

METAFORA CONCEPTUALĂ „NOROCUL CA DESTIN” ÎN LIMBA ROMÂNĂ

Viorica LIFARI

ORCID: 0000-0001-5274-1968

Universitatea de Stat din Moldova

Rezumat. În contextul globalizării, oamenii comunică intercultural și o fac mai ales prin intermediul limbilor străine, mai degrabă decât cu ajutorul limbilor materne. Foarte des apar cazuri de neînțelegere din cauza faptului că oamenii sunt predispuși să fie etnocentrice și folosesc limbile străine ca instrument rudimentar, dar nu ca instrument cultural. Din aceste motive, cercetătorii au început să studieze legătura dintre limbă, gândire și cultură. Așa au luat naștere științele cognitive. În această lucrare, punem în practică teoria metaforei conceptuale introdusă de G. Lakoff și M. Johnson și implementată ulterior în lucrările altor oameni de știință, aplicăm teoriile regăsite în lucrările lui Z. Kövecses și le folosim în calitate de ghid în studiul conceptului de „noroc” în limba română. Reușim să clasificăm 93 de proverbe despre „noroc” în limba română conform teoriei Cadrului/scenariului sugerată de Ch. Fillmore (identificăm Modelele Cognitive Ideale) și urmăm teoria prototipului.

„Norocul ca destin” este metafora conceptuală prototipică în limba și cultura românească, bazată pe studiul proverbelor și pe cercetarea exemplelor culese din nuvela „Moara cu noroc”, acest cadru/scenariu fiind urmat de alte metafore conceptuale precum „norocul ca inteligență”, „norocul ca muncă/disciplină/ascultare”, „norocul ca succes” și „lipsa de noroc”.

Cuvinte-cheie: lingvistică cognitivă, metaforă conceptuală, cultură, cadru scenariu, limbă, gândire, teoria prototipurilor.

The Conceptual Metaphor "Luck as Destiny" in the Romanian Language

Abstract. In the context of globalization people communicate inter-culturally and they do that mostly by means of foreign languages rather than by their native ones. Very often there happen cases of miscommunication due to the fact that people are inclined to be ethnocentric and use foreign language as a rudimentary instrument but not as a cultural tool. It is because of these reasons that scholars started to study the connection between the Language, Mind and Culture. This is how cognitive sciences were born. In this paper we put into use the conceptual metaphor theory introduced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson and later implemented in the papers of the other scientists, we apply the theories found in the works

of Z. Kövecses and use them as a guide in conducting the study of the concept of "luck" in Romanian. We manage to classify 93 proverbs about "luck" in Romanian according to the theory of Frames suggested by Ch. Fillmore (identify the Ideal Cognitive Models) and follow the prototype theory.

"Luck as destiny" is the prototypic conceptual metaphor in the Romanian language and culture based on our study of proverbs and the research of examples collected from the short story "Moara cu noroc" ("The Lucky Mill"), this frame is followed by other conceptual metaphors such as "luck as intelligence", "luck as work/discipline/obedience", "luck as success" and "lack of luck".

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, culture, frame, language, mind, theory of prototype.

The multitude of research papers devoted to the study of concepts are inclined to support the idea of the famous Polish-Australian scientist A. Wierzbicka that terms or words which exist in any language and apparently seem to denote a similar concept according to their cultural specific meaning fail to do that (Wierzbicka, 1992). Even if it may seem that the idea of "noroc" can be translated by means of the term "luck" in English, "Glück" in German, «удача» in Russian, etc. the term "noroc" and the situations which are associated with this idea in the Romanian language are proved to be culture specific.

In order to study a concept from the cultural point of the view and its linguistic representation researchers suggest we should use the method of definition, the method of the cognitive prototypic scenario (also called the theory of Frames (Kövecses, 2006) and introduced by the famous researcher Ch. Fillmore) and analyze the metonymic /metaphoric representation of the idea under analysis.

The American Linguist Z. Kövecses claims that "the comprehensive account of meaning in many linguistic and cultural phenomena is crucially based and dependent on cognitive capacities that human understanders and producers of language possess independently, on their ability to use language" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 16).

Giving a definition to cognitive linguistics the scholar says that "it is far more than a theory of language; we can perhaps think of it as a theory of «meaning making» in general in its innumerable linguistic, social, and cultural facets, ..." (Kövecses, 2006, p. 17).

Moreover "Cognitive science makes use of the results of a variety of fields that all study the mind in their own ways. These include cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence, neuroscience, linguistics, cognitive anthropology, and several others. Needless to say, there is no unanimous agreement among the practitioners of these fields concerning their main subject matter: the human mind and its workings, let alone its relationship to language and culture" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 17).

Explaining the relationship between the mind and external reality, Z. Kövecses states that "There are basically two major views here. In one, the relationship is such that the mind reflects a preexisting reality, and in another, it is the mind

that «creates», that is, provides structure for, this reality. The former conception describes the mind as some kind of a «mirror of reality». The latter gives more room for humans to create an idea of reality that can differ more or less from «actual reality»; that is, reality as it is, independent of human beings. Indeed, it is possible to claim in the second view that we can see only an «imagined», a «projected», kind of reality” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 19).

When discussing the about the relationship between the mind and the body, the same scholar comes with the arguments that "human beings have both a body and a mind. We can ask if the mind is independent of the body or, just the contrary, if it is based on the body. If we adopt the first view, we would say that humans have a «transcendent» mind, that is, a mind that is abstract and goes way beyond the body, in that its real powers come precisely from those capabilities of the mind that have nothing to do with the physical body" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 19).

Another interesting issue with reference to the cognitive study of language is the relationship between language and cognition. Z. Kövecses considers that "the major issue here is whether language is an expression of thought or shapes thought" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 20). In order to explain that, the scholar introduces two approaches to study the mind: the "objectivist" one and the "experientialist" approach.

We are all humans and are inclined to have similar activities and feel similar emotions thus "a view of the universality of human knowledge would maintain the «psychic unity of mankind». We share the most significant knowledge about the world in the form of transcendental universal concepts. We have a universal faculty of reason. Such transcendental universal ideas make up the faculty of reason and are innate. Experience, including linguistic experience, is helpful only in triggering the acquisition of universal concepts and principles for their organization" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 24).

"By contrast, the view of the relativity of human knowledge would maintain that our knowledge of the world derives primarily from experience – experience that "is obtained through culturally mediated conceptual schemes, i.e., historically situated, contingent frameworks of meaning and understanding" (Foley, 1997, p. 169).

At the same time we have to keep in mind that the theory of the American linguists E. Sapir and B. L. Whorf who introduced Linguistic relativity is identified by having a strong and a weak version: 1) the language we speak determines the way we think and 2) the language we speak influences the way we think.

In this context Z. Kövecses considers that "if the strong version is true then it would be impossible to learn a foreign language. We would be prisoners in the «prison house of our own language». But many people learn foreign languages, often several languages, and often acquire native or near-native competence in them. In addition, if our native language strictly determined the way we think, we could not translate from one language to another. Clearly, then, our cognitive abilities (such as learning another language

and translation) are not limited in this strong sense by our native language. For reasons such as these, the strong version of the theory has minimal support among scholars" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 44).

The majority of works devoted to cognitive studies of the language are using the Experimentalist View (G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, Wierzbicka, etc.). "For an experientialist, the mind reflects the world as we experience and perceive it. Thus, the categories of mind do not fit categories of the world, that is, an objective reality. The world is «created» or built up by the mind in several imaginative ways. These include such cognitive processes as categorization based on prototypes, organizing knowledge in terms of frames, and understanding experience through metaphors" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 22).

In experientialism, the body is seen as playing a decisive role in producing the kind of mind we have. The mind is based on the body. In other words, the kind of body humans have influences the kind of mind they have. As a result, thought is taken to be embodied. As an example, take the conceptual category of TREE. How can the body play any role in our understanding what a tree is? For one thing, we understand a tree as being upright. This comes from how we experience our own bodies; namely, that we experience ourselves as being erect. [...] We call such features of conceptual categories "interactional properties" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 23).

Further on in experientialism language is not an independent module of the mind. "Language operates on the basis of the same principles that other cognitive faculties of the mind (intentionality, attention, perception, emotion, dreams, personality and volition, thought, memory, belief, learning) use. The cognitive processes of categorization, framing knowledge, figure-ground organization, and many others are just as important in language as in other aspects of the mind. In addition, the key component of language is not form but meaning and conceptualization. Language serves the function of expressing meaning. In the study of language and thought, meaning is more important than form. Grammar serves the purpose of conceptualization; indeed, it is taken to be conceptualization" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 23).

"In addition, meaning is relative to how we frame experience. If I say, «I paid five dollars for the drink», I take the perspective of the buyer, but if I say, «I sold the drink for five dollars», I take the perspective of the seller. Different people can frame the same event in different ways, depending on their perspective. In other words, meaning is not simply a matter of conceptual content; it is equally a matter of how I construe some conceptual content" (Kövecses, 2006, p. 24).

"In the experientialist view, truth is not a direct correspondence between a sentence and a situation. Rather, truth can only be assessed relative to a particular understanding of a situation" (*Ibidem*).

We, as humans categorize things and ideas, a cognitive process which is essential for survival. The categorization of objects and events is taking place unconsciously

most of the time. "The conceptual categories we establish are the backbone of language and thought. Much of our meaning-making capacity depends on the system of conceptual categories we acquire" (*Ibidem*, p. 28).

The cognitive psychologist L. Barsalou describes the process of acquiring categories: "1) form a structural description of the entity; 2) search for category representation similar to the structural description; 3) select the most similar category representation; 4) draw inferences about the entity; 5) store information about the categorization" (Barsalou, 1992, p. 26).

Mentioning the theories of categorization we have to keep in mind the "classical model" (componential analysis), prototype models, exemplar models, spreading activation models, connectionist models, and intuitive theories (Barsalou, 1992).

Having introduced the theoretical background to the study of conceptual categories we announce that we are inclined to put into application the prototype categorization for the study of concept "noroc" (luck) in Romanian. This is the type of categorization introduced by philosopher Wittgenstein based on the example of the GAME concept which could not be studied under the classical model, i.e. componential analysis due to its complex features and the impossibility of introducing of all types of "games" under the rules established ("the same features, equal status, sharp and rigid boundaries") (*apud* Taylor, 1989/1995).

As a result of his study "Wittgenstein came to the conclusion that there is not a single essential feature that characterizes all instances of the category of GAME. Instead, he suggested that what holds the category together is what he called "family resemblance" relations. This is a metaphor used by Wittgenstein. It suggests that members of a family have different properties, such as being blond, having green eyes, having large ears, having small feet, and so forth, but that not all members have all of these properties. Some of them have blond hair and large ears, others have green eyes and small feet, however others have blond hair and small feet, and so on" (*apud* Kövecses, 2006, p. 32).

In connection with the above mentioned theory we have to introduce the work of philosopher John Austin (*Apud*: Kövecses, 2006, p. 33) as the scholar "extended the notion of categories to the senses of words. He thought of the sense of words as being organized around a prototypical sense. For example, he showed by way of analyzing the different senses of the word *healthy* that one of the senses is central, while others are non-central, or peripheral. *Healthy* can mean a *healthy body*, and it can also mean *productive of healthy body*, as in a *healthy exercise*, and *resulting from a healthy body*, as in a *healthy complexion*. Thus, we have a category of senses with the sense "healthy body" in the center, that is, being the prototypical one, and two non-prototypical senses, "producing a healthy body" and "resulting from a healthy body", that both derive from the prototype. The relationship between the prototypical and non-prototypical senses of words are motivated by "metonymic relations".

Thus the notion of prototype-based organization in categories can be applied to three distinct levels, or areas of language: 1) categories for everyday concepts; categories for senses of words and 3) categories for linguistic concepts (Kövecses, 2006, p. 34).

Speaking about the notion of prototype-based organization in categories it is clear that prototypes "differ from culture to culture, subculture to subculture, and so on, this will affect how we understand members of other groups. [...] prototype-based categories involve all kinds of abstractions as well, including emotions (anger, pride, joy, etc.), personal relationships (marriage, friendship, privacy, etc.), evaluative and personal qualities (beauty, intelligence, etc.), political concepts (democracy, conservatism, etc.), and more" (*Ibidem*, p. 38).

An example of "propaganda" meaning is given in an intercultural dialogue between an American and a Chinese. The reaction to this word given by the American is "That's hilarious! In English it will cause an entirely negative feeling". While in China they use the word frequently to mean a lot of positive things. For example government has propaganda division, propaganda office (Kövecses, 2006, p. 38).

Universality and non-universality in categories among cultures is another issue that interests us in the context of concept study. As stated above most problematic to categorize and identify is the meaning of abstract ideas that at the first sight may seem universal cross-culturally, for example the primary colours or basic emotions. Moreover there are categorical concepts that are called "contested" as they are very complex in their structure, meaning and the processes involved. The definitions of these concepts do not give any features and it is the course of historical development that can help in identifying the common features that unite the producers and products of such concepts.

An example of such concept is ART announced by the English Philosopher W. Gallie as a highly contested category and further provides seven conditions to define an essentially contested concept: 1) The category must be appraisive or evaluative (must evaluate an achievement); 2) the achievement must be internally complex (consisting of a number of parts or aspects); 3) the explanation of its worth must make reference to the individual parts or aspects, but in doing so it can make reference to and assign different amounts of value to these parts or aspects; in other words, its value is describable in many different ways; 4) the achievement must be capable of indefinite modification, that is, must be "open" in character; 5) each party recognizes that his or her definition is contested or challenged by others and each party is aware, to some extent at least, of the differing views of others; that is, the concept is used both "aggressively and defensively"; 6) The category involves a concept that derives from an original exemplar whose authority is acknowledged by all the contestant users of the concept; 7) The continuous competition between contestant users enables the original exemplar's achievement to be sustained and developed (Gallie, 1956).

Concept "noroc" in Romanian is not such a complex one as the idea of "art" discussed above and in order to study it we are going to use the theory of Frames and determine the Ideal Cognitive Models (ICM) that are found in the Minds of the people who speak Romanian and manage to express it linguistically by means of proverbs.

From the perspective of an experientialist in cognitive science, meaning is defined by frames; as the best known formulation of this idea suggests, "meanings are relativized to frames/ scenes". Many frames are structured by the elements they contain. The frames that we use are not only cognitive but also cultural constructs (Kövecses, 2006, p. 77).

If we speak about "noroc", its frame contains a number of elements such as: "luck", "fortune" and "destiny" (in its positive and negative meaning). The elements are connected by particular events such as playing a lottery and winning some money, obtaining something by chance (without making any effort), being involved in a number of successive successful activities, being lucky or unlucky to be successful and is used in Romanian in such expressions as *la (într-un) noroc* (by chance); *a avea noroc* or *a fi cu noroc* (to be lucky or to be favoured), *cu sau fără (de) noroc* (successful or non-successful); *Noroc că...* (luckily); *a avea noroc de cineva* (sau *de ceva*) (to have a supporting person in some business, to make use of someone/something helpful) (Dex online).

Professor V. Țapoc în his paper "Preocupări filosofice asupra tehnicilor de cumul de «noroc» în viață sau despre avantajele consilierii filosofice", makes reference to Aristotle's writings and claims that "it is a certain thing that every activity of the ancient Greeks included the act of thinking. Even "luck" indirectly depends on the thought. In his work entitled "Fizica" (Physics) Aristotle wrote: "It is evident that "luck" is a cause by accident in the things which are done for a purpose act in which the doer makes a choice. Thus "thought" and "luck" belong to the same category because a choice is made by means of thinking. This method is used by the humans and it is interesting why the wise ancient Greeks paid attention to the events that happened by chance and did not consider the usual events. Probably the rest of the living beings exist conducted by their needs and only the man is wise enough to choose the freedom of benefitting from the causes which happen accidentally rather than benefiting from the common/ usual results and logical activities. Further on V. Țapoc makes reference to R. Rorty who considered that the chance had more importance than the necessity for a human being. Possibly the ancient Greeks understood this idea in a similar way and found the universal mechanism to capture "luck" making use of the main tool of the human being, i.e. his brain with all the processes inside it: thinking, cognition, meditation, volition and emotions by making it an adherent of the formative and consulting function of philosophy to reach the previously set goals (our translation), (Țapoc, 2011, pp. 8-9). Thus we see that the idea of "chance" was attractive to the people from ancient times.

As announced above in this paper we have worked with Romanian proverbs that render the idea of the Romanian "luck". The 93 proverbs were collected from "Dicționar de proverbe și zicători românești" the authors of which are Anatol and Dan Vidrașcu.

Having classified the proverbs according to the Theory of Frames we have identified 9 prototypic scenarios which share common features and bear metaphorical meaning as they contain the source domain and the target domain elements, the source domain representative not always being physical one. The nine frames are as follows: "luck as a gift of destiny" (37 ex.) with further subdivision into "specified quantity of luck" (6 ex.), the "Path of luck" (11 ex) and "luck as good/ bad destiny" (15 ex.); "luck as intelligence" (11 ex.); "luck as success" (10 ex.); "luck and work" (discipline/obedience) (10 ex.); the "lack of luck" (8 ex.) and three more classes with 2 examples each: "luck and argument"; "luck and unsatisfaction" and "luck as/ and food". By the number of examples identified in each frame we can infer that the most prototypical frames for the Romanian culture with reference to "luck" are "luck as a gift of the destiny" and its opposed frame "luck and destiny", the latter being classified separately because it bears both positive and negative meaning and differs by its features from the previous frame. The next frames by importance are "luck as intelligence"; "luck and work/discipline/obedience", "luck as success" and "lack of luck", each frame containing about 10 proverbs from our list and may be considered prototypical as well.

In what follows we would come with examples of the announced frames which are linguistically expressed by metaphors, e. g: LUCK AS A GIFT OF DESTINY (in a large quantity)

- (1) *A-i nimeri norocul în palmă.*
- (2) *A avea noroc cât frunză și iarbă.*
- (3) *A se naște în cămașă.*
- (4) *A-i merge ca din apă.*

Within the same frame but being part of a subcategory, we consider LUCK AS A GIFT OF DESTINY (its Path), e.g.:

- (5) *Se va întoarce ea roata norocului.*
- (6) *A-i merge plugul bine.*
- (7) *A-l ajunge norocul.*
- (8) *Norocul nu fuge după om ci omul după noroc.*

LUCK AS DESTINY (AS GOOD LUCK OF BAD LUCK):

- (9) *Așa i-a fost partea și norocul.*
- (10) *Fiecare cu norocul lui trăiește.*
- (11) *Nici nu trebuie să fii frumos când ești norocos.*
- (12) *Cine noroc are pune-n piatră și răsare.*

LUCK AS INTELLIGENCE

- (13) *A avea mai mult noroc decât minte.*
- (14) *Norocul calcă în urma minții.*
- (15) *Norocul prostului.*

(16) *Prost să fii, noroc să ai.*

(17) *Norocul e nimic, înțelepciunea e totul.*

(18) *Mintea e bună dacă e soră cu norocul.*

(19) *Decât un car de minte, mai bine un gram de noroc.*

LUCK AND SUCCESS

(20) *Dacă are omul noroc, măcar să semene cărbuni și tot se face.*

(21) *I-a bătut ceasul norocului.*

(22) *I-a ieșit iepurele înainte.*

(23) *Î-l ține norocul de păr.*

LUCK AND WORK/DISCIPLINE/OBEDIENCE

(24) *Unde tot la loc este și noroc.*

(25) *Norocu-i după cum și-l face omul. (Luck and thought)*

(26) *Cine șede își leagă norocul.*

(27) *Nu sta că-ți stă norocul.*

(28) *Munca omului noroc îi aduce.*

LACK OF LUCK

(29) *A avea noroc cât păr în palmă.*

(30) *A fi plin de noroc ca broasca de păr.*

(31) *A-i dormi norocul.*

(32) *A-i fi norocul pleșcat.*

The image of "luck" in the last category often appears in the image of "hair" (ex., 29, 30, 32), the lack of which stands for "no luck" in Romanian.

Metaphor is only derivatively a linguistic phenomenon. It exists in the language because it exists in the body/brain and thought. Linguistic metaphors (i.e., metaphors in language) are expressions of metaphorical concepts in the brain's conceptual system. So, on the one hand, metaphorical linguistic expressions make conceptual metaphors manifest, and on the other, we can use these metaphorical expressions to arrive at metaphors in thought by means of hypothetically assuming links between two domains that can, in turn, be put to the test in psychological experiments (Kövecses, 2006, p. 126).

Metaphors according to their cognitive functions are structural (they impose structure on the target), other metaphors are ontological (they specify the existential status, processes, actions, states and so on) and orientational metaphors which suppose that such issues as health, morality, rationality, consciousness and control are metaphorically oriented UPWARDS, whereas their opposites are all metaphorically DOWN (Kövecses, 2006, p. 132).

To analyse the metaphorical frames in the Romanian language we have chosen the short story "Moara cu noroc" ("The Lucky Mill", our translation). It was written and published in 1881 by Ioan Slavici (2001). It represents the author's view on the community of the village, a community very important in the Romanian culture. The short story belongs to the classical realism genre by depicting the true to life social reality in the end of the 19th century in Ardeal (Romania). It is a psychological novel according to the theme treated in it. The title has an ironic valence as it brings

no luck to the protagonist and has a tragic ending. “Moara cu noroc”, a title which supposes this is a good place is seen as a material object. Instead of grinding wheat into flour and contributing to a happy human life it stands for an “Inn which grinds the human destinies”.

The conceptual metaphor LUCK AS DESTINY is expressed in the whole work, though linguistically it can be noticed only in some examples, for instance:

(33) *Ei! ce să-mi faci!? grăi Ghiță, când își văzu zădărnicit astfel planul. Se vede că acesta e norocul meu, și dac-ar fi nenorocirea mea; cine poate să scape de soarta ce-i este scrisă!? Poate că e mai bine așa. (p. 44)*

(34) *Dar ce să fac, își zise el în cele din urmă, dacă Dumnezeu nu mi-a dat gândul cel bun în ceasul potrivit? Dacă e rău ce fac, nu puteam să fac altfel. (p. 50)*

(35) *Bătrâna ședea cu copiii pe-o piatră de lângă cele cinci cruci și plângea cu lacrimi alinătoare. – Se vede c-au lăsat ferestrele deschise! zise ea într-un târziu. Simțeam eu că nu are să iasă bine; dar așa le-a fost dat!... (p. 53)*

As we see, the idea that every human has or has no “luck” and s/he is born with it (the idea which represents his/her destiny).

LUCK AS INTELLIGENCE is also a prototypical metaphorical frame in Romanian, expressed linguistically in the following sentences, e.g.:

(36) *Buză-Ruptă și pe Săilă Boarul nu-i putură prinde decât treizeci și șase de ceasuri în urmă, la Salonta, cale de vreo două poște înspre Oradea-Mare, și nici nu se mai întoarseră cu ei la Ineu, ci-i duseră drept la Oradea- Mare, unde aveau să fie judecați și unde se aflau și ceilalți, afară de Lică, pe care judecătorul îl ascultase mai nainte decât pe toți ceilalți și-l lăsase iar să-și caute de trebile stăpânilor. (Lică era norocos, știa cu cine să prietenească.) (p. 33).*

(37) *... însă Dumnezeu e pretutindenea, fiindcă pretutindenea, în tot locul și în toate timpurile soarta omului atârnă de întâmplări a căror tainică legătură el cu mintea lui mărginită nu poate să o cuprindă. (p. 49).*

As mentioned above in the Romanian society “Noroc” (luck) is a part of destiny the human is born with and the first appearance of the person in a new societal circumstance may be an examination or a test of his/her luck, in this case we identify a metaphor which depicts LUCK AS A DRESS/COVER which, on the one hand protects the body, and on the other one influences the people around, e.g.:

(38) *... dacă voi vă duceți la moară, nici vorbă nu poate fi ca eu să rămân aici ori să mă duc în altă parte: dacă vă hotărâți să mergeți, mă duc și eu cu voi și mă duc cu toată inima, cu tot sufletul, cu toată dragostea mamei care încearcă norocul copilului ieșit în lume. (p. 1).*

The protective character of “luck” is also noticed in other examples in the short story, for instance: (39) *Iară pentru Ghiță cârciuma era cu noroc. (p. 2).*

In the contemporary society people associate “luck” with gambling which is a vice and a tragedy for the whole family if the gambler is addicted to it. Still, in gambling we see the movement of a wheel and the moment it stops becomes crucial in determining the moment of “luck” for the gambler. This idea is used in many so called “good games”, or “entertainment games” used in the Romanian society.

The game's name is "Roata norocului" and you can find it in entertainment centers or at the sea-side. I saw it last year in Constanța, Romania. One has to pay for the entertainment and then spin the wheel (start to rotate it) and see what s/he gets (the result determines the luck of the person). If you obtain a pre-determined gift you are considered lucky, if you get nothing then you are unlucky. Certainly it is an activity used only for entertainment or for fun. The conceptual metaphor that is construed from this situation is LUCK AS A MOMENT IN THE ACTION.

Another interesting idea to be discussed is the slogan used by marketologists to promote people's playing lottery for entertainment. It says: "trezeșteți norocul", as if "luck is your companion" and you have to take care of it, i.e. wisely use it, a hint to the implicit metaphor LUCK AS INTELLIGENCE.

Having conducted the study on the conceptual metaphor in the Romanian language we came to the following conclusions: The cognitive sciences are one of the best theoretical backgrounds for studying the universal and the culture specific concepts in various languages. They can explain the processes that happen in the Mind of a human as a universal being on the one hand and also help us identify the culture specific features of concepts by their expression as the individual belongs and lives in a certain cultural environment putting into use linguistic expressions that render concepts from the view of the representatives of that very culture (in our case the Romanian language and culture).

While trying to understand how to study concepts we looked at the theory of linguistic relativity and could compare and comprehend the two parts of Whorf and Sapir hypothesis (the strong and the weak ones) and also adhere to the point of view of the majority of researchers about it.

The study of "noroc" concept in the Romanian language revealed the nine frames of metaphors, the one announced in the title of the paper being dominant, followed by other frames like "luck as intelligence", "luck as success", "luck as work/discipline/obedience" and "lack of luck".

The examples from the short story "The Lucky Mill", the title of which is ironic as it "grinds" not wheat into flour but human destinies", proved the correctness of the hypothesis which is expressed in the title of the paper.

Today the act of "trying one's luck" in the Romanian culture transformed into an action of entertainment and is promoted socially by encouraging people to play Lottery or the Lucky Wheel.

Referințe bibliografice:

1. BARSALOU, Lawrence, W. *Cognitive Psychology: An Overview for Cognitive Scientist*. New-York and London: Psychology Press, 1992, 400 p. ISBN 13: 978-0-805-80691-5.
2. FOLEY, William. *Anthropological Linguistics. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997. ISBN 978-0-444-51747-0 https://www.academia.edu/28923470/Anthropological_Linguistics [accesat 2025-08-11].

3. GALLIE, W. B. *Essentially contested concepts. In The Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. Vol. 51, pp.167-198. London: Harrison and Sons, 1956. [online] <https://cooperism.law.columbia.edu/files/2023/12/Gallie-Essentially-Contested-Concepts-1955-CL.pdf> [accesat 2025-08-11].
4. KÖVECSES, Zoltán. *Language, Mind and Culture. A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006, 410 p. ISBN 0- 19-518720-2.
5. TAYLOR, John, R. *Linguistic Categorization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989/1995, 328 p. ISBN 978-0198700135.
6. ȚAPOC, Vasile, *Preocupări filosofice asupra tehnicilor de cumul de „noroc” în viață sau despre avantajele consilierii filosofice*. În: *Lucrările conferinței ... Științe Socioumaniste*. 2011, pp. 5-10. https://repository.utm.md/bitstream/handle/5014/6189/Conf_StiinteSocioUmanist_2011_pg510.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [accesat 2025-07-28].
7. WIERZBICKA, Anna. *Semantics, Culture and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, 487 p. ISBN 0-19-5073266.
8. Dex [online] <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/noroc> [accesat 2025-07-28].
9. VIDRAȘCU, A. și D. VIDRAȘCU. *Dicționar de proverbe și zicători românești*. București: Litera, 2020, 272 p. <https://ru.scribd.com/document/629871197/Proverbe-si-zicatori-romanesti> [accesat 2024-03-07].
10. SLAVICI, Ioan. *Moara cu noroc*. București-Chișinău: Litera Internațional, 2001, 312 p. ISBN 973-8358-19-1. <https://bgrmihailsturdza.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/slavici-ioan-moara-cu-noroc-carte.pdf> [accesat 2024-03-01].