

UDC 811.111'1'28(045)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/69-2-29>**Malvina MIKITINA,***orcid.org/0000-0002-6891-6061**Lecturer at the Department of English and Methods of its Teaching
Uman State Pavlo Tychyna Pedagogical University
(Uman, Ukraine) m.kolomiiets@udpu.edu.ua***Yulia BILENKA,***orcid.org/0000-0001-7909-5070**Lecturer at the Department of English and Methods of its Teaching
Uman State Pavlo Tychyna Pedagogical University
(Uman, Ukraine) yuliabil91@gmail.com*

LEXICOLOGICAL MEANING OF CONCEPTS “ANIMAL” AND “BIRD” IN THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE

Typology of concepts is at the center of scientific research of many researchers today. The directions of their research differ depending on the scientific preferences of linguists. The article describes the scientific observation and research of the concept in the American lexical environment. It was determined that the meaning of the concept “concept” depends on the direction of research. The concept is considered as a key concept of culture. This direction borders on linguistic and cultural studies and is often considered as a part of it. According to the interpretation of the concept in the works of culturologists, the concept is a “cultural constant” that exists constantly or for a long time. We have studied such a generalized concept, which can be used in a narrower, sometimes slang language environment. The concepts “Bird” and “Animal” are characterized in more detail. Attention is focused on identifying ideas about various animals and birds necessary to describe a fragment of American slang. Within the framework of the cognitive approach, the typology of concepts is presented according to two parameters: the concept belongs to a certain group of media and its content. Various views on the understanding of the essence, nature and structure of the concept are presented, various classifications of concepts are considered according to the degree of abstraction, significance, structure, representation and the nature of their observability. Despite the large number of interpretations, most scientists agree that the concept is an existing linguistic and cognitive unit in the human mind, but finds its expression in language. It is worth considering the environment of using concepts. It should be noted that in the case of rhyming slang, there are often cases when cognitive analysis is complicated. In such cases, it can be stated that it is impossible to restore the motivational situation. A conclusion was made regarding the perspective of further research and the creation of a more perfect typology.

Key words: *concept, bird, animal, the American language.*

Мальвіна МІКІТІНА,*orcid.org/0000-0002-6891-6061**викладач кафедри англійської мови та методики її навчання
Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини
(Умань, Україна) m.kolomiiets@udpu.edu.ua***Юлія БІЛЕНЬКА,***orcid.org/0000-0001-7909-5070**викладач кафедри англійської мови та методики її навчання
Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини
(Умань, Україна) yuliabil91@gmail.com*

ЛЕКСИКОЛОГІЧНЕ ЗНАЧЕННЯ ПОНЯТЬ «ТВАРИНА» І «ПТАХ» В АМЕРИКАНСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Типологія концептів перебуває в центрі наукових пошуків багатьох дослідників сьогодення. Напрями їхніх досліджень різняться залежно від наукових уподобань лінгвістів. У статті описане наукове спостереження та дослідження поняття концепту в американському лексичному середовищі. Визначено, що зміст поняття «концепт» залежить від напрямку дослідження. Концепт розглядається як ключовий концепт культури. Цей напрям межує з лінгвокультурологією і часто розглядається як її частина. Відповідно до трактування концепту в працях культурологів, концепт – це «культурна константа», яка існує постійно або тривалий час. Нами було

досліджено таке узагальнене поняття, яке може вживатися у більш вузькому, інколи сленговому мовному середовищі. Більш детально охарактеризовано концепти «Птах» та «Тварина». Зосереджено увагу на виявленні уявлень про різноманітних тварин і птахів, необхідних для опису фрагмента американського сленгу. У межах когнітивного підходу типологію концептів представлено відповідно до двох параметрів: належність концепту до певної групи носіїв та його змістове наповнення. Наведено різні погляди щодо розуміння сутності, природи та структури концепту, розглянуто різні класифікації концептів за ступенем абстракції, значимості, структури, репрезентації й характеру їх спостережуваності. Незважаючи на велику кількість трактувань, більшість вчених сходяться на думці, що концепт є існуючою мовно-когнітивною одиницею у свідомості людини, але знаходить своє вираження в мові. Варто враховувати середовище використання концептів. Слід зазначити, що у випадку римованого сленгу часто бувають випадки, коли когнітивний аналіз ускладнений. У таких випадках можна констатувати, що відновити мотиваційну ситуацію неможливо. Зроблено висновок щодо перспективності подальших досліджень і створення більш досконалої типології.

Ключові слова: концепт, мова, дослідження, пташка, тварина.

Formulation of the problem Every language is social, so it cannot exist without interconnection with people and society. Society actively influences the formation of language and vocabulary. Language is primarily a means of communication between people, but at the same time it is a sign system with its own internal laws of functioning. In recent decades, more and more scholars have chosen speech, or rather oral language, as the object of their research, analyzing live, unprepared speech that hides the full flavor of the people who use the language. An integral part of everyday communication is the use of non-standard vocabulary or slang.

The absence of a holistic concept of functional differentiation of language affects the development of principles for distinguishing between standard and non-standard vocabulary, despite the interest of linguists in the relevant units of different languages and the more than two hundred-year history of compiling slang dictionaries. Moreover, this problem is exacerbated by the fact of the transition of units due to the natural processes of language development (Ivashchenko, 2005: 137).

The traditional view of language as a macrosystem, which includes a corpus of standard and non-standard vocabulary, assumes that non-standard English is closely related to standard English; it is not an isolated system but a part of the sociolinguistic structure of English.

Analysis of the latest research and publications.

Basic research by scientists into such phenomena as colloquialism, social dialects (V. Zhyrmunsky, Ch. Fillmorr, L. Yakubynsky) became a prerequisite for studying slang. The attention of philologists to non-literary forms of language was renewed in the 90s of the twentieth century. This was due to changes in the language against the background of various transformations. At that time, the strongest influence of slang and colloquial vocabulary on the literary language was noted, caused by the entry into public life of representatives of various social groups – speakers of specific slang and other forms of non-literary speech.

Today, substandard vocabulary is an integral part of the lexicon, and it is absolutely impossible to do without it when learning a foreign language. It helps to understand everyday speech, find and interpret hidden meaning in statements.

The purpose of the article is to identify the ideas about various animals and birds necessary for describing the fragment of the CS of American slang in the next section, we need to turn to the cognitive analysis of verbal representatives of these concepts of animals and birds- macro concepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD”.

The cognitive analysis of the macro-concepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD” should be carried out on the basis of a cognitive analysis of the internal form and actual meaning of the linguistic units that verbalize these macro-concepts.

Presenting main material. Most works in the field of cognitive linguistics use a range of concepts that are associated with various linguistic and cognitive structures and mental processes in general. These include such key categories as concept, prototype, cognitive structure, categorization, etc. To solve the research tasks, it is necessary to clarify the basic concepts of cognitive linguistics.

The conditions for the formation of cognitive science have determined its interdisciplinary nature. As a result, CL (cognitive linguistics), as part of cognitive science in its domestic and foreign versions, has borrowed the term “concept” as a result of the collision with psychology, philosophy, cultural studies and other disciplines. In foreign cognitive science, a concept is understood as a certain construct that refers to the mental level of a person (Ivashchenko, 2004). A concept is sometimes equated with a mental representation, which can be the meaning of a linguistic expression. The main units of the conceptual structure are its conceptual constituents – concepts correlated with conceptual “parts of speech”: the concept of the Object (Thing) – “dog”, Event – “war”, Property – “redness”, Place – “in the house”, etc. The term “concept” (concept) can be interpreted as a basic mental formation involved in conceptualization.

Today, there are several areas of concept research in the national CL (Sukhorolska, 2009). Therefore, we consider it expedient to distinguish several main ones, based on the developed classifications of leading researchers: linguistic and cultural, which is adjacent to cultural, psycholinguistic and linguistic and cognitive. Accordingly, the content of the term “concept” depends on the direction of research.

In line with the cultural studies trend (Jackendoff, 1992: 107), the concept is considered as a key concept of culture. This direction borders on linguistic and cultural studies and is often considered as a part of it. According to the interpretation of the concept in the works of cultural studies, a concept is a “cultural constant” that exists permanently or for a long time (Jackendoff, 1992). A concept is a unit of culture in a concentrated form (Sukhorolska, 2009). The property of concepts as cultural constants is their representation of the cultural heritage of a particular ethnic group, as well as the characterization of the mental world (Jackendoff, 1992).

From the standpoint of psycholinguistics, concepts are interpreted as basic cognitive essences contained in human knowledge and subconsciousness. They are the end product of the conceptualization process (Yaroshchuk, 2012: 159). The psycholinguistic interpretation of the term “concept” implies the definition of a concept as a “perceptual, cognitive and affective formation of a dynamic nature” that obeys the laws of the human psyche (Yaroshchuk, 2012: 159–160).

The interpretation of the concept as a linguistic and cognitive entity is most relevant for this study. A concept is a meaningful unit of memory, the language of the brain (“lingua mentalis”), as well as a picture of the world represented in the human psyche, and language is the most convenient means of accessing the language of the brain and, accordingly, the essence of the human conceptual system. Following many researchers of concepts (Jackendoff, 1992), it is advisable to follow the semantic-cognitive (linguocognitive) approach, i.e., to move from the study of linguistic material to the description of the conceptual sphere of an ethnic group. In a number of studies on CL, there is a certain tendency noted by many concept researchers (Soudek, 1967: 104).

Despite the differentiation of the above areas in the study of the concept, the linguistic-cognitive and linguistic-cultural approaches are closely related and not mutually exclusive. Both approaches differ only in the vector of research: analyzing the linguistic-cognitive concept, researchers go from the consciousness of the individual to the culture of the ethnic group, while considering the linguistic-cultural concept – from culture to individual consciousness (Sukhorolska, 2009).

The multi-level nominal units of any language objectify and reflect certain mechanisms. In the process of categorization, representatives of one language community create a certain conceptual world picture (hereinafter – CWP). This CCP is objectified in the language – at the level of the linguistic world picture (hereinafter – LWP), and at the cognitive level is represented by concepts.

The categorization of various phenomena of reality concerns various phenomena, including the animal world.

A cognitive is a propositional cognitive element, a cognitive unit that is reconstructed when analyzing the cognitive space of linguistic units. The cognitem characterizing the macro-concepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD” are identified on the basis of the analysis of the semantics of the internal form in interaction with the substandard meaning of the verbal representatives of the analyzed macro-concepts. It should be emphasized that the cognitive analysis of non-standard lexical and phraseological units that objectify macroconcepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD”, is analyzed in the same section due to the specificity of the analyzed material. Firstly, the specificity lies in the fact that both FPs and substandard lexemes are signs of secondary nomination – they show semantic duality, i.e., they record two types of cognitive information about the world and its fragments at the level of internal format and at the level of actual meaning (Soudek, 1967: 108; Ivashchenko, 2004). Secondly, the fixation of cognates for each of the macro-concepts revealed regular intersections of cognates for both non-standard lexical and substandard phraseological units.

Despite the fact that the methodology of cognitive analysis has been developed in detail and described in cognitive research (Soudek, 1967: 111), it is advisable to highlight the key points related to it.

The structure of the cognitive system or “cognitive record” can be described within the formula “concept + associative relationship + concept”, which at the verbal level corresponds to the “word + word” scheme (the case of implicit associative relationship) or the “several semantically significant words” scheme (the case of explicit associative relationship) (Soudek, 1967: 108; Ivashchenko, 2005: 140).

Thus, the cognates for the analyzed macro-concepts are divided into those consisting of two or more semantically significant words (*A bird flies; An animal moves in a certain way; A bird is kept in a cage*). Since the animal concepts are summarized under the integrating category of “microconcept “ANIMAL”, and bird concepts – under the “macroconcept “BIRD”, then the name of the concepts is the name of the corresponding macro-concept. However, for each cognitive theme, within this pair of macro-

concepts, the names of the concepts in which they are actualized are indicated. Let's illustrate this thesis: “*A bird is nocturnal*” (bat, owl) is a generalized conceptual feature (*nocturnal* lifestyle) actualized in the concepts Bat and Owl and verbalized by the units bat (a prostitute or promiscuous woman (like the creatures, they appear at night)); owl (the late-night customers of bars, cafes and restaurants)).

The introduction of the concept of “single cognitive unit” in this study is appropriate in view of the need for a clearer classification of cognitions by volume, rather than simply bringing cognitions into the framework of differentiation: cognitive unit, cluster cognition. Thus, the term “single cognitive theme” refers to single conceptual features (macro) of a concept that have a fairly high frequency of actualization in its structure, which, however, cannot be combined into a cluster. According to the specifics of the analyzed material, it seems expedient to expand the scope of the concept of “subcognitive”. The analysis revealed sub-cognitions that are not only included in a certain cluster cognition, but also act as a kind of cluster themselves, which unite, in turn, sub-cognitions-2. Let's illustrate this thesis with an example: within the macroconcept “ANIMAL” there is a cluster cognitive “*An animal has a body*” that integrates a number of subcognates: “*An animal has eyes*”, “*An animal has skin*”, “*An animal has a tail*” and so on. In turn, the subcognitive “*An animal has eyes*” itself represents a cluster – a cluster subcognitive. It is partitioned into subcognates-2: “*An animal has red eyes*”, “*An animal has black eyes*”, “*An animal has green-grey eyes*”.

The scope of the analyzed macroconcepts is not limited to cluster and single cognitemes that make up its core. In the structure of both macroconcepts, there are peripheral features – low-frequency cognitemes. They are poorly represented in their structure and, accordingly, are actualized by single non-standard derivatives. These low-frequency cognates characterizing individual concepts are integrated into the macro-concepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD”, can also be identified and described, as they provide additional information necessary for analysis. However, for this study, this type of cognitemes are irrelevant, given their low level of involvement in the structure of the analyzed macroconcepts.

Cognitemes specify various characteristics of animals and birds, as well as actions performed by them and on them: external characteristics (“*An animal has teeth*”; “*A bird has feathers*”); qualitative characteristics (“*An animal is aggressive*”); “*A bird is foolish*”); behavioral traits caused by metabolism – eating behavior, defecation, urination.

(“*An animal egests*”, “*A bird eats seeds*”); behavioral characteristics related to reproduction and offspring (“*An animal copulates*”, “*A bird lays eggs*”); territorial behavior (“*An animal inhabits cities*”, “*A bird is migratory*”); behavioral traits related to natural abilities (“*An animal bellows*”, “*A bird sings*”); behavioral traits related to the performance of actions (“*An animal cuts down trees*”, “*A bird puts eggs in another bird's nest*”); animals and birds are the object of various actions by humans and their natural enemies (“*An animal is tranquilized to calm*”, “*A bird is trapped*”) (Sukhorolska, 2009).

Let us dwell on the general principles of searching for cognitemes and their varieties. It is customary to distinguish between “actual” and “etymological” cognitemes. The first type is differentiated into “explicit” and “implicit” cognitemes (the latter can be extracted from a “prototype situation”). The second type is characterized only by implicit features and its “decoding” requires reference to the “prototype situation”. There are also mythological and meta-language cognitemes (Ivashchenko, 2005). Guided by the developed methods of cognitive analysis outlined in the works of a similar orientation (Soudek, 1967: 198), it seems possible to apply them to the material analyzed in this study. The allocation of relevant explicit cognitemes at the level of the internal form of multilevel nominal units in which the analyzed macroconcepts are verbalized is easy. However, explicit cognitemes are distinguished only in lexical units with the structure of a compound or compound-derived word, as well as in any type of FP. The compound noun *cat-lap* (milk) encodes the cognitive “*An animal laps*”; in the FP *hare's fur* (Ceramics) a brown or black glaze streaked with silvery white or yellow, used on certain varieties of Chinese pottery) – cognitive concept “*An animal has fur*”. In the unit “*hare's fur*” reveals another cognitive theme that is implicit in the word. To decipher it, it is necessary to refer to the substandard meanings of the FO – (Ceramics) a brown or black glaze streaked with silvery white or yellow, used on certain varieties of Chinese pottery). Accordingly, the implicit cognitive “*An animal has colored fur*” is revealed, which complements the explicit cognitive.

The analysis of substandard LFOs indicates that most of the identified cognitemes are implicit. There are also cases of coincidence of explicit and implicit cognates in the structure of one concept. Cases of fixation of only explicit features within the internal form of a linguistic unit have also been noted (*Does a chicken have lips?* (US a rhetorical phrase of which the implication is, “Don't ask me stupid questions. Of course...”) → cognitive unit “*A bird has lips*”), but they do not exceed the threshold of 16% of the

entire corpus of analyzed verbal representatives of the macro-concepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD”.

Let us illustrate these points. In the compound noun *donkey-feet* ((Horse-racing) a description of a horse with especially narrow hooves], the cognitive “*An animal has feet*” can be explicitly obtained at the level of the internal form. Here, the analysis of the actual meaning allows us to identify the implicit cognitive “*An animal has thin legs*”. The combination of explicit and implicit cognates (hereinafter referred to as EC and IR) was archived in formations: *calf-legs* (US Cattleman, a horse whose legs are disproportionately short compared to its body) → EC “*An animal has legs*”, IR “*An animal has short legs*”; *goose egg* (a zero) → EC “*A bird lays eggs*”, IR “*A bird has round eggs*”; *cold turkey* (withdrawal from drugs without medication (Skin resembles cold plucked turkey)) → EC “*A bird is cold*”, IR “*A bird has skin*”, IR “*A bird is plucked*”; *bird's nest* ((the image of the nest filled with eggs) US somewhere worth robbing) → EC “*A bird builds a nest*”, IR “*A bird has a nest filled with eggs*”, IR “*A bird lays eggs*”; *monkey-face* (a grimace) → EC “*An animal has a face*”, IR “*An animal grimaces*”; *take off like a bat out of hell* (US to leave very quickly) → EC “*A bird flies*”, IR “*A bird flies fast*”, IR “*A bird flies faster when escaping danger*”; *dead bird* ((like the bird. It can not ‘move’; note Stephens & O’Brein, Materials for a Dict. Of Aus. Sl.: ‘derived from pigeon shooting (...) the prowess of any champion shot that “anything he aims at is a ‘dead bird’”). US a hopeless case or situation) → EC “*A bird dies*”, IR “*A bird can’t move when dead*”; *turkey neck* (the dreaded slack skin or “waddle” under the chin and along the front of the neck that can appear either genetically or as a result of aging. Notoriously resistant to topical creams and scrubs, it is widely believed that the only lasting method for eradication of the turkey neck is a surgical neck lift) → EC “*A bird has a neck*”, IR “*A bird has saggy neck skin*”. It was mentioned earlier that the identification of topical explicit cognates at the level of internal form is possible only when analyzing lexical items with the structure of a compound or compound-derived word, as well as any structural types of FPs. Only implicit cognates are archived in non-standard lexical items representing simple or derivative words in structural terms.

The identification of implicit cognates at the level of lexical units that were not formed by word formation is possible only when referring to the internal form, when correlating the literal and actual meanings, based on the analysis of the secondary semantics of the unit, its metaphorical, substandard meaning. Let us illustrate this thesis: *goat* (US Military, a West Point cadet who has the low-

est academic rank in his class) → IR “*An animal is foolish*”; whale (US Medicine, a grossly obese patient) → IR “*An animal is fat*”; zebra (US Football, an umpire; it comes from the black and white vertically striped shirts worn by the officials) → IR “*An animal has stripes*”; *canary* ((senses based on the yellow color of the bird (Soudek, 1967) although that may image refer to the cage) a convict’s yellow jacket) → IR “*A bird has yellow plumage*”; IR “*A bird is kept in a cage*”; *chicken* ((the stereotype of the chicken as a cowardly creature) US teen, a contest of nerve in which two cars drive towards either each other or an obstacle, cliff edge, etc. – the loser being the driver who turns aside first) → IR “*A bird is a coward*”; *penguin* ((the black and white pill) a variety of LSD) → IR “*A bird has black-and-white plumage*”. As already mentioned, in addition to topical cognates, there are etymological cognates. They are opposed to each other by the parameter “synchrony-diachrony” (Soudek, 1967). If certain cognitive features of the analyzed macroconcepts “ANIMAL” and “BIRD” cannot be detected with the synchronous approach, you must refer to the procedure for restoring the motivating situation or “prototype situation” at the diachronic level. Accordingly, cognitemes, “deciphered” as a result of etymological analysis are etymological. Let’s illustrate this thesis with examples of reconstructing a prototype situation and identifying etymological cognates. Let us consider the compound words *rabbit-catcher* [a midwife] and *rabbit-snatcher* (US an abortionist), which hide the same conceptual feature of the Rabbit concept. This feature (etymological cognitive) can be deciphered only at the level of the situation-type. Accordingly, the etymological search reveals the low-frequency IR “*An animal is delivered by a woman*”, and the situation-type is a historical fact that was included in medical textbooks: in 1726, a certain Mary Tofts stated that instead of a child, she gave birth to a litter of rabbits. This case received great publicity, although it was later proven to be a falsification. Another example: the lexical unit *buck* (US \$1, \$10) encodes the etymological cognitive “*An animal has skin (used as barter)*”, to “decipher” which it is necessary to refer to the following situation-image: in the XIX century, deer skin was a means of barter trade between American colonists and indigenous peoples of the United States (Indians) (Soudek, 1967). The analysis revealed etymological cognates that are extracted on the basis of the reconstruction of the biblical situation-type. Thus, in the *lexeme raven* ((the Biblical story) a small portion of bread and cheese) the etymological ICs “*A raven finds*

food in hard conditions" and IC "A raven brings food to people" are archived: the situation-type refers to the biblical story of how the prophet Elijah predicts a drought throughout the earth and is fed by crows: "And the prophet said (...) to Ahab, 'As the Lord God of Israel lives, in whose sight I stand, there will be neither dew nor rain these years, (...). And the word of the Lord came to him: Go from here, and turn eastward, and hide yourself by the brook Kerith (...); of this brook you shall drink, and I have commanded the ravens to feed you there. And he went and did according to the word of the LORD (...). And the ravens brought him bread and meat in the morning, and bread and meat in the evening, and he drank from the brook" (3 Kings). A number of the selected cognitemes represent a special subtype – mythological cognitemes. They are based on "fictional, but firmly entrenched in folk traditions, ideas about animals" or are related to folklore (Soudek, 1967), mythology, and biblical texts. For example, both etymological and mythological cognates underlie the lexical unit *goat* ((the traditional characteristics of the animal, i.e. lechery, stubbornness, etc.) a womanizer, a lecher): IR "An animal is lecherous". This etymological and mythological cognitive refers to the situation-type: in Greek mythology there were mythical creatures – satyrs, outwardly resembling both a man and a goat, who were distinguished by

excessive lust and lustfulness. Accordingly, under the influence of Greek myths, the association of a goat with lust was strengthened in folk beliefs. The idea of a quail as a bird associated with love and lust has been entrenched in the folk tradition: *quail* ((SE quail, a supposedly amorous bird] a prostitute) → IR "A bird is amorous". Some researchers supplement the range of cognates described above with another subtype – meta-linguistic cognates. They "contain an indication of the sound-symbolic external form of zoolexemes" (Jackendoff, 1992) and involve various euphonic mechanisms: alliteration and rhyme.

Conclusions. Thus, we found out that the concept "concept" is quite complex because it has a large number of interpretations. There are five main approaches to understanding this term: linguistic-cognitive, linguistic-cultural, logical, semantic-cognitive, philosophical-semiotic. However, despite the large number of interpretations, the majority scientists agree that the concept is an existing linguistic-cognitive unit in the mind of a person, but finds its expression in language. There are many classifications of concepts based on various criteria, for example, according to by way of expression, by origin, by structure, etc. It should be noted that in the case of rhyming slang, there are often cases when cognitive analysis is difficult. In such cases, we can state that it is impossible to restore the motivating situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Іващенко В. Змістова структура наукового концепту і зміст наукового поняття. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. 2005. Вип. 16, кн. 1. С. 135–142.
2. Іващенко В. Типологічна диференціація концептуальних структур як одиниць ментального простору. *Мовознавство*. 2004. № 1. С. 54–61.
3. Ярошук Л. Комп'ютерний сленг як форма молодіжного спілкування. *Актуальні проблеми романо-германської філології та прикладної лінгвістики*. 2012. № 1. С. 156–164. URL: http://www.chnu.edu.ua/res/chnu.edu.ua/period_vudannia/web13/pdf/2012_1/Larysa_Yaroshchuk.pdf (дата звернення: 27.11.2023).
4. Soudek L. Structure of Substandard Words in British and American English. Bratislava: Slovenská akademia vied. 1967. 229 p.
5. Сухорольська С.М., Федоренко О.І. Методи лінгвістичних досліджень: Навч. посібник. 2-ге вид., перероб. і доп. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка. 2009. 344 с.
6. Jackendoff R. What is a concept? Frames, Fields, and Contrasts. *New Essays in Semantics and Lexical Organization*. Hillsdale, 1992. 154 p.

REFERENCES

1. Ivashchenko V. L. (2005) Zmistova struktura naukovooho kontseptu i zmist naukovooho poniattia. [The content structure of the scientific concept and the content of the scientific concept] *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu*. Vyp. 16, kn. 1. S. 135–142. [In Ukrainian]
2. Ivashchenko V. (2004) Typolohichna dyferentsiatsiia kontseptualnykh struktur yak odynyts mentalnoho prostoru. *Movoznavstvo*. № 1. Pp. 54–61. [In Ukrainian]
3. Yaroshchuk L. Kompiuternyi slenkh yak forma molodizhnoho spilkuvannia. [Computer Slang as a Form of Youth Communication]. *Current Problems of Romano-Germanic Philology and Applied Linguistics*. 2012. No. 1. Pp. 156–164. [in Ukrainian]. URL: http://www.chnu.edu.ua/res/chnu.edu.ua/period_vudannia/web13/pdf/2012_1/Larysa_Yaroshchuk.pdf (date of application: 27.11.2023).
4. Soudek L. Structure of Substandard Words in British and American English. Bratislava: Slovenská akademia vied, 1967. 229 p.
5. Sukhorolska S.M., Fedorenko O.I. (2009) Metody lnhvistychnykh doslidzhen. [Methods of linguistic research]. Navch. posibnyk. 2-he vyd., pererob. i dop. Lviv: Vydavnychy tsestr LNU im. Ivana Franka. 344 s. [In Ukrainian].
6. Jackendoff R. What is a concept? Frames, Fields, and Contrasts. *New Essays in Semantics and Lexical Organization*. Hillsdale, 1992. 154 p.