents, and therefore more equivalents that could best be used as part of the translation strategy of replacing a source language phraseological unit with a target language one that has a similar meaning, but a different form, were found between genetically unrelated languages (English and Croatian).

Keywords: cultural attitudes, money, phraseological units, phraseological equivalents, translation strategies

Аннотация

В настоящей работе исследовались культурные взгляды на деньги и другие, связанные с ними концепты (работу, богатство, бедность...). Мы решили, что термин *фразеологическая единица* лучше всех других охватывает все собранные и анализируемые нами выражения. Целью работы является поиск ответа на вопрос, отражают ли фразеологические единицы, связанные с деньгами и похожими концептами (работой, богатством, бедностью), фиксированные в словарях русского, хорватского и английского языков эти культурные взгляды. Исследовались и виды

фразеологической эквивалентности и стратегии перевода, как часть которых каждый из видов фразеологических эквивалентов лучше могут употребляться.

Оказалось, что российские культурные взгляды на деньги (и связанные с ними концепты работы, богатства, бедности) являются отрицательными. Это основывается на многих факторах. Православная религия, в которой бедность считается достоинством, а жадность осуждается, является одним из самых важных факторов. Ещё одной причиной отрицательного взгляда на деньги в российской культуре являются экономические проблемы, с которыми Россия в своей истории сталкивалась очень часто, что снизило число людей среднего слоя в России. Помимо того, западные финансовые инновации пришли в Россию относительно поздно, и были принуждены. На отношение россиян к деньгам очень повлияла и коммунистическая идеология, а также и период перехода к капитализму, который произошёл в 90-х годах.

Американские и великобританские взгляды на деньги (и связанные с ними концепты работы, богатства...) являются положительными. Причиной этого является влияние протестантизма, следовательно которым приобретение богатства считалось Божьим делом, а бедность осуждалась, потому что она обозначала, что человек плохо заботится о дарах Господних. Кроме того, Америка и Великобритания долгое время в своих историях были финансовыми центрами мира, их средние слои в истории были большими, а финансовые инновации и капитализм в этих странах развились рано и естественным способом.

Хорватские взгляды на деньги находятся между российскими и английскими. Хорватия, как и Россия, в своей истории часто сталкивалась с экономическими проблемами, находилась под влиянием коммунизма и прошла тяжёлый переход к капитализму, и на неё влияло католичество, которое, как и православие, осуждало жадность и считало бедность достоинством. Но, Хорватия находилась и под влиянием западной культуры, и её политическая позиция часто позволяла её проще принять западные финансовые инновации

Оказалось, что эти взгляды только частично отражаются в фразеологических единицах, собранных из использованных словарей. В некоторых из них взгляды отражаются полностью. Но, в других они отражаются либо частично, либо вообще не

отражаются. Показалось, что хорватские и русские взгляды на деньги действительно являются более отрицательными, чем американские и великобританские. Но, положение хорватской культуры между более отрицательными русскими и более положительными американско-великобританскими взглядами не отражается в фразеологических единицах по причине нехватки доказательств. Собранные фразеологические единицы не отражают разницы между американскими и великобританскими взглядами на деньги. Вместо того, они отражают общие, «англоязычные» взгляды на деньги и связанные с ними концепты.

Больше всего полных фразеологических эквивалентов, а следовательно и больше всего эквивалентов, которые лучше было бы употреблять как часть самой удобной стратегии перевода (заменить фразеологическую единицу исходного языка фразеологической единицей целевого языка, которая похожа на неё и внешним образом, и значением в текстах, где присутствуют фразеологические единицы) в словарях найдено между генетически близкими языками (хорватским и русским). Тем временем, больше частичных эквивалентов, а следовательно и больше эквивалентов, которые лучше было бы употреблять как часть стратегии перевода, заключающейся в замене фразеологической единицы исходного языка фразеологической единицей целевого языка, похожей на неё значением, но не и внешним образом, в словарях найдено между генетически неблизкими языками (английским и хорватским).

Ключевые слова: культурные взгляды, деньги, фразеологические единицы, фразеологическая эквивалентность, стратегии перевода

11. Biography

Sara Zobel was born in Zagreb on the 29th of January 1998. In 2015, she visited the European Parliament in Strasbourg, France as part of the Euroscola project, where high school students compete in discussing issues that the EU is currently facing. In 2017, she started studying English and Russian at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. She also speaks German at the C2 level. She volunteers as an English teacher.