

МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 811'111'373.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.1/32.214474>**Tetiana BILETSKA,***orcid.org/0000-0002-5376-4819**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Assistant Professor at the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**(Kyiv, Ukraine) t.biletska@knu.ua***Yevheniia NIKIFOROVA,***orcid.org/0000-0001-6249-9781**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Assistant Professor at the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**(Kyiv, Ukraine) ye.nikiforova@knu.ua***Elizaveta GALITSKA,***orcid.org/0000-0002-0859-1322**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Teacher of English and German**Kyiv Gymnasium № 86 "Konsul"**(Kyiv, Ukraine) liza-g@ukr.net***INTERTEXTUALITY OF PERFUME AND COSMETIC NAMES**

The purpose of this article is to find out intertextuality properties as representatives among seven standards of textuality within the perfume and cosmetic goods names. Intertextuality in names investigated is recognized according to the text nature of perfume and cosmetic names. The functions of these names are regarded as the integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex where integration is created with the simultaneous coexistence of four nominative components: brand, basic, genitive and functional-descriptive. These nominative components are reflected in the text construction as relevant text blocks. Intertextuality as one of the standards of textuality is reflected as relationships between a given text (or text block) and other relevant texts (text blocks) encountered in prior experience. Intertextuality in perfume and cosmetic text constructions may be represented in three different models. The first model happens when the brand text block is common for text constructions. The second model takes place when the brand text block and the genitive text block are common for text constructions. The third model is realized when the brand text block and the basic text block are common for text constructions. The first model is classified as a singlet type of intertextuality. The second and the third models belong to a dublet type of intertextuality according to the number of common text blocks. As intertextuality is responsible for the discrimination of text types as classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics, the perfume and cosmetic text construction is classified as a segment of goods names reflecting qualitative and quantitative parameters and belongs to the descriptive text, its pattern is a frame. There is a definite correlation and connection between nominative components of the nominative complex, text blocks of the text construction and frames which contain common sense knowledge about some central concept. A brand nominative component and text block are reflected in the possessive frame. A basic nominative component and text block are reflected in the object-item frame. A genitive nominative component and text block are reflected in the taxonomic frame. A functional-descriptive nominative component and text block are reflected in the actional frame. Some frames are divided into subframes. A taxonomic frame has an existential subframe. An object-item frame contains a comparative subframe. An actional frame is divided into locative, qualitative and quantitative subframes. The integrated perfume and cosmetic nominative complex bears the necessary information and the text construction as the biggest communicative unit creates the communicative background.

Key words: *descriptive text, frame, intertextuality, nomination complex, perfume and cosmetic name, text construction.*

Тетяна БІЛЕЦЬКА,

orcid.org/0000-0002-5376-4819

кандидат філологічних наук,

асистент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

(Київ, Україна) *t.biletska@knu.ua*

Євгенія НІКІФОРОВА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6249-9781

кандидат філологічних наук,

асистент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

(Київ, Україна) *ye.nikiforova@knu.ua*

Єлизавета ГАЛИЦЬКА,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0859-1322

кандидат філологічних наук,

вчитель англійської та німецької мов

Київської гімназії № 86 «Консул»

(Київ, Україна) *liza-g@ukr.net*

ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНІСТЬ ПАРФУМЕРНО-КОСМЕТИЧНИХ НАЗВ

Статтю присвячено виявленню інтертекстуальних властивостей, які входять до семи стандартів текстуальності, в межах парфумерно-косметичних товарних назв. Інтертекстуальність у досліджених назвах визначається відповідно до текстової природи парфумерно-косметичних назв. Спочатку функції цих назв розглядаються як інтегровані парфумерно-косметичні номінативні комплекси. Інтеграція зумовлена одночасним співіснуванням чотирьох номінативних компонентів: брендового, базового, родового і функціонально-описового. Ці номінативні компоненти відображені в текстовому конструкті відповідними текстовими блоками. Інтертекстуальність як один із семи стандартів текстуальності віддзеркалюється як взаємозв'язки між наявним текстом (текстовим блоком) та іншими відповідними текстами (текстовими блоками), які попередньо були задіяні як джерела інформації. Інтертекстуальність у парфумерно-косметичних текстових конструктах може бути репрезентована трьома різними моделями. Перша модель реалізується, коли брендовий текстовий блок є спільним для текстових конструктів. Друга модель спостерігається, коли як брендовий, так і родовий текстовий блоки є спільними для текстових конструктів. Третя модель має місце, коли брендовий текстовий блок і базовий текстовий блок є спільними для текстових конструктів. Перша модель може бути класифікована як прояв синглетного типу інтертекстуальності. Друга та третя моделі належать до дублетного типу інтертекстуальності відповідно до числа спільних текстових блоків. Оскільки інтертекстуальність лежить у підґрунті визначення текстових типів як певних класів текстів із типовими шаблонами характеристик, парфумерно-косметичні текстові конструкти можуть бути схарактеризовані як сегмент товарних назв, що віддзеркалюють якісні та кількісні параметри, належать до описових текстів, які вкладаються в рамки фрейму. Має місце чітка співвіднесеність між номінативними компонентами номінативного комплексу, текстовими блоками текстового конструкту та фреймами, що містять основну інформацію про основний концепт. Бренд-овий номінативний компонент та відповідний текстовий блок віддзеркалені в посесивному (присвійному) фреймі. Базовий номінативний компонент та відповідний текстовий блок відображені у предметному фреймі, а родовий номінативний компонент і текстовий блок відбиті у таксономічному фреймі. Функціонально-описовий номінативний компонент і текстовий блок проєктуються на акціональний фрейм. Деякі фрейми розмежовані на відповідні субфрейми. Таксономічний фрейм має екзистенціальний субфрейм, предметний фрейм вміщує компаративний субфрейм. Акціональний фрейм розмежовано на локативний, квалітативний, квантитативний субфрейми. Інтегрований парфумерно-косметичний номінативний комплекс є носієм необхідної сукупності інформації, а текстовий конструкт як найбільша комунікативна одиниця створює комунікативне підґрунтя.

Ключові слова: описовий текст, інтертекстуальність, номінативний комплекс, парфумерно-косметична назва, текстовий конструкт, фрейм.

Introduction. Perfume and cosmetic names verbalize all peculiarities, qualities, individual characteristics of these goods. Nomination is the process and the result of that process when linguistic units correlate with the named objects. Nomination is

the combination of process and forms of nomination. Nomination practice may be understood as keeping to established traditions, rules, ethic(al) norms which regulate the nomination of some objects, in particular, perfume and cosmetic (make up) goods.

The estimator's activity of the nominator is reflected in the goods names. Selecting lexical units the nominator forms nominative units (words, phrases, sentences) which gradually form text functioning as the biggest nominative unit. **The purpose** of the investigation is to study intertextuality as a component of textuality standards in the perfume and cosmetic goods names. The investigation of nominative processes and the formation of nominative units on the text level is a challenging task which needs the detailed analysis of the nominative units, which stipulates the topicality of the article. The scientific novelty of the research arises from the investigation which aims at revealing intertextuality features in the goods names. The object of the investigation is the corpus of perfume and cosmetic names which represent corresponding goods on the consumer market. The subject of the investigation is intertextuality specification and the text properties of these goods names.

Literature review. Perfume and cosmetic names have been in the focus of linguistic investigations and are treated in different ways. Being the goods of wide consumption perfumes and make up are represented with their individual names to make their choice comfortable. These names were investigated and analysed under the aspect of trademark strategy (Petty, 2008) and were observed within the communicative market strategy, avoiding the division of these names into subnames. On the other hand, there was another attempt to investigate perfume and cosmetic names where they were studied as the names that created the naming space consisting of four nominative components: brand, basic, genitive, functional-descriptive names. It was the basic nominative component that reflected the main part of information about the perfumes and cosmetic goods (Galicka, 2018). However, perfume and cosmetic names were not treated as text in its general and specific aspects. Robert de Beaugrande offered the following standards of textuality to be the legitimate basis of the actualization and utilization of texts: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, situationality, informativity and intertextuality (Beaugrande, 1980: 29–30). These seven standards of textuality may be used as targets and directions of name investigations. It may help to reveal certain text properties and parameters which are hidden in the perfume and cosmetic names. The seventh standard of textuality is to be called intertextuality and concerns the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon the knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts (Beaugrande, 1981: 82–83). Intertextuality subsumes the relationships between

a given text and other relevant texts encountered in prior experience with or without mediation. Intertextuality is the major factor in the establishment of text types, where expectations are formed for all classes of language occurrences (Beaugrande, 1980: 114–115). Some linguists confirm that intertextuality is, on the whole, responsible for the evolution of text types as classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics (Beaugrande, 1981: 161; Dijk, 1977: 110; Dressler, 2011: 192). Intertextuality looks attractive and perspective for further perfume and cosmetic name investigation in the aspect of revealing text nature and text properties of these name units.

Results and discussion. Perfume and cosmetic naming uses mostly the secondary nomination, involving available words functioning in the language. The formation of the perfume and cosmetic goods names is based on the collection of motivation features. They are grouped around two focuses where the first focus grasps qualificatory (proper) features which they are used for creating perfume names whereas the second focus grasps external (differential) features (colour, shade) using them for make-up names. The backsets of motivation features make the investigation too narrow. As a result, some nominative components fall out of the linguists' attention. Perfume and cosmetic names should be analysed considering all nominative components which may be distinguished. Perfume and cosmetic naming is recognized as a segment of goods names reflecting qualitative and quantitative parameters. Perfume and cosmetic nomination complex is an integrated construction and consists of four individual segments which are recognized as nominative components. From the market point of view the initial position in the nomination complex is occupied with a brand nominative component which may be represented with the symbol **A** (brand nominative) component. **A**-component indicates producer, company, firm, market-goods line (Petty, 2008: 192), which are involved into the production of perfumes and make-up goods. The variety of **A**-components is reflected in the broad spectrum of brand names. There are traditional perfume and cosmetic producers (*AVON, REVLON, L'ORÉAL, LANCÔME*); fashion designers' names who have been involved into the fashion industry and later into the perfume production (*Dior, Givenchy, Dolce&Gabbana, Gucci, Giorgio Armani, Roberto Cavalli, Prada*); authentic British (*Jo Malone, Miller Harris, Penhaligon's, Burberry, Creed, Paul Smith, Clive Christian, Alexander McQueen*) and American (*Elizabeth Arden, Ralph Lauren, Tommy Hilfiger, Estée Lauder, Calvin Klein, Tom Ford, Donna Karan,*

Michael Kors) manufacturers. The second position is connected with **B** (basic nominative) component. It is an individual name of goods which helps to select certain perfume or make up on the market. **B**-components of perfumes (*Pink Sugar, Cool Water, Beautiful Life*), eau de toilette (*Lovely Garden, Old Spice, Royal Copenhagen, Fresh Rose, Purple Lilac*), eau de cologne (*English Leather, British Sterling, Grey Flannel*). In case of perfume, eau de toilette, eau de cologne nomination of all factory properties are the leading motivation features. That's why qualifying (proper) characteristic, which belongs to the external differential characteristic – association with plants – and qualifying (proper) characteristic, which belongs to the qualitative – aroma, fragrance – together create the motivation features for nomination. In the case of cosmetic, make-up nomination of optic (colour, shade) properties motivation features belong to qualifying (proper) class, external differential subclass. Here colour plays the leading role (*White Linen, Black Pine, Mattifying Ivory, Cherry Blossom, Light Blue*). The third position is connected with **C** (genitive nominative) component whose function is connected with the classification of goods. The selection of **C**-components is restricted in the field of perfume and cosmetic terminology (*eau de parfum, eau de toilette, eau de cologne, antiperspirant-deodorant, mascara, eye pencil, brow pencil, eye shadow, lipstick, lip gloss, lip liner, lip balm, nail polish, shave foam, aftershave balm, exfoliator, face foundation, anti-aging mask, cleanser, micellar water, sunscreen lotion, body spray, protective emulsion, body oil, powder, blush, cream, shampoo, hair serum, hair repair oil, shower gel, soap, toothpaste*). The last position is associated with **D** (functional-descriptive nominative) component whose function is to give potential consumers further information about perfumes and make-up, for instance, the quantity of perfume or make-up substances (*50ml e, 1fl oz spf, 75ml e, 3g, with 2%*), pigment index (*48189, 11723, 90381, #15 pa, 27236, 20082, 34810, 98374*), ingredients (*with grape seed oil and vitamin E, acetone free, with white tea extract, multivitamin, silicic acid, with soybean and vitamin E, fruits and pear, with chamomile and witch hazel, dead sea minerals*), physiological effect (*24h protection, nail treatment, strengthening, moisturizing, agedefying, rejuvenating, treatment, hydration reviving, relaxing, repair, nourishing, pH balanced, odour neutralizing*), usage for some purposes (*dry ends, for all hair types, for body, sensitive skin, permanent*), place of production (*Paris, New York, England, London, Made in France*). The coexistence of **A, B, C, D** nominative components within one common naming

and information space forms the necessary information about the corresponding perfume and cosmetic goods. Perfume and cosmetic integrated nominative complex demonstrates the properties of the linguistic naming unit which has the specification of upper-naming unit as it consists of four nominative components that supplement one another, consolidating the nomination complex despite its segmentation.

The investigated nomination complex having the naming function as a naming unit demonstrates the process of function expansion. The functions are expanded into the sphere of communication. Perfume and cosmetic goods are produced for being the mediator in the market communication: demand and supply. It is possible to distinguish in this communication two main participants, they are a producer and a purchaser (buyer). A producer is always connected with the supply and offers perfumes or cosmetics to potential purchasers (buyers). As a result of accepting an offer buyers purchase the selected or necessary perfume and cosmetic goods. In case of nomination complex it is problematic to separate the producer and the seller. In our investigation they are both recognized as one integrated participant who is responsible for supply, and they cooperate for perspective and high profits. A seller may perform their function in different ways; they sell whole sale, sell by retail, sell by auction, sell on credit, sell for cash, they never sell at a loss or at a low price. They always consider purchase price and purchasing capacity. A producer (seller) forms the nomination complex whereas a purchaser accepts the same nomination complex. The Integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex according to the expansion of its function to the direction of communication may be projected on the sphere of communication as it demonstrates the mediator peculiarities and has the intermediate position between two communicants: producer / seller – purchaser (buyer). According to the communicative theories there are two main units of communication where the smallest unit is a sentence and the biggest one is a text. The Integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex (having the properties of the biggest naming unit) after being involved into the process of communication may be associated with the biggest communicative unit, i.e. the text. After the projection on communication Integrated perfume and cosmetic naming complex correlates with the Text Construction. As the biggest communicative unit the Text Construction outlines the communication between such participants as: text creator – text acceptor, text sender – text receiver; goods producer – goods consumer. These schemes have the common background

«producer + seller – purchaser (buyer)» which grasps two consecutive processes: selling – purchasing / buying. These two processes are closely connected to each other and cannot be separated without destroying the logical relation of communication. The mechanism of the naming projection on the communication predetermines the correlation and connection between the corresponding units: integrated nomination complex and text construction. There is not only the general correlation between the units but there is the same correlation between subunits: nominative components and text blocks. It means that **A** (brand nominative) component corresponds to **A** (brand text) block; **B** (basic nominative) component corresponds to **B** (basic text) block; **C** (genitive nominative) component corresponds to **C** (genitive text) block; **D** (functional-descriptive nominative) component corresponds to **D** (functional-descriptive text) block. The coexistence of four text blocks creates the communicative background and confirms the segmentation of the text constructions and outlines the text boundaries. **A** text block and **D** text block are exterior and indicate the text boundaries whereas **B** text block and **C** text block are interior, forming the informative core. According to the informative significance **D** text block is inferior. It contains supplementary, additional, extra, subsidiary information about the corresponding perfume or cosmetic goods. The block segmentation of the text construction indicates that the most evident standard of textuality may be intertextuality. We base our investigation of perfume and cosmetic names on R.A. de Beaugrande and W. Dressler's definition: "We introduce the term intertextuality to subsume the ways in which the production and reception of a given text depend upon the participants' knowledge of other texts. This knowledge can be applied by a process describable in terms of mediation (the extent to which one feeds one's current beliefs and goals into the model of the communicative situation): the greater the expanse of time and of processing activities between the use of the current text and the use of previously encountered text the greater the mediation" (Beaugrande, 1981: 85).

Applying this definition to our research it is necessary to compare different text constructions with the purpose of revealing some text block(s) which are mentioned in text constructions. The participants' knowledge of other texts is associated with the previously mentioned text blocks and the same text blocks are used later in new text constructions. Within the integrated perfume and cosmetic text construction there are three different models reflecting the realization of intertextuality. The first

model demonstrates the cases when different text constructions have common **A** text block which means that all goods are produced by one and the same company and belong to one and the same brand: *A Chanel, B Coco, C eau de parfum; A Chanel, B Chance, C eau de toilette; A Chanel, B Allure Homme Sport, C eau de cologne; A Chanel, B Perfection and lightness, C face foundation.*

The first model of intertextuality describes the case when under the common and shared **A** text block there is a developed and ramified system that has in its structure different **B** and **C** text blocks that are independent. This means that beyond **A** (brand text) block there is a net of individual **B** (basic text) blocks, each of which is connected with its corresponding **C** (genitive text) block. The first model of intertextuality having only one shared **A** text block may be classified as a singlet type that describes the communicative situation when on the perfume and cosmetic market there is only one brand of a corresponding producer. The perfume and cosmetic seller is restricted to the brand choice. At the same time there is no restriction in the variety of classes and names of corresponding goods. This restriction is reflected in the purchaser's choice. The potential buyer is limited to the sphere of brands, however, there is no limitation in the variety of goods, their classes and individual names. In general the first model of intertextuality demonstrates the case of brand monopoly. It happens in the catalogues of goods manufactured by one company, producer sharing one and the same brand.

The second model of intertextuality may be classified as a dublet type. Within the text construction there are two common text blocks: **A** (brand text) block and **C** (genitive text) block: *A Dior, B Hypnotic poison, C eau de parfum; A Dior, B Dior Addict, C eau de parfum; A Dior, B Pure Poison, C eau de parfum; A Dior, B Miss Dior, C eau de parfum.*

The second model of intertextuality describes the case when under the common and shared **A** and **C** text blocks there is a varied and numerous group of **B** text blocks. It means that beyond **A** (brand text) block and **C** (genitive text) block there is a net of individual **B** (basic text) blocks. The second model represents the communicative situation when on the perfume and cosmetic market there is only one brand available. It represents only one producer responsible for supply. The invariability of **C** text block shows the situation when the perfume and cosmetic seller is restricted not only to the brand choice, there is also a restriction to choosing the classes of goods. In this case there is only one class available for buying i.e. eau de parfum. This market situation influences purchasers' choice. The potential buyer is limited to two spheres. The first

limitation is connected with the brand choice while the second one is connected with the class of goods. The second model of intertextuality demonstrates the case of double brand monopoly. It occurs to the chapters (parts) which are published to enumerate only one class of goods (in our case it is the class of perfumes). The brand dominates in all cases regulating the given list of perfumes.

The third model of intertextuality is also classified as a double type. There is only one difference if it is compared with the second type. The difference is connected with another pair of text blocks. The pair of common blocks consists of **A** (brand text) block and **B** (basic text) block: *A Yves Saint Laurent, B Opium, C eau de parfum; A Yves Saint Laurent, B Opium, C eau de toilette; A Yves Saint Laurent, B Opium, C rich body crème.*

The third model of intertextuality outlines the situation when under the common and shared **A** and **B** text blocks there is a variety of **C** text blocks. It means that beyond **A** (brand text) block and **B** (basic text) block there is a net of individual **C** (genitive text) blocks. The third model represents the communicative situation when on the perfume and cosmetic market there is only one brand name available for buyers. It represents the variety of perfume and cosmetic goods under one and the same basic name. The invariability of **A** and **B** text blocks shows the situation when the seller is restricted not only to the brand choice; there is also a restriction to choosing the basic names; there is only one basic name for all goods available. The third model demonstrates the case of a broad selection of corresponding goods including not only perfumes, but make up of different subclasses. This market situation influences purchasers' choice where the potential buyer is limited to two spheres. The first limitation is connected with the brand choice while the second one is connected with the basic name. The third model of intertextuality demonstrates the case of double brand monopoly. It may be traced looking through the catalogue of one and the same brand. The existence of intertextuality in the perfume and cosmetic text construction confirms the text nature of the corresponding integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex.

Text blocks which were distinguished within the text construction demonstrate the fact that the Integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex which is reflected in the corresponding text construction corresponds to the descriptive text type. Text types are established including functional lines, i.e. according to the contributions of texts to human interaction. Descriptive texts would be utilized to enrich knowledge spaces whose control

centres are objects or situations. Descriptive texts have commonly applied global patterns, which are frames. Frames are global patterns that contain common sense knowledge about some central concept. Frames state what things belong together in principal, but not in what order things will be done or mentioned (Beaugrande, 1981: 88; Knott, 2001: 199). From the logical and pragmatic point of view the central concept of the text construction which is the reflection of the integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complex is a substance which is labelled with the basic name. It means that **B** (basic text) block may be represented by a global pattern which is realized as an object-item frame. This frame occupies the central position and creates the interframe net around. The object-item frame has the central slot which may contain: anthroponic names (*Nino Cerruti, Miss Dior, Cherie, Paloma Picasso*), toponic names (*Roma, Tokio Days, London Beat, Fiji*), common names (*Angel, Miracle, White Diamonds, Opium*), borrowings (*Pour Femme, L'Homme Libere, Magie Noire*), artificially created words (*Lancôme, L'Oréal*). The dominant object-item frame has a satellite possessive frame which demonstrates interspace relation «owner-possessor possesses object-item». This frame indicates the producer-possessor-owner of the corresponding perfume or cosmetic goods. The possessive frame (in case of the perfume and cosmetic text structures) is narrowed down to a subframe of the direct possession. The object-item frame is recognized as main and basic as it demonstrates basic, fundamental principles of categorization and verbal information structuralisation (Zhabotynska, 2002: 131). The frames are understood in a rather general and broad way, they are knowledge structures or idealized cognitive models. There is a certain difference between a cognitive model and complicated situation in reality (Clausner, 1999: 2). The introduction of satellite frames and relative subframes is called into annihilating the difference between a cognitive model and situations in reality. The possessive frame functions as a mediator smoothing over contradictions between a basic frame and a real situation. The possessive frame in our case has the subframe-container. From the possessive point of view that subframe describes the possessiveness in two different aspects: qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative aspect is connected with the enumeration of substances, ingredients used for producing corresponding goods: *with shea butter and honey; only use natural ingredients; with white tea; nourishing ash tree concentrate; with collagen and elastan; with glycerine, calcium, vitamin;*

4 roses extracts; jojoba oil; contains natural lactic acid; fluoride; siliconfree; with chamomile and witch hazel; multivitamin; with grape seed oil and vitamin E; acetonefree. Quantitative aspect is connected with the figure indication of ingredients in different units of measurement according to the liquid or solid perfume and cosmetic substances: *E 50ml 1.7fl.oz; 100ml E 35fl.oz; volume 80%; 3g; 7ml / 0,26oz; 40g 1.4oz; 10g E NETWT 35oz; 3g 0,105oz.* The subframe-container is partly connected with **D** (functional-descriptive text) block. It makes the possessive frame a bit diffusive providing further cohesion and coherence to the text construction, giving additional consolidation to the text unit in case of perfume and cosmetic nominative complex. The possessive frame has a price subframe which is reflected in **D** (functional-descriptive text) block including figures and different symbols of currency: *€17.50; €50; \$112; \$121.* **D** (functional-descriptive text) block may be described with a locative and actional frames. The first frame indicates the place of production or the place of headquarters: *US; Made in England; This Company, W9 186 UK; Paris; Made in France.* The second frame indicates the physiological and decorative peculiarities of corresponding goods: *second skin effect; firming and antiwrinkle, lengthened lashes without clumping; wide eyelook; extreme shine soft and light texture; hardening and beautiful coat; high colour high shine; minimizes appearance of wrinkles in 1 min; fresh replenished skin; dry to very dry skin; minimizes age spots; strengthens nails.* **C** (genitive text) block is described with the taxonomic frame which is a definite classification of goods dividing them into classes and subclasses: *eau de parfum; mascara; eye brow pencil; lipstick; nailwear; body spray; shower gel; foot cream; tooth cream.* In our case the taxonomic frame separates perfumes and their derivatives, decorative make up, hygienic goods. The object-item frame contains

a comparative subframe which reflects the relation of similarity and likeness. The comparative subframe is a background of comparative metaphor (Zhabotynska, 2002: 132) or metonymy. There are metaphorical **B** (basic nominative) components (*Purplelilac; Orange blossom; Organic vanilla; Gentlemen only*) and metonymical components (*Eyes to kill; Shine lip; Hand beauty care; Skincare and foundation*). All the distinguished frames and subframes confirm the text nature of the analysed integrated perfume and cosmetic nominative complexes which are realized in corresponding text constructions.

Conclusion. As a result of the linguistic research the text nature properties were revealed in the integrated perfume and cosmetic nominative complexes. The intertextuality standard was found when nominative complexes were correlated with the corresponding text constructions. Quadricomponent structure of nomination complexes was reflected in quadriblock structure of the text construction. Quadruple organization of naming and text units demonstrates the integrated nature of these linguistic objects. Intertextuality is realized including shared text blocks. According to the number of shared text blocks it may be singlet or dublet. If the naming unit (as a nomination complex) is projected on the textual unit (as a text construction) it helps to reveal the system of frames and subframes. The frames and subframes correlate with corresponding text blocks and the interframe net demonstrates the significance of the basic text block and minor position of genitive and functional-descriptive text blocks. Intertextuality as a standard of textuality does not grasp all text features. Another standard of textuality which is known as informativity looks promising to be revealed in the integrated perfume and cosmetic nomination complexes. This aspect of investigation should be taken into consideration for further and perspective research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beaugrande R.A.de, Dressler, W. Introduction to text linguistics. L, N.Y.: Routledge, 1981. 286 p.
2. Beaugrande R.A.de. Text, Discourse, and Process. Norwood N.J.: Ablex, 1980. 351 p.
3. Clausner T.C., Croft W. Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 1999. № 10. Vol. 1. Pp. 1–31.
4. Dijk T.A. van. Text and context explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. London, New York: Longman, 1977. 261 p.
5. Dressler W. Einführung in die Textlinguistik. Tübingen: W. de Gruyter, 2011. 303 s.
6. Galicka, J. Specyfika nazewnictwa srodkow kosmetycznych: aspekt strukturalny. *Filologia Polska. Roczniki Naukowe Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego*. 2018. № 4. Pp. 307–318.
7. Knott A., Sanders T., Oberlander J. Levels of representation in discourse relations. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 2001. № 12. Vol. 3. Pp. 197–209.
8. Petty R.D. Trademark Strategy and Beyond: Part one. Selecting a Brand Name. *Journal of Brand Management*. 2008. № 15. Pp. 190–197.
9. Zhabotynska, S.A. Shorts, breeches and broomers: Plurality in blends. The way we think. *Odense working papers in language and communication*. 2002. № 23. Vol. 2. Pp. 127–142.

REFERENCES

1. Beaugrande R.A.de, Dressler, W. Introduction to text linguistics. L, N.Y.: Routledge, 1981, 286 p.
2. Beaugrande R.A.de. Text, Discourse, and Process. Norwood N.J.: Ablex, 1980, 351 p.
3. Clausner T.C., Croft W. Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 1999, № 10, Vol. 1, pp. 1–31.
4. Dijk T.A. van. Text and context explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. London, New York: Longman, 1977, 261 p.
5. Dressler W. Einführung in die Textlinguistik [Introduction to text linguistics]. Tübingen: W. de Gruyter, 2011, 303 s. [in German].
6. Galicka, J. Specyfika nazewnictwa srodkow kosmetycznych: aspekt strukturalny [The specificity of naming cosmetic products: structural aspect]. *Filologia Polska. Roczniki Naukowe Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego*, 2018, № 4, pp. 307–318. [in Polish].
7. Knott A., Sanders T., Oberlander J. Levels of representation in discourse relations. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2001, № 12, Vol. 3, pp. 197–209.
8. Petty R.D. Trademark Strategy and Beyond: Part one. Selecting a Brand Name. *Journal of Brand Management*, 2008, № 15, pp. 190–197.
9. Zhabotynska, S.A. Shorts, breeches and broomers: Plurality in blends. The way we think. *Odense working papers in language and communication*, 2002, № 23, Vol. 2, pp. 127–142.