

UDC 811.111'42:502

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/76-3-3>**Mariana BANEVYCH,***orcid.org/0009-0001-0881-9569*

*Assistant at the Department of English Philology and Methods of Teaching English,
Leading specialist of Centre for Projects and Research
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University
(Ternopil, Ukraine) m.banevych@gmail.com*

LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION GENESIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DISCOURSE

This article is dedicated to the review of modern various approaches to the interpretation of environmental discourse, as well as to the disclosure of genre and structural features of the system of discursive environmental texts of the English language. In addition, the basis of this article is the study of ecological discourse as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon from within modern society. This study analyzes key terms, concepts and arguments used in communication about environmental issues. Special attention is paid to the linguistic means used for the formation and dissemination of ecological ideas and values. The article also examines the influence of environmental discourse on the formation of public perceptions of nature, as well as on the adoption of environmentally sound decisions. The results of the study will help to better understand the role of language and communication in the context of environmental problems and will contribute to the development of more effective strategies for environmental education and enlightenment. Moreover, the given article conducts a linguistic analysis of the ecological discourse in order to identify the main linguistic features and principles of construction of linguistic material used in this field. This article partially examines the terminology, stylistics, syntactic constructions, and other aspects of the speech process that typically characterize environmental discourse. This study focuses on key themes and ideas that arise in speech on the topic of ecology, as well as ways of expressing them. In particular, linguistic aspects of speech practice related to environmental problems are investigated. The results of this study can be used to improve the understanding of environmental problems through the lens of language communication and contribute to the construction of effective communication strategies in the field of ecology.

Key words: *ecological discourse, linguistic ecology, ecological crisis, ecological communication.*

Мар'яна БАНЕВИЧ,*orcid.org/0009-0001-0881-9569*

*асистент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови, провідний фахівець
навчально-наукового центру проєктної та науково-технічної діяльності
Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка
(Тернопіль, Україна) m.banevych@gmail.com*

ГЕНЕЗИС ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО ОПИСУ ЕКОЛОГІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ

Дана стаття присвячена огляду сучасних різноманітних підходів до інтерпретації екологічного дискурсу, а також розкриттю жанрових і структурних особливостей системи дискурсивних екологічних текстів англійської мови. Крім того, в основі цієї статті закладено дослідження екологічного дискурсу як складного та багатогранного феномену з поміж сучасного суспільства. У даному дослідженні аналізуються ключові терміни, концепти та аргументи, що використовуються у комунікації про екологічні питання. Особлива увага приділяється лінгвістичним засобам, які використовуються для формування та поширення екологічних ідей та цінностей. В статті також досліджується вплив екологічного дискурсу на формування суспільних уявлень про природу, а також на прийняття екологічно обґрунтованих рішень. Результати дослідження допоможуть краще зрозуміти роль мови та комунікації в контексті екологічних проблем і сприятимуть розвитку більш ефективних стратегій екологічного освіти та просвітництва. До того ж, у даній статті проводиться лінгвістичний аналіз екологічного дискурсу з метою виявлення основних лінгвістичних особливостей та принципів побудови мовного матеріалу, що використовується в цій сфері. У цій статті частково досліджується термінологія, стилістика, синтаксичні конструкції та інші аспекти мовленнєвого процесу, що, як правило, характеризують екологічний дискурс. У даному дослідженні акцентується увага на ключових темах та ідеях, що виникають у мовленні на тему екології, а також способи їх вираження. Зокрема, досліджуються лінгвістичні аспекти мовленнєвої практики, що стосуються екологічних проблем. Результати цього дослідження можуть використовуватися для покращення розуміння екологічних проблем через призму мовної комунікації та сприяти побудові ефективних стратегій комунікації у галузі екології.

Ключові слова: *екологічний дискурс, лінгвістична екологія, екологічна криза, екологічна комунікація.*

Introducing the problem. Each stage of the evolution of society raises new questions concerning various aspects of human existence and most fully illuminate its needs and aspirations. Linguistics, like any other science, reflects a complex path of knowledge of reality, passing through a number of stages in its development determined by a complex of linguistic problems, which acquire primary importance at each of them. The reorientation of linguistics to anthropocentric orientations shifts the focus of researchers' attention to the study of language in close connection with a person, their thinking, spiritual and practical activity, which provides an opportunity to approach the understanding of the nature of communicative activity. The introduction of the term «discourse» into linguistic circulation played a crucial role in creating the theoretical foundations of the study of the human factor in language. A social system has developed in the world, which is the cause of the emergence and exacerbation of socio-economic and environmental problems, different in scale and nature. The environmental situation as a whole continues to deteriorate.

Research analysis. Modern society is characterized not only by rapid technological development and increased attention of scientists to communication problems, but also by the instigation of a global ecological crisis, problems of human interaction with nature and environmental protection. In order to know how to solve ecological problems people must be aware of the main key instrument, which is discourse. As for the term discourse, as J. Siegfried notes, it is «language within language.» Discourse really exists not just as «grammar», «lexicon», language, but, above all, in texts, with a special grammar, a special lexicon, special rules of word usage and syntax, special semantics, a special world. Each discourse is one of the «possible worlds». The very phenomenon of discourse is proof of the thesis «Language is the home of the spirit» and the thesis «Language is the home of existence» (Siegfried, 2004: 45) and ecology is the science of home. Nature is the house for human in which he/she lives.

As O. Sidorkina notes: «culture is also a home for a person, and a home that is created by the person him/herself. This includes various phenomena – materially realized and embodied in the form of ideas and various spiritual values» (Sidorkina, 2020: 49). By ecology we understand the science of the relations of organisms and the communities formed by them among themselves and with the environment. Discourse as a cultural phenomenon is also defined by K. Karpenko, emphasizing as its main characteristic are value characteristics. «If we understand the

function of an object as its place in the system of a higher object, then the functional characteristic of language is its place in culture» (Karpenko, 2006: 22).

One of the aspects of discourse research is the classification of discourse types and the description of individual discourses corresponding to spheres of human activity, in each of which communication acquires specific features. In recent years, works have appeared in which argumentative (A. Belova), conflict (O. Fadeeva), evaluative (N. Myronova), political (T. van Dijk, R. Vodak, O. Fomenko), advertising (J. Cook, J. Leach), legal (T. Skuratovska), pedagogical (O. Koroteeva) and a number of other discourses were distinguished.

The purpose of the article. The article aims to investigate and analyze the main trends in ecological discourse in the linguistic paradigm and generalize the interpretation of its concept.

Presentation of the main material. The concept of ecological discourse is considered in humanitarian studies not only from the point of view of linguistics and philosophy, but also from the standpoint of cultural studies, forming the so-called cultural-ecological discourse. At the current stage of the development of society, it is difficult to imagine culture «without its component – ecology» (Babire, 2013: 9), while «ecological culture characterizes the general level of human culture, the bearer of ecological consciousness, its ability to make reasonable use of nature, which involves the implementation of economic and economic activities, conscious and careful with respect to the surrounding natural environment» (Babire, 2013: 10).

The question arises not only about human ecological culture, but also about the future development of an ecologically conscious society. Researcher I. Rozmaritsa, speaking about the ecology of culture, noted that «ecology cannot be limited only to the tasks of preserving the natural biological environment. For human life, the environment created by the culture of his ancestors and the person him/herself is no less important. The preservation of the cultural environment is a task no less important than the preservation of the surrounding nature. If nature is necessary for people for their biological life, then the cultural environment is also necessary for their spiritual and moral life. A truly new cultural value arises in an old cultural environment» (Rosmaritsa, 2006: 6). Thus, as the scientist notes, there is biological ecology and cultural ecology.

Society should not oppose nature, as they are an integral part of it. «The emergence of ecological discourse belongs to the number of symbolic phenomena for culture and is closely connected

with the formation of ecological consciousness, with reflection on the ecological situation and ideas about strategies for solving ecological problems. Culturology investigates ecological problems in various directions, because it studies the formation of a new social consciousness, focused on the need to overcome ecological contradictions, contributes to overcoming the limitations of personal scientific positions, the one-sided spiritual and practical orientation of people's relations with nature» (Rosmaritsa, 2006: 3).

The need to reveal the environmental component in the texts and discourses that formed the culture of a certain society, at the same time, implies a cautious attitude to such information, since it affects consciousness and thus forms a cultural personality. Therefore, for the awakening of ecological consciousness, it seems promising not only to study modern texts on ecology, but also texts of past generations, including sacred ones.

In the process of understanding the relationship between society and nature, there is a transformation of the subject of ecology and the differentiation of ecological knowledge and its characteristics from the point of view of various aspects – philosophical, sociological, psychological, etc.

The result is the emergence of a number of new sciences, among which ecolinguistics, which combines ecology and linguistics, occupies a prominent place. This shows that environmental topics and issues attract the attention of linguists as well. Thus, linguistic and cognitive features of ecological discourse are studied, ecological terminology is studied (S. Ovseichyk, K. Simonova), ecological journalism is analyzed (T. Bondarenko, H. Hopko), conceptual metaphors in ecological discourse are described, a linguistic analysis of the discursive structures of environmental topics is carried out (O. Khitarova).

Ecological discourse can be considered from two positions: first, as a discourse that is limited exclusively to issues of ecology as a science; secondly, the ecological discourse can be understood more broadly, i.e. as the discourse of the environment that surrounds a person in his/her life activities.

In the first case, we are talking about the professional discourse of ecologists, whose position through speeches, recorded in scientific articles, reports, monographs, as well as in mass media, has a purely scientific character, and the discourse itself contains all the signs that are characteristic of any scientific discourse (Herring, 2005: 5). The second approach, as noted, is much broader. He rightly testifies that today ecology as an interdisciplinary paradigm has gone far beyond biological disciplines and defines

the intellectual and moral sphere of the modern world. As noted by F. Verhagen, «in the discourse that knowledge and power are closely intertwined» (Verhagen, 2008: 15). Therefore, the methodological foundations of new humanitarian (philosophical, sociological, psychological, pedagogical, educational) paradigms, in particular the strategies of ecological thinking and ecological ethics, show significance based on the interdisciplinary synthesis of knowledge at the discourse level. Researchers call this discourse ecological discourse in the broadest sense of the word, which means ecology of mind, ecology of cognition, action, communication, creativity, etc.

Turning to the origins of the ecological discourse, it should be noted that person has been connected with nature since the first days of his/her existence, which caused the emergence and development of the ecological discourse at the dawn of human civilization. It is formed within the framework of the mytho-religious worldview. The original ideas about nature were reduced to three images according to which nature was understood as:

1) hierarchical order; 2) the unity of opposites: the nourishing mother and the wild uncontrolled force; 3) an idyllic image of benevolence and peacefulness.

As noted by K. Karpenko, each of these interpretations had different social implications: the first image could be used as a justification and support of the existing order, the second – to change society in accordance with the new ideal, the third – to prevent problems that appear as a result of the intervention of production in life. The metaphor of mother nature, which carried the burden of hidden control and limitation, gradually disappeared as the dominant image as the scientific revolution progressed through the rationalization of the worldview. Thus, in the era of the primitive communal system, there was a huge number of beliefs and cults, the source of which was the cult of the Mother Goddess (Mother Earth, Mother Nature), which amounted to worshiping the forces of nature and their identification with the deity. These beliefs manifested themselves in the following forms: animism, totemism, fetishism, shamanism, polytheism and pantheism. In the Middle Ages, in contrast to the polytheistic one, characterized by a hierarchy of gods, a monotheistic worldview emerged. Nature, like people themselves, is understood as God's creation.

During the Renaissance, biology experienced rapid development, within which ecology developed, which was separated into an independent science at the beginning of the 20th century and is defined by the famous German naturalist E. Haeckel as the science of the interaction and mutual influence of living beings and their environment. In the 90s of the XX

century in connection with the need to solve global environmental problems that have resulted from the extensive use of natural resources and the belief that human can control nature, ecological discourse becomes the object of ecolinguistic research that combines ecology and linguistics. The purpose of such studies is to study the role of language in the description of current environmental problems, to reflect in language the problems of human-environment interaction, etc.

Today, among scientists, there is no single approach to the interpretation of ecological discourse. Thus, O. Babire believes that ecological discourse can be understood in a narrow and broad sense. In his opinion, ecological discourse in the narrow sense is a type of discourse that has specific features that distinguish it from other forms of communicative behavior and has a limited scope of use — the speech of people who are interested in ecology and describe the world by means of their own system of cognition and interpretation. In a broad sense, ecological discourse is a set of texts (separate, structured sequences of oral or written statements) in which the relationship between human and the environment is outlined openly, that is, through mass media; or the impact of human activity on the environment and the consequences of this impact on the person himself (Babire, 2013: 4). Environmental discourse can be defined as a text immersed in a situation of use in order to reveal the essence of some environmental problems and influence on the addressee.

An ecological text should be understood as a unit, which has in its semantic content the problems of the relationship between person and the environment, which are marked by social orientation and different degrees of evaluation; at the same time, the central place belongs to the specific fact of such relationships. I. Rozmaritsa interprets ecological discourse as a set of verbal and non-verbal acts used to verbalize knowledge about the environment in order to influence public opinion (Rozmaritsa, 2004: 6). Despite the diversity of approaches to the interpretation of ecological discourse, the key words in all of the above definitions are the words «environment», «person», «relationships», «influence», «information».

Having analyzed the approaches of linguists to the interpretation of ecological discourse, we define it as a specific type of discourse, the purpose of which is to reflect the interaction between man and the environment and the results of such interaction, aimed at informing the population about the state of the environment and the impact on public consciousness.

Environmental discourse is a relatively new phenomenon in language, and therefore not well

studied. However, it is possible to highlight some established points of view on certain aspects of the ecological discourse. In particular, researchers are trying to build a classification of ecological discourse texts. From the standpoint of functional and stylistic differentiation, the following types of ecological discourse are distinguished:

- 1) scientific discourse;
- 2) media discourse;
- 3) religious and preaching discourse;
- 4) artistic discourse (Shevchenko, 2005: 97).

1) scientific discourse, which includes texts created by ecologists (scientific articles, studies, etc.). Scientific discourse is the core of ecological;

2) media, which mainly examines texts created by journalists and distributed through the press, television, radio, and the Internet. The near periphery, in this way, is made up of genres of media discourse;

3) religious and preaching discourse – a set of components of religious communication of oral and written texts;

4) artistic discourse presented by works of fiction.

On the far periphery of ecological discourse are artistic and religious-preaching discourses, as well as texts created by «media citizens» who, while not being professional ecologists, journalists, writers and preachers, occasionally participate in ecological communication» (Shevchenko, 2005: 106).

Also, researchers single out the legal discourse as part of the immediate periphery of the environmental discourse, since the goal of the legal discourse is the institutional regulation of the environmental situation.

In his work, S. Herring singles out Internet discourse as a part of media discourse. Internet discourse will also be at the periphery of environmental discourse, forming a hybrid domain. The texts proposed within the Internet discourse are not created by ecologists, but are often based on facts presented in scientific works. We include the following genres of environmental Internet discourse: websites, forums, blogs, public pages, campaign and informational electronic posters, and online petitions.

At the same time, the ecological discourse can be considered within the framework of the political one. This type of discourse is a sociopolitical and sociocultural phenomenon. Ecological discourse takes an active part in the formation of ecological consciousness, passing through many concepts.

The reasons for the separation of ecological discourse into a separate type of discourse were the relevance of ecological topics; growing attention paid to environmental problems at all levels of society; formation of the nature protection sphere as an environment of human activity; constant

replenishment of the ecological glossary; emergence of special ecological axiological units; the presence of separate models of the addressee-addressee configuration, which determine the use of certain communicative strategies in specific communicative situations; political and ecological correctness, which are the organizing principles of ecological discourse (Herring, 2005: 8).

I. Shevchenko attributes the following to the criteria for the selection of ecological discourse: the thematic marker «human interaction with the environment of his existence»; text-forming value components (concepts); target attitudes of communicators and speech strategies; structural and functional characteristics, etc. (Shevchenko, 2005: 141). Ecological discourse is separated into a special type of discourse based on thematic criteria. Its macro theme is the relationship between a person and the environment. However, no matter what criteria are used as a basis for the selection of environmental discourse, the fact that its specificity is determined by the importance of the topic it raises remains indisputable.

Ecological discourse is implemented in oral and written forms. The oral form includes public speeches during conferences, seminars, speeches by politicians, their speeches on radio and television, interviews, press conferences, parliamentary debates, discussions during public hearings, round tables, television and radio news concerning above-mentioned topics, environmental TV and radio broadcasts, environmental advertising videos. The written form of environmental discourse includes various publications, articles in magazines and newspapers, reports, reviews, analytical materials, environmental posters and brochures.

Along with this, the ecological discourse is distinguished by the wide use of non-verbal components of communication, paragrams, color symbolism – this feature brings communication in the field of ecology closer to advertising discourse. Environmental communication is combined with political discourse by a clearly expressed appeal to the system of values that has developed in a certain society (Verhagen, 2008: 6).

In the middle of the scientific ecological discourse, scientific (monograph, dissertation, report), scientific-educational (lectures, seminars, essays, term papers) and popular science (books, lectures, articles, essays) are distinguished. Media environmental discourse is related to the socio-political sphere of communication and serves a wide area of social relations. According to the traditional approach, it is divided into informative (note, report, interview), analytical (conversation, article, review) and artistic and journalistic (essay, pamphlet, feuilleton) (Sidorkina, 2020: 48). Artistic ecological discourse is realized in the form of drama, poetry and prose. Religious and preaching environmental discourse is a collection of oral and written texts of religious communication.

Within the ecological discourse, we deal not only with a variety of positions, but also with different models of addressee-addressee relations. According to P. Schiffrin, environmental specialists, members of pro-environmental public organizations, foresters, hunters, representatives of the authorities, civil servants, opposition politicians, journalists, producers of «environmental» goods, representatives of creative associations speak out about environmental protection in the public arena. as well as amateurs who are interested in the problems of nature protection (Shiffrin, 2005: 71).

Considering such diversity of communication participants in the field of ecology, the fact that the structure of ecological discourse is not uniform seems to be quite natural. Ecological discourse has a field structure. In the center are the genres that implement the main purpose of the discourse, therefore the core of the ecological discourse is the scientific discourse, as it corresponds to the goals, values and social functions of the discourse to the greatest extent, and also has the largest number of connections with the texts of other varieties of this discourse.

In peripheral genres, the main function and characteristics of ecological discourse are intertwined with the functions and characteristics of other types of discourse within the same text. The near periphery, thus, is represented by genres of media discourse. The far periphery of the ecological discourse consists of texts created by «ordinary citizens» who, while not being professional ecologists, journalists, writers and preachers, occasionally participate in environmental communication. These can be various types of letters and appeals addressed to politicians or state institutions, letters to the mass media, everyday conversations on environmental topics, etc. Similar texts are in the sphere of intersection of environmental and household discourses (Shiffrin, 2005: 367).

Ecological discourse as an institutional formation is represented only by mass media discourse and scientific discourse and its varieties (popular science, science and education) (Siegfried, 2004: 141). However, given the number of configurations of addressee-addressee relations within the environmental discourse and the constant expansion of the circle of participants in environmental communication, such an approach does not seem entirely legitimate.

As F. Verhagen notes, the study of modern ecological discourse is possible in several aspects, which differ depending on the angle from which the main ecological problem is studied:

- a) the conditions of continuity and changes in the historical interpretation of ecological relations are considered from a cultural-historical point of view;
- b) from a natural point of view, the question arises about regularities in the relations between living beings and the environment;
- c) the peculiarities of ecological thinking are investigated from a philosophical standpoint;

d) the perception of ecological relations is studied from an aesthetic point of view;

e) from a sociopolitical position, the question arises about the conditions for the development of new social behavior based on ecological knowledge;

f) from an ethical point of view, the normativity of individual and collective communication with the ecosystems surrounding a person is studied in practical discourses (Verhagen, 2008: 13).

Conclusions. All of us are addressees of ecological discourse, as we possess information about the state

of the environment to a certain extent, so studying how language affects environmental behavior and public consciousness is an extremely relevant issue in the context of the global environmental crisis. Due to the rapid development of scientific and technical progress, human intervention in nature, our life has become faster, more vulnerable, and nature has begun to affect people. Taking into account these facts humanity should be more environmentally aware and know how to communicate on various important ecological issues effectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бабире О. В. Стилістичні засоби як аргументативні прийоми в англomовному екологічному дискурсі. *Лінгвістика XXI століття: нові дослідження і перспективи*. К.: Логос, 2011. С. 51-56. URL: www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Lingv/.../Babire%2051-56.pdf (дата звернення: 12.04.2024)
2. Карпенко К. І. Гендерний вимір екологічної комунікації: автореф. дис... д-ра філософ. наук: спец. 09.00.03 «Соціальна філософія і філософія історії». Харк. нац. ун-т ім. В.Н.Каразіна. Х., 2006. 32 с. URL: http://dissua.com/gum_n1/ist1-44--pk-7090--l-ua--st-5--s-2--p-2.html (дата звернення: 12.04.2024)
3. Розмаріца І. О. Лінгвокогнітивні особливості комунікації у сфері екології: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філ. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київ, 2004. 15 с.
4. Руденко Н. С. Екологічні концепти в різних типах дискурсу (на матеріалі науково-технічного та поетичного дискурсів). *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету ім. В.І. Вернадського*. Серія Філологія. 2007. Том 20 (59). №1. 3. 197–201.
5. Сідоркіна О. М. Людина і природа у феномені робінзонади. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. Філософія. Культурологія. 2020. № 2. С. 47-51.
6. Шевченко І. С. Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен. Харків: Константа, 2005. 356 с.
7. Herring, S.C. Computer-Mediated Discourse. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Malden, Massachusetts. 2005. 939 p.
8. Shiffrin D. Approaches to discourse. Oxford: Cambridge, 2005. 470 p.
9. Siegfried J. Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. 4 Aufl. Unrast, Münster. 2004. 238 p.
10. Verhagen F. C. Worldview and metaphors in the human-nature relationship: an ecolinguistic exploration through the ages. 2008. Vol. 2 No. 3. P.1 – 17. URL: http://www.ecoling.net/worldviews_and_metaphors_-_final.pdf (дата звернення: 12.04.2024)

REFERENCES

1. Babire O. (2011) Stylistychni zasoby yak arhumentatyvni pryomy v anhlomovnomu ekolohichnomu dyskursi. [Stylistic devices as argumentative techniques in the English-language ecological discourse] *Linhvistyka XXI stolittya: novi doslidzhennya i perspektyvy*. Linguistics of the 21st century: new research and perspectives. 51-56. Available at: www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Lingv/.../Babire%2051-56.pdf (accessed April 12, 2024) [in Ukrainian].
2. Karpenko K. (2006) Hendermyy vymir ekolohichnoyi komunikatsiyi. [Gender dimension of ecological communication: autoref. dis... Ph.D. in Social philosophy and philosophy of history] *Avtoref. dys... d-ra filosof. nauk: spets. 09.00.03 «Sotsial'na filosofiya i filosofiya istoriyi»* Khark. nats. un-t im. V.N.Karazina. V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Available at: http://dissua.com/gum_n1/ist1-44--pk-7090--l-ua--st-5--s-2--p-2.html (accessed April 12, 2024) [in Ukrainian].
3. Rozmaritsa I. (2004) Linhvokohnyivni osoblyvosti komunikatsiyi u sferi ekolohiyi [Linguistic and cognitive features of communication in the field of ecology]. *Avtoref. dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. fil. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 «Hermans'ki movy»* Author's abstract. thesis for obtaining candidate of Phil. Sciences degree: Germanic languages. 15. [in Ukrainian].
4. Rudenko N. (2007) Ekolohichni kontsepty v riznykh typakh dyskursu (na materialy naukovy-tekhnichnoho ta poetychnoho dyskursiv). [Ecological concepts in different types of discourse (based on the material of scientific, technical and poetic discourses)] *Vcheni zapysky Tavriys'koho natsional'noho universytetu im. V.I. Vernads'koho*. Seriya Filolohiya. Scientific notes of the V.I. Vernadsky Taurida National University. Philology series. 20 (59). 1. 197 – 201. [in Ukrainian].
5. Sidorkina O. (2020) Lyudyna i pryroda u fenomeny robinzonady. [Human and nature in the Robinsonade phenomenon] *Visnyk Natsional'noho aviatsiynoho universytetu*. Bulletin of the National Aviation University. Philosophy. Culturology. 2. 47-51. [in Ukrainian].
6. Shevchenko I. (2005) Dyskurs yak kohnityvno-komunikatyvnyy fenomen. [Discourse as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon] 356. [in Ukrainian].
7. Herring, S.(2005) Computer-Mediated Discourse. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by D. Schiffrin, D.Tannen and H. E. Hamilton. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Malden, Massachusetts. 939 p.
8. Shiffrin D. (2005) Approaches to discourse. Oxford: Cambridge, 470 p.
9. Siegfried J. (2004) Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. 4 Aufl. Unrast, Münster. 258 p.
10. Verhagen F. (2008) Worldview and metaphors in the human-nature relationship: an ecolinguistic exploration through the ages. Available at: http://www.ecoling.net/worldviews_and_metaphors_-_final.pdf (accessed April 12, 2024)