DELINEATION
OF LINGUOPERSONOLOGY
AND LINGUOAXIOLOGY

UNIWERSYTET POZNAŃSKI 1919·2019

UAM UMP UPP AWF

ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY IN POZNAN

Tetyana Kosmeda, Anatolij Zahnitko,
Zhanna Krasnobaieva-Chorna

DELINEATION
OF LINGUOPERSONOLOGY
AND LINGUOAXIOLOGY

UAM
WYDAWNICTWO
NAUKOWE

POZNAN 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Axiological World's Image – AWI
Conversational – conver.
Derogatory – derog.
Disapprovingly – disappr.
Ethnographic – ethnogr.
Familiar – fam.
German – Germ.
Invective – invect.
Ironical – ironic.
Literary – liter.
Obsolete form – obsol.
Playful – playf.
Phrasemic Axiological Oppositions – PhAO
Phraseme-Semantical Groups – PhSG
Phraseme-Semantical Subgroups – PhSSG
Russian – Russ.
Solemn style – solemn
Ukrainian – Ukr.
Vernacular – vernac.
Vulgar – vulg.

INTRODUCTION

Linguopersonology is a part of linguistic science which concentrates attention on studying of language personality in its integrity. *Language personality* is a totality of all language abilities and realizations of the personality where language personality has two main conceptual dimensions – monopersonologic and polypersonologic. The first represents a separate language individuality in the whole scope of their expressions – temporal, spatial, evolutional, cultural and aesthetic, social, linguocultural and others. Language personality in their formation goes through two main periods of linguoindividuational expressions: 1) *externally personologic* when the potential of language abilities is formed spontaneously as a self-formation of individuality through the strengthening of "I", the determination of one's own main function and dominant directive, the development of a peculiar "mask" through which the individual activates, accommodates to the requirement of the society; 2) *internally personologic* in which "the initiation into internal reality" becomes the most active, profound self-cognition as well as cognition of the human nature is functionally loaded. Within this period, everything that was earlier cognized and accumulated is internally analyzed, with the formation of the integral picture of self-awareness, internal and external connection with the Universe, fixed world arrangement. Within the first period of linguoindividuation, the personality acquires sufficient resources for realization, self-acknowledgement and gaining the corresponding level of recognizability.

The principle of system and *the principle of contrastiveness* are functionally topical in linguopersonology. The integrity of the description of linguoperson is based on the first principle, demanding the processing of the description model with consecutive analysis of the collection of factors and parameters, motivators and indicators of

language realization of the personality. The differentiation of the verbal and non-verbal values of language personality is also rather important. The second principle provides an adequate analysis of linguoperson on the basis of comparison providing corresponding commenting of certain peculiarities of language behaviour of the personality, their expression in different life periods and in corresponding social surroundings, the realization of mono-, bi- or polylingual intentions by the communicant.

The main categories of linguopersonology include the categories of person, linguoperson, personalism. The category of person and/or linguoperson comprises the investigation of their needs comprising five binary foundations (by H. Murray): 1) primary (the needs of the body) – secondary (psychogenic) need; 2) open (assumptive in consciousness) – latent (excluded from consciousness) need; 3) focal (connected with certain object) – diffuse (do not depend on certain objects) need; 4) proactive (the reaction on internal factors) – reactive (the reaction on the factors of the environment); 5) effective (oriented on the result) – procedural (oriented on the process) – modal (oriented on the perfection of the result). The studying of the latter foundation seems essential, comprising *theme* as the main unit of the analysis which determines communicative behaviour of the personality and conceptual scope, and verbal stereotypes, etc. The identification of themes, their diagnostication demand the investigation of the whole language scope of personality, the ascertainment of the factors of potential realization/non-realization of communicative inclinations, tactics, intentions and strategies (mainly, it is the absence of family support, care and so on; according to H. Murray, press) of language personality. "A common theme is usually a single stereotype of connected needs and presses extracted from infantile experience, which gives sense and coherency to the most pert of the individual's behaviour" (Hall C. S. Theories of Personality / C. S. Hall, G. Lindsey. – N.-Y: John Wiley and Sons, 1970. – Pp. 23).

Linguopersonologic investigations comprise the consideration of the regulations of the realization of the person *Ego, Super-ego, Alter-ego* etc. in verbal and non-verbal communicative practice, the uncovering of their evolution and usage of capacity, regularity, coexistence in different periods of life of the linguoperson.

Within linguopersonology one should differentiate *general linguopersonology*, *linguocultural and linguocognitive personology*, *social linguo-*

personology, *linguopersonology of self-realization and self-esteem*. *General (fundamental) linguopersonology* deals with notional and terminological apparatus, studying of different types of language personalities, works out the models of consideration of such personalities. *Linguo-cultural personology* investigates the influence of national and other cultural backgrounds on language personality, the determination of the significance of certain linguocultural codes in the evolution of language personality, as well as studies the functional specificity of concepts in individual-cogitative scope of personality. *Social linguo-personology* is oriented on the diagnostication of the influence of the society on language personality, as well as the ascertainment of social strata in a speech scope of the personality. Social stratum is always regular, it mainly reflects the fixed models of social assessment, quali-fication, classification and so on of certain events, facts, persons, be-haviour models. Social stratum is a basis for the formation of corre-sponding linguosocial strata whish gain the status of customary usage realization, their reflection being regular and compulsory. the confir-mation of such linguosocial strata may be traced in the formation and functional loading of certain precedent phenomena (*Однак найбільші проблеми християн зосереджуватимуться в місцях, описаних у* **Біблії***: 2013-й стане одним із найскрутніших років у історії Христової віри на Близькому Сході* (Тиждень. – 04.01.2013) 'But the most serious problems of Christians will be centred in the places described in the **Bible**: Year 2013 will become one the most difficult years in the histo-ry of Christian belief in the Near East' (Tyzhden (Week). – 04.01.2013)), their functional loading. They often become the markers of linguosocial portraits. The studying of the corporative groups, where the formation of the language personality, their self-realization and self-expression took place, is nonetheless important (compare, for example, the influence of the linguocorporative group on the linguo-portrait of the personality, the choice of the language in language-communicative intentions). The studying of all spatial, temporal, so-cial-corporative, cultural and aesthetic and other factors having influ-ence on self-sufficiency of the language personality and so on is rather essential for *linguopersonology of self-realization and self-esteem*. Linguo-person may be disclosed through the analysis of their language ma-sking (modus *persona*), consideration of their inner essence (studying of discursive practices – modus *perse*), studying of linguospiritual state, value orientations (modus *perzon*), tracing of the unity of worlds

and realizations of the language personality in others (modus of *personal*).

Lingual personality is one of the primary basic objects of modern linguistics since the language ontology, as it has been mentioned, is determined by the explicit inclusion of man. Language is a necessary attribute of people, the most important activity of human spirit. Each lingual personality is singular and, therefore, unique. This singularity is specifically interpreted in the verbal and discursive space. The conception of the description of lingual personality takes into consideration the unity of lingual capacities of an individual. This gives the possibility to create specific texts, which are termed *ego-texts*, i.e. texts about oneself where an author's subjective viewpoint is verbalized. Psychologists interpret Ego as a complex creation reflecting vast diversity of emotions of an individual with his/her mental expressions, thoughts, reflections which constantly interact and intertwine. Ego plans its activity, evaluates and remembers everything, thus, acquiring experience, and is affected by its physical and social surrounding. Ego, or "I-image", is treated as self-perception, certain psychological "self-portrait". Modernism, and especially post-modernism, witness the dominance of the subjective factor of describing the world, increasing interest in individual forms of the author's self-expression, active development of speech and literary genres about oneself and for oneself. These texts are conventionally shaped into a broad system of generic forms which, as a spiritual reflection of reality, are realized in various spheres of lingual creative activity according to certain principles. These flexible genres are subject to variations, transformations and applications; they are open-ended texts whose content does not have a rigid model in the generic aspect and in the communicative one (private letters and diaries, memoirs, autobiography etc.) Ego-text is a part of an individual, a detail of his/her soul, actions and character. Ego-texts manifest signs of documentary and artistic texts, use the system of factography and modeling of reality and transformation of the author's image in the text. Mobility, structural heterogeneity, syncretism, attraction are most characteristic features of ego-texts. Selection and interpretation of facts and events, their evaluation in the ego-text is a direct expression of the author's position. Ego-texts demonstrate recognitions and re-presentation of the category of *selfhood.* Authors of ego-texts have borrowed the system of artistic images, symbols, archetypes, philo-

sophic foundation and poetic features from fiction while their non-fiction properties comprise aspiration to reproduce real and inner spiritual facts, space and place of action and focus more on historical than on artistic time. Contemporary readers of ego-texts are inclined to perceive real, concrete facts, get involved in the documentary communicative space, since our time is called an era of non-fiction where evidence and reliable description of events witnessed by the author himself appeal to the recipient more than the most successful fiction. Ego-text is a means of self-cognition, self-estimation and self-organization. Ego-texts represent the many-faceted author's "I" which may be intimate, public, explicit / implicit, disguised etc. Thus, the developing *theory of ego-text (I-linguistics)* accumulates methodological basis, expands its research aspects, generates new methods, forms its own metalanguage and trends of investigation. These aspects are represented in the monograph submitted with the focus on episteme.

An important role in the framework of linguoculturology and social linguopersonology belongs to the phraseme level of the ***conceptual*** and ***axiological world's images*** in single-structured and multi-structured languages, since the concepts and values (as conceptualization and categorization products), represented by phrasemes, actualize the phenomenon of personal and social significance, confirming the thesis about the unique character of value perception, its experience by an individual subject (the speaker of a particular language), filling it with the socially meaningful sense (universal one) that implements the unity of the individual and universal. Relevant in this aspect there define purpose and tasks, terminological apparatus and methods of ***axiophraseme pragmatics*** with mandatory: 1) formation of a evaluation profile of phraseme and qualification basis of the classification of phrasemes according to their evaluation load; 2) description of the constitutive features of value and the axiological world's image in phrasemics; 3) presentation of the reconstruction algorithm of the axiological world's images in phrasemics of single-structured and multi-structured languages (the research illustrative corpus, a nomenclature of universal values, the levels of the axiological world's image, phrasemic axiological oppositions of values, the ideographic parametrization of values, the level organization of values, cultural coding of values, axiological world's image).

The modelling of language personality must be based on all their discursive practices, sound or written real filling of the latter which

allows to ascertain the most important modi of the realization of the linguoperson. At the same time such pattern of studying is enabled by the diagnostication of correlation of modi of linguoperson with their needs, the stage of linguoindividuation and the disclosure of the active, semi-active, passive or direct, mediated influence of linguobackground on language personality. Linguoindividuations have internal and external motivation where the first always correlates with that primary environment in which the ascertainment of the primary linguoperson occurs. External motivation is correlated with that influence which the language background has on linguoperson causing the necessity of formation of the corresponding pattern of masking, differentiation of *Ego* as a self-expression.

The studying of linguopersonology is promising as it meets social demands and is oriented on the correlation of personality and corporative group, communicative community, enabling not only the statement of existing regularities of the realization of language personality, but also the creation of the technology of protection and self-defence of personality from various informational influences, language and communicative aggression and so on.

The monograph submitted is the first work of the Ukrainian and Polish linguistics which presents aspects of the new linguistics – *linguopersonology* and elucidates constitutional principles of *the theory of linguopersonology* and methodological postulates of *ego-text* and *axiophraseme pragmatics.*

CATEGORIES, LEVELS AND UNITS OF LINGUOPERSONOLOGY

A. Zahnitko

1.1. Categorical and paradigm scope of modern linguopersonology

The researches on linguopersonology are noticeable in the linguistic scope of modern studies concentrating their attention on its separate levels: orthographic (O. M. Tataryntseva [2007]), categorical or functional-morphological with an attempt to determine the typology of personotexts (T. A. Golovina [2006]) or outline general background of its research area (V. P. Neroznak [1995: 12−14; 1996: 114−116], I. A. Sternin [2004: 4−20] and others). Also, we should add the attempts to clearly define the conceptual-terminological apparatus of linguopersonology, where it is necessary to differentiate (I. A. Sternin [2004: 4−20] and others) such levels as actually-communicative (*communicative behaviour, communicative fact, communicative sign, communicative action,* etc.), verbally-/nonverbally-communicative (*verbal communicative act, nonverbal communicative act* and so on), communicative-cognitive (*linguistic concept, language-mental substrate,* etc.), functional-pragmatic (*connotation, expressiveness* and so on), motivational-symbolic (*linguistic cultureme, intentionality, motivation-fatic* and *communicative-situational attitude, linguistic symbol* and so forth). It is mostly considered (V. P. Neroznak [1995: 12−14; 1996: 114−116], Yu. Ye. Prokhorov [2006: 18−21] and others) that M. S. Trubetskoy [1927: 3–7] was the first who pointed out the necessity of singling linguopersonology out as a separate linguistic branch and asserted that personality is "not only a separate person but nation as well", though its sources rise from philosophic foundation of human personality as a philosophic person.

At the beginning of the XX century the problem of personalism was actively studied by M.O. Berdiaiev, L.I. Shestov, and the term

itself was used for the first time by F. Schleiermacher (1799). In the investigations of F. Jacobi, A. Alcott, Ch. Renouvier, L. Prat the issue of personalism was tangentially studied. Later, linguists started to discuss ethical personalism (M. Scheler), critical personalism (V. L. Stern (the concept of intellectual coefficient)), personalism as a constituent of theological ethics (H. Thielicke), eschatological personalism (M. O. Berdiaiev, for whom it is obvious that individual is an indivisible part of natural world with subordination to its laws; personality is similarity to God). Personalistic tendencies in German philosophy became actualized with the analysis of aptitudes and skills of the individual, underlying spheres of individual life, and as a result "personality method" was analyzed as a universal means of human cognition.

In modern linguistics, linguopersonology belongs to actively developing tendencies. It is a science capable to answer the actual questions connected with the changes of linguistic portrait of the speaker in different periods of his life, to trace the dynamics of linguistic portrait of language ethnos in synchronic and diachronic dimensions. All this confirms the topicality of ascertainment of categorical system of linguopersonology and its paradigm status.

Thorough analysis of categorical and paradigm scope of linguopersonology contains in its foundation the determination of the system of its categories with consecutive disclosure of their hierarchy, functional loading of certain categories in communicative-discourse practices.

Certain observations about the peculiarities of linguistic personality, linguistic portrait of the nation may be found in the works of W. Humdoldt [2000], W. Wundt, O. Potebnja and other outstanding linguists of the end of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century. In the philosophy of this period the notion personalism appears, used for the first time by the founder of French neocriticism Ch. Renouvier (1903) in his work "Personalism", clearly defined in the researches of E. Mounier in a so-called personal universe where seven levels of personality are really important: 1) incarnate existence; 2) communication; 3) intimate treatment; 4) confrontation; 5) freedom and necessity; 6) higher dignity; 7) engagement [Мунье 1995: 126], which are gradually traced in language and speech realizations of the linguistic personality. The latter are correlated with two tendencies of creative language personality – depersonalization and personalization whose

interaction determines the functional loading of personal universe. Human personality in its anthropological universality is determinative for personalism, because it is individual, unique and single. Personality becomes the only reality which motivates the necessity to differentiate individual and personality. The latter thought may be easily traced in the searches of existentialists who thoroughly depicted the hostility of society and personality. In his works, E. Mounier tried to show the main goal and objectives of personalism recognizing that the study which claims "the primacy of the human personality in terms of material needs and systems of collectivity" [Мунье 1994: 126] is personalistic. Personality in personalistic interpretation comprises the unity of three characteristics: exteriorization, interiorization and transcendence. Exteriorization is expressed through the realization of personality outside, interiorization is expressed as their inner concentration, their own inner world. Being in active interaction and transcendent move, they are oriented on higher values – truth, beauty, good. That is why one of the main ideas in the understanding of a person is a thought about involved existence. Personalists specificate the awakening of the personal beginning in the individual, the expressions of personal communication. Such approach has something in common with ethical views of M. Scheler and phenomenologic ethics of E. Levinas, who developed the idea of dual character of personal communication, as every individual "has a goal in himself and at the same time for everybody", and the meeting of *I* and *You* in *We* creates special experience – the communication of souls which is realized "on the other side of words and systems". For personalism, personalistic philosophy the interpretation of the notions *personality*, *creativity*, *communication*, *community*, *culture* is important, while for linguopersonology the interpretation of the corresponding notions *language personality*, *language creativity*, *language community*, *language culture* is important. For linguopersonology the following tendencies worked out in personalistic philosophy are topical – social, ethical, relativistic, where the first tendency grounds the project of new civilization with personality and spiritual values dominating, the second one actualizes the significant questions of justice in human relations. Relativistic tendency is based on conditionality of any communication in which it is more implicated than explicated. Modern revival of E. Mounier's ideas testifies the necessity of studying of human personality in all its dimensions.

In V. P. Neroznak's opinion, "The concept *language personality* is formed at the intersection of philosophic concepts of personology, personalism and the theory of language personality which we call personology" [1995: 12], which, in the range of general personality, becomes the basis for singling out of the independent tendency of science about language – linguopersonology. The latter investigates the state of language (individuation) and "separate human personality (idiolectic personality), and multihuman (polilectic) language personality of the nation" [1996: 114]. We may speak about language individuations of a separate personality systematically changing in time which together make up their language biography and for the nation we may observe such change in space and time. Their multitude reveals a diachronically changing and territorially variational language portrait of the nation. For a separate language personality (individual) it is easy to determine the key words as dominant indicators of world-view guidelines, cognitive parameters, representants of their ethic tastes, etc. Thus, for the poetry of T. Shevchenko these are such words as *Людина/Люд/Люде/Люди* "Man/Person/Nation/People" – 299, *Бог* "God" – 284, *Серце* "Heart" – 185, *Доля* "Destiny" – 142, *Україна/Вкраїна* "Ukraine" – 127, *Слава* "Glory" – 103, *Слово* "Word" – 99, *Душа* "Soul" – 93, *Воля* "Freedom" – 90, *Правда* "Truth" – 74, *Кров* "Blood" – 75, *Рай* "Paradise" – 65, *Добро* "Good" – 53, *Дума* "Thought" – 45, *Живий* "Alive" – 29, *Рід* "Family, kin" – 10, *Зло* "Evil" – 8, *Лжа / Неправда / Брехня* "Lie / Untruth / Lying" – 6 (http://www.mova.info/cfqsh.aspx), etc, they are also frequency for G. Skovoroda (see: (http://www.arts. ualberta.ca/~ukr/skovoroda/ NEW/index.php)). The frequency of each of them in a certain period of creativity of each writer will be higher or lower what can be easily ascertained on the basis of a four-volume concordance of the language of his poetry. In their multitude they outline the expression of his language personality, and their semantic field, taking into account all the tendencies of potential growth, will cover almost main association background. Rather substantial is the fact that the representativity of the named lexemes is significant in virtual space even today: *Україна/Вкраїна* 'Ukraine' – 6 030 000 in "Google" and 148 000 000 in "Yandex", and correspondingly: *Воля* 'Freedom' – 22 100 000 / 17 000 000; *Доля* 'Destiny' – 28 200 000 / 26 000 000; *Бог* 'God' – 45 700 000 / 198 000 000", *Душа* 'Soul' – 37 400 000 / 160 000 000; *Добро* 'Good' – 77 000 000 / 126 000 000, *Зло* 'Evil' – 20 500 000/ 26 000 000;

Правда 'Truth' – 125 000 000 / 146 000 000; *Лжа* 'Lie' – 48 500 / 51 000; *Серце* 'Heart' – 1 780 000 / 2 000 000; *Рід* 'Family, kin' – 528 000 / 2 000 000; *Дума* 'Thought' – 20 200 000 / 46 000 000; *Слово* 'Word – 76 200 000 / 673 000 000; *Слава* 'Glory' – 37 800 000 / 62 000 000; *Живий* 'Alive' – 2 060 000 / 2 000 000; *Кров* 'Blood' – 1 240 000 / 44 000 000; *Людина* 'Man' – 10 300 000 / 18 000 000; *Рай* 'Paradise' – 23 200 000 / 213 000 000, from the highest frequency (there are some differences between "Google" and "Yandex", which do not influence significantly on absolute rate of reactions) is characteristic to words *Людина, Україна / Вкраїна, Бог, Серце, Слово, Рай* 'Man, Ukraine, God, Heart, Word, Paradise' as verbalizers of corresponding concepts. We can surely affirm their actualization in time and space individuations of the nation/nations as a language personality, linguocognitive loadings and motivation-communicative attitudes. For M. Kotsiubynsky the corresponding frequency is characteristic, which serves as a manifestation of his esthetic tastes and so on, compare: *Людина* "Man"– 1140, *Серце* "Heart" – 801, *Слово* "Word" – 613, *Живий* "Alive" – 317, *Правда* "Truth" – 311, *Бог* "God" – 262, *Душа* "Soul" – 218, *Кров* "Blood" – 190, *Україна/Вкраїна* "Ukraine" – 108, *Доля* "Destiny" – 86, *Дума* "Thought" – 81, *Слава* "Glory" – 51, *Воля* "Freedom" – 76, *Добро* "Good" – 38, *Рід* "Family, kin" – 28, *Зло* "Evil" – 10, *Рай* "Paradise" – 8, *Лжа / Неправда / Брехня* "Lie/Untruth/ Lying" – 5, where *Людина* "Man" is on the highest level, a bit lower we may see *Серце, Слово* "Heart, Word" (The texts of M. Kotsiubynsky: experimental scientific-research complex of texts // Access: http://corpora.donnu.edu.ua/). Even a quick glance allows to see the unity of common values in individuations of the artists and polyindividuations.

For human personality changing nonsimultaneous individuations are determinative, while for polyindividual language personality *nation* they may be simultaneous and nonsimultaneous with different variations in space, but for both of them the connection *language↔consciousness↔culture* is substantive. The notion of individuation for the denotation of the process of spontaneous self-formation of personality is widely used analytical psychology. Individuation is characteristic to every person and comprises maturing, deployment and improvement of personality, what motivates the differentiation of at least three chronological sections of individuations. Ancestral language units and evolutional units are present at each level, their

dynamics comprises different amount of fixed changes. The latter should be stated considering sudden and/or gradual alterability.

Language personality in the process of their self-formation has several determinative stages: 1) the awareness of one's own language potential; 2) self-awareness of language *I* as *Ego*; 3) conscious deepening and self-development of speech intentions, which of them having its sub-steps. Correspondingly the individuation of the nation as a language personality comprises a number of stages: 1) the formation of language space as an ethnic unity; 2) self-awareness of language-ethnic community with an appropriate level of self-identification; 3) lingual-spiritual development of language-ethnic community with acquiring of the qualities of the nation. The named stages are usually extremely capacious in their disclosure and comprise vast sub-steps, whose selection and characteristics demands special approach. Moreover, the individuations of the personality are dynamic in temporal space and are not equal, as a result it is easy to trace modifiable dynamics of author's lexicon as one of the most important components of the qualification of the language personality, the evolution of modal intentions, etc. In author's lexicon the following may be observed: a) the peculiarities of functional loading of the oppositions of congestion, counterpart, equivalence, privativeness, etc.; b) narrowing or widening of attributive, nominative and other components; c) decrease or increase in the amount of thematic words (compare personotexts of G. Skovoroda, T. Shevchenko, M. Kotsiubynsky); d) decrease/strengthening of certain lexical components (compare verbalizers of concepts *Людина, Душа, Горе* "Man, Soul, Grief" and others in linguistic personalities of G. Skovoroda, M. Kotsiubynsky); e) the repeating of verbalizers of key concepts; f) the creation of new concepts and their verbalization; g) the evolution of grammar norm on the basis of general national norm and so on. This may be easily traced, for example, in the linguotexts of M. Kotsiubynsky structured in the experimental research complex of texts (http://52.28.184.95/bonito/) with general volume of 86.5 million word forms, created in the department of the Ukrainian language and applied linguistics of Donetsk national university in 2009–2014 (author N. A. Broiko), compare: in writer's linguotexts there were fixed 53 cases of lemma *подарунок* 'present' in 76,8 million of word forms, from which 46 are testified in epistolary of different periods with particular intensity while preparation and release of the story "A Present for Birthday" and after it. Such loading of

the lexeme *present* testifies about its attaching in the lettering and diary notes, in artistic heritage it appears key only for the story written in the last period of creativity – in 1912 on Capri, becoming its topic with constant accretion (sixfold) of different notional layers in it. In epistolary lexeme *present* is one of the realizations of the imperative in its separate varieties: a) delicate – the necessity to simply discuss the question of the celebration: *Цілий тиждень знайомі обмінювались подарунками, які виставляють на цілі святки на столі* (1911) "For the whole week the acquaintances had been exchanging the presents, which are put on Christmas on the table'; b) strict, when the situation motivates realia: *Треба було йти* "весілля''. *Купив я йому в подарунок краватку й пішов* (1910), 'I had to go to the wedding. I bought him a tie as a present and went' and others.

Not concerning the questions of profound qualification and the qualification of the types of the linguistic personality – linguopersonologies, as such analysis is not included in the scope of research tasks, we may speak about the system of levels, categories of linguopersonology. Basing on determining dynamics and/or the change of idiolect personality in temporal scope, it is necessary to distinguish nuclear, half-peripheral and peripheral components which are realized on the corresponding levels and in specific created dimensions (utterances ↔ statements), in particular personotexts. Due to the singling out of three levels of organization of linguistic personality by Yu. M. Karaulov [2010: 56–60] – verbal-semantic, linguistic-cognitive, pragmatic (or motivational) – we have grounded its potential possibility to express itself on each of them. Each of these levels reflects the peculiarities of organization of linguistic personality, their intentions. More or less, the ideas of peculiarities of the realization by linguistic personality on each level were developed and deepened in a number of studies (V. I. Karasyk [2002: 187–194], T. A. Kosmeda [2006: 104–114], I. A. Sternin [2002: 4–21] and other). The most indicative studies are studies of lexical potential of linguistic personality with the description of the regularities of manifestation of semantic saturation of certain structures. Indicative are the studies of linguistic personality in separate functionally loaded for such personality discourse practices with the ascertainment of status loading of separate lexical layers – political, ecclesiastical-religious, philosophical and so on, the expression of the role of evaluation space – from actually-positive, neutral to deeply negative, condemnatory, the qualifications of certa-

in things as nationally foreign, unacceptable, compare, for example, the phrases in the diary notes of Catherine II, such as *отвратитель-ная гримаса* "disgusting grimace", *глупая физиономия* "silly phiz", *девицы дрянного поведения* "drabs", *язвительная насмешка* "caustic smear", *в человеке, самом тупом и лишенном всякого воображения и ума* "in the silliest person without any imagination and intellect" as negatively marked (op. cit.: [Никитина 2013: 248–252]). The characteristic feature of discourse practices of M. Kotsiubynsky is absolute correlation of belles-lettres (comprises 373 907 lemmas) and epistolary-autobiographic (comprises 300 529 lexemes and word forms) discourse practices, their relative correlation with journalistic (46 431 lemmas) and folkloristic (more than 3000 lexemes). There is also an indicative fact that general verbal background of the artist comprises 553 860 units, and sentence formations – 61 766 with maximal investigation of his documents – 718. On verbal-semantic and associative level of M. Kotsiubynsky we may find the dimensions of actually-human outlook and interpretation, so evaluation scale is adjusted on the expression of environmental realia through world perception what is expressed through the verbalization of the concept *Людина* "Man", compare: 1) man as person, personality, spiritual essence: *Він досі не був цілою **людиною**, іно половиною* "He still wasn't a complete person, just a half"; *Вона була для нього чужою **людиною*** "She was a strange person for him"; *Най добрі **люди** розсудять* "Let good people judge"; *Ще **люди** сміятимуться* 'People will still laugh; *З карих, трохи посоловілих очей визирали неспокій та задума, наче вона загубила моральну рівновагу нормальної **людини*** "Restlessness and thought were peering out of hazel drowsy eyes, as if she had lost the moral balance of a normal person"; 2) a person as a carrier and an impersonator of relationships, social relations, established models of cohabitation which often becomes the ground for comparison: *От краще помиріться з Олександрою та живіть, як добрі **люди*** "You'd better make up with Olexandra and live as goodies"; *зять – чужа **людина*** "son-in-law is a strange person"; the source of the report is also the reference on person*: казали **люди*** people said; *добрі **люди** нараяли жити на віру* "good people advised to live on faith". It is completely logical to ascertain that the most intensive component of M. Kotsiubynsky's metaphor field, his expressive-semantic version of the world are vertex frequent lexical units (compare: [Космеда 2012: 34–45; Карасик 2007: 78–87].

The nuclear categories of the linguopersonology are "linguistic personality", "linguistic consciousness", as well as the categories "language picture of the world", "cognitive picture of the world". Personotexts of the language personality form a unity with corresponding temporal sections, which allow to ascertain: a) the evolution of the language-speech intellectualization of language personality with the differentiation of periodic individuations; b) the regularities of the deepening of the reflection of extra-language reality; c) differentiation of communicatively adjusting and expressive-esthetic realizations; d) intensification of psychological-intentional effect; e) the growth of communicative-connotative background, etc. Language personality treats their own language practice consciously and responsibly becoming a manifestation of social-corporative, social-cultural, territorial-regional background, the traditions of upbringing [Загнітко 2012/$_2$: 345–346], so the investigation of the language personality should be carried out on the basis of a number of semantic, communicative and other categories with the usage of the contrastive, systemic principles, etc. of W. von Humboldt, considering the connection of language and person's thinking, cultural values, emphasized the importance of language force field for the personality [Гумбольдт 2000: 46], whereas the individual is capable to cognize the spirit of the language through the deepness of the language sign. Individual is formed in the "semantic captivity of the language", mastering and acquiring it, so the individuations of language of personality correlate with national-language personality, their space and temporal individuations directly and / or mediately. The determination of the peculiarities of the realization of differential features in discourse practices and general differentiation of discourses on the basis of these qualification parameters of a separate language personality and national-language personality is based on the level structuration of linguopersonology which may be viewed in a generalized model of lexicon and grammarticon of language personality in the boundaries of which it is easy to trace creative potential of the constructions, emotional-expressive saturation of certain formulas, connotative manifestations of the word forms, semantic filling of the formations, widening and/or narrowing of syntagmatic potential, etc. (compare [Радбиль 2010: 86–185; Домброван 2013: 94–123].

Linguocognitive level (thesaurus) demands particular approach to the considering of language personality or national-language perso-

nality as it interacts with ethnopsychological, social-corporative, national-mental, psychomental and linguocultural properties. Language treatment is significant in national consciousness as well as its evaluation as self-sufficient, unique, self-identificational, able to culturally accumulate knowledge, attainments and achievements of other nations, able to optimally disclose national-language picture of the world.

Motivationally-oriented level comprises active communication with its corresponding pragmaticon (the system of strategies, tactics, intentions, motives, attitudes, disclosed in the process of text creation and in their contents, and also in the peculiarities of perception of strange texts with the determination of the hierarchy of values in the language model of the world of personality) [Загнітко 2012/$_2$: 345–346].

We can denote as perspective linguopersonologic the studies of all levels of language personology and the ascertainment of the planes of the most active interaction of nuclear categories of the linguopersonology. The theory of language levels opens the perspectives of studying of individual portraits of lexical, morphological, syntactic, word-forming language personalities, functional loading of the spelling principles [Татаринцева 2007: 7–12] as a unity of reflection and conditionality and punctuation – individual portraits of spelling, punctuation language personalities. The ascertainment of abilities of the native speakers with tracking of maximal / minimal inclination to variability – phonetic, phonologic, morphemic, semantic – is substantive for linguopersonologic descriptions [Загнітко 2011: 495–505].

Modern linguopersonology with its several levels from which verbal-semantic is the most researched, as well as partially communicative-motivational with the attempts to determine the typology of pragmatic intentions, the manifestation of different deviations, the directions of the realization of communications with their maximas and postulates, the observation of communicative strategies and tactics, cognitive one with consistent examination of certain conceptospheres, the ascertainment of correlation of cognitive depths with formal-superficial ones. Lately, the studies of linguodiscourse practices, ascertainment of their national-language specificity have become wide-spread. Special attention should be paid to the study of communicative – linguodiscourse tonalities, linguodiscourse registers – with the characteristics of the levels of language personality on each of the outlined planes of linguopersonology.

1.2. The theory of modern linguopersonology levels and categories

In modern linguistic studies linguopersonology is one of the actively investigated directions, what is motivated by the opportunities to adequately use anthropocentric (anthropocentered) approach in its correlation / non-correlation with systemocentric. Anthropologic approach was first justified in philosophy, the main principles and postulates being transferred into linguistics, where it was studied in conceptual understanding of the language and its relation to person. The latter caused the formation of two dyads: 1) *person ↔ language* and 2) *language ↔ person*. The first dyad includes the influence of person on language, the subordination of the language to the demands of the personality, etc., the second dyad investigates the influence of human language on personality, their behaviour, the establishment of status role of the language in the formation of the individual as a language personality [Плесовских 2014: 173−179]. Dyad *language ↔ person* is determinative for the studies oriented on language personality, the analysis of their lexicon, grammaticon, the research of linguistic-culturological manifestation of the personality, the determination of the communicative intentions, the disclosure of the mistakes of the language personality determined by the action of language principles. etc. All these became the ground for establishment of specific sphere of scientific cognition – linguopersonology.

The notion linguopersonology, as a lot of linguists consider, was introduced by V. Neroznak [1996: 112−116] to determine the scientific discipline the object of which is language personality. For the scientist, the correlation *language personality ↔ language community* is particular, where the first component is always subordinated to the second one, though it is necessary to consider the retroaction as well, since active personality with their language potential influences significantly the general-language environment of the community. At the same time, we should also take into account the fact that even personality as a leader cannot dramatically change the language background of the community alone, without any support of other language personalities, though the personality's influence in the general community manifestation may significantly *vary → modify → transform* the language portrait of the community, what, in the long run, may comprise a range of such studies. Moreover, sometimes language personalities

establish language priorities, language values not only in language community, but *nationwide* as well. The confirmation of this is, for example, the functional status of language personalities of Ivan Kotliarevsky, Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, compare, for example, interesting observations of language personality of Ivan Franko [Космеда 2006: 124−145], Vuk Karadžić, Alexander Pushkin, Juliusz Słowacki and others. So, we may consider as fully motivated the statement that linguopersonology researches "the state of language (individuations) of partially human language personality (idiolect personality) and polyhuman (polylectic) language personality (nation)" [Нерознак 1996: 113]. We may assume as interesting the fact that the magic of word of any speaker often becomes determinative; *„… вірю в магію слова, в його здатність матеріалізуватися. Старша донька знайомої письменниці несподівано поставила її перед фактом: Мамо, я одружуюся і виїжджаю до Словаччини". Мати тільки випалила з гіркотою: „Ну от, вона виходить за словака. Тепер тільки залишається, щоб друга вийшла за американця і я залишилася сама…" Через два роки хлопець з Америки, наш емігрант, приїхав до Ужгорода, щоб забрати з собою її молодшу доньку"* (M. Dochinets) "…I believe in word magic, in its ability to materialize. The older daughter of an acquaintance writer put her unexpectedly before the fact, "Mum, I'm getting married and leave to Slovakia". The mother only said bitterly, "Well, she is going to marry to a Slovak. The only thing left is for the second daughter to marry an American and leave me alone…". In two years a boy from America, our emigrant, came to Uzhhorod in order to take her younger daughter with him".

The singling out of three levels of language personality organization – verbal-semantic, linguocognitive, motivational – by Yu. M. Karaulov [2010: 11−17] is based on their potential possibility to express themselves on every of the levels. To one degree or another, the ideas about the peculiarities of realization by language personality on every level found their development and deepening in a range of studies (V. I. Karasyk [2002: 187−194], T. A. Kosmeda [2006: 104−114], I. A. Sternin [2002: 4−21] and others). At the same time, they started to ascertain profoundly the regulations of the realization of speech potencies in separate customary usage practices which found the development in the ideas of discourse practice or discourse practices.

In modern studies we may clearly distinguish several approaches to the analysis of language personality: 1) psychological (the peculia-

rities of the character and the peculiarities of its communicative disclosure); 2) sociological (the study of indicators of language personality, corporative groups and so on and indicators of communicative behaviour of language personality, small groups, the disclosure of parameters of customary usage and speech restrictions); 3) culturological (the modelling of linguocultural types as recognized national phenomena such as *український козак* "Ukrainian Cossack", *польський шляхтич* "Polish gentlemen", *американський бізнесмен* "American businessman"); 4) linguistic (communicative behaviour of the native speakers of different social categories, the ascertainment of the parameters of communicative behaviour, "the recognition" of speech-communicative types, the research of the regulations of the realization of communicative strategies and tactics, the study of the peculiarities of the ascertainment of language personality in their different discourses [Космеда 2012: 57−68]); 5) pragmatic ↔ pragmatic-linguistic ↔ linguodiscoursal (the determination of the variations of the communicative tonality) (compare [Карасик 2007: 78−86]). For linguodiscoursal approach, a range of features is functionally loaded, each feature having self-sufficiency to describe language personality according to corresponding discourse practice: 1) one- / polyplanity of the meaning; 2) predictability / non-predictability (openness) of the reaction; 3) expediency / non- expediency of communication; 4) cooperativeness / conflict of communication; 5) priority of contents / form of communication; 6) thoroughness / brevity of communication; 7) normativeness / non-normativeness of communication; 8) distinctness / abstractness of communication; 9) one- / polytheme communication; 10) seriousness / non-seriousness (irony, joke, sarcasm, etc.) of communication; 11) openness /closeness of communication. The study of the most quantity of discourse practices is necessary for optimal description of the language personality.

The ascertainment of categorical apparatus of linguopersonology is rather essential. Its nuclear categories include "language personality", "language consciousness", connected with such categories as "language world picture", "cognitive world picture". In modern linguistics language personality is usually treated as a certain personality who knows the language perfectly, has its conscious and creative command, perceives the language in the context of national mentality and culture as their spiritual centre, uses the language as an integral element of self-formation, self-cognition, self-affirmation and

self-expression, development and improvement of own intellectual and emotional-role, expressive-feeling possibilities and as the most important means of socialization of personality in human society [Загнітко 2012$_{/2}$: 345−346].

After abstraction and ascertainment of the generalized sample of language personality, their model may be qualified as a collection of skills and characteristics of a person, which lead to personality's production and understanding of the texts, which differ from each other in: 1) the level of language-structural difficulty; 2) deepness, consistency and accuracy of reality disclosure; 3) communicative attitude; 4) esthetic loading; 5) psychological effect, etc. Thus, language personality is a combination of: a) language competence, b) aspirations for creative self-expression, c) free, automatic fulfillment of speech activity, d) harmonious existence in language community, e) own language self-identification and so on. Language personality treats their own language practice consciously and with responsibility, becoming an expression of social-corporative, social-cultural, territorial-regional background, the traditions of upbringing in society [Загнітко 2012$_{/2}$: 346]. Verbal art (which is like other kinds of art (*painting, music,* etc.), but it is different at the same time) of language personality combines and accumulates all visual, auditory, tactile sensations in a word as a specific syncretic and synergic sign. The latter leads to specific meaning of the language as a factor of personality formation. Investigating the connection between language and thinking of a person, their inner world and cultural values(the beginning of the XIX century), Wilhelm von Humboldt particularly emphasized the meaning of the language force [Гумбольдт 2000: 46] field, the spirit of which individual can cognize only realizing the deepness of language sign on the one hand, and functional loading of the latter for all native speakers. The following remark is undeniable: "There is an indisputable connection between language structure and success in other kinds of intellectual activity" [Гумбольдт 2000: 47], as "Language is a mirror of culture" [Гумбольдт 2000: 188]. Any individual is formed in "a semantic language captivity", mastering and assimilating it. The ascertainment of peculiarities of the expression of suggested signs in discourse practices and the differentiation of the discourses in general on the basis of these qualification parameters is relied on level structuration of linguopersonology, which should not be viewed simplified, as in such structuration all traditionally singled out language

levels have essential meaning, but we should speak about special structuration where motivation, and intention, and creativity, and expression, and lexicon, and grammaticon and so on are valid.

The ideas of the German linguist were creatively developed by Alexander Potebnja and others. Such approach emphasized the co-gency of anthropocentrism, i. e. the superiority of psychological (compare the allocation of *psychological subject* and psychological pre-dicate by Alexander Potebnja, as well as *the qualification of the sentence* as the apperception of the feelings) and ethnopsychological (the rese-arch of language psychology by Wilhelm Wundt) elements in the studies of language and the focus of attention on human personality as a producer of language world picture [Радбиль 2010: 86−168]. This allowed to differentiate three levels of structural expression of the language personality: 1) zero – verbal-semantic (lexicon of the lan-guage personality) with corresponding set of lexical and grammatical means used by the personality while creating certain texts (the disco-urse of language personality that comprises communicative units of different genres and different styles); 2) linguocognitive (thesaurus of language personality) – traceable vision of the objective world (the system of knowledge about the world). On this level intellectual cha-racteristics, appropriate for the world picture of the personality are essential (for the thesaurus of the personality).

Intellect is gradually detectable in the language, it may be easily analyzed through the language. This level is sometimes called intel-lectual [Загнітко 2014: 136−168]. The units of this level (thesaurus) are notions, words-symbols, images, fragments of phrases, formulas, models, schemes, ideas, which are formed by each language indivi-duality into an ordered in a certain way, systematized individual world picture with a corresponding hierarchy of significances and values. Linguocognitive level (thesaurus) is enriched with the help of world cognition, and as a result the notions, evaluations of a certain language personality cross and interlace with ethnopsychological, social-corporative, national-cultural properties, thus, language perso-nality becomes an actually national phenomenon. In national consciousness, attitude to language, its evaluation as a self-sufficient, unique, self-identificational, capable to accumulate knowledge, the achievements of other nations, to optimally express national-language picture are significant. National comprises all structural levels of the language personality; 3) motivational (the level of activity communi-

cation) which reveals personality pragmaticon (the system of strategies, tactics, intentions, motives, attitudes expressed in the process of text formation and in text contents, as well as in the peculiarities of the perception of strange texts with the definition of the values hierarchy in a language world model of the personality).

Language personality in communicative linguistics is viewed as a typical, exceptional or original speaker (native speaker of a certain language), expressed in the collection of their speech characteristics – strategies and tactics. The description (portrait) of a speech personality should not be identified, for example, with the description of the language of a certain writer, because his formal and informal communication should be taken into account (particularly, the presence of epistolary heritage, memories of witnesses, his translational activity and so on) [Загнітко 2012$_{/2}$: 345−346]. We consider to be interesting the attempts to interpret creative language personality through characteristic discourse practices, compare: hobby, superstitions, anecdotes [Посмішки 2011] as an active language-speech section of seventy writers – from Volodymyr Baylevsky, Yevhen Baran – to Volodymyr Shavkoshytny, Volodymyr Yavorivsky. In two hundred ten masterly fulfilled stories – discourse practices is easy to recognize jokes and irony, deep wisdom and youthful insolence, a game with readers and appeal to them.

General structure of linguopersonology is based on the significant notions of linguoethnics, communicativeness, cognition, sociality, linguoculturology, linguodiscourseness, which enables the differentiation of linguoethnic (language personality and ethnos), communicative (communicative intentions of language personality, their creativity, tactics and strategy, communicative competence), cognitive (national-cognitive base, corporative-cognitive multitude, conceptual sphere, concepts and categories, symbols and images, notions and senses of language personality, language community), social (sociolinguistic (communicative-status roles, sociolinguistic portrait of the community etc.), linguoculturological (“linguocultural motivation” of the personality, linguocultural samples etc.), linguodiscourse (communicative tonalities, communicative registers, marked discourse practices of the personality, community, typology of discourse practices of language personality, primary and secondary senses, situationally determined senses, etc.) levels. The ascertained nuclear categories on every level have the peculiarities of their expression. If we

consider communicative, linguodiscourse and other levels of general-national language personality, they correlate with general-national fund of language memory, functional expressions of the language, etc. General-national multitude of discourse practices is reflected in explanatory dictionaries, in which you may easily follow the dynamics of the vocabulary contents, the decrease of volume of certain thematic groups, widening / narrowing of semantic wealth in general and certain word in particular.

Any explanatory dictionary is a relative section of relative semantic language space in all dimensions. Thus, from the first Ukrainian grammars up to the latest ones, the classification of the parts of speech is already the most fixed but its reflection in different dictionaries, especially in those where different transfer planes are present, word form gets different functional expression, as a result it is treated in a different way in lexicography (compare, for example, (23), (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29)). At the beginning of the XX century the notion of indeclinability became usable in all normative grammars and dictionaries correspondingly, (see: (1), (2), (3) and further), the notion embraces noun features, adjective features, being an exception in them. semantic and grammatical realizations of this complex of words is rather significant for different discourse practices, what is confirmed by the dictionary reality. Either systematically normative usage of the word / words in corresponding meanings (see feature (7)), or the orientation on corporative interests (see features (4), (11)), or acting out in order to receive certain effect (see features (5), (10)) is significant for communicative competence of the language personality. In this case, only functional-dictionary expressions of separate lexemes are viewed, as their complete analysis demands rather vast space. Thus, for example, among indeclinable words in modern Ukrainian their functioning based on corresponding semantics plays a specific role. If we proceed from positional attachment of indeclinable lexemes, it is easy to make sure in some rather interesting facts as for their categorization as a part of speech (here, we do not take into account the question of zero declension of these nouns and the presence of 14 homonymic formal- and semantic-declensional forms in systemic expression [Загнітко 2013: 613−632], of dynamics of their gender differentiation in usage and speech practices, where the usage of such lexemes with a corresponding categorization of gender belongs to

communicative competence of the language personality[1], their social / social-role status, the presence of collective intentional realizations and so on). For our observations we may use several lexemes: *каре* "bob", *індиго* "indigo", *інженю* "ingīnue" and others. The word *каре* "bob" in modern dictionaries and according to the inventory of fact material from National complex of the Ukrainian language of the National academy of sciences of Ukraine [Загнітко 2015: 13−70] has the following meanings: 1) "*невідм., с.* Бойове шикування піхоти у формі чотирикутника; застосовувалося з XVIII ст. перев. для відбиття кавалерійських атак" "a body of soldiers drawn up in the form of a square since the XVIII century": (1)[2] *Після того* [присяги прапорові] *полк знову вишикувався в каре, командир з комісаром стали поруч на поличку тачанки* (Ю. Смолич)[3] "After that [the oath of the flag] the regiment again lined up in a square; the commander with the commissar stood beside the cart"; (2) *Тричі налітали дроздовці на це маленьке каре, … але щоразу на землю падала більшість вершників* (П. Панч) "Drozdovtsi had attacked this small square for three times, … but every time the majority of riders fell to the ground"; (3) *Пролунали команди. Загриміли барабани. Сколихнулися і завмерли прямокутники каре, рівні й застиглі, мов витесані із каменю. Блискуча кавалькада придворних і генералів на чолі з імператором рушила вздовж фронту* (В. Малик) "The commands were heard. The drums thundered. The squares waved and stopped, equal and frozen as if carved of stone. The brilliant cavalcade of courtiers and generals led by the emperor moved along the front"; (4) *Наш взвод розвертався в каре – лицем до ворожої кінноти. Передні лягали, ті, що позаду, ставали на коліна, а ще задні на весь зріст цілились в уявну кінноту* (А. Дімаров) "Our platoon turned in a square – with face to enemy cavalry. The front lay down, those behind, stood on

---

[1] If we take into account the qualification features of discourse practices in linguodiscourse analysis of language personality, the usage of the nouns of zero declension, may help to distinguish one of the qualification aspects of the language personality under several such features (compare (2), (4), (6) and other features).

[2] For a more convenient description, all the examples are numbered, and further in the text of this chapter links on corresponding ordinal numbers are present.

[3] These and further interpretations and examples are taken from *Virtual lexicographic laboratory of Ukrainian language-information fund of the National academy of sciences of Ukraine.*

their knees, and even the rear for the full height, they were aimed at the imaginary cavalry"; (5) *Солдати підійшли, стали навпроти і почали розвертатися **в каре**, попереду із рипінням викотилися візки із гарматами й каноніри почали розвертати їх, наводячи мідні жерла на козаків* (Д. Білий) "Soldiers approached, stood in front and began to unfold in a square; trolleys with guns were driven to the front with stamping, and the gunsmen began to turn them over, bringing copper vents to the Cossacks"; 2) "*невідм., с.* Різновид жіночої зачіски середньої довжини перев. з прямою гривкою" "a hairstyle for women and children in which the hair is cut short evenly all round the head": (6) *Навіщо вона постриглася сьогодні? Зробила якесь зовсім коротке **каре**. Такі зачіски чомусь завжди додають віку* (І. Карпа) "Why has she had her hair cut? She was made a really short bob. Such haircuts always add the age"; (7) ***Каре** стало користуватися популярністю після Першої світової війни, зокрема завдяки танцюристці Ірені Касл* (із журн.) "Bob became popular after World War I, particularly thanks to the dancer Irene Castle"; 3) "*у знач. прикм.* У формі чотирикутника" "in the meaning of adj. Being a square in shape": (8) *Вивчаю Віку поглядом … Темні кільця довкола очей, зачіска **каре*** (Любко Дереш) "I study Vika with a glance … Dark rings around the eyes, bob hairstyle"; (9) *Комір **каре*** "The square collar". The first meaning contains the shade "Which has a square shape": (10) *Посередині **каре**, на вільному місці плацу, як мушина крапка на шибці вікна – стояв крихітний аналой* (Ю. Смолич) "In the middle of the square, on the free place of the parade ground, like a louse's dot on the window's frame –a tiny lectern stood"; (11) *Всього шість п'ятиповерхових будинків, стулившись **у каре**, оточували двір* (О. Ірванець) ''Just six five-storey buildings standing in a square surrounded the yard". The first captious look at this fact material signals about relative conditionality of the qualification of the part of speech of the semantic space of the lexeme *каре*. If we compare (8) – *haircut bob*, (9) – *colour brown* as a confirmation of the belonging of he word to (in the sentence *каре* on formal-grammatical level is an attribute, weak adjoining based on the form of subordinate adverbial syntactic connection) and (1) – *вишикувався в каре* lined up in the square, (4) – *розвертався в каре* "turned around into square", (5) – *почали розвертатися в каре* "began turning around into square", where in all the cases the construction *в каре* into square is post-verbal, actualizing

the semantics of the verb *розвертатися* "turn around" and is the carrier of the separate proposition, it is easy to notice that *в каре* into square is used adverbially. Such a statement may be easily confirmed by the comparison with similar constructions in post-verbal syntactic position of lexeme *розвертатися* marked by the subordinate adverbial syntactic connection in a form of adjoining. For the verb *розвертатися* "turn around" with its ten systematically fixed meanings semantics "Повертаючись, змінювати своє положення або напрям свого руху; робити розворот" "To change one's position or the direction of the movement with a turning; to do a turning' is pointed out in the dictionary after the meaning '*розм.* Переставати бути згорнутим, скрученим; розгортатися, розправлятися" "col. to stop being folded, to unfold". With the consideration of the presence of space sema in the semantic structure of the verbal sema *розвертатися* as being the main, the analyzed meaning must be the first (in this case the peculiarities of the realization of the space sema are not studied – zero / formally expressed, as it is important that we can turn around only in some space): (12) *Він [теплохід] зайшов у тиху бухту і став розвертатися* (в бухті), *щоб причалити до пристані* (В. Собко) "It [the motor ship] came into the bay and began turning (in a bay) in order to moor to the pier"; (13) *Машина в'юнко виписувала віражі, різко змінювала швидкість розверталася **на місці*** (із журн.) "The car tying out the circles, sharply changing the velocity turned on the spot"; (14) *Не глянувши на подругу[4], Марійка круто розвернулась і швидко подалась до лісу* (О. Донченко) "Not looking at her friend, Mariika turned abruptly and quickly went to the forest – zero expression"; (15) *Пролунала команда, і ми спинились. Потім колона розвернулася й загородила шлях* (П. Колесник) 'The command rang out, and we stopped. Then the column turned around and blocked the way' – zero expression. Functional expression *в каре* is adverbial, identical with (16), (17), (18), (19), compare also: (16) *Ріос ще трохи зачекав на порозі, розвернувшись **боком** і нахиливши голову* (А. Азімов) "Rios would wait a little longer turning sideways and bending

---

[4] The status of functional-author principle of punctuation is particular, it does not get the loading of structural, semantic and intonation-rhythmic. Its expressions in the individual speech of the author, his discourse practices reveals the peculiarities of artist's attitude to punctuation symbols in general and their status in topicalization, notional creation in particular (see: [Загнітко 2011: 525−784]).

his head"; (17) *Переяславські сотні зрештою розвернулись* **тилом** *до Вовчого Хвоста* (І. Білик) "The Pereyaslav hundreds finally turned their back to Vovchyi Khvist"; (18) *У бушуванні прожектора моряцькі машини розвернулися* **в ряд** (М. Вінграновський) "In the raging of the spotlight, seaman machines turned into a row"; (19) *А там дорога* **низом** *та* **низом** *і верболоззя над дорогою, далєй очерети і болота* (В. Дрозд) "And there was the road in the lower part, and the osier grew above the road, and further there were reeds and bogs". In (16) – *боком*, (17) – *тилом*, (18) – *в ряд* with the peculiarities of the speech position, they confirm the adverbial status of syntaxemes, though in modern lexicographic thesaurus dictionaries such realization is not expressed. As an exception we may name such lexemes as *кидком*, *ривком* in a throw, with a jerk with the following explanation in the dictionary: *кидком* – "*присл.* Швидко кидаючись або швидко кидаючи" "adv. to fling oneself in a throw": (20) *Єдиний рятунок для них [оточених] в цю мить – кинутись* **кидком** *саме вперед* (О. Гончар) "The only salvation for them [surrounded] at this moment is to fling in a throw forward"; (21) *Не нападав, а підходив. Чому ж підходив? А як саме підходив? Крадькома чи* **кидком?** (В. Фіялко) "He did not attack, but approached. Why did he approach? And how did he approach? Stealing or in a throw?"; (22) *Юнак миттєво оцінив всю складність ситуації –* **кидком** *випередив усіх* (із журн.) "The young man instantly estimated the complexity of the situation – he was ahead of all in a throw"; *ривком у знач. присл.* Одним різким коротким рухом; поривчасто "in the meaning of adv. With one short, quick movement, jerky, abruptly": (23) *Він став оглядати мотор, непомітно поставив на місце деталь (раніш зняту). Потім сів на мотоцикл,* **ривком** *натиснув ногою – мотор зразу ж завівся* (А. Головко) "He began to inspect the engine, quietly placing a part (previously taken away). Then he sat on a motorcycle, kicked with a jerk – the engine immediately wound"; (24) *Допаливши цигарку, рвучким* **ривком** *викинув [Мартин] її за вікно на вулицю* (Г. Епік) ''Having smoked the cigar, [Martin] pulled it out of the window out into the street"; (25) *Запалившись, Оля з останніх сил,* **ривком**, *викручує ногу, і переслідувач … летить сторч головою* (Л. Юхвід) "Furiously, Olya, from the last strength, jerks, twists the leg, and the pursuer … flies with his head"; (26) *Він* **ривком** *притягнув до себе Маргариту* (О. Авраменко, В. Авраменко) "He jerked Margaret to

himself"; *стрибком* – "*у знач. присл. Різко змінюючись*" in a jump – "in the meaning of adv. Abruptly changing": (27) *Надпровідність полягає в тому, що при наднизьких температурах, різних для кожного металу, у них* **стрибком**, *практично до нуля, падає опір. Матеріал стає надпровідним* (з наук.-попул. літ.) "Superconductivity consists in the fact that at extremely low temperatures, different for each metal, the resistance falls practically to zero in a moment. The material becomes superconductive" It also should be added, that lexemes like *ривком, стрибком* are given in corresponding lexicographical articles of the lexemes *ривок, стрибок* as a separate expression of their semantics. Below in the article there is also a noun lexeme *ривок – ривками* – "*у знач. присл. Порушуючи ритм чого-небудь; неритмічно, нерівномірно*" "in the meaning of adv. Disturbing the rhythm of something; not rhythmically, unevenly": (28) *Кашубський ігнорував будь-які планові основи постачання експедиції, вся робота велась* **ривками**, *штурмівщиною* (Л. Дмитерко) "Kashubsky ignored any planned bases for expedition delivery, all work was carried out by jerks, storming' – with a shade 'not smoothly" (29) *Щось крикнули з гурту, та Саїд не озирався. Відкрив допоміжний кран пального, і машина* **ривками** *понесла в гори* (Іван Ле) "Something was shouted from the group, but Said did not look back. He opened the auxiliary fuel tap, and the car rushed into the mountains", and in the article – *стрибок* – *стрибками*: "*у знач. присл. Підскакуючи при переміщенні від поштовхів, коливань і т. ін.*" "in the meaning of adv. Jumping while moving because of impulses, fluctuations and so on", compare: (30) *Дерев'яний рибальський човен пливе* **стрибками** (з наук.-попул. літ.) "A wooden fishing boat floats by leaps". For language personality with their lexicon as the reflection of general national not only the knowledge of general semantic space of the word is essential but the ability to recognize its categorical part-language semantics as well.

A glance at exposure of lexical potential of the word in modern explanatory dictionaries testifies that the category of lexical meaning has a special status in linguopersonology with the expression on communicative, linguodiscourse, cognitive levels. Lexical meaning is correlated with all levels of linguopersonology, the loading of its corresponding forms is aimed at the perspective of its studies. Reflecting the complex of the majority of general-national linguodiscourse practices, explanatory dictionary is aimed to reflect the meaning of the

word from all sides. The total quantity of functional expressions of the word form with a certain meaning can represent its lexeme separateness (see: (20), (21)), low frequency of realization – testifies about the connection with the main (hierarchically top) meaning and qualification *у знач.* "in the meaning" (compare: (23), (24), (25), (26)). The qualification of the indeclinable lexemes is connected with language competence, within their status they may cover noun, adjective, adverb statuses (*індиго* "indigo", *ін-фоліо* "in-folio"), adjective and adverb (*ін-октавіо* "in-octavio"). In general, the indeclinability as a language and corset peculiarity deserves separate examination in linguocreative and linguocognitive dimensions of linguopersonology, not speaking about such forms as *вечорами* "in the evenings", *веснами* "every spring", *днями* "every day", *ранками* "every morning" or lexemes with maximal / relative potential of grammatization (*іти, піти, ходити* "go"). The studies of all levels language personality are perspective, as well as the ascertainment of the planes of the most active interaction of nuclear categories of linguopersonology. The theory of language levels gives perspectives of studying individual portraits of lexical, morphological, syntactic, word-forming language personalities, functional loading of spelling principles [Татаринцева 2007: 4–14] as a combination of reflection and conditionality and punctuation – individual portraits of spelling, punctuation language personalities. The ascertainment of the abilities of native speakers with the tracing of maximal / minimal inclination to variation – phonetic, phonologic, morphemic, semantic – is rather essential for linguopersonological descriptions.

Modern linguopersonology with its several levels, where the most researched levels are communicative with the attempts to determine the typology of pragmatic intentions, the expression of different deviations, tendencies of realization of the principles of communication with their maximas and postulates, tracing of communicative strategies and tactics, cognitive with consistent examination of certain conceptospheres, ascertainment of cognitive depths correlation with formal-superficial ones. Lately, the studies of linguodiscourse practices have become popular, as well as the ascertainment of their national-language specificity. Special attention should be paid to the study of communicative – linguodiscourse tonalities, linguodiscourse registers – with the characteristics of the levels of language personality on every of the mentioned planes of linguopersonology.

THE THEORY OF LINGUOPERSONEME: THE TYPOLOGY OF LINGUOINDIVIDUATIONS AND LINGUOINDIVIDUALIZATIONS

A. Zahnitko

2.1. Language personality in epistolary discourse: the typology of linguoindividuations and linguoindividualizations

Language personality in its integrity can be cognized through the observation of the peculiarities of its self-expression and consistent identification in texts which give rise to different discourse practices that make plurality in their integrity. It is easy to distinguish different power planes in this plurality as well as active loading of certain discourse practices in corresponding life periods, at the same time their continuous examination makes the peculiarities of the individualization of a personality brighter. That is why the determination of the general volume of personologic texts for thorough studying becomes topical as they allow to easily explicate the peculiarities of the usage of the units of all structure levels of the language and at the same time to determine the regularities of the realization of such personality in the language, their life in it, to correlate the used language resources with national language practice in its different expressions.

The main interpretation of the term *language personality* has not undergone material changes since the time of its appearance in the works of the founder of Neo-Humboldtism J.L. Weisgerber *Muttersprache und Geistesbildung* [Вайсгербер 2004] in 1929. For the analysis of language personality [Загнітко 2012/2: 345], their language and society portrait based on a certain discursive practice the accentuation of axiomatically substantiated delimitation of language and speech, which is always sensually perceived (according to J. L. Weisgerber), is

essential. Such perception may be direct – in dialogue-situational oral speech, mediated – in a certain manifestation of a written speech. The study of epistolary discourse practices appears especially topical with its maximal saturation with individually revealed senses, orientation on certain addressee. The questions of self-identification of a language personality in epistolary discourse remain unsolved, as well as tracing the changes of individuations of language personality based on addressee, social conditions, life experience. That is why the disclosure of the language personality in epistolary discourse with the determination of their individuations appears really important with the ascertainment of the typology of these individuations. For the realization of the study it is necessary to: 1) ascertain the differential features of the notion language personality; 2) determine the peculiarities of the epistolary discourse; 3) characterize the evolution of the views on individuation and its correlation with linguoindividualization; 4) reveal the main ways of variations and modifications of linguoindividualizations; 5) explicate the place of epistolary-discursive practices in language and social portraying of a personality.

Language personality is viewed as a collection of capacities and characteristics of a person which determine the production and comprehension of texts which differ in: 1) the level of language-structural difficulty; 2) deepness, consistency and precision of reality expression; 3) communicative instruction; 4) esthetic loading; 5) psychological effect, etc. [Загнітко 2012$_{/2}$: 345]. That is why language personality is a combination in a speaker's personality of: a) language competence, b) striving for creative self-expression, c) free, automatic fulfillment of detailed speech activity. language personality is a plurality of linguoindividuations and linguoindividualizations. Linguoindividuation is expressed in a spontaneous need of the speaker to realize themselves in their language and through language: to verbalize the thoughts, to render the read, etc. Linguoindividuation correlates with natural process of personality development, which suggests two main types of linguoindividuation – external and internal. The first is based on the strengthening of one's own language *I*, the creation of language "mask" with its adaptation to a certain language background. Such linguoindividuation correlates with the first half of the human life (compare psychological individuations singled out by C. G. Jung [1998: 156–245]). Internal linguoindividuation is exclusively centred on the inner world of the communicant, deepening of the needs of lingual self-identi-

fication, language self-identification. Linguoindividualization should be understood as a deliberate emphasis on subject connected with their striving to acquire language self, recognizability, create such procedures of language operating which acquire the status of diagnostic indicators. The latter comprises regularities of syntactic structuring, the loading of morphologic and word-forming means, as well as the creation of the palette of lexical means, the strengthening of overtones of word sounding. Grammatical expression of the linguoindividualization is occasionalistics – creation of fully author's words, the formation of occasional figurative-metaphoric background, as well as language game with active usage of different language resources.

In order to examine the peculiarities of expression of language personality and the ascertainment of the regulations of their individuations and individualizations, we took one passage of epistolary of a famous man of science Yurii Shevelov. His epistolary-discursive practice is analyzed on the material of 265 letters addressed to Oleksa Izarsky (whose real name is Oleksii Malchenko), Ukrainian novelist, scholar in literature, translator, who was born in Poltava (30.08.1919), and died in Cleveland (28.03.2007; the USA). Chronologically analyzed letters cover 1946 – 1996. Epistolary "dialogue" of two intellectuals had been continuing for 50 years.

Epistolary-discursive practice is maximally individualized and its expression is based on maximal realization of phatic function. Epistolary-discursive practice has special speech genres of realization – letters, notes, and others. According to its style epistolary-discursive practice has two main kinds – official and private. For the first one set patterns are characteristic. Official epistolary-discursive practice has clearly identified classification and qualification parameters. Private or personal epistolary-discursive practice is marked by the presence of individualized and personological senses and reminiscences. For the practice analyzed a special sphere of social existence is characteristic – private contacts, which comprise different planes of communication in their scope: 1) the descriptions of the seen and heard; 2) stories about watched events, phenomena; 3) the analysis of the read and interpreted material; 4) the expression of critical attitude towards acquaintances; 5) the description of one's own feelings; 6) the stories about mutual acquaintances; 7) the discussion of important problems, projects, etc. The mentioned planes find consistent realization in the majority of Yu. Shevelov's, compare: *Враження від Львова. Суцільно*

україномовний. Сірий, як і Харків. З того, що я бачив, єдиний Київ ухитрився не бути сірим. Але, як і інші міста, Львів має новий тип інтелігенції – не гуманітарії, а техніки, промисловці. Це їм подарували Сталін і Брежнєв [Листи 2014: 281] "The Lviv impressions. Thoroughly Ukrainian. As grey, as Kharkiv. From what I have seen, only Kyiv managed not to be grey. But like other towns Lviv has a new type of intelligentsia – not humanists, but technically qualified people, manufacturers. They got this present from Stalin and Brezhnev" – the description of what was seen and so on.

Epistolary-discursive private practice comprises different individualizations of a personality, as a result linguoindividualizations in its scope can be analyzed in several aspects – linguosocial, linguoterritorial, linguocultural, linguopersonologic. In section, each linguoindividualization has its own peculiarities. Linguosocial epistolary-discursive practice reflects in its integrity the speech background in which the sender mostly expresses himself: the sender in the movement of Ukrainian Diaspora in the German surroundings – Germany; work at Ukrainian Free University; the sender in Ukrainian society in English surroundings – the USA and others. The research of corporation contact, the ascertainment of active/passive field of their influence are essential in such cases, as well as the clarification of the influence of social speech tastes and priorities on characteristic features of the language personality, compare: *Тепер я в пластовому таборі разом з Петровим, серед озера на манесенькому острові. Їсти привозять човнами* [Листи 2014: 20–21] "Now I am in the plast camp together with Petov, in the middle of the lake on a tiny island". Thus, language personality can use one type of language in everyday life, and other one at work, in corporation contacts. The same is true for linguoterritorial aspect which comprises territorial scope of a personality and their reticence on language-territorial priorities. Linguopersonologic dimension of epistolary-discursive practice is motivated first of all by language-esthetic tastes of the personality, their internal and external intentions. Thus, communicant may use one language in private letters (Ukrainian), another language in teaching (English, German), completely different language in corporation communication, etc. As for linguocultural aspect, its investigation should be based on the investigation of certain linguocultureme as determining functionally loaded themes. Such themes for Yu. Shevelov are painting, architecture, cinema, theatre, literature, but first of all – linguistics.

The assertion that communicative nature of the letter is determined by the intentions and illocutions of epistolary I, pragmatic orientation as an expression of the author's beginning is considered to be correct, and this assertion finds its manifestation in speech-forming practice of epistolary, linguosocial and cultural traditions and the peculiarities of individual style of the author of the letter [Чигридова 1999]. Integrity is characteristic for the epistolary of Yu. Shevelov, what can be traced in the analogy of certain fragments of this or that letter with literary-belletristic or literary-critical texts, the differentiation of speech-forming cooperation being determinative and comprising: 1) role positions of communicants (sender – Yu. Shevelov and addressee – O. Izarsky); 2) local-temporal division as monologue-dialogic communication. The latter is easily felt in the inner conversation of the sender, partially by debatable description: *Ваше запитання: Кошелівець відходить сам. (Я його бачив у Муніхені.). Але – "розлука будет без печали". В "Пролозі" вони мали б видати ніби другий том "не для дітей", вибір із старих статей, назва мала б бути "Друга черга"* [Листи 2014: 107] "Your question: Koshelivets is leaving by himself. (I saw him in Munich). But the "parting will be with no sorrow". In "Prologue" they must have published the second volume "not for children", a selection from old articles, the title must have been "*The Second Queue*". It is also necessary to add here special loading and the status of phatic function. These initial components of the text already testify especially delicate usage of the communicative strategy of politeness by the sender together with the underlining that the addressee is very important for the sender: *При цій нагоді шлю Вам для ОБЩЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ порядок денний перших двох днів. Щоб Ви бачили, в якому товаристві я мав би бути. Принаймні протягом дня* [Листи 2014: 254]. "Having an opportunity, I send you for general education the agenda of the first two days. In order you could in what company I could stay. at, during the day". Conative, cognitive and etiquette functions directly cooperate with phatic function [Акишина 1989: 52–54]. The status loading of the etiquette function is easily proved by the fact that in 265 letters the forms of address repeat in no more than one third of all the letters, which testifies author's skill to discover a new – newest – occasional-author form of address, that renders Yu. Shevelov's deeply friendly terms with his addressee: *Дорогий "Старий Ізарський" (це цитата)* [Листи 2014: 257] "Dear «Old Izarsky» (it is a quotation)"; *Дорогий Озерянин /*

Лісовиче, сиріч лейквудівче [Листи 2014: 322] "Dear Ozerianyn (Lakeman) / Lisovyche (Woodman), or leikvudivche (Lakewoodman)".

Conative function covers considerable text space of epistolary differently rendering necessary information, establishing necessary dialogue: *Що Полтава видала Вам посвідку про європейськість, то вітаю. Радію. Тішуся* [Листи 2014: 327] "I want to congratulate you on the fact that you were given the certificate about your Europeanness. I'm glad. I rejoice myself at this". Cognitive function of Yu. Shevelov's epistolary is especially activated in the period of 1982–1996: *Поки людина знову вставлена в час, зовсім утриматися від майбутнього неможливо. Усе береться з "якщо", але про це якщо мовчиться* [Листи 2014: 347] "Until the person is set again in time, it is impossible to completely keep from future. Everything is viewed with "if", but all keep silence as for this if". The analyzed text structures of epistolary discourse reflect communicative strategy of naturality with the actualization of pragmatic coordinates.

Communicative strategy of expressiveness in the epistolary of Yu. Shevelov is motivated by the possibilities and necessity of the communicant to self-express and to show the emotions. The level of expressiveness in general textual-epistolary discourse varies from neutral to medium and to the highest manifestation. Communicative strategy of is actualized by different lexical emotives, intensifying particles, the usage of exclamatory and interrogative sentences: *поводжуся скандально: мовчу, мовби вже не живий. А воно тільки того, що пиячу без стриму. Не алькоголем, а творчістю, звиняйте за таке вираження. … Запитаєте, куди мене чорт несе. Сам не знаю* [Листи 2014: 268] "I behave scandalously: I keep silence as if not alive. And I drink non-stop. Not alcohol, but creativity, sorry for such expression. … You can ask where I am moving. I don't know myself", compare: *скандально, пиячу, алькоголь* – lexical emotives with figurative loading; *куди чорт несе, пиячу без стриму* – phrasemes, etc. The extraordinary variety of language-game moments should also be mentioned here, it comprises different layers of word-forming Russisms (*Моє **впутышествие** було цілком задовільне* [Листи 2014: 234]) "My trip was quite satisfactory", sometimes with graphic emphasis (*Це, **КАНЕШНО**, дуже мило супроти дисидентів, чиє життя не мед* [Листи 2014: 233] "Of course, it is good for dissidents whose life is tough") or underlining (*Якщо згода, пришліть мені копію Вашого твору, а я Вам <u>неукоснительно</u> пошлю свою* [Листи 2014: 236] "If you

don't mind, send me the copy of your work, and I will obligatorily send you mine"). Some Russian idioms should also be mentioned here, which are graphically emphasized in some cases: *І всі ні про що, такий собі* ***ВЗГЛЯД И НЕЧТО*** [Листи 2014: 233] "And all are about nothing, such a view and something"), *Чи Ви намагаєтеся академізуватися?* [Листи 2014: 295] "Are you trying to academize?"). Sometimes the expressiveness is motivated by the deep conceptual background with actualized barbarisms: *Щоб Ви знали, що робиться на Україні, не* ***цайтунги*** *і не* ***таймси*** *треба читати читати, а прикласти вухо до землі. Отже, голубе, там росте нове покоління – мені видно в літературі, а воно, мабуть, не тільки в ній* [Листи 2014: 295] "If you want to know what is going on in Ukraine, you should read not zeitungs and times, but put your ear to the ground. So, my old fellow, a new generation is growing in Ukraine, as I can see from literature, but I think this generation is not only in literature").

General background of epistolary heritage of Yu. Shevelov is filled with intertextuality which is expressed through different quotes, links, recalling of names and surnames (about 800 [Листи 2014: 352–376]), which are read in the letters of both artists identically, recognized in their symbolic and expressive loading. At the same time, sender's position is active in the assessment of certain works, the meaning of the artist in the history of national or European, world civilization. Axiological and assessment communicative strategy of Yurii Shevelov has an open character – sometimes the given marks are rather abrupt, being recognized as such by the communicant. The plurality of the used names comprises wide cultural-historic, theatre-artistic, film critic, architectural background, we should also add here the active loading of the names of the writers, poets, linguists, representatives of Ukrainian Diaspora. The panorama of name plurality of Yurii Shevelov testifies his active creative elements, and the expressed assessments with the usage of expressions characteristic only for him reflect a unique world of linguoindividualizations which gradually gain a delicate expression as years pass by.

The investigation of linguoindividuations and linguoindividualizations of Yurii Shevelov may become complete provided that all the massive of his heredity is examined. Thus, one of the most topical tasks is to create a corpus of the texts of this outstanding researcher, which foresees the reflection of genre specifics of the corresponding text in navigation commands, as well as the time of its creation and

disclosure by the author himself, its alteration. Creation of this corpus will help to solve a lot of questions connected with the evolution of scientific and linguistic, literary and critical, cultural and artistic and other views of the scientist, as well as the ascertainment of the special status of restless struggle characteristic to the Ukrainian national and language sphere of norms in his scientific and research heredity, these norms being taken into account in the unification of the Language Code of the Ukrainian language.

2.2. Communicative and discourse scope of the language personality of Ivan Franko

The determinative notion of the study is *communicative scope*, *discursive scope* in their relation to the genius language personality of Ivan Franko. The language of the great sage was researched in the aspect of his stylistic innovations (Ivan Tsikhotskyi [2006] and others) concentrating the attention on stylistic "experiments" and "language tradition" in prosaic, poetic and dramatic works of the outstanding master, the disclosure of the correlation of the language portrait of the artist and the "philosophy" of the direction with the deepening into anatomy of the language image of Ivan Franko (Lev Poliuha [1977] and others). The studies of the whole scope of the heredity of the great artist with the tracing of internal and external loading of language issues in it are also topical [Грицютенко 1968], which gives an opportunity to ascertain the most loaded dimensions of analysis of consolidating, self-identifying, uniting and centripetal status of the Ukrainian language as national (Vasyl Hreshchuk [2007], Fedir Medvediev [26], Oleksandra Serbenska [2006] and others), the consolidation of the Ukrainian literary language in Galicia [Корнієнко 1956], the elucidation of the attitude of the master himself to such questions, his ascertainment of the ways to create integral Ukrainian language without sacramental geographic division into Western and Eastern. Numerous investigations of the directions of processing of "human dialects" in belletristic context adjoin here (Ivan Denysiuk [2008], Mykhailo Drahomanov [1991] and others). At the same time we may name as notable the studies of language parametrization of the characters of different status in belles-lettres of the artist (I. Tsikhotskyi [2006] and others), the determination of the works of Ivan

Franko in the formation of Ukrainian general national norm in its numerous prescriptions and functional loading of integral prescriptive grammars (Fedot Zhylko [1956] and others), as well as the attempt to determine the loading of certain language units in the realization of creative conception of the outstanding master (folklore words (Svitlana Yermolenko [1987], Polonisms and dialecticisms (Myroslav Onyshkevych [1963: 36−51]), dialecticisms (Ivan Matviias [2003: 11−13]) and others [Білодід 1966; Білоус 1998: 633−637])), desire to create integral language portrait of the great artist (O. Serbenska [2006] and others), to determine the ways of self-perfection of the language background of the works (Iryna Oshchypko [32]), to ascertain the correlation of the notions *language* and *nation* in the general structure of artistic heritage of the master (Tamila Panko [1992: 21−44]), as well as characterize the status of artistic scope of Ivan Franko with German-speaking world (Leonid Rudnytskyi [1995]) and so on. These studies also, undoubtedly, comprise the investigation of language, wider communicative competence of Ivan Franko (Tetiana Kosmeda [2006: 67−94] and others), the peculiarities of his conceptospere with striving to trace the evolution of concepts *Україна* "Ukraine", *Держава* "State", *нація* "nation", *народ* "people" *мова* "language" along whole artistic scope of the artist and so on (Yaroslav Yaremko [2015: 150–210] and others), to reveal the pragmatics of communicative instructions (Florii Batsevych [1] and others) and so on. In modern folkloristics the investigation of the integral communicative and discursive scopes of linguopersonality of Ivan Franko remains unconsidered, as well as the ascertainment of the primary and secondary evolution tendencies in the dynamics of discursive practices.

Communicative scope should be qualified as background and territory where the interaction of language personalities take place, as well as the realization of the corresponding communicative strategies, communicative intentions, communicative tactics, communicative genres become revealed, and so on. If we pay attention on the territory, on which communicative scope of Ivan Franko realized itself or where the scope was the most active, then the answer will be easily established from geography of his numerous trips, travels. Communicative-geographic scope of Ivan Franko was dynamic – from village communication (village Nahuievychi, Kryvorivnia and others) to spacious towns of Galicia, and Vienna, Krakow and other scopes. Analyzing communicative scope of Ivan Franko, it is possible to speak abo-

ut narrow and wide aspect of this notion where the first means active scope in which the formation of the master, the formation of his language and speech and primary communicative competences took place, the scope where his first linguoindividuation and striving to show oneself as a self-sufficient personality became significant. in the wide sense, communicative scope of Ivan Franko covers all numerous communications during his trips, travels, thesis writing, speeches at numerous meetings, and also different meetings with social activists, peasants, miners and others. Both aspects are functionally important, though the second aspect, not controverting the first one, covers it becoming more suitable for studying.

Communicative scope in which the first linguoindividuation of Ivan Franko arose as active is undoubtedly multidimensional, including the period of childhood and studying at school, gymnasium, partially at university, when we may easily find language and existentialistic attempts of the master in any of these microgeographic scopes. These attempts particularly testify active formation of creative linguopersonality with the implication of language "intensiveness", neutrality, consent, domination of certain creative and intentional instructions in the communication with a certain addressee. In this case it is necessary to take into account the fact that the interaction of several language elements was active in the communicative scope of the primary linguoindividuation, where mother tongue element (Ukrainian) and partially Polish element were active, while German element was passive because studying at Drohobych normal school of fathers Vasylian, where he had been studying in 1864–1867, was in the German language, whereas studying at Franz Joseph I Drohobych state gymnasium was mostly in German or in Polish because school was becoming Polish-speaking. Communicative and age scope during the period of studying at school, gymnasium as well as university is also extremely significant. As the data of school registers testify, Ivan Franko had a background corresponding to his age starting from the first form. The form had 51 pupil, 45 pupils being public and 6 being private, the first-formers were: ten-year-old – 1 (born in 1858; 1.96%), eleven-year-old – 9 (born in 1857; 17.6%), twelve-year-old – 12 (born in 1856; 23.5%), thirteen-year-old – 12 (23.5%), fourteen-year-old – 5 (9.8%), fifteen-year-old – 4 (7.8%). Ivan Franko was also twelve, so his communicative and age range of school communication embraced five years – minus two years and plus three years. Even at this period

discursive-school practice of a famous artist was under significant age, social and national and language influences.

Institutional-school communicative background based on confession peculiarities was also significant, because there were Greek Catholics (Matviias 2003: 11−16; 49%), Catholics (Zhylko 1956: 18−26; 33.3%), Evangelists (Bilodid 1966; 3.9%), the followers of Moses confession (Batsevych 2016; 1.96%). National and language scope was also particular, because the form consisted of Rusyns (Matviias 2003: 11−16; 47%), Poles (Zakrevska 1998: 652−657; 41.2%) and others. Ivan Franko was thirteenth in the form register and for the disclosure of his institutional-school background it is necessary to take into account the complex of subjects, the language of their studying and the characteristics of his class teacher, as Ivan Franko's class teacher was a talented master of belles-lettres, responsible pedagogue, initiator and organizer of different social initiatives Ivan Verkhratskyi. As for the prediction of the future of his pupil, the class teacher pointed out that it is indefinite, the column confession included the note Greek Catholic. Ivan Franko will adhere to confession tolerance during all his life, pointing this in all discursive practices. The progress of Ivan Franko at the end of the second term of the first form, namely in the Latin, Ruthenian, (teacher Ivan Verkhratskyi), German (teacher Yurchakevych) languages is assessed as excellent (celujący), while his mastering of the Polish language (teacher Kasper Kadlevich) is assessed as commendable (chwalebny). He also preserved similar progress in the second form: Latin – commendable (chwalebny), Polish, German – excellent (celujący), Ruthenian – excellent (celujący) in the first and excellent (znakomity) – in the second. The level of language learning in the third form does not differ significantly: the Latin, Polish, Ruthenian, German languages – excellent (celujący), the Greek language appeared with Ivan Franko's excellent (celujący) results (see: http://lib.if.ua/franko/1312287818.html). As years passed by, Ivan Franko's language-communicative range widened, because he wrote his works in Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, Czech, German, Bulgarian, French [Бровіньок 1981: 37−43]. Discursive-language practices of Ivan Franko still require profound investigation, because phenomenal command of a number of languages gave him an opportunity to easily use different languages in his communication. Thus, in epistolary-discursive practice with Olha Roshkevych at first he used German (6 letters), later – Ukrainian. And in the first letter written in Ukrai-

nian, Ivan Franko emphasized the importance of language self-identification: "Німецька бесіда – то для мене модний фрак… Руська бесіда – то для мене той любий, домашній убір, в котрім всякий показується другому таким, яким єсть… Руська бесіда – то бесіда мого серця" [Франко 1986/₄₈: 46] "A German conversation is like a fashionable tailcoat for me… A Ruthenian conversation is like a lovely housecoat in which you show yourself to others as you are… A Ruthenian conversation is a conversation of my heart".

Later Ivan Franko wrote about his social-school discourse in his *Memories from my Gymnasium Time*: "The students of Drohobych gymnasium in the second half of 60-ies and the first half of the 70-ies usually lived in circles outside school, except those locals who lived in their own families and did not participate in circle life. Those who were not local rented flats (so-called stations), usually of petty bourgeois in the suburbs, and according to those flats circles were created. To the flats where several students lived together students from other flats who lived alone used to come. Such circles suggested vivid conversations; in small circles students gathered by two or three and read additional extra-curricular books with one student reading and others listening to him. In such a way together with my friend Joseph Reichert, the sun of German colonist, I read the dramas of Shakespeare, Schiller and Goethe. Together with his elder brother Phillip who transferred from Sambir gymnasium to Drohobych I rented one flat of cooper Korpak for a year". We may implicitly understand that even in the years of gymnasium studying Ivan Franko used different languages in his communicative surrounding in either active or passive form. In difficult time of Russian occupation (1914) Ivan Franko lived at Joseph Reichert's place, which also confirms his maximal national and language and religious tolerance.

It is also necessary to mention that communicative intentional surrounding of Ivan Franko in the years of studying at gymnasium had some relative attraction, as after the fourth form of Drohobych normal school of fathers Vasylian 27 out of 51 students (52.9%) continued their education at Drohobych gymnasium together with Ivan Franko: Ivan Bachynskyi, Karlo Bandrivskyi, Dmytro Bilas, Adolf Broder, Ivan Didynskyi, Dmytro Hladkyi and others. At gymnasium, communicative and social surrounding somewhat changed. At school, the majority of students were the children from the villages surrounding Drohobych, the children of petty bourgeois and craftsmen, while at

gymnasium the children of peasants made up a bit more than one fourth of the class (14 people or 27.45%). There were less children of priests – 11 (21.54%), and even less were the children of the craftsmen – 8 (15.68%), the majority of the students were not from Drohobych. In the second form of gymnasium only Ukrainians (25 people or 55.56%) and Poles (20 people or 44.44%) studied with the domination of the first. Age range was quite significant. In the class there were eighteen-year-old students (1 student or 2.2%) – twelve-year-old (7 people or 15.56%), Ivan Franko was thirteen, so twenty-nine students were older than he (64.4%), and only seven were younger (17%), nine students being thirteen (20%). It is easy to notice that institutional and age communicative surrounding had a range of seven (+6/-1) years, which, undoubtedly, influenced the motivation of communication, taking into account the age requirements of the classmates. The same picture is also seen in the third form of gymnasium where it is easy to reveal the differentiation of students according to their age. Out of 45 students twenty-seven (60%) were older (the age being from nineteen – two (4.44%) to fifteen – nine (20%)), and eight (17.8%) were one year younger, fourteen-year-old students of the same age numbered ten people (22.2%), so at the general class background Ivan Franko was surrounded by students of similar but not the same age (see [Шурат 1956: 267−281]). In such communicative institutional and age range the shift of instructive moments of the sender and his taking into account of communicative competences of the addressee are significant.

If we have a look at communicative scope of Ivan Franko during school and gymnasium years, it is easy to notice: 1) active communication with the representatives of different confessions; 2) language contacts with the representatives of different nationalities who actively used their mother tongue in their own circle; 3) significant age range of the classmates what caused the need to properly react the needs of communicants and others. Fixed initial elements of communicative universalism became the basis of conceptual branching of the artist's linguopersonality in student and following years. During school and gymnasium tears we may see the formation of the first linguoindividuation – the period of external expression, formation of his own creative language *I* which became determinant for the future. During this period the skills of command of other languages were formed, as well as the understanding of their importance in the formation of

human personality, loading in self-identification, as the coming out from the element of mother tongue deeply traumatizes language personality: "Pardon, *ти не маєш до вибору* (Italics by I. Franko); в якій мові вродився і виховався, тої без окалічення своє душі не можеш покинути…" [Франко 2001: 265] "Pardon, you have no choice; you cannot leave language in which you were born and brought up without hurting your soul…". The great master emphasizes functional loading of the mother tongue in poetic discourse as well (see, for example,"Якби ти знав, як много важить слово…" "If only you knew how much the word means" and others). In his linguoidentification, Ivan Franko travelled a long road where gradually arose both the period of wavering and the period of comprehension of the status of the language state and national scope etc. In one of the letters to Mykhailo Dragomanov he emphasized: "Coming to Lviv, to "Academic circle" I found myself in the middle of language and national arguments which were almost strange and incomprehensible for me, so I could not fix the up and wavered to one or another side for a long time" [Франко 1986: 244]. It was not surprising, as the struggle between "iazychie" and narodniks was rather critical which influenced the artist's young soul. So, later Ivan Franko summarized: "The fact that my language in my early poems is not clean may be easily understood taking into account the fact that I personally passed some such stages of development (who in Galicia had not passed them at that time!) where the attempt to muffle the feeling of the live clean language was dominating, whereas my feeling has been well-developed since childhood. I experienced myself in miniature what is seen in the whole Galician-Ruthenian literature: school, grammars and language arguments fastened and stirred up the cleanness of national language" [Франко 1976/1: 20–21].

Another notion is *discursive scope* [Космеда 2006: 45−49]. Sometimes the notions *communicative scope* and *discursive scope* are viewed as synonymous (M. Merleau-Ponty [1999: 101−211], S. Domysheva [15], S. Plotnykova [2008: 131−136]), though they have some differences. Discursive scope is that logical background in which discourses and discursive personalities – the creators of discourses – are realized. Logical background is comprehended as abstract extension – continuum which comprises discourses-texts, and the creators of discourses, and space, and time. Discursive scope is created between the speakers during certain interaction. M. Merleau-Ponty remarks: "In

a dialogue between me and the other person a mutual territory is set up, my and his thinking are interlaced into an integral texture. Here the existence is fulfilled by two, our existence takes place in the same world. If I give my thoughts him for using, he reciprocally makes me think. Only later, when I leave the dialogue, the other comes back to his absence" [1999: 451]. Not paying to much attention to the theory, it is necessary to point out on polyphony of discourse scope of Ivan Franko in which even the simple "of names will make up quite a large volume – more than one thousand, and, apparently, it is not a full list. The discursive scope genre according to the specificity of his results – texts – is also rather diverse. Among these texts we may easily distinguish properly scientific, popular science, publicistic and other studyings. We may totally correctly speak about whole discursive layers connected with folklore and historiographic, philosophic investigations. Ivan Franko "…with equal inspiration wrote poetic, prosaic and dramatic works, spoke at the meetings, translated the works of many … writers, published scientific works in literary criticism, folklore, linguistics, history, economics…" [Бровыньк 1981: 38]. Scientific discursive scope of Ivan Franko is differentiated according to studyings – literary-critical, linguistic, historical, historiographic, ethnographic, economical, philosophic and others.

In discursive scope of Ivan Franko we can trace changeable and constant expressions. The first ones include reactions on certain speeches. It is confirmed by instant and at the same time continuous, for example, external reaction with different directions of aggressiveness on the article of Ivan Franko about Adam Mickiewicz. Permanent constants of discursive scope include the personality expression of a person which allows to refer all rendered discourses to such scope as well as the characteristics of discursive practices of the personality, reflected by certain addressees. Such discourse expression has clearly marked time boundaries – person's life. Discursive scope of Ivan Franko was chronologically limited by the years of his life, while functionally it is diverse and versatile both in changeable and permanent expressions – from poetically-artistic, belletristic to critical-analytical, publicistic-political and others. It should be remarked at once that the artist did not try to skirt around, constantly experiencing critical remarks, even people who shared the same views with him did not accept his very ambitious but generally fully just qualification values of some authors. The attitude of Franko's contemporaries to

his article "Поет зради" *The Poet of Treason* is significant [Мельник 2009: 237−242]. The publication motivated immediate reaction with the following domination of negativism in Polish surrounding. Even a lot of those who were working together with the master changed their mind – from aggressively contemptuous to indifferently neutral, from blame – to silent imperception. And only some people treated critic's thoughts with verification, trying to understand the depth of analytical thinking of the great master. As an example we may offer the change of behaviour of contributors of the newspaper "Kurjera Lwowskiego", where he had been working for ten years. V. Shchurat recollected: "When Franko appeared at the editorial office at his table, all his colleagues rushed into another room, chose one delegate Mr. Freeling to come to Franko and tell him "Pan tu nie masz miejsca!" [1956: 267−281]. The analysis of such discursive practices requires proper evaluation of a number of factors of textualitet [Загнітко 2007: 101–108], without which the qualifications of the corresponding actions of the artist will not be motivated, as well as his communicative steps and strategies, linguoindividualizations in certain discursive practices.

The thought of Hryhorii Hrabovych seems to be just [1997], studying the peculiarities of Ukrainian-Polish cultural relationships with singling out of several periods in them (the earliest (from the last decades of the XVI century to the XVIII century); romantic (the first half of the XIX century); post-modern (up to World War II); after-war period (up to now)) and describing the dispute around the novel *With Fire and Sword* ("Ogniem i mieczem") by H. Sienkiewicz, its perception by leading critics, he ascertained: "Conservative Krakow circles excitedly greeted the work (S. Tarnowski considered H. Sienkiewicz to be equal to Homer, Dante and Shakespeare); while other critics like Bolesław Prus or Ivan Franko, who in fact spoke on behalf of all Ukrainians, were extremely disappointed" [Грабович 1997: 108]. Ivan Franko really not only skillfully estimated the novel of H. Sienkiewicz, but also ascertained the real spirit of the creative tread of the author. In this case it is easy to notice one of the manifestations of the discursive-critical practices of Ivan Franko. The source of the mentioned practice may be easily traced back to gymnasium not numerous comments on the read books of different writers. The diversity of this practice comprises different genres upon the model of critical articles, analytical surveys, reviews, etc.

Ivan Franko was also active in publicistic discourse, within the limits of which his numerous descriptions of different trips and travels appear especially topical. Thus, meeting on August 4–7 1884 in Stanyslaviv Ukrainian writer O. Konyskyi who came from St. Petersburg, on August 5 they together visited the veche (public meeting) of the students – participants of the trip, which is described in detail in his correspondence *The Trip of Ruthenian Youth* (Dilo. – 1884. – July 24 (August 5); Dilo. – 1884. – July 26 (August 7)) and others. Systemic work of Ivan Franko in mass media allows us to speak about gradual extension of his communicative-genre element (from a paragraph to critical, analytical article, etc.), branching of thematic horizons (the life of Galician peasants, miners, public initiative of intelligentsia, intensification of feministic movement and so on), letting alone extremely prolong reviews, critical articles, surveys of different scientific questions.

By his activity the thinker tendentiously "conquered new fields of hitherto unknown notions" [Франко 1980$_{/28}$: 167–175]. The main role in the formation of Ukrainian political terminology belongs to him, this terminology comprising the notions of the bodies of state authority (*парламент, уряд, комітет, суд, адміністрація, інстанція, міністерство, канцелярія* "parliament, government, committee, court, administration, instance, ministry, office"), the naming of political parties, unions, social groups (*фракція, опозиція, делегація, асоціація, партія, суспільство, суспільність, товариство* "fraction, opposition, delegation, association, party, society, community, company"); the denotation of political forms of government, regime, courses (*демократія, демократизм, держава, опонент, автономія, парляментаризм, лібералізм, централізм, абсолютизм, шовінізм, націоналізм, радикалізм, анархізм, капіталізм, соціалізм* "democracy, democratism, state, opponent, autonomy, parliamentarism, liberalism, centralism, absolutism, chauvinism, nationalism, radicalism, anarchy, capitalism, socialism"), the naming of political and historical processes (*революція, маніфестація, переворот, прогрес, пленум, протест, перевибори, голос, санкція, корупція, рівноправність* "revolution, manifestation, upheaval, progress, plenum, protest, re-election, vote, sanction, corruption, equality"), the names of different documents, laws, resolutions (*документ, конституція, закон, проект, постанова, декрет, резолюція, звіт, статут, протокол, петиція, апеляція, контракт* "document, constitution, law, project, regulation, decree, resolution, statement, charter, minute, petition, appeal, contract") and other [see: Яремко 2015: 99–100].

The inclusions of slang discourse in prosaic-discursive practices of Ivan Franko not only testify dictionary knowledge of corresponding materials but also reflect the artist's knowledge of functional peculiarities of argot: *"Е, що ви, молоді яндруси говорите!.. По місті тротуарами ходять та ходаки з долини висмикують – велика штука. А зловлять хатраки, то також що? Заведуть на дідівню, ковзнуть там чи й не ковзнуть, та й по всій історії"* [Франко 1978/15: 236–248] "Hey, what are you, young hooligans, saying!.. They go all around the town and pickpocket the wallets – what a big deal! And if the policemen catch them, so what? They will take them to the police station, beat them or maybe not beat, and that's the whole story".

Popular science discourse may be studied in two variations – written and oral. The latter may be observed in numerous speeches of Ivan Franko at different meetings of the Society of Ukrainian women founded by writer N. Kobrynska (1884, December). The artist highly appreciated the initiative of women, proving this in the article *Before the Meeting of Ukrainian women's society in Stanyslaviv*: "Only that nation can live long and complete life whose women are full of consciousness and ideals of this life… only clever and educated mothers, sisters and women, who think, can bring up and educate clever and educated generation" (Dilo. – 1884. – December 5). His impressions from the meeting with the members of the Society of Ukrainian women Ivan Franko put into words in the article *First General Meeting of Ukrainian Women's Society in Stanyslaviv* (Dilo. – 1894. – December 11), this article being a detailed analytical report (according to its structure and arrangement) with a number of author's interesting summarizations.

Moreover it is necessary to add the symmetry of themes in artist's discursive practices which may be traced in his heredity. Thus, the main ideas of the speech at the meeting with the members of the Society of Ukrainian women became the basis of his poem "Женщина: алегорія на привітання товариства "Руських женщин" у Станиславові" *A woman: an allegory on the greeting of the society of "Ukrainian Women" in Stanyslaviv"*: *…по стежці життьовій / Іде з ним* (чоловіком – А. З.) *спільно, / Думає і вчиться, / Учасниця всіх трудів, вміх, надій''* (http://lib.if.ua/franko/1310568978.html) "…along the road of life / She goes with him (a man – A. Z.) together, / thinks and studies, / A participant of all labour, joys, hopes". After the meeting with the members of the Society of Ukrainian women Ivan Franko

was going to publish a periodical *Bratstvo* (*Brotherhood*) as an official publication of this society. Discursive-publishing practice of the great master is exceptional as it comprises not only corresponding texts created by him, but the texts of an editor as well.

Ethnographic discourse should also be added as an active one of Ivan Franko, because the master of words investigated the ethnography of different places and territories, sinking into the depth of customs, rituals, their sense filling, etc., gradually forming different thematic groups of notions and terms. Ethnographic discourse of Ivan Franko comprises more than forty ethnographic surveys, a number of reviews and comments on ethnographic works of Ukrainian, Polish, Czech and other scientists. His immense correspondence about life of Drohobych workers is extremely valuable (Korespondencje, Drohobycz, 1880), as well as various observation-analytical and generalizing-concluding materials, compare: *The Trip of Ruthenian Youth* (Dilo. – 1884. – Part 85), *Kilimy podolskie* (Kurjer lwowski. – 1892. – No. 91 (31.03.) – P. 2–3; No. 92 (01.04.) – P. 2–4; No. 93 (02.04.) – C. 2–3); *The Traces of Sexual Relations between Fathers-in-Law and Daughters-in-Law in Our Mountains* (Zhitie i slovo. – 1895. – T. 4); *Eine ethnologischehe Expedition in das Bojkenland* (Zeitschrift цsterreichische Volkskunde. – 1905. – No. 11) and others. Ethnographic discourse may also be found in different studies on history, folklore (see: *Thoughts about Evolution in the History of Mankind* [1881–1992] [Франко 1986/45: 76–136]; *Science and its Interrelations with Working Classes* [1878] [Франко 1986/45: 24–40]; Ukraina irredenta [1895] [Text] / Ivan Franko // Selected works: In three volumes. – Drohobych: Kolo, 2004. – Vol. 3. – Pp. 378–393 and others). Considerable organizational work of Ivan Franko should also be mentioned here, oriented on ethnology and ethnography of different countries on the position of the head of ethnographic committee of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, editor of *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* (*Ethnographic Herald*). Together with V. Hnatiuk he compiled the programme *In the Cause of Collecting of Ethnographic Materials* (Khronika NTSh (The Chronicles of the Shevchenko Scientific Society). – 1901. – No. 8. – Issue 4), later they prepared the set of advice as for the writing down funeral customs and lamentations (Questionnaire for writing down funeral customs and lamentations // Khronika NTSh (The Chronicles of the Shevchenko Scientific Society). – 1909. – Issue 3. – Part 39) [Мушинка 2006: 945−953]. This programme especially reveals Ivan Franko and Volodymyr Hnatiuk's careful treat-

ment of local dialects when they emphasize that the existing forms like *шепка, жеба, соль, ходит, робет, водов, юж, цимра* should not be replaced or corrected by the literary ones *шапка, жаба, сіль, ходить, роблять, водою, вже, кімната* "hat, frog, salt, goes, does, by water, already, room". In order to adequately collect the data, regulate them the researchers suggested a thorough method of data acquisition, their certification, they initiated the widening of the ethnographic work all over Ukraine providing proper guidance.

Historiographic discourse of Ivan Franko covers different studies of Galicia, Volhynia, Podilia. His active part in "Travel committee" run by "Academic conversation" is confirmed by several studies about the meaning of analysis of local history material, its presentation in systemic description. He initiated the creation of "The ethnographic-statistic society for studying life and world outlook of the folk" (1883), later – "The society for the arrangement of trips all around our region". The results of such trips were synthesized by I. Franko in numerous written ethnographic materials, theoretic works on ethnology and ethnography, a number of popular articles. The term *краєзнав-ство* 'local history' itself belongs to I. Franko [Франко 1986/46. – Кн. 2: 116–150] with singling out of *крайове природознавство* 'regional local history', the qualification of the main directions of its studying, etc.

Discursive scope of Ivan Franko is extremely rich and diverse, various interpenetrations of different discursive practices (scientific and publicistic into prosaic ones, prosaic into belletristic) are easily traced in this scope, as well as the symmetry of a number of discursive practices (poetic and publicistic, scientific-political and belletristic-prosaic, ethnographic and historic, historiographic). It is possible to speak about special linguoindividualizations – language-playing, nominative-existential, belletristic-fable, which requires profound studying.

Studying of communicative and discursive scopes of Ivan Franko affirms extremely active interrelation of different language elements in his communication, the widening of functional loading of the Ukrainian, Polish, German, Russian, Bulgarian, Czech and other languages in the process of realization of his communicative intentions. Discursive scope of the great titan is multilayer, comprises different time, kinds and genre sections, various communicative steps, instructions, strategies and tactics evolve in it. The necessity to study the great master's linguoindividualizations should be added here, which confirm the internal dynamics of his language-creative element, reflect the

tendencies of the great master's comprehension of functional loading of the language in the self-identification of a separate personality, corporation group, folk, the formation of nation on the world map. The ascertainment of the loading of each discourse present in the scope of language personality of Ivan Franko, certain discursive practices demands the examination of the whole corpus of Ivan Franko's works, thus making the creation of this corpus essential.

2.3. Grammatical conception of Yurii Shevelov: evolution of views (1940–1950)

Yurii Shevelov belonged to creative personalities, who can not only comprehend the problems, analyze them, but also suggest the solution of the most topical problems. If we make an attempt to look at the evolution of his esthetic-grammatical views, we should single out 40–50-ies of the previous century because in this period the scientist finished his work on integral simple sentence analysis (the beginning of 1941), which at first was planned a chapter for academic course of the Ukrainian language, also, the monographic work *On Genesis and Nature of Nominative sentences* (1947). The first work, nevertheless, appeared as apart of integral academic *Course of the Ukrainian Language* (edited by L. Bulakhovskyi), though the author's name was not mentioned. though it happened with a certain interval within 15 years. Work on the chapter was extremely difficult, but at the same time rather prolific, as after the work on stylistic problem (candidate thesis) Yu. Shevelov went on researching fundamental grammatical problems, which influenced the system of his views, activated the study of kinds of sentences in their connection and interconditionality. The scientist himself pointed out the importance of the realization of the project about simple sentence: "As a scientist I went through a childish way of my first interests in literature to linguistics itself. this way lead through stylistics – my thesis about Tychina – through the history of literary language to syntax and further to grammatical and phonological structure of the language in its historic development" [Шевельов 2001: 271], compare also [Коруник 2012: 3]. The questions of evolution of sentence structures begin to call his vivid interest, deepen his critical thinking of existing views. They are organized in stages because the first one marked the passage to syntactic investiga-

tions while the second one marked the comprehension of himself as a linguist. The significance of the chapter is in its comprehensive belonging to fundamental academic description of the Ukrainian language, and the second point is that one of the chapters of such detailed description became the reason for granting him (1949) the doctor's degree at Ukrainian Free University. Monographic studying *On Genesis and Nature of Nominative Sentences* [Шевельов 2012(б)] is not "transitional", as K. Korunyk claims [Коруник 2012: 3–18], but culminational in his realization as a linguist, it becomes the boundary between external and internal linguoindividuations. The scientist understands his scientific status, points out the range of problems which he will investigate in future at Lund (Sweden), Harvard and Columbia universities. At the same time, syntactic studying reflected the changes in scientific-grammatical views of Yurii Shevelov and emphasized the loading of onomasiologic-semasiologic approaches (analytical-genesis, nominative-existential and others). The expression of the main directions of evolution of grammatical views reveals the perspective of tracing the changes of his scientific-conceptual approaches with the argumentation of analysis with corresponding philosophic-methodological foundations, this confirming the topicality of the current studying the aim of this studying is to ascertain the evolution of the conceptual-grammatical postulates of Yurii Shevelov in the 1940–1950-ies of the XX century with the determination of the climax points of the dynamics of these approaches. The declared aim motivates the solution of the following tasks: 1) the elucidation of the foundations of the early grammatical conception of Yurii Shevelov; 2) the ascertainment of the main factors of the dynamics of the grammatical views of the researcher; 3) the determination of the main components of the middle grammatical conception of Yurii Shevelov; 4) to characterize the influence of the change of linguoterritorial, linguocorporational and linguosocial background on this evolution of grammatical views of the researcher. Scientific novelty of the investigation is determined by the fact that at attempt to follow the dynamics of Yurii Shevelov's scientific-grammatical approaches and views on relatively chronologically limited scientific-creative heredity (the 1940–1950-ies of the XX century) is made for the first time. Theoretical significance of the analysis is motivated by the justification of scientific-grammatical linguoindividuation of Yurii Shevelov with the ascertainment of the status of the nominative-existential and functional-

communicative constituents. Practical significance of the studying is oriented on the usage of its results in scientific-investigational practice while examining the creative heritage of Yurii Shevelov as well as in university master's programmes on the history of Ukrainian, Slavic and general linguistics.

In one of his determining works *An Outline of Modern Ukrainian Literary Language* Yu. Shevelov distinguishes three main approaches to language phenomena – scientifec, normative, stylistic [Шевельов 2012(б): 33], which fully corresponds not only to the set tasks but to scientific-methodological foundations as well. Understanding of language structure as an appropriate organization of its levels – lexical, morphological, syntactical and others found adequate reflection in the logical structure of the investigation – from a word (in its semantic-paradigmatic connections) [Шевельов 2012(б): 37–98] to a sentence [Шевельов 2012(б): 99–196], categorization of parts of speech [Шевельов 2012(б): 197–403], partial observations on word formation [Шевельов 2012(б): 403–407]. The most capacious of all the chapters is categorization of parts of speech done on the vast functional basis which is confirmed by the name of the chapter itself "A Word in a Sentence (Parts of Speech)", and the ascertainment of differential categorical features among which: "the ability to govern and to be governed" [Шевельов 2012(б): 197] for a noun, "by its forms agrees with nouns" [Шевельов 2012(б): 257] for an adjective, "in the sentence it fulfills the function of the predicate or predicative (link verb)" for a verb [Шевельов 2012(б): 313] and others.

For Yu. Shevelov, like for A. Potebnja earlier, the status of the infinitive remains problematic, though he never emphasizes the possiblity to change its belonging to another part of speech. At the same time, he substantiated the functional analogy of the infinitive with the form of the nominative case of the noun: "Like the nominative case shows the very name in a noun, taken separately, apart the sentence context, so the infinitive shows the name of the action, taken by itself: *ходити, питати, їхати* "go, ask, drive", e. g. "Вміти по-французьки належало до доброго тону" (Лепкий) "To be able to speak French meant good manners". That is why in the dictionaries the infinitive serves for name of the verb like the nominative case serves for the name of the noun" [Шевельов 2012(б): 314]. For the scientist, who adhered to the foundations of the comparative-historical linguistics which lately gave phenomenal results in his *A Historical Phonology of*

the Ukrainian Language [Shevelov 1979; Шевельов 2002], the usage of consecutive comparison with other languages of the same or different system was scientifically weighed and conceptually grounded. The significance of such studyings was repeatedly emphasized in his letters to Oleksa Izarsky [Листи 2014: 141, 156 i далі]. The result of the consecutive usage of comparative-historical methodology was the grounding of his own version of the origin of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Russian languages [Шевельов 1994: 5–27], the attempts to reproduce the Ukrainian language of the X century [Шевельов 2012(б): 472–481], as well as the tracing of the peculiarities of the names of the Dnieper rapids by Kostiantyn Bahrianorodnyi [Шевельов 2012(б): 482–504] and others.

The usage of the syntactical (wider – functional) principle in the categorization of parts of speech predetermines the study of the adverb and parenthesis in one chapter with an accent on adjoining as the main feature: "An adverb has no forms of agreement of government, being in a sentence unchangeable which adjoins another word. Most often, an adverb adjoins a verb" [Шевельов 2012(б): 378], while for parenthesis the determinative characteristic is that "they adjoin neither a verb, nor an adjective, nor any other word, like an adverb does, as they are not grammatically connected with the sentence, concerning the sentence in general but not a separate part of this or that member of the sentence" [Шевельов 2012(б): 390].

Analyzing the formations of the parts of speech Yu. Shevelov actively unites emphasized by him normative, scientific and stylistic approaches, this principle consecutively used in the studying of a participle as "an adjective deriving from a verb" [Шевельов 2012(б): 362] with an emphasis that "not any adjective deriving from a verb is a participle but only the one that preserves some morphological and syntactical properties of the verb" [Шевельов 2012(б): 362], that is why the participle always preserves the government and the aspect of the verb. In this case, to ascertain the directions of the narrowing of regular participiality in modern Ukrainian language the researcher applies to Old Ukrainian language in which it was rather developed while in modern language there is only "one type of participles like … *переймлений (перейнятий), загнаний* 'borrowed, exhausted". In others we may find the traces of other types of participles ending in *-мий* (*знайомий* "familiar"), in *-лий* or *-ший* (*померлий, померший* "dead"), in *-чий* and *-ший* (*караючий* 'punishing')" [Шевельов

2012(б): 363]. Yu. Shevelov believed the reduction of the greater part of the verb tense forms to be the main factor of the decline of many varieties of the participles, though later it is possible to observe the tendency of artificial reanimation of some of the declined forms of the participle. The latter is motivated by the dual character of the participle, namely of grammatical nature: "having the government and adjoining of the verb, it, at the same time, agrees with a noun like an adjective…; having the peculiarities of the verb, it has case endings of an adjective" [Шевельов 2012(б): 363], that is why it "is well used there where it is necessary to show the activity of the object as its secondary property which is expressed in the connection with another, main activity, e. g.: "На кручі стрімкій смерека *лежить* (головна дія) у могилі м'якій, *повалена* (другорядна дія, що стала властивістю) громом на вічний спокій" (Мак.) "On a steep slope a fir tree is lying (the main action) in a soft grave, felled (secondary action which became a property) by a thunder for eternal rest" [Шевельов 2012(б): 363]. Widely showing the peculiarities of active participial formations, the researcher pointed out that "In literary language, especially in newspaper and publicistic one, sometimes participles occur ending in *-аюч(ий)*, *-уюч(ий)*, like: "Подібні хвилинки криють у собі надзвичайну, особливу цінність – щось *інтригуюче, заохочуюче, підбадьорююче*" (Любч.) "Such moments contain incredible particular value, something intriguing, stimulating, encouraging', but such cases are purely literary, impossible in colloquial speech" [Шевельов 2012(б): 364].The analyzed formations are a result of the influence of an old tradition (here we notice profound researcher's knowledge of old Ukrainian literary language, the expression of such forms), as a well as the influence of foreign languages with a developed system of such derivatives. Yu. Shevelov's proposition about the change of active participles into either adjectives ending in *-ний* (*здобувний, обробний, вичерпний* "obtained, manufacturing, exhaustive"), or nouns (*курець, мовець, невірник, завідувач, службовець* "smoker, speaker, unfaithful person, manager, clerk"), or past participle (виявляючи, оперуючи 'revealing, operating') is complete. Though about seventy years have passed since the appearance of the corresponding work, its conceptual foundations are significant for modern grammatical theory and practice.

The basis of grammatical studyings of Yu. Shevelov at the end of the 30-ies – the beginning of the 40-ies of the XX century was logical-

grammatical approach with consecutive widening of the investigation of the language levels through the analysis of their structure, the peculiarities of combinability of the language units. The second half of the 40-ies of the XX century testifies not only the adherence to three mentioned aspects (scientific, normative and stylistic) of the investigation of the language-grammatical phenomena, but also the usage of the functional approach to their qualification: "A so-called personal sentence, i. e. a one-centre two-element sentence, is determinative for the syntactical system of the Ukrainian language" [Шевельов 2012(б): 505], understanding one-centre quality as a presence of only one grammatically absolutely independent word. The latter for Yu. Shevelov is a subject in a form of its independence – nominative case, all other members of the sentence are subordinated to it either directly or indirectly. Such approach was based on logical-grammatical theory taking into account considerable factors of formal-grammatical approach (though it was not determinative), the chapter about simple sentence for the academic course of the Ukrainian literary language was investigated by the researcher based on this theory [Курс 1951]. Yurii Shevelov repeatedly stresses his adherence to the initial postulates of the declared theory in a number of his works with gradual widening of the status loading of the formal-grammatical view: "Potebnja's approach to nominative sentences is … first of all determined by the fact that he does not assume the existence of the sentences without verbum finitum. […] Potebnja really considers the sentences with nominative case of the noun *пожар! пора! стыд!* ''fire! it is time! what a shame!" […] to be a secondary type of the structure of the sentence, putting them in one line with such sentences which do not have nominative case of a noun *хорошо! хожено! убито! пробі! цабе!* "well! gone! killed! help! gee!" because they all "are dependent on the structure of modern language, are explained by this structure as a part of it, having together continuous language development as a premise" (the quotation of A. Potebnja – A. Z.). Unfortunately, he is not confined to this profoundly right, though a bit general, observation (which, though, hardly concerns nominative cases of the headings, signboards, etc., to full extent, as he thinks), but he assumes further in a rather flat form that here "the omission of the verb […] is suggested as a matter of cause" (the quotation of A. Potebnja – A. Z.). So, for Potebnja nominative sentences do not stand out on the background of incomplete sentences" [Шевельов 2012(а): 23–24]. This point catego-

rizes the attitude of A. Potebnja to functional status of the verb in a Slavic sentence and traces the Yu. Shevelov's deviation from absolute grammatical logicism and the assignment of certain status loadings to a separate form as a sentence forming beginning. At the same time such researcher's approach does not controverts the flavour to the determinative status of a subject in a sentence structure.

The argumentation of Yu. Shevelov unfolds from partial observations of the usage of analyzed isolated nominative constructions in belletristic and colloquial speech to ascertainment of their specific linear order when they "have not isolated form others, are not cut from them, but make a row with two-element (or impersonal) sentences" [Шевельов 2012(a): 57]. The analysis is made on the basis of poetical material of T. Shevchenko after the model of Ще молоді собі були, / Жили самі. Були багаті: / *Високі на горі палати, Чималий у яру ставок, / Зелений по горі садок, / І верби, і тополі, / І вітряки на полі*, / І долом геть собі село / Понад водою простяглось "Also, there were a newly married couple, / They lived alone. They were rich: / A high house on the hill, A rather big pond in a gully, / A green garden on the mount, / And willows, and poplars, And windmills in the field, / And a village in the valley, / Which spread along the water", where, to linguist's mind, the presence of colon after *Були багаті* is motivated, as further there is a list of things which make the wealth of the prince and the princess. The properties of the existential sentence *Були багаті* do not foresee the enumeration in a form of a nominative case which significantly influences the independence of such noun-nominative forms. An unexpected ending of the line with a two-element sentence is rather interesting І долом геть собі село / Понад водою простяглось, which is functionally equal to the previous forms of nominative sentences. And here, for complete explanation, Yu. Shevelov uses a cognitive model: "Then, these nominative cases, which have already had relative independence, are rearranged in our consciousness into nominative sentences" [Шевельов 2012(a): 58]. To denote such model of formations Yu. Shevelov uses the notion "intermediate type between incompleteness and nominativity", emphasizing that in such cases it is necessary to see "the early level of development of nominative sentencesfrom incomplete ones […], a level which is connected not with written but with oral speech" [Шевельов 2012(a): 58]. In conclusion, the linguists ascertains that in oral speech nominative sentences make "sometimes the remnants of

archaic constructions, ad these constructions are mostly metrically bare. They are either the fragments of sentences or parts of the sentence which are not grammatically connected with its main core" [Шевельов 2012(a): 94]. Such formations fundamentally gravitate to poetic speech as it is relaxed, their occurrence in its element is fully natural and justified. Poetic text formation gave to the nominative sentences "new quality relying on laconism present in them, determined by the combination of subjective and predicative conceptions in one word" [Шевельов 2012(a): 94]. The creation of linearly arranged structures of nominative sentences in poetic speech later became the ground for appearance of such model of formation as isolated from text and from eac2h other, the accumulation of lines of such constructions with special functional-stylistic aim. In his thoughts the scientist consistently uses the groundwork of logical-grammatical (subjective and predicative features and others) and formal-grammatical (form as a fixed way of expression of the member of the sentence and others) approaches to the sentence analysis, gradually expanding the methodology of analysis on due to the tracing of interlevel passages and interaction, the ascertainment of the construction status (structural linguoparadigm). Linguistic world of Yu. Shevelov integrally absorbed in the 1940–1950-ies of the XX century the groundwork of systemic-structural linguomethodology with consecutive taking into acount the regulations of the interaction between the language and speech, the opposition of the oral and written speech. Even at this time it is easy to trace certain elements of functional-communicative and partially communicativ2e-cognitive in his studyings.

The tracing of the evolution of linguogrammatical views of Yurii Shevelov in the 1940–1950-ies of the XX century with gradual extension of the analysis made to all literary heritage of the outstanding researcher is extremely perspective in several directions: 1) linguopersonologic; 2) historic-linguistic; 3) linguocorpus. The first direction enables the ascertainment of stage moments of linguoindividualization of Yurii Shevelov with the determination of the influence and role of social-corporative and other factors. The second one is oriented on the elucidation of the correlation of dynamics of linguistic views of Yurii Shevelov with general linguistic gravitation and Ukrainian in particular, and the third direction has the task to elaborate holistic Corpus of Linguistic Texts of the outstanding researcher for their adequate studying and usage of the heredity in modern scientific works.

2.4. Language existentiality of Vasyl Stus: artistic-speech scope

In general philosophic understanding existence (from Latin *exsistentia*) is "the being of person who experiences their uniqueness, finiteness, loneliness, as well as the possibility to cross the boundaries of finiteness and loneliness, which comprise real human existence" [Хамітов 2007: 74]. As a uniqueness of existence of human personality the notion *existence* was first used by Danish philosopher and theologian, founder of existentialism Sшren Kierkegaard. In modern studies *existence* is usually defined as human being, full of tragedy, on the verge – boundary being, though in existence the hidden foreboding of being beyond the boundaries of tragedy, the premonition of transcendence, is personally tinted beyond-boundary [там само: 75].

Language esthetics of Vasyl Stus is notable among other language-artistic searches of certain authors for supersensitivity, absence of contemplation, imperativity with domination of top directivity which does not foresee the avoidance of corresponding instructions: *Тож іспитуй, як золото, на пробу / коханих, рідних, друзів і дітей…* ("У затишку прожити не судилось…") "So, test your beloved, relatives, friends and children, like gold for purity…" (*We were not Fated to Live in Harmony…*); *Тож просторся, душе моя, / на чотири татамі, / і не кулься від нагая, / і не крийся руками* ("Розпросторся, душе моя…") "So spread, my soul, on four tatami, and do not shrink from whip, and do not cover yourself with your hands" (*Spread, My Soul…*); *Прагни! О, тільки прагни! Ти свого доможешся…* ("Плазунам до альбому") „Strive! Just strive! And you'll achieve…" (*For Toadies into an Album*); *Рятуйте мене, хто навколо* ("Народження") "Save me those who are around" (*Birth*). Language existence of the poet as a core has the premonition of being beyond the limits of tragedy, where personally determined and personally marked beyondboundarity ↔ nonboundarity is significant: *Мовчання – перша заповідь моя. / Страждання – друга, сподівання – третя. / А з заповідей народився кетяг, / що гронився – та змила течія. / Тепер пливи, як пліт, поперед себе, до нього власні якості долучай* („Здається, нас ніколи й не було…") "Silence is my first commandment. Suffering is the second one, hope is the third. A cluster was born from commandments, growing, but the current washed it away. Now, swim, like a raft, in front of yourself, add your own properties to it" (*It Seems We Have Never Existed*).

Language existence should be treated as a transfer of uniqueness and finiteness, loneliness and at the same time the reproduction of unique existence of human personality with the creation of a unique world of existence beyond the limits of tragedy already felt and being constantly felt, already experienced and being constantly experienced: *Іще допіру / мізки сушили тисячі клопотів – думи про друзів, / дисертацію і любов / обступали мене, рвучи на часточки. / Вічна порожнеча / калюж і зір, / ворогування чистоти й бруду, / дитинства й надломленої змужнілості, / поезії і гросбуху. / А потім – в гуртожитку / одержав з дому листа, / прочитав – / і облетіли / всі маруди. / Все – відійшло, / ніби сховалось у тінь, / і стали / тільки мама і тато, / і сестра, / і донецька домівка. / Пише тато / незвиклою до письма рукою, / що* ("Батьки") "Just not so long ago thousands of thoughts troubled me – thoughts about friend, thesis and love circled me tearing me apart. Eternal emptiness of puddles and stars, enmity of purity and dirtiness, childhood and broken down maturity, poetry and ledger. And then in a hostel I got a letter from home, read – and all the bores fell over. Everything as if stepped aside, hiding in the shadow, and only mum, and, dad, and sister, and Donetsk home were left. Dad is writing with a hand, unaccustomed to writing, that" (*Parents*). According to external narration and flowing development of events (*одержав → прочитав → облетіли → відійшло → сховалось → стали*) the deep perception of beyondboundarity ↔ beyondlimitness: *стали / тільки мама і тато, / і сестра, / і донецька домівка. / Пише тато / незвиклою до письма рукою, / що*. Incompleteness realized by the absolute beginning of the subordinate object clause *що* represents that dimension of unreal expression of the author's world in which current personal emotional experience is correlated with the previous one which today is transformed through the current one.

Linguistic peculiarity of the belles-lettres text is specified by its belonging both to language sphere and to the sphere of art. As productive information exchange is a condition of society development, each culture at this or that epoch has a number of conventions (rule, norms) which instruct the addresser how to create the texts and the addressees how to understand them. Beyond functional and constitutive expression of such set of conventions it is impossible to forecast adequate perception of any text: publicistic, official-manner style, scientific and others. Each culture forms a repertoire of genres – types of the texts represented by current samples, as well as in a form of

instititive by grammars and stylistics examples, 2norms, rules of creating (coding) and perception (decoding) texts of certain kind, which exist in human consciousness. In general the text acts as a communicative universal being the middle chain of communication: *addresser → text → addressee*. In a text (textual potential) addresser expresses existence, self-sufficient value because the text itself appears as a result of creative realization of author's modality, communicative instructions, etc. In this case text acts as a unity with coding-decoding orientation because the first component reflects synthetic tendencies of the author-addresser and the second one reflects analytical orientation of the receiver-addressee. To perceive the belles-lettres style like *Висамітнів день. Висмоктали сили, / висотали біль. / Все тобі – чуже. Все тобі – немиле. / Все гірке тобі. / А немудре все! Хоч би дотягти, / та бодай – до краю. / Світ – уже не світ. Ти – уже не ти. / (Хто із вас – конає?) // Хочеш – задушись. Можеш – утечи / сам од себе. / Скільки не волай, скільки не кричи, а – порожнє небо. / Хто б тебе почув? Хто б тебе схотів / зрозуміти? / Висохло перо. І мулькавий стіл / слізьми – жовтий* ("Висамітнів день…") "The day has become lonely. The lifeblood is sucked out, / the pain is drained. / Everything is strange to you. Everything is not dear to you. / Everything is bitter for you. / And everything is not wise! Oh, how I wish to drag up / to the end. / The world is not the world. You are not you. / (Which one agonizes?) If you want, you may choke. If you can, run away / from yourself. / No matter how you scream, no matter how you cry, the sky is empty. / Who would have heard you? Who would want to understand you? / The quill is dry. And the depressing table / is yellow with tears" (*The Day Has Become Lonely…*) the following is necessary: 1) knowledge of natural language and the regulations of its systemic-level organization; 2) the perception of primary and secondary meanings of the word; 3) the realization of the whole complex of presuppositions; 4) the expression of purely author's implications (their comprehension and interpretation make the infinite range of cognition of the read become possible); 5) the elucidation of actually textual and extra textual potentials of text units; 6) the ascertainment of the determining textual component; 7) the determination of the directions of differences between systemically fixed normative regulations of linear text structure and realized potentials in a specific text; 8) "interpretation" of the author's punctuation grammar with tracing of functional-stylistic loading of all used information separators – struc-

tural-grammatical, semantic-grammatical, intonation-rhythmic, and others; 9) the differentiation of general language, customary usage speech and occasional-author thought verbalizers; 10) proper perception of actualizators as clusters of "tension" of word-thought, word-emotion, word-meaning and so on. To testify the second argument we may give the correlation of the words used in the poem in primary and secondary meaning (69 words totally, 52 of which are notional ad 19 are syncategorematic) taking into account that the secondary not regular valency (left- or right-sided) acts as a realization of secondarity (*Висмоктали сили, / висотали біль;Висохло перо* and others ↔ primary expressions of the notional words – 26, and secondary – 24) and maximally strengthens the semantic field of the word, at the same time actualizing the connection of semantic intentions of the word with their primary sounding.

Proper comprehension of presupposition foresees the knowledge of the whole depicted event background of the epoch in which the artist lived and wrote. Thus, for example, the lines *Світ – уже не світ. Ти – уже не ти*, where the component *уже* contains information which refers to the previous experience: to some period when the world was full of happiness, hope for the lyrical character, while his present status does not create happiness and inspiration (in 1966 the author held the position of the main engineer of the Ministry of building industry of Ukrainian SSR), through antithesis they actualize the impossibility of choice, stress the negation of the existing as being possible.

Author's implications are not of equal level in belletristic speech of Vasyl Stus, their cognition should be based on the realization of significance of metaphors as cognitive models of transformation of cognated or cognized: *Висамітнів день* – "the day which ended as a result of spiritual tiredness". The latter deepens the existing model → *Висмоктали сили, / висотали біль* (**someone unknown** both sucked out the lifeblood and drained the pain – in this case pain means a complex of empathized and sympathized). Implications may be viewed as 1) contextual sense; 2) implicit sense; 3) subtext. Each of these dimensions is considerable though the first is more correlated with the second, third, fifth, sixth and eighth aspects of text perception and comprehension. The investigation of the implicit sense is possible in two directions: in the section of text linguistics – the study of text implication as varieties of sense which is derivative from additional sense plane as a result of juxtaposition of text units (*Світ – уже*

не світ; Можеш – утечи / сам од себе), as well as the semantics of lexical units which determines a change in the notional structure of the word, creation of metaphorized structures: **Висохло перо. І мулькавий стіл / слізьми – жовтий**. Both directions are acceptable for the expression and disclosure of the author's implications.

The analysis of proper-textual and extra-textual potentials of text units is based on the tracing of proper-textual uniting potentials through their comparison with general language ones, compare: *порожнє небо* "empty sky" ← derivative from regular associations about the sky through psychological perception, impression: *небо → байдуже, безстрашне, безрадісне, безсиле, важке, веселе, гнітюче, гучне, грізне, горде, гробове, дзвінке, дивне, дивовижне, залізне, замислене* "the sky → indifferent, fearless, without fun, powerless, heavy, merry, depressing, loud, stern, proud, deathlike, ringing, weird, wonderful, iron, thoughtful" and so on (totally – 64): *І неба **молодого** синя грива, / І ялиновий теплий оксамит* (Борис Олійник) "And a blue mane of a young sky, and warm velvet of the spruce" [Бибик 1998: 221]. Extra-textual information is easily comprehended basing on 1) a number of social-historic and culturally meaningful factors of literary work creation; 2) the determination of significance of ellipsis of text formations through the tracing of the system of literary standardized and systemically-codified structures: *Хоч би дотягти, / та **бодай – до краю*** (*бодай *дотягти до краю*) and so on.

The ascertainment of text component is rather difficult because it should be based on the tracing of work concept and its verbalizers. Apparently, the concept of analyzed poetry *"Висамітнів день…"* is lexically indefinite *душа* "soul" in its variation-analytical expression *стомленість душі* "tiredness of soul" because of hostility of internal environment: ***тобі – чуже; тобі – немиле; гірке тобі; немудре все*** → becomes the basis of generalization: ***Світ – уже не світ; Ти – уже не ти***; all this together determines the result: ***Висохло перо***, where sense loading of the metaphor is aimed at preliminary association-figurative flow.

The disclosure of the tendencies of difference between systemically set normative regulations of linear text ordering and realized potentials in a certain text is possible basing on ascertainment of prior aspects with ascertainment of systemically set uniting intentions and properly-author's, aimed at the disclosure of corresponding instruction: *Скільки не волай, скільки не кричи, **а – порожнє небо*** and so on.

At the same time it is necessary to take into account the usage of set models for the creation of esthetically loaded constructions via repetition in their structure of the same lexemes in the function of different members of the sentence, thus creating repeated actualization (*Світ – уже не світ. Ти – уже не ти* – theme-rheme organization is fully subordinated to author's instruction of negation of being as an expression of fixed understanding of existentiality. Rheme is strengthened by the component *уже* and sentence modificator of negation *не*, as a result, logical relation of identity is aimed at the compositional structure of the work – for the whole identity of the notions *світ – світ, ти – ти* their prepositional and postpositional filling is directly opposite: *Світ – уже не світ. Ти – уже не ти*, which is strengthened in both sentences by an adverb *уже*, which "points at final fulfillment or coming of the action, phenomenon, property, state" [Словник української мови, X: 400]. Rhematic component *світ* is strengthened by negative particle *не* and adverb *уже*, at the same time its actualization is maximally actualized by centering on thematic component, which is semantically wider in postposition and is qualified leaving not covered value in existential field. Such existence of thematic component may be seen in fourteen-time actualized-initial repetition in the poem "Страх" *Fear* by Roman Lubkivskyi: **Хто** *боїться густого лісу,* / **Хто** *– запродати совість бісу,* / **Хто** *– доносу, а* **хто** *– обмови,* / **Хто** *– живої людської мови,* / **Хто** *боїться людської тиші,* **хто** *грому,* / **Хто** *– знічев'я набить оскому,* / **Хто** *– на рідній дорозі впасти,* / **Хто** *– збрехати, а* **хто** *– украсти,* / **Хто** *– веселого,* **хто** *– сумного,* / **Хто** *– поїсти мало,* **хто** *– много,* / **Хто** *боїться мати дитину,* / **Хто** *– в собі убити людину,* / **Хто** *боїться вогню і кулі,* / **Хто** *боїться крику зозулі…* 'Someone is afraid of thick forest, / Someone is afraid of selling his conscience, / Someone is afraid of delation and someone is afraid of defamation, / Someone is afraid of living human tongue, / Someone is afraid of human silence and someone is afraid of thunder, / Someone is afraid to suddenly set the teeth on edge, / Someone is afraid to fall on native path, / Someone is afraid to lie, someone is afraid to steal, / Someone is afraid of merry things, someone is afraid of sadness, / Someone is afraid to eat little, someone is afraid to eat a lot, / Someone is afraid to have a child, / Someone is afraid to kill a human in oneself, Someone is afraid of fire and bullet, / Someone is afraid of cuckoo's cry', where the pronoun lexeme *хто* 'someone' is addressed directly to the reader-addressee with maximal widening

of own thematic background in its linear-positional and bush unfol-
ding. Existence *хто* is his self-identification and, at the same time,
constant rhematization in repeated postposition informatively princi-
pal component (*боїться густого лісу / запродати совість бісу / доносу /
обмови / живої людської мови / боїться людської тиші / грому / знічев'я
набить оскому / на рідній дорозі впасти / збрехати / украсти / веселого
/ сумного / поїсти мало / много / боїться мати дитину / в собі убити
людину / боїться вогню і кулі / боїться крику зозулі*). The repetition of
the theme component creates linear closure and integrity of the notio-
nal background, as syntactic constant of the subject-theme forms
n-quantity of propositions with dominance of absolute state of the
personality in different expressions of the latter – speech, activity,
quality, etc. Existence of thematic component *хто* gradually gives its
place to the existence of fear as determinative and overall in human's
being.

The "interpretation" of author's punctuation grammar with tracing
of functional-stylistic loading of all used punctuation symbols – struc-
tural-grammatical, semantic-grammatical, intonation-rhythmic – is
based only basing on disclosure of status loading of normative-
codified punctuation symbols and so on. After the ascertainment of
the usage of punctuation symbols according to fixed principles of
punctuation those will be left which are used in purely author's mo-
dality and whose destination is to maximally actualize the expressed
thought. For "punctuation grammar" of Vasyl Stus the domination of
the dash is characteristic in order to create special rhythmic-semantic
"balancing": *Скільки не волай, скільки не кричи, а – порожнє небо*; in
identical sentence structures usage / non-usage of different punctua-
tion symbols is motivated by the change of the linear arrangement of
members of the sentence – addresser modifies his actualized position
from post-subject-objective to post-predicate. Such modification leads
to maximal actualization of the addressee (*тобі*), addressee centered
on addresser – self-interpretation, self-cognition through alienation of
properly-author's and his transformation on observation: *Все тобі –
чуже. Все тобі – немиле. / **Все гірке тобі***. Equidistant contact senten-
ce structures *Все тобі – чуже. Все тобі – немиле* act as an exposition in
this line for absolutized (absolutized because the change of theme-
rheme linearity causes thematization of properly-predicative element
немудре and rhematization of pronoun element *все*): *А немудре все!*
The absence of hypothetically possible punctuation symbol dash (–)

in **Все гірке тобі**, by analogy to *Все тобі – чуже. Все тобі – немиле* acts as functionally loaded though as a base it has fixed linear order of the members of the sentence and direct theme-rheme division. Maximilization of disuse of punctuation symbol dash (–) is revealed in a sentence structure *А немудре все!*, where subjective-predicative foundations merge intonation-rhythmically characterizing the expression of the existentiality as amalgam with nonsegmented nominative and existential components.

Vasyl Stus uses author's own loading of punctuation symbols to full extent and exhaustively, giving special status to a dash as a realization of pause with maximal semantic concentration: *Прорвися устами, / прорвися чолом / і руками, / очима прорвися! / Сина! Сина, о Земле! / У спеку – роси! / І погроззя. / В спеку – грому із ясного неба, / Блискавиць! / І – ударило… / І – задвигтіло* ("Передсвітання") "Break through with your mouth, / break through with your face / and hands, / break through with your eyes! / A son! a son, oh the Earth! / During the heat – dew! / And a storm. During the heat – thunder out of the blue, / The lightnings! / And – the thunder struck… / And – everything moved" (*Before Dawn*). A dash maximally shows one of the peculiarities of existence of language esthetics of Vasyl Stus – exit beyond the boundaries of loneliness and finiteness and the creation of one of the planes personally coloured beyondboundarity. Thus, the author crosses the limits of his own *I* and widens its plane through the perspective of development, transformation of self-perception: *Вглиблюйся у глиб? / Допоки не утратиш повертання / останньої надії – далі йди, об безнадію обіпрись, безсилий. / Рушай же далі. Рвуться ланцюги / старого спокою. Твій водолазний / скафандр продерто нижче твого горла, і серце – ніби риба, на гачок / заловлен*е ("Від себе не сховаєшся між лиць") "Deepen into the depth? / Until you lose the glimpse / of the last hope, move further, leaning on despair, without strength. / Go on further. They break the chains / of the old calm. Your dry / suit is torn below your throat, and the heart is like a fish on a hook / caught" (*You Will not Hide from Yourself among the Faces*).

The loading of the dash in the sentence structure is not less significant, the sentence structure being a fixed component with its own parameters of modality and purpose *(Хто із вас – конає?)*, where the usage of the dash between complex subject (selective semantics) and a predicate completely contradicts structural-grammatical and semantic principles of Ukrainian punctuation. Its loading is completely tra-

73

ced in functional-stylistic or properly-author's scope of punctuation grammar with possible ascertainment of the regulations of similar usage of punctuation symbols by the author – deliberate separation of the personal verb for the actualization in rhematic position.

Functional-author's punctuation device also includes parcelling which causes the division of the integral sentence into separate semantic and communicative units. Such parcelling is usually loaded by the creation of the integral functional ranges of parcellates: *Ти десь блукаєш досі, босоніжко. / **По ранніх травах. В лузі. По росі*** ("З давніх мотивів") "You are still wandering somewhere, barefooted girl. / On early grasses. In the meadow. On the dew" (*From Ancient Motives*).

The differentiation of the generally-language, customary usage-speech and occasionally-author's verbalizers of the thought enables the ascertainment of the correlation of generally-systemic lexemes and occasionally-author's new formants in the realization of the creative aim of the artist. In the analyzed poem only lexeme *мулькавий* (derivative from the adjective мулький – 1) який муляє, тисне "which hurts, pinches": *Величай ніяк не міг заснути. Якесь ліжко **мульке**, жарко навіть без ковдри, душно в кімнаті* (Олександр Копиленко) "Velychai couldn't get asleep. The bed was tight, it was hot even without blanket, it was stuffy in the room"; 2) який бентежить, турбує, гнітить 'which confuses, bothers, depresses': *Дівчина знічувалася, відчувала **мульку** ніяковість від того, що в розповідях своїх, особливо про себе, Роман Петрович по двічі і по тричі, певне забуваючи, повторювався* (Петро Козланюк) [Словник української мови, IV: 826] "The girl was confused feeling some depressing awkwardness from the fact that Roman Petrovych repeated himself for two or three times in his stories, especially about himself, maybe being forgetful") is not registered in general linguistic lexicographic works. Its semantics is "with a tint of something that depresses" [see also: Словник 2003].

A special position is taken by the actualizators as clusters of "tension" of words-thoughts, words-emotions, through which the author's instructions are expressed: *світ ↔ світ, ти ↔ ти, задушись ↔ утечи, не кричи → не волай* "the world ↔ the world, you ↔ you, suffocate ↔ escape, don't cry → don't scream" and so on, integral images realized in cognitive models ↔ metaphorized structures where the integrity of nominative-existential beginning is determinative:

Висохло перо ↔ *the creative beginning has died which is confirmed by the final poetic line: *I мулькавий стіл / слізьми – жовтий.*

Language existence of a personality may modify within text background (homogeneous totality of signs with a certain meaning). Text background is understood as one single sign with indeterminative but potentially determinable meaning [by: Загнітко 2006: 9–10]). Representating and actualizing within text space, language personality indirectly projects language consciousness via special code. The text is perceived as phenomenologically projected primary way of language existence.

Text may be interpreted as a space where the process of semantic base formation takes place. "The text is subject to observation not as a complete product, but as a producing which happens in front of us. which connects to other texts, other codes (the sphere of intertextuality), thus connecting society, history, but it connects not by relation of determination but by the relation of citation" [Барт 1994: 424]. The process of formation of the meanings and senses in the text arises as determined by the speech intention progressive selection of functional and efficient potencies of initial elements, their significance is universal: *Люблю цю тишу гробову, / що всесвіт облягла вельможно. / Ні то[б]і пікнути не можна, / бо під параграфом живу. / Державить мною цей статут, / ці дозволи і заборони, / ці пункти, приписи, закони, / єдиний прихисток – сурдут, / розписаний в дві цвілі барви – / червону й чорну – ніби крик і німота. Заціп язик, / негідний доброї покари. / Ти досі висох на патик? / То долучайся до казарми* "I like this deathlike silence, / which lordly covered the whole universe. / I don't dare utter a word, / as my life falls under the article / This charter controls me, / as well as all these permissions and prohibitions, / these clauses, additions, laws, / the only shelter is frock coat, / made in two faded colours – / red and black – is like a scream / and dumbness. My tongue is numb, / being not worth of good punishment. / Are you dry like a stick? / Then, join in the barracks". The progression of selection is traced in the increase of underlying structures, for example, prohibitions: *під параграфом живу → Державить мною цей статут + дозволи і заборони + пункти + приписи + закони*, where each contains seme "regulatory act" with variations "directive" (*параграф* [Словник української мови, VI: 62]); "law" (*статут* [Словник української мови, IX: 671]); "compulsory rule" (*закон* [Словник української мови, III: 154]); "consent on the right" (*дозвіл* [Словник

української мови, II: 347]); "order" (*заборона* [Словник української мови, III: 26]); "chapter of the official (normative) document" (*пункт* [Словник української мови, VIII: 388]); "rule" (*припис* [Словник української мови, VII: 706]). Constant increase of the semantic field of prohibition forms *цвілі барви – / червону й чорну – ніби крик / і німота. Заціп язик*, because norm, addition, rule, law, paragraph, etc. really foresee only *you may* and *you may not*, i. e., two colours with their more precise definition and separation *red* and *black*, where the first is an expression of life –– *scream*, and the latter is complete dumbness. Existential conclusion-refrain *Заціп язик* is completely motivated, fully reasonable.

Semantic accumulation may also be interpreted as a the process of the individualization of functions which are determined in the system of language, ascertained in general or for a certain class and determined formally. Semantic base of the text does not stay autonomous: it is liable to mutations, dissolves in the plurality of other units. Semantic induction of the text develops not linearly, being associated with movement. "Open semantic fields which flow into information do not tear it from inside and do not blur its textual design. Moreover, the principle of textual design and integrity is supported and strengthened by the centred increase of material from which its sense develops" [Гаспаров 1996: 344]. Text as a spiritual formation may be interpreted with the help of the notion of the structure model, being, functioning and evolution of the language picture of the world which reflects language consciousness of all subjects of certain unity. Such explication in general also agrees with the characteristics of belletristic text which is a phenomenon / creation of specific language personality – esthetic, in whose language consciousness superconcepts "Beauty" an "Excellence" dominate. Expressing in the text their internal world, language personality explicates in it the quintessence of their own unique "I", extrapolating their own being and its essence. This allows to interpret the text as a verbal hologram, copy, as a semantic-psychological negative of inner "*ego*" of the author of discourse: *Нас порозсовано по цих мурах, / не чути ані ворога, ні друга. / Лиш колобродить у душі недуга / і колобродить розпач мій по снах* "We are pushed in behind these walls of iron, / not hearing either enemy, or friend. / And just the malady is rambling in my soul / and just despair is rambling in my dreams". The negative of the inner "*ego*" is motivated by the author's stay behind these *walls, not hearing either*

enemy, or friend, as a result *just the malady is rambling in my soul / and just despair is rambling in my dreams*. In what does the existence of "*ego*" as a self-expression and selfhood of the author lie – it lies in that the felt unhappiness will overcame everything due to its self-denial: *Струмуй, бідо! І самотою впийсь, і доки світу-сонця золотого, / шукай по зорях, де твоя дорога, / і – радістю од себе засвітись* "Flow, misfortune! Gloat over loneliness, until the golden sun arises, / look for your way with the help of the stars, / and shine with gladness from yourself". The latter is confirmed by a number of imperative forms with the motivation of induction with maximal expression: *струмуй → впийсь → шукай → засвітись*, where the second and the fourth forms create symmetry through adjoining of the same mood components: *самотою впийсь → радістю засвітись*. The misfortune in existential scope of the author's "*ego*" is not abstract, it comprises inner state together with external world perception. The following is important in this world perception: *Де ти, мій милий друже? Озовись! / Чи ми ще разом зійдемось колись / на тиху на ласкаву на розмову? / Де щире серце зігріває слово* "Where are you, my dear friend? Answer! / Will we ever meet again / for a quiet for a tender for a conversation? Where sincere heart is warmed by the word". The top imperativity of "*ego*" is easily traced through the end actualized-exclamatory form *Озовись!* in the fifth line and correlated *впийсь* in the ninth line and *засвітись* in the twelfth line. Actually, they are core elements in existential searches of author's "*ego*", which in the fifth – ninth lines has internally motivated recall with lyrical filling with three interrogative sentences with philosophic-existential expression. At the same time absolute distant repetition of the preposition *на* in a semantically complete three-propositional construction *на тиху на ласкаву на розмову* actualizes the semantics of the purpose and makes it determinative, which obtains the qualification characteristic due to predicative part *Де щире серце зігріває слово*, which shows the sense of human conversation-talk, with heart to heart, in harmony. Uniqueness of the existential source in these lines lies in double loading of author-lyrical character – narrator and observer his words are addressed at the same time to the addresser and the addressee. Rhetoric question is motivated not by the inner doubts of the lyrical character, not by double status of the author's *I*, but by external circumstances, "the Iron Curtain" of the system, "the walls of iron" of addressee's inaccessibility, space-temporal mediation of his perception.

Existential manness as an expression of spirituality is traced in the whole speech-artistic scope of Vasyl Stus: *Що, коли може статись так: / ти сам. Ти пустка в пустці. / І тільки мати пресвята / в картатій грубій хустці / з туману дивиться: давись / довіку чорним хлібом, / але не зрадь. Не схиб. / І впасти в ноги не дано, / і не дано повідать, що все одно* ("Що, коли може статись так…") "What if it happens in the following way: / you are alone. A desert in a desert. / And only holy mother / in a checked rough shawl / is looking from the mist: choke / with brown bread for eternity, / but don't betray. Don't miss. / And you can neither kneel in front, nor tell that you don't care" (*What if It Happens in the Following Way*). Spirituality as an expression of struggle against non-spirituality, amorality and absence of morality, toadiness and unprincipleness (*For Toadies into an Album*), which borders with the blurring of everything human and is associated with scums and dregs, which is only not worth anything human, but should be taken away from it.

The cognition of discreet senses of the work is especially important. Within language existence, it is not only the investigation of the language facts that is necessary, but also the way of their arrangement, their connections and correlation, the usage of technique of androgyne-analysis (Greek *andros* – a man + *gin* – a woman), for intertextual tracing of correlation of spirituality (existential manness) and warmth (existential womanness). Language esthetics of Vasyl Stus is characterized by complete prevalence of spirituality which may be treated as existential strategy. It is the Spirit that provides the victory over human and unhuman suffering and going out of the limits of sensitivity, sheer being for the feeling of beyondboundarity, where *ego* does not experience the past, does not feel constant humiliation and striving to annihilate a person, lead her to "the cell of spiritual impoverishment", but it affirms the perspective of domination of high morality, importance of one's own *ego* as a constituent of the upper level, debarred from endured: *Скажіть – хіба то так, / Хіба то не віра у потойбічність? / Хіба то – не релігія? / Нація, народ, край? / Хіба то усе відчувши між ребер, / Ти виживеш, не помреш?* ("Поміж землею і небом…") "Tell me: is it so, / Is it not the belief in the other world? / Isn't it the religion? / Nation, folk, land? / And after feeling all this under the ribs, will you survive, not die?" (*Between the Earth and the Sky…*). Semantics of the lexeme *віра* is aimed at the expression of existential *ego* as a carrier of spirituality (*віра* – "упевненість у чомусь,

у здійсненні чого-небудь" "confidence in something, in the fulfillment of something" or "визнання існування Бога, переконання в реальному існуванні чогось надприродного" "the acceptance of God's existence, assurance in real existence of something supernatural" [Словник української мови, I: 679]), *потойбічність* (noun ← from adjective *потойбічний* "неземний, загробний" "unearthly, beyond the grave" [Словник української мови, VII: 414]) and others, what is also strengthened by a range of questions (four), which contain both the question and the answer: it is really the religion – nation, folk, land. Every next notion in this range is semantically narrower and at the same time reveals the essence of existential spirituality – only in the union with the nation, with the folk, with the land human personality is capable to save their self and self-expressiveness.

Real existence of any text as a necessary premise has the presence of genre "label" which is not equal to the author's interpretation and its comprehension by the reader. Such genre "label" may prepare the addressee, orient his sensuality on corresponding register. Even in 1922 B. O. Larin stated: "We should read the poems in such a way as a virtuoso perceives musical play. When he has parted everything and then tuned, noticed everything in detail and remembered all the passages, then he can rest, so that the impressions will merge. If then he blows the ash from blinking memory, the artistic work will be lit, enlivened. … But it is more difficult for the researcher. He must listen to the poems so captiously that the perception blunts, the esthetic effect of the poem weakens. Then even the right self-observation may lead to wrong results – it is like superficial acquaintance" [Ларин 1997: 161–162]. In this sense, Vasyl Stus expressively affirms: "The strength of the poetry is in that it keeps unsplit concreteness of surrounding reality which has its own beauty, its own wisdom, its own ethics" [Стус 1994: 176].

The thinness of poem's material and internal contradiction of form and content, meaning and sense complicate the task of expression of peculiarities of language existence in the work, tracing of its regulations on different levels of organization of artistic speech, especially syntax, which, according to the neat remark of Richard Oman, determines the style. The significance of the syntax itself and – wider of grammar – for poetic text was doubted for many times because poetry is maximally oriented on agrammatism: *Кожна шпарочка – горить, пломеніє – кожна шпара. О моя скорбота, кара – не наживши і не жить*

("Ти скажеш – день…") "Every pore is burning, every pore is on fire. Oh, my sorrow, punishment is not having gained not to live" (*You will say – a day…*); the disturbance of the rules of units and their structural organization operating, which is often qualified as a non-normativity in grammatical aspect: *А день твій. День. А дні твої / ледь голубі підводять роги. / І літ розстеблені гаї, твої розстеблені – під ноги. / Твої мороки. Жах твій. Жаль / затисни між ребер – собою* ("І кулі свист, і рота зашморг…") "And the day is yours. The day. And your days are barely raising their blue horns. / And the stalking groves of your years, your stalking ones are under your feet. / Your darkness. Your frights. Tuck / your pity under your ribs with yourself" (*And the whistle of a bullet, and the loop of the mouth…*). Though we may see rather potent expression in this non-normativity (*дні підводять роги; літ розстеблені гаї*, etc). The loading of syntax in artistic-esthetic scope is determinative because syntactic organization subordinates the flow of the thought and the author's interpretation of the perceived, arranges communicative instruction and intentionality: *Хай живу я, / оскільки мені хочеться жити, / а той, що не дає мені й дихнути – / хай здохне. / Обов'язково, / тільки-но відлунають звуки курантів, / тільки-но чокнуться фужерами із шампанським, / тільки-но перейде на новий рік – / хай здихає. / Хай здихає. / Хай здихає / отой, що не дає мені і дихнути* ("Передноворічні заклики") "May I live a long life / as I want to live, / may the one who does not let me breathe – / may he die. / Obligatorily, at the very moment when chimes strike, / at the very moment when the glasses with champagne clink, / at the very moment when New Year comes – /may he die. / May he die. / May he die, / the one who does not let me breathe" (*New Year's Eve calls*). The domination of the thesis *той, що не дає мені й дихнути – / хай здохне* is somehow levelled by the initial position of the concept *Хай живу я*, strengthened by the subordinate predicative clause of cause *оскільки мені хочеться жити* with its semantic closeness on the main part (*той … хай здохне*): *Хай живу → хочеться жити*. The corresponding repetitions are also aimed at this: *Хай живу ↔ жити; я ↔ мені*. The domination of the thesis *той, що не дає мені й дихнути – / хай здохне* in the internal structuration of the poetic work is actualized by constant repetition of the predicate in analytical form of the third person singular of imperative mood: *Хай здихає* (four-time repetition) and its final status in the structure of the main predicative part as a constituent part of non-segmented complex sen-

tence of adverbial-correlational type: *Хай здихає / отой, що не дає мені і дихнути*. In the final position of this structure the verb-predicate is used in a form of imperfective aspect (in the initial position it is used in a form of perfective aspect in order to stress directiveness) for the denotation of the continuity of the process in its non-reversiveness. Non-segmentation of the syntactic structure of a complex sentence correlates with the integrity of the rheme.

Even completely grammatical lyrics, in contrast to prose, is the art of the word, not sentence. This, in particular, makes difference between poetic and prosaic "suspense". Whereas in prose "suspense" is a prolonged wait of an event, in poetry it is an abstracted appearance of the word, suddenness of its rise: *Яке блаженство – радісно себе / пуститися, неначе човен берега* ("Яке блаженство – радісно себе…") "What a bliss – to happily let oneself, like a boat along the bank" (*What a Bliss – to Happily Let Oneself…*). construction *яке блаженство* is a condensate of expression, which later unfolds completely in the conclusive lines "*Блаженна смерте! Рано ще! Не надь. / Та довжиться твоя висока падь / і душу виголублює пречисту*" "Blissful death! It is too early yet! Don't attract. / But you secrete the honeydew / and fondle pure soul".

Poem forms propose and display another form of being, in which the chance of temporary and unrepeated flow of life gives place to "eternal" properly-language form, as the poem form itself transfers the extralinguistic situation into a modus of language existence (according to I. I. Kovtunova). And here one of the most determinative questions of language existence because in each case the studying of this or that construction faces the problem of norm, its correlation / non-correlation with the latter and correlation with reality / unreality. Apparently, for the ascertainment of esthetic, language-esthetic significance of syntactic construction, approaches of its variations, modifications and transformations the latter should be analyzed on the background of typologically related equally levelled formations. Language norm, exhaustively realized in communicative function of the language, is an external norm on whose background esthetic function of the language is outlined and expressed to full extent, esthetic function comprising: 1) esthetics of the literary language (this motivates its spread on the general ethnic territory and its subordination to the principles of the majority of language texts); 2) esthetics of the language of belletristic literature; 3) esthetics of linear arrangement and horizontal unfolding of poetic structures; 4) correlation of hori-

zontal and vertical forms with their esthetic filling; 5) variativity of linear order and punctuation loadings, etc.

Syntax of poetic works of Vasyl Stus is aimed at the elimination of factual reality and the creation of self-valuable / self-evaluated and self-sufficient world of artistic senses – the creation of modalized poetic reality: *В мені уже народжується Бог / і напівпам'ятний, напівзабутий, / немов і не в мені, а скраю смерти, / куди живому зась – мій внук і прадід – / пережидає, заки я помру* ("В мені уже народжується Бог…") "God is being already born in me / and half-remembered, half-forgotten, / as if he is not in me, but at the side of death / where alive can't pass – my grandson and my grandfather – / and he is waiting for me to die" (*God Is Being Already Born in Me…*). Panoramity of the depicted events with numerous propositions within one complex syntactic construction (1) *В мені уже народжується Бог* + 2) *and* (Бог) *напівпам'ятний*+ 3) (Бог) *напівзабутий* + 4) (The God is born) *немов і не в мені* + 5) (The God is born) *скраю смерти* + 6) *куди живому зась* + 7) *мій внук* + 7) *внук пережидає* + 8) *прадід пережидає* + 9) *заки я помру*) reveals the wealth of existential scope of lyrical *I*.

The repetition of the one-structural and equally levelled by their semantics utterances facilitates the generation of the capacious gradation row, in which the last communicative formation includes illation, which is maximally strengthened by the presence of three, four and more (seven were found) verbs-predicates as the carriers of certain propositions: *Отак і є. Отак і жий. Отак / Творись, таврований, печись, казися* ("Убогий смерд – не владарює нині…") "It is so. Live in such a way. Just so. / Create, burnt in, scorch, go mad" (*Poor Lackey does not rule now…*). Maximal unfolding of the number of propositions in exposition, which are represented by certain components as formal complicators, signals about microdimension of the event flow, widening of the background itself of the following drama outlined by the verb-predicate and arguments dependent on: *Вервечка заборонених бажань – дружина, мати, син, сестра і батько, побравшися одне за одним, ніби на проході якоїсь божевільні, мій сон веде й сама снується сном* ("Вервечка заборонених бажань…") "A row of forbidden desires – wife, mother, son, sister and father, hand in hand, as if in the asylum, leads my dream and is lead by the dream" (*A Row of Forbidden Desires…*), where the isolated apposition "*вервечка заборонених бажань – дружина, мати, син, сестра і батько*" comprises seven propositions as elementary senses. At the same time it has its own subor-

82

dination "*ніби на проході якоїсь божевільні*", which is an incomplete subordinate determinative-comparative predicative clause, whose maxim is recognizable in an internal "dialogue" with the main parts "*мій сон веде й сама снується сном*". Being in properly determinative scope as for the main parts, the subordinate clause correlates with complete semantic row represented by isolated apposition, whose structure may induce to its comprehension as separate nominative structures. Such approach leads to the levelling of the lexemes – components of the utterance: *вервечка – сон – сама.*

In such cases it is necessary to maximally take into account the peculiarities of the syntactic structuring of the text by Vasyl Stus, his striving to express semantic wealth not in a superficial but in an underlying structure of the utterance which in this case obtains the status not only of the nominative unit, but existential as well, because being dimension of the next propositions is cognized though it. Initial dynamics of the sentences – grammatical stems – may strengthen the existentiality, where the position of the subject is filled by predicative name: ***Думи визбираю***, *мов зерня, / ніби стернями колоски. / Колять сльози. Колючі сльози. / Остюками – в очах… // За вікном гуркотять літаки, ніби відьми – на шабаш. / Понад дахами, / понад затихлими, / понад примахлим Києвом – гуркотять* (Безсонної ночі) 'I collect the thoughts like grains, / like ears of wheat. / The tears prickle. Prickly tears. / Like awns in the eyes… // The planes roar outside, like witches hurrying to Sabbath. / Above the roofs, / above the quiet, / above quiet Kyiv – they roar' (*In the Insomniac Night*). In such cases the information like *Остюками – в очах* (*колять сльози + Остюками – в очах*) is implicated.

Much attention in the syntactic macroworld of Vasyl Stus is devoted to the constructions in which the position of the predicate is filled by the infinitive which, according to its expression, is potentially modal, and this becomes the main point in its realization: *Несила – бачити. Несила – перестать. / Бо де подітись з зрадними очима? / Ховаються за нашими плечима / пиха і гонор. Стали і мовчать* ("Життя симфонія", "Симфонія весни"…) "There is no strength to look at. There is no strength to stop. / As where should the betraying eyes be set? / Pride and haughtiness are hiding behind our backs. / They stood there and are silent" (*The Symphony of Life*, "*The Symphony of Spring*"…). In this case infinitive is a carrier of relative imperativity which correlates with the beginning of the following strophe where imperative is maximally expressed formally and semantically:

Мовчіть і начувайтесь. Бо струну / торкне смичок – і раз, і два, і тричі ("Життя симфонія", "Симфонія весни…") "Keep silence and beware. Because the fiddlestick will touch the string – once, twice, three times" (*The Symphony of Life*, "*The Symphony of Spring*"…). Imperative semantics is strengthened by parcelling in the first and in the second case, where parcellates-determinants *"Бо де подітись з зрадними очима?", "Бо струну / торкне смичок – і раз, і два, і тричі"* are separated into communicatively independent units which contain the whole potential of cause motivation of such behaviour. At the same time these parcellates in semantic and structural sense are oriented on structurally main component (in the first case we deal with two equally levelled parts *"Несила – бачити. Несила – перестать"*, punctuation separation is aimed at transformation of equally levelled semantics into self-sufficient and self-exhaustive; while in the second, we deal with of instructive sense *"Мовчіть і начувайтесь"*). In general, the imperative instruction of the poem "Життя симфонія, Симфонія весни"…"*The Symphony of Life, The Symphony of Spring*"… is strengthened by constant adding of the imperative forms used in their primary function: *І вже здається – ледве вхопить зір – / пливе митець, простерши руки-крила… / І темінь у ногах провалля вирила… / Не упади. Дивися вгору й вір // Дивися й вір. Увіруй в торжество бузково-синіх звуків серед тиші. Нехай хоч розпач до дерзань привіншує, тож рвися вгору з вірою удвох* "And it seems – it is barely noticeable – / the artist is floating spreading his arms-wings… / And the darkness of the abyss was twirling… / Don't fall. Look up and believe // Look and believe. Believe in the triumph of lilac-blue sounds in the silence. And though despair prompts to bold strokes, then strive up together with belief". Capacious semantic row of imperative semantics in poetical structure is created by verb forms of imperative mood: *мовчіть, начувайтесь, не упади, дивися, дивися, вір*, which being formally expressed by the second person singular are aimed at the addressee and at the same time in their expression contain certain subject of the action which clearly defined in the last strophe: *Докіль ти сині руки не розкрилиш, / з душі не вирвеш моторошний крик / чуття, котрого не назве язик, / чуття, котрого у словах не виллєш* "Until you spread your blue arms like the wings, / until you tear from your soul a frightful scream / of the feeling which the tongue can't name, / the feeling which can't be expressed by words". In this case imperative semantics is not blurred, on the contrary, it is stre-

ngthened, as both forms of the imperative mood and forms of the future tense carry unreal meaning which causes the creation of the united integral background of the poem where the first strophe appears as an exposition. In the last strophe torn constructions, violation of normative word order create emotional-existential potential: *Життя симфонія, ''Симфонія весни'' і сатанинський, зойками – Малевич… / Єврей – по горло. І по горло – невір, / по горло – маячний і мудрий світ* "The symphony of life, "the Symphony of spring" and satanic, with shrieks – Malevych… / A Jew is up to the ears. And atheist is up to the ears, / and mad and wise world is up to the ears". The beginning contains nominative sentence deprived of aspect, modal, temporal and personal dimensions which is maximally used in the following formations. it is necessary to see considerable difference between isolated apposition "*Симфонія весни*" and two-member binominative sentence "*сатанинський – Малевич*", in which "*зойками*" (according to its formal thinking and functional-semantic loading is an indirect object, but at the same time syncretizes the semantics of the adverbial modifier due to the usage of the method of segmentation – separation of a single word and giving it specific significance thanks to placing into syntactic position not characteristic to it. Further utterances "*Єврей – по горло. І по горло – невір, / по горло – маячний і мудрий світ*" are two-member sentences in which complex predicative nominal provides internal seeming uniformity and external pseudosimilarity which correlates them with the starting nominative sentence. Existential dimension of the nominative construction, centered in temporal dimension on present, is strengthened by the following structures, also centered on present, beyond which zero expression of the auxiliary link verb is impossible, which maximally lost its own meaning and fully realizes its structural function.

Language-existential semantics in general and imperative one in particular may be referred to dominant signs of syntactic macroworld of Vasyl Stus as because of these rows of forms of the imperative mood the poet expresses his artistic creed, thus, including in its display the addressee: *На Голгофі і дурні були, / чесний хліб несучи, як покару. / **Подивися** на суддів своїх – / де в них очі, де брови, де губи?* ("Не насушить ніхто сухарів…") "On Golgotha there were fools who were carrying honest bread like a punishment. / Look at your judges – where are their eyes, where are their brows, where are their lips?" (*Nobody Will Dry the Rusks*…). In such poems we may easily feel the

procession of speech activity in which the author himself foresees the expression of addressee's co-activity. The example of such poems is "Оптимістичне" *Optimistic*: *Коли ти вірити в добро навик, / то **віруй** в землю.* ***Віруй** в смерть і крики / Тривожних породіль. Нема одвіку / Легкої віри і легких утіх. // Замало й слів, де треба людських рук. / Будинки зводити, мости ладнати, / Чи древні перелоги поорати. // **Учися** брати віру. Як беруть / Снопи на плечі. Як беруть лопати / Садівники, щоб Землю перерить / І здобрити. Так, як беруть солдати / Гвинтівки в руки – край свій боронить. / **Бери** у праці втому і печаль, / **Глибій** у радості, **глибій** в стражданні, **Звіряйсь** на них, немов на пробнім камені, Загартувавши серце, ніби сталь. / В роботі **научайся**, як народ. / До скону свято вірити в добро* 'When you have got accustomed to believing in goodness, / then do believe in land. Believe in death and screams / Of troubled women in childbirth. There's never / Easy belief and easy delights. // The words are scarce there, where human hands are needed. / In order to build the houses, repair the bridges, / Or to plough the ancient fallows. / Learn to take the belief. Like they take / Sheaves on their shoulders. Like the spades are taken / By the gardeners in order to dig the soil / And fertilize it. In a way the soldiers take / The guns in their hands in order to defend their land. / Take tiredness and sorrow from the work, / Deepen in the happiness, deepen in the suffering, Check against them, as against a touch stone, / Harden your heart like steel. / Study working like the folk. / Believe in goodness till the end of times', in which forms *віруй, віруй, учися, бери, глибій, глибій, звіряйсь, научайся* are nuclear, and predicative parts dependent in structural and notional field are grouped around them, the verb lexemes *беруть, беруть, перерить, здобрити, беруть, боронить, вірити* together with nuclear ones integral notional flow, as due to them the manner of the action is made concrete (*Як беруть / Снопи на плечі. Як беруть лопати / Садівники, щоб Землю перерить / І здобрити*), its aim (*Будинки зводити, мости ладнати, / Чи древні перелоги поорати*). It is significant that the last predicates parcellate, and in case of singling out of the aim of the action as a self-sufficient communicative unit, even a specialized means of structural dependence reduces. Verb predicate *беруть – беруть – бери* is the most frequent in this poetry, which at first appears in infinitive neutral-modal-temporal-personal form and fills the syntactic position of the complex object (*учися брати*), though such role may be interpreted as syncretic as the component *учися* tends to lose its full-meaningness.

The effect of the torn utterance is rather significant for Stus's poetic syntax when one structurally and communicatively whole utterance divides into two or more units. The most important thing there us that the singled out unit is informatively perceived as self-sufficient, moreover, it takes upon itself all the volume of information of previous parts, compare: *В роботі научайся, як народ. / До скону свято вірити в добро*, where the last component *До скону свято вірити в добро* structurally becomes the constituent of subordinate adverbial-explicating clause *як народ*, which together with the component *До скону свято вірити в добро* make integral predicative part.

In language-existential scope, syntactic macroworld of Vasyl Stus is strengthened by the usage of subject-modus components to which, without any doubt, should include deictic element "*I*", which is especially noticeable in poems aimed at elevated sounding, depicting of his own civic position. In this case the poem "Земля" "September Land" is extremely significant where beginning with the epigraph of Franko the author starts his dialogue with ancient cradle of humanity where the last appears as the connoisseur of poet's actions. The realizations of this task are subordinated to grammatical forms of indicative and imperative mood, compare: *Я до тебе прийду і змовкну. / І нічого тобі не скажу* і *Пожури ти мене. / Пожур – / Вже чи лагідно, чи жорстоко* "I will come to you and lapse into silence. / And I'll tell you nothing" and "Scold me. / Scolding – / Either tenderly or cruelly". All his poetry is full of exclamation marks whose main purpose is realization of the function of address – address to native Ukraine as the poet's cradle fully capable to assess all his intentions and realized actions. Together with them we may also see rhetorical questions (*Що докину до твого золота?; Чом забракло мені уміння / Звеселити серце твоє?; Чом не можу я дать тобі / Своє серце – у добрі руки?* 'What can I add to your gold?; Why don't I have enough skills / To make your heart merry?; Why can't I give you / My heart – into good hands?'), in which clots of existential energy are condensed. The author begins the row with the address to Ukraine (*О, Вкраїно моя осіння!*) which belongs to constants of Ukrainian culture (compare Roman *Late patet patriamea* (My motherland has spread far)). Through the separate artistically loaded detail of the native land (*голубінь* 'blueness') – important element of the nationally-cognitive space as represent of constant *being* of Ukrainian culture (compare the row of synonyms to lexeme

голубий "blue"*: блакитний, лазуровий, лазурний, небесний, бірюзовий, аквамариновий, барвінковий* (*Dictionary of synonyms* of the Ukrainian language: In 2 volumes. – Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1999: 68) "azure, sky-blue, turquoise, aquamarine, periwinkle"; *небесний, ясносиній, блаватний, волошковий,* совєтизми *голубий, лазурний, лазуровий* (*Karavanskiy S.* Practical dictionary of the synonyms of the Ukrainian language [Text] / S. Karavanskiy. – Kyiv : Kobza, 1993: 29) 'sky-blue, blue, bluet, cornflower, sovietisms like azure'; *агатовий, бірюзовий, блаватний, блакитний, блакитнуватий, васильковий, волошковий, голубенький, голубесенький, голубісінький, голубуватий, лазуритів, небесний, світло-голубий, світло-синій* (*Vusyk O. S.* The dictionary of Ukrainian synonyms. – Dnipropetrovsk : Sich, 2003: 88)) "agate, turquoise, bluet, blue, bluish, cornflower, bluebottle, azure, sky-blue, light-blue, light-indigo", identified with corresponding soul state, the poet deepens the rhetoric of the question through the singling out of *серця* "heart" as a self-sufficient quantity to strengthen the power of earth. the last is motivated by the fact that *heart* in this case becomes the carrier of top moral-spiritual values of a person: *Земле рідна! Сором мені – / Що докину до твого золота? / Марно зринули юні дні, / Нині ж сушить мене гризота. / Разом з осінню я догорів, / Листям осені опадаю, І між млисто-гірких вечорів / Неприкаяний, сам блукаю. / Осінь крилами в груди б'є. / О, Вкраїно моя осіння! Чом забракло мені уміння / Звеселити серце твоє? / Голубінь моя, голубінь! / Розтривого моя і муко! Чом не можу я дать тобі / Своє серце – у добрі руки? / О, коли б то, коли б я зміг! / Рідну землю, тривогами краяну, / Проорав би, як переліг, / В ріллях радості неокраїх! / Земле рідна! Тобі одній / Я волів служить до скону / До твоїх до прийдешніх днів / Дотягнутися б хоч рукою* "Native land! Shame on me – / What can I add to your gold? / Young days have passed in vain, / Now pangs of conscience bother me. / I burnt together with autumn. / I fall with autumn leaves, And among the misty bitter evenings / I wander alone, restlessly. / Autumn beats me with her wings. / Oh, my autumn Ukraine! Why don't I have enough skills / To make your heart merry? / Blueness, my blueness! / My trouble and my torment! Why can't I give you / My heart – into good hands? / Oh, if only, if only I could! I would have ploughed, as fallow, my native land, broken by anxieties / In tillage of boundless happiness! / Native land! To you alone / I would like to serve forever / I would like to reach my hand / To your to coming days".

The structure of the utterance *Земле рідна! Тобі одній / Я волів служить до скону. / До твоїх до прийдешніх днів / Дотягнутися б хоч рукою* foresees the actualization of concept *earth* which is comprehended as a complex of essences like own mother (a direct correlation is created with the epigraph by Ivan Franko "*Земле моя, / всеплодющая мати!*" *My land, fruitful mother!...*, who is capable to assess her son's actions. In lexicographic interpretation, lexeme *земля* "earth" would have gained the qualification of "a territory with which the person identifies themselves as one whole and for which the person considers themselves to be responsible" (but in none of the existing dictionaries such meaning is fixed, though in Ukrainian culture it is widely used).

In language-existential searches of Vasyl Stus special attention is paid to the filling of syntactic position with non-specialized components, which usually becomes the realization of separate proposition as an integral drama with its participants and circumstances: ***Напівзабуте*** *напливає хвилями; Минулі дні видяться* ***майбутнім*** ("Минулі дні видяться майбутнім…") "Something half-forgotten flows with waves, Past days are seen as the future" (*Past Days are Seen As the Future…*); ***Далеке й призабуте*** */ Зринає в пам'яті, мов видиво легке…* ("Була ти мрійною…") "The far and forgotten things / Are recollected in the memory like a light view…" (*You were dreamy…*).

The determinant features of language existence of Vasyl Stus are: 1) the understanding of human personality as originality and outlining of their world in beyondboundarity through corresponding structures – formal complication of the simple sentence with isolated members of the sentence, the most common of which are isolated appositions, which sometimes may form entire rows, formal complication of a simple sentence with parenthesis constructions: *В такі ночі не можна спати, гріх! (Не бійся: для тебе є денна покута)* ("Тиха ніч, і місячно") "At such nights you must not sleep, it is a sin! (Don't be afraid, for you there's a day redemption)" (*A Silent Night, There Is a Moon*); *Завжди пробуєм доростати до себе (одвічний егоїзм людського серця!), але ніхто не може подвоїтись* ("З гіркотою…") "We always try to grow to ourselves (eternal egoism of human heart!), but nobody can double" (*With bitterness…*); 2) the boundarity of the being, in which tragedy is not a dimension of destruction, but a basis for spirit and spirituality perfection in their existential sense; 3) co-dimension of two or more situations in one capacious syntactic construction with the emphasizing of their time symmetry / asymmetry, contrastive-

ness, etc. (complicated compound sentences with basic coordinating connection); 4) giving special existential significance to a separate component through segmentation – putting the actualized component to the very beginning of the utterance, which under direct word order is characterized by blurring of semantics, the accompanying factor of segmentation is the usage of the dash which may be viewed as the most used punctuation symbol in the poems of Vasyl Stus, compare: *І поблизу – радянський сад…* ("І поблизу – радянський сад…") "And near there is a soviet garden" (*And There Is a Soviet Garden nearby*); *старий ясмин – оцвіттям весь німує, а віддалі – німує чорний ліс* ("Націлений у небо обеліск") "old jasmine is dumb with flowers, and at some distance, the black forest is dumb" (*The Obelisk Aimed into the Sky*). In the syntax of Vasyl Stus segmentation is wide-spread at the end of the sentence as well, when the segmented component comprises quite capacious structure: *Вона сліпа – свічадом осіннього промерзлого ставка…* ("Націлений у небо обеліск") "She is blind – a mirror of the autumn frozen pond" (*The Obelisk Aimed into the Sky*); 5) language-existential domination of syntactic-stylistic changes of the inner sounding of complex sentences as a result of singling out of subordinate clauses using a dash and the contraposition of notional planes of the main and subordinate clauses: *Тож, чорний вороне, замовч і головоньки не мороч, / бо так накрячеш – що аби уже й добрався б до товариша…* ("Гайдамацьке") "thus, black raven, shut up and don't take me in, / or you will croak – in such a way that I won't get to my friend" (*Haydamak*); 6) artistic-esthetic usage of a number of predicative words as expositions of the poetry on whose background the elaboration of the poetic reality takes place: *Гарноброва, пожежностанна, / снами вимріяна і трачена, / зголоднілим поглядом спалена, / непокірна, нічна і лячна. Як твоє розпросторилось тіло!* ("Гарноброва, пожежностанна…") "With pretty eyebrows, with shapely figure, / in the dreams mused and wasted, / burnt by a hungry look, / disobedient, nocturnal and timid" (*With Pretty Eyebrows, with Shapely Figure…*); 7) active usage of equally levelled structures for the elaboration of the integral gradual row the final component of which is the most logically important component; 8) violation of normative-codified inter-sentence word order and predicative parts in a complex sentence in order to emphasize certain sense, its stressing is distinctly outlined by existential instruction of spirituality; 9) the usage of the verb predicate in the absolute end of the line as the most impor-

tant and finishing component of the sentence: *Ти словом і мовчанкою – караєш, / байдужістю холодною – караєш, / ти спокоєм і кроками – караєш, / морозом – теж, і віхолою теж* ("Хрещатиком вечірнім під неоновим блідавим світлом…") "You punish with a word and silence, / you punish with cold indifference, / you punish with calmness and steps, / with frost as well, with snowstorm as well" (*Along Evening Khreshchatyk under Neon Pale Light…*); 10) dialogues inside the text as an expression of existential manness as spirituality which is realized in two varieties: implicit (compare "Вони сидять за столом…" *They Sit at the Table…*) and explicit ("Ця п'єса почалася вже давно…" *This Play Began a Long Time Ago…*; "Я знав майже напевно…" *I Knew Almost for Sure…*); 11) imperativization of syntactic units with basic forms of imperative mood of the verb: *Коли настає апатія / і прикрутить, як кажуть, до сліз. / **Пиши**: хай живе партія! / Хай живе комунізм!* ("Коли настає апатія…") "When the apathy begins, / and it screws up, as they say, to tears. / Write: long live the party! Long live communism" (*When the Apathy Begins…*); 12) expositional two-part / one-part sentences with the giving of the status of fluidity of the depicted: *Ми порівнялись у правах, у звичках, у мові, в горі й радості, в печалях, / у пайках, у однаковості…* ("Ми порівнялись у правах…") "We have become equal in the rights, in habits, in the language, in grief and merriness, in sorrows, / in rations, in sameness…" (*We Have Become Equal in the Rights…*); *Дерева гнуться на поріг…* (''Дерева гнуться на поріг…'') 'The trees are bending to the threshold…' (*The Trees Are Bending to the Threshold…*); *Мені наснилась мати у сльозах, / Сестра наснилась* ("Мені наснилась мати у сльозах…") "I've dreamt about the mother in the tears, / I've dreamt of sister" (*I've Dreamt about the Mother in the Tears…*); *Без свят не можна. Хочеться душі / Полоскотати небо зайчиком* ("Без свят не можна…") "We cannot live without holidays. The soul wants / To tickle the sky" (*We Cannot Live without Holidays…*); 13) spreading of nominalizational tendencies and partially placing of the inner verbness into the background in a number of poems: *А нам з тобою **не біда**, / Коли життя – **навхрест і через**. / Коли життя – як **зов** вождя, / Коли життя – як **поклик** плоті / Від мезозойських ер жадань…* "Лапата блідла лобода…") "It does not matter for us / When the life is crosswise and through. / When the life is like a call of chief, / When the life is like a call of flesh / From Mesozoic era of desires…" (*Palmate pale orach…*); 14) parcelling of the structure of the complex

sentence for the singling out of cause and purpose semantics: *Перепечалюсь я. Перепечалюсь. / Тугою тугою і тишею тугою…* ("Перепечалюсь я…") "My grief will pass. It will pass. With tight sorrow and tight silence…" (*My Grief Will Pass…*); *Ти десь блукаєш досі, босоніжко, / По ранніх травах. В лузі. По росі* ("З давніх мотивів") "You are still wandering somewhere, barefooted girl. / On early grasses. In the meadow. On the dew" (*From Ancient Motives*); *Так кінь переходить з клусу / в галоп. В перебіжні трави* ("Холодна, синяво-полискова…") "In such a way the horse changes the trot / into gallop. Into temporary grasses" ("Cold, Shot with Blue…"); 15) syncretization of semantics in subordinate predicative parts: *Не гнівайся, коли тобі я мовлю / Синівськи чесно* ("Немало люблячих тебе, народе мій!") "Don't fly into a rage when I tell you / Filially honestly" (*There Are a Lot of Them Loving You, My Folk!*); 16) the repetition for the stressing and emphasis of a certain existential dimension: *Стежа крута. Стежа прокручена / через горби. Через любов. / Через нечемність і падучу / дарів, поборів і побоїв, / через світання орифлами, / через пітьму, хлипку і пугачну, / через червоно-бурі плями / болиголова у степу – / в блідавий приворотень дня, / в отруйний спів шорсткої дудки, / в іржання хижого коня, / туди, звідкіль не буде й чутки…* ("Літа. Між вас не раз я вивірюся…") "A steep path. A crooked path / over the hills. Across love. / Across discourtesy and fallen sickness / of gifts, taxes and beatings, / through dawns like a flag, / through darkness, weak and fearful, / through red-brown spots / of hemlock in the steppes – / into a pale beginning of the day, / into a poisonous singing of a rough flute, / into neighing of a wild horse, / there from where you will not be heard…" (*Years. I Verify You not Once…*).

Language existence of Vasyl Stus is determined by the understanding of human being as uniqueness, human personality as unique, self-sufficient and constant actualization of the possibility of stepping of one's own *ego* beyond the boundaries of being, perception of tragedy of the situation not as without dimension, irreversible, but as such which must and has to be changed. In Vasyl Stus's speech scope spirituality and greatness of spirit prevail, his own intentions are aimed at timelessness and beyondboundarity, unity of the present with the future, with the instruction of struggle and victory. The ascertainment of conceptosphere of artistic discourse of Vasyl Stus is especially perspective along with the tracing of regulations of its structuring and the ways of verbalization.

2.5. Psycholinguistic model of linguopersonality: categorical and level scope

The research of psycholinguistic model should be based on understanding of the processes of perception and understanding of the speech (Ch. Osggod, L. S. Tsvietkova and others), speech production (E. Bates, D. McNeill, T. V. Akhutina), and also language acquisition, regulations of the expression of psycholinguoindividuations and psycholinguoindividualizations, realization of speech-psychological intentions with tracing of their correlation with social-psychological criteria and so on. In psycholinguistics the problems of nominative aspects of speech, of tendencies and peculiarities of formation of speech skills in ontogenesis and phylogenesis and others were analyzed in section of the main stages of the development, the ascertainment of their loading in the process of language personality formation. The studies of different deviations from fixed processes of psycholinguoindividuations adjoin here. In the research of psycholinguistic model of linguopersonality the studying of the main factors of the realization of corresponding psycholinguistic instructions is significant. These instructions have social-discursive, verbal-psychological, communicative-intentional, situation-linguopsychologic and other factors.

Studying of psycholinguistic model of linguopersonality demands clear definition of notional-terminological apparatus of linguopersonology within which it is necessary to differentiate (I. A. Sternin and others) such levels as properly-communicative (communicative behaviour, communicative fact, communicative sign, communicative action and others), verbally-/nonverbally-communicative (*verbal communicative act, nonverbal communicative act* and so on), communicative-cognitive (*linguistic concept, language-mental substrate,* etc.), functional-pragmatic (*connotation, expressiveness* and so on), motivational-symbolic (*linguistic cultureme, intentionality, motivation-fatic and communicative-situational attitude, linguistic symbol* and so forth). It is mostly considered (V. P. Neroznak, Yu. Ye. Prokhorov and others) that M. S. Trubetskoy was the first who pointed out the necessity of singling linguopersonology out as a separate linguistic branch and asserted that personality is "not only a separate person but nation as well", though its sources rise from philosophic foundation of human personality as a philosophic person.

At the beginning of the XX century the problem of personalism was actively studied by M. O. Berdiaiev, L. I. Shestov, and the term itself was used for the first time by F. Schleiermacher (1799). In the investigations of F. Jacobi, A. Alcott, Ch. Renouvier, L. Prat the issue of personalism was tangentially studied. Later, linguists started to discuss ethical personalism (M. Scheler), critical personalism (V. L. Stern (the concept of intellectual coefficient)), personalism as a constituent of theological ethics (H. Thielicke), eschatological personalism (M. O. Berdiaiev, for whom it is obvious that individual is an indivisible part of natural world with subordination to its laws; personality is similarity to God). Personalistic tendencies in German philosophy became actualized with the analysis of aptitudes and skills of the individual, underlying spheres of individual life, and as a result "personality method" was analyzed as a universal means of human cognition. Today it is necessary to speak about psychological linguopersonalism.

In modern linguistics, linguopersonology belongs to actively developing tendencies. It is a science capable to answer the actual questions connected with the changes of linguistic portrait of the speaker in different periods of his life, to trace the dynamics of linguistic portrait of language ethnos in synchronic and diachronic dimensions (compare the dynamics of the creative personality of M. Kotsiubynsky (in the first elaborated Experimental-research corpus of writer's texts it is to trace psycholinguoindividuations and psycholinguoindividualizations motivated by discursive practices, social-corporative factors, situational-role instructions, etc. (http://52.28.184.95/bonito/)). All this confirms the topicality of ascertainment of categorical system of linguopersonology and its paradigm status in general and psychological linguopersonology in particular.

Thorough analysis of categorical and paradigm scope of linguopersonology contains in its foundation the determination of the system of its categories with consecutive disclosure of their hierarchy, functional loading of certain categories in communicative-discourse practices, what is seen as the aim of the research. The actualized aim foresees the clarification of the corresponding tasks: 1) to characterize the evolution of the views on linguopersonology; 2) to define its categorical system; 3) to establish the paradigm scope of linguopersonology; 4) to show levels of linguopersonology with consecutive disclosure of the peculiarities of the research on every of the levels.

Certain observations about the peculiarities of linguopsychologic personality, linguopsychologic portrait of the nation may be found in the works of W. Humdoldt, W. Wundt, O. Potebnja and other outstanding linguists of the end of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century. In the philosophy of this period the notion *personalism* appears, used for the first time by the founder of French neocriticism Ch. Renouvier (1903) in his work *Personalism*, clearly defined in the researches of E. Mounier in a so-called personal universe where seven levels of personality are really important: 1) incarnate existence; 2) communication; 3) intimate treatment; 4) confrontation; 5) freedom and necessity; 6) higher dignity; 7) engagement, which are gradually traced in language and speech realizations of the linguistic personality. The latter are correlated with two tendencies of creative language personality – depersonalization and personalization whose interaction determines the functional loading of personal universe. Human personality in its anthropological universality is determinative for personalism, because it is individual, unique and single. Personality becomes the only reality which motivates the necessity to differentiate individual and personality. The latter thought may be easily traced in the searches of existentialists who thoroughly depicted the hostility of society and personality. In his works, E. Mounier tried to show the main goal and objectives of personalism recognizing that the study which claims "the primacy of the human personality in terms of material needs and systems of collectivity" [Мунье 1994: 126] is personalistic. [Мунье 1994: 126]. Personality in personalistic interpretation comprises the unity of three characteristics: exteriorization, interiorization and transcendence. Exteriorization is expressed through the realization of personality outside, interiorization is expressed as their inner concentration, their own inner world. Being in active interaction and transcendent move, they are oriented on higher values – truth, beauty, good. That is why one of the main ideas in the understanding of a person is a thought about involved existence. Personalists specificate the awakening of the personal beginning in the individual, the expressions of personal communication. Such approach has something in common with ethical views of M. Scheler and phenomenologic ethics of E. Levinas, who developed the idea of dual character of personal communication, as every individual "has a goal in himself and at the same time for everybody", and the meeting of *I* and *You* in *We* creates special experience – the communication of souls which is

95

realized "on the other side of words and systems". For linguopersonalism, personalistic philosophy the interpretation of the notions *personality*, *creativity*, *communication*, *community*, *culture* is important, while for linguopersonology the interpretation of the corresponding notions *language personality*, *language creativity*, *language community*, *language culture* is important. For linguopersonology the following tendencies worked out in personalistic philosophy are also topical – social, ethical, relativistic, where the first tendency grounds the project of new civilization with personality and spiritual values dominating, the second one actualizes the significant questions of justice in human relations. Relativistic tendency is based on conditionality of any communication in which it is more implicated than explicated. Modern revival of E. Mounier's [1994; 1995; 1999] ideas testifies the necessity of studying of human personality in all their dimensions.

We can denote as perspective linguopsychopersonologic the studies of all levels of language personology and the ascertainment of the planes of the most active interaction of nuclear categories of the linguopersonology. The theory of language levels establishes the perspectives of studying of individual portraits of lexical, morphological, syntactic, word-forming language personalities, functional loading of the spelling principles as a unity of reflection and conditionality and punctuation – individual portraits of spelling, punctuation language personalities. The ascertainment of abilities of the native speakers with tracking of maximal / minimal inclination to variability – phonetic, phonologic, morphemic, semantic – is substantive for linguopersonologic descriptions.

Modern linguopersonology with its several levels from which verbal-semantic is the most researched, as well as partially communicative-motivational with the attempts to determine the typology of pragmatic intentions, the manifestation of different deviations, the directions of the realization of communications with their maximas and postulates, the observation of communicative strategies and tactics, cognitive one with consistent examination of certain conceptospheres, the ascertainment of correlation of cognitive depths with formal-superficial ones. Lately, the studies of linguodiscourse practices, ascertainment of their national-language specificity have become wide-spread.

EGO-TEXT LINGUISTICS: THEORETICAL OUTLINE ASPECTUAL APPROACHES TO THE PRIVATE LETTER ANALYSIS

T. Kosmeda

Modern linguistics is focused on the theory of linguopersonology, in particular, on its ability to generate and perceive texts, to realize itself in different types of discursive practice, to model its communicative space in the area of the corresponding lingual culture.

Text is a recognized object of linguistics and literary studies, cultural studies and philosophy, semiotics and semantics, history and psychology. Due to different approaches this concept is interpreted and classified in a number of ways.

Text is traditionally interpreted as an output of the process of the language creation, characterized by such features as completeness, intentionality, coherence and the presence of pragmatic positions. This is an objectified document, written and literally processed. It has a heading and functions of a supra-phrasal unity based on the connection of units of all language levels, primarily lexical, grammatical, and stylistic one.

However, the text (statement) is a unit of communication, "because an integral specific communication is realized only in the text, where communication becomes an informative act" [Колшанский 1984: 49]. The text correlates with the discourse which is defined by N. Arutyunova as a text immersed in life.

Varieties of speech activity in the whole are perceived as a system of discourses, which, depending on the purpose and tasks of communication, are carried out in various modifications, or, according to M. Bakhtin, in different lingual genres, cf.: "Each statement must be individual, but each sphere of the language usage produces relatively

stable types of such statements (texts − T. K.), which are called speech genres" [Бахтин 1996: 159]. Of course, in ego texts there is a system of lingual-literary and speech genres, typical of this type of speech, which are still insufficiently represented in the ego-texts theory. However, the very concept of *ego-text* today needs special academic consideration, since this term is not well-established. For example, V. Karasik uses the synonymic term *personal discourse* [see: Карасик 2000], Polish researchers supplement the latter with the terms *personal text*, *personal text document* [Jarosiński 1998], *ego-document* [Szulakiewicz: electronic resource], *discourse of privacy* [Kita 2013], *text about oneself* [Lubas-Bartoszyńska 2006].

3.1. Ego-text and its main genres
(diary, memoirs, autobiography, letter). General characteristics

Understanding the process of communication as a particular type of speech activity has expanded the limits of theoretical awareness of this lingual phenomenon, cf.: "The activity of members of society is a form of the society's existence, and at the same time, a source of motives for communication. Communicants are objects of mutual speech influence, and the goal of each is to prompt the interlocutor to a certain activity. Accordingly, communication is a form of mostly symbiotic interaction between communicants, in which their speech unfolds, subordinated to their communicative intentions. Thus, communication with respect to the text began to play the role of an interpretative system which determines the text itself" [Диалектика текста 1999: 23]. Agreeing in general with this statement, we would like to argue that auto-communication is a communication in the system I–I_1 (Yu. Lotman), the influence of *I on I_1*, i. e., a communicant has impact on himself, or *Alter Ego* affects its *Ego* [see: Космеда 2012]. However, undoubtedly, this type of communication determines corresponding texts, which fosters their new linguistic interpretation and classification.

Linguistics of the 21st century has recognized the importance of *ego-texts*, the study of which allows us to deeper understand the linguopersonality, its psychotype, and the nature of the personal lingual space, features of lingual creativity, way of speaking, communicative strategies and tactics, which manifest themselves in the creation of

personal, intimate or intimized texts. The analysis of these texts makes it possible to comprehend the concept of a *linguopersonality* more profoundly.

The success of communication, in particular during the creation of ego-texts, depends primarily on the linguistic competence of the participants of communication, on their communicative competence, also on the life experience of the linguopersonality, knowledge of the social interaction laws in a certain field, on socio-psychological competence of the linguopersonality, which is the basis of genre interpretation [Седов 2002: 42]. Without these positions, linguistic analysis of ego- texts will be incomplete.

If a written text is analysed not only as a result of the process of communication, but also as a reflection of a certain discourse (units of communication), the text seems a "lingual shape" of a discourse, which is organized according to the communicative priorities of a person in a certain area of social life, rules of speech behavior and knowledge of interaction methods, mediated by the types of life situations, social roles of the communicants, the degree and quality of their participation in communication, the level of their knowledge and culture. Everything mentioned above has a historical character, since it is determined by the general development of the society and all its rules and regulations. Thus, what was typical of the corresponding ego-text (discourse) in the past, could not always be its integral feature today.

Most obvious changes in the discourse are observed in the time of significant social and economic changes. On comparing ego-texts of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, one may notice that human values clearly have a slightly different scale now**.** "Wily" or "stilted" speech of the Soviet times (Y. Apresyan) has changed. Today there is no need to conceal, cipher one's own thoughts, use the Aesopian language, because prohibitions, taboos of all kinds and censorship have disappeared, the speech of society has been democratized and liberalized, the freedom of speech has been actualized. The abovementioned is consistent with the theoretical postulates of linguistics regarding the importance of the verbalized expression being actualized in the process of language functioning, while the opposition of *language* and *speech* can be traced on the basis of colloquial speech and real communication practice.

The use of lingual units in communication and in linguistics is called discursive, since in a particular statement (text) they do not only

transform their semantics and pragmatics, but also perform a variety of functions, ensuring the realization of the speaker's goals and creating a certain "territory", the space of interaction and mutual understanding of communicants.

The analysis of lingual forms used by authors of ego-texts results in assessing their communication as either false, focused on the achievement of egocentric purpose, or true, oriented on the real understanding, which represents a dialogue or a monologue [Rodak 2009]. This issue is so attractive for linguists now that a new linguistic direction, "linguistics of lies", is being formed on its basis.

The study of ego-texts requires modern methods of linguistics, aside from traditional ones, in particular, content analysis, intertextual and narratological analysis. The methods of discursive analysis contribute to: a) the explanation of the significance of the social reality phenomena; and b) the determination of the way in which this reality is constructed. To understand the discourse, it is necessary to put it in historical and social contexts [see: Іванов, Костенко 2003].

3.1.1. Formation of the concept of ego-text in modern linguistics. Its dependance on the psychological cathegories of Ego and Alter Ego

The concept of *ego-text* is not yet fixed in the dictionaries of linguistic terms. However, in academic literature, there are some works where this concept is gradually outlined. For example, the term "*I-text*" is defined in the dictionary of linguistic terms by A. Zahnitko briefly, but precisely, with the focus on its most characteristic features, cf .: "**I-text** (I + text) is a personal type of text, constructed from the 1st person singular or plural" [Загнітко 2012, 4: 184]. In the academic comprehensive explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language, the lexeme *I* in the function of the noun is used "to denote a person's awareness of one's own nature and of the world around", as well as in the terminological philosophical meaning – "to define the subject" [see: Словник української мови, 11, 1980: 618]. Despite its functioning in the colloquial speech, the word *ego* is not represented in this dictionary, as well as in Ukrainian dictionaries of linguistic terms.

What does Ego mean? This concept denotes the identity of the individual, that is, the way a person separates himself from others. *I* is the subject that is aware of one's own physical and mental state,

processes and actions, comprehends one's own identity and unity with the world, as well as with time and space of one's presence. Each person changes with time and his identity changes too. Compare Likhachiov`s statement: "When a person is born, his time is born too. In the childhood, it is young and flows youthfully − it seems fast at short distances and slow at large ones. At old age, time seems to stop. It is flabby. The past at old age is very close, especially childhood" [Лихачев 2017: 7]. This statement allows us to understand in what period of life and why people write such texts as diary and memoirs.

In psychology, *ego* is interpreted as *the inner self of a person*, a complex formation that reflects the totality of emotions, which are inherent in the personality, their mental expressions, reflections, which constantly interact and interwine in a peculiar way. In psychoanalysis, *Ego* is regarded as a part of the human personality whose work is directed at the corresponding world perception, worldview and world outlook. This is an expression of contact with the environment. *Ego* plans its activities, evaluates and memorizes everything, acquires experience, responds to the influence of physical and social environment. *Ego,* or *I-image*, is interpreted as a representation of oneself, a certain *psychological self-portrait* [Космеда 2012: 77].

K. Jung defines *Ego* as a *complex of mental factors* characterized by strong magnetism attracting the inside of the unconscious, about which virtually nothing is known; the impression from the outside that, when confronted with Ego, turns into a fact of consciousness. According to K. Jung, Ego is the most important complex of personality, which is always in the center of attention and the center of consciousness. Ego destruction leads to the destruction of personality.

In psychology the most widespread is the idea that *Ego is localized* in the mental and sensory informational space of an individual. This means that Ego is spread everywhere: both in and around the person, in thoughts of individuals, their feelings, emotions, and even the cyphered signs of the genus, gender assumptions and code. This all is human memory [see: Космеда 2012: 77; and also: Lejeune 2003].

Psychologists claim that our *Ego* has a dual nature. It is in constant "communication" with itself, but this is another *Ego (Alter Ego),* based on intuition, emotion and feelings of a person as an expression of his / her soul. Such communication is called inner speech. Inner speech is exclusively dialogic [see: Okulus 2009]. Our *Ego* and *Alter Ego* constantly make assessments, approve or condemn, often criticize, make

a negative assessment while a positive one is usually perceived as a norm. In the dialogue between *Ego* and *Alter Ego* we make verdicts, assess, make conclusions about what is good, what is bad, what we like and what we do not, we evaluate the environment what every mentally healthy personality does automatically. Inner speech can be verbalized graphically in ego-texts.

Today psychologists have worked out an appropriate definition of the concept *Alter Ego. Alter Ego* (translated from Latin as "the second (other) – I") is another person's essence, that is, another person within this person. Actualization of *Alter Ego* in a person makes the phenomenon of an individual completely change in the appropriate environment under the influence of relevant factors, a situation: all that is under the surface comes out, for example, a timid, modest, quiet person suddenly turns into someone aggressive, direct, too emotional. So, *Alter EGO* is a real or imaginary (made-up) alternative personality. It can be a narrator, an image which is encoded in a pseudonym, a figure, the Internet diaries agent, even a personality, which is formed as a result of a mental illness, a split personality [see: Космеда 2012]. O. Zabuzhko, for example, characterizes *Alter Ego* of Lesya Ukrainka as the heroine of her work, Cassandra [Забужко: 71], emphasizing that "… for Lesya Ukrainka, more precisely, for Larysa Petrivna Kosach, the riot began … with the first threshold (J. Kempel), and the departure from her socially-conventional status-bound "I" (or rather, Freud's Id) of a lady of birth and breed ("a noblewoman, a daughter of an acting state councilor")…" [Забужко 2007: 87]. O. Zabuzhko interprets the dialogue between *Ego* and *Alter Ego* as the opposition of *the Ukrainian poetry* ("Kobzar") and *Russian prose* by T. Shevchenko, emphasizing the "open duality of Russian prose in relation to Kobzar" [Забужко 2001: 93]. She is positive that the author of Russian stories is *Kobzar-Darmohrai*: "This is a mask which is worn by T. Shevchenko and at the same time is rejected by him "to echo and paraphrase the authentic Kobzar, a narrator of hsi Ukrainian poetry, into Russian lingual and cultural tradition". There is an obvious "element of the rivalry of the game" through which, as I. Heising proved, "poetry in the broad sense gestated in the spiritual ontogenesis of humanity, and this rivalry is not in favor of the Russian side. While Kobzar plays in earnest, his Russian-speaking *alter ego "plays in vain" ("darmo-hraye")*; he is apriotri "fake", like reflected light or a shadow. Shevchenko since his student years might have always felt

the spiritual rivalry with the Russian literature. Even a superficial content analysis of his letters from this angle reveals, for example, that when writing poetry in Russian, he was, most probably, motivated by his own, namely, vengeful persistence, so to speak, to beat the enemy on its territory. "Now Muscovites can`t say that I do not know their language", − Shevchenko realized that his motives were entirely impure and not blessed by God. The "two Kobzars" game, which started in Novopetrovs fortification was actually the ending of the long-term fight, only this time it was motivated not by hostility, but by love and mercy to the "poor Darmohrai" [Забужко 2001: 93–94]. O. Zabuzhko argues that Shevchenko's mind is a place of a Russian-Ukrainian dialogue within the framework of *the Kobzar − Kobzar Darmogray* dichotomy as a dialogue of cultures, which turns into a deep dialogue between his *Ego* and *Alter Ego.*

Obviously, a personality split into "positive" and "negative" components can be considered as a manifestation of a dual relationship to yourself. There is an ancient account of two human sides − positive and negative, constantly interacting. One of the basic laws of our being is the clash of opposites.

Ego language, as psychologists argue, is the activity of our uncontrolled brain, which continuously "talk", mostly condemn, criticize, assess, impose evaluation on everything within the scale *approved – disapproved, good – bad, satisfactory – unsatisfactory, useful – useless, beautiful – ugly* and so on, according to the theory of linguoaxiology [see: Космеда 2000].

Consequently, it can be argued that synonyms for the *Ego* in modern humanities are such terms as *self-consciousness*, *the sphere of personality*, *the human "I"*, *"I"*, *"I-image"*, *"psychological self-portrait"*, *"complex of mental factors"*, *"optical deception of consciousness"*, *"the false essence of* personality", *"twin"*.

Ego is an mental construct, containing the awareness of one's sex, body, feelings, thoughts. *Ego* contains relevant complexes, fears, beliefs, desires, awareness of belonging to a nationality, race, religion, society, profession, as well as the distribution of social roles − male-female, mother-father, husband-wife, son-daughter, etc. This construct includes all the experience, thoughts, likes and dislikes, memories, desires, etc, which are accumulated by the person.

Most consistently and directly ideas inherent in *Ego* can be seen in the inner speech, dialogue with *Alter Ego,* which can be partially reali-

zed externally in the form of *auto-communication*, a demonstration of human communicative types, made manifest, for example, in the process of keeping a diary. With this approach, the terms *Ego* and *Alter Ego* can be used to determine the situation of auto-communication, where *I* and I_1 are traditionally distinguished. These terms are borrowed from the paradigm of psychological, philosophical and literary knowledge to the linguistic knowledge paradigm and text linguistics.

So, *I and I1, Ego and Alter Ego* denote the activity of an individual in the process of auto-communication, more broadly – in the process of writing personal texts, i.e. ego-texts, when a person has an inner dialogue and records it, i.e. keeps a diary, writes autobiography, memoirs, letters. In fact, the dialogue between *Ego* and *Alter Ego* require additional study of the activities of famous scientists, writers, cultural figures, which will ensure better understanding of mentality, emotions, promotion of ideas of each individual, Ukrainian people or other peoples and nations.

Auto-communication has different varieties, for example, I–I_1 information may change with time (this is observed in memoirs and autobiographies) or be an instant reflection of personal events (diary genre). A syncretic type of auto-communication is also possible, when the information is transmitted from I to I_1 as a reflection of a specific fact or event which can evoke certain memories. Then the information from *I to I_1* or, using different terms, from *Ego* to *Alter Ego* moves in time. This syncretic type of auto-communication is observed in the Shevchenko's "Journal" [see: Космеда 2012].

Reflected in speech activity, *Ego* is realized in *apperception* [Kosmeda 2000]. According to A. Potebnia (see "Thought and language") and I. Franko (see "From the secrets of poetic creativity"), apperception is actualized at the level of consciousness and characterizes the personal level of the human world outlook; it reflects the dependence of perception on the past experience and attitudes of an individual, on his general mental activity and personal characteristics. In modern psychology, apperception is understood as a process in which new experience is assimilated and transformed under the influence of traces of the past [see: Golovin 1998]. *Apperception* is interpreted as a result of an individual's life experience, which shapes a conscious world outlook and depends on the worldview, beliefs, education, emotions, attitudes of each person. Most consistently it is expressed in *ego-texts* as an individual speech space.

A. Zahnitko defines linguistic terms derived from *ego*, cf.: "**Egotism** (French *Egotisme* from Latin *Ego* − I) is the habit of talking a lot about yourself in a conversation. It is evaluated as a violation of speech etiquette and gives the impression of lack of the speech culture" [Zahnitko 2012, 1: 242], but in the *ego -text* space we, obviously, do not consider such expression of *I* as a violation of speech etiquette; "**Egocentrism**" (lat. *ego* – I + *centrum* – center) **of new systems** – information about *who, when, where and to whom* transmits information in the process of a speech act" [Zahnitko 2012, 1: 243], in ego-texts, obviously, textual egocentrism is unavoidable; "**Egocentric speech** (Latin *ego* – I + *centrum* – center) − in **psycholinguistics** – is a child's speech addressed to himself in the process of performing a certain activity (the phenomenon is discovered by Jean Piaget). Egocentric speech performs the function of plan2ning one's own actions" [Загнітко 2012, 2: 243]. *Egocentered speech* is also typical of adults, especially women (gender specificity of their speech), because in order to calm down, gain confidence, a woman uses communicative tactics, verbalized in a speech genre of praise, projected onto herself. With this in mind, she speaks out loudly speech formulas of praise, for example: "I am so clever!", "I am the best!", "No one can do it better than me". A woman can say to herself after sneezing: "Bless you, dear. Do not fall ill!". And after an unpleasant conversation she can calm herself down: "Do not worry! This means nothing! You are still beautiful and unique!". In order to cheer up, a modern woman can say: "Look. What a day! So sunny! There is so much wonderful around us! Be happy!" etc. [see: Космеда 2017: 201–202]. The contemporary Russian psychologist A. Shatskaya describes such tactics of female speech behavior [see: Е. Шацкая 2007].

The term *ego-text* is further updated by the Russian linguist M. Mikheev, namely in his monograph "The Diary as an Ego-Text" [Михеев 2007]. In the preface, the scholar emphasizes that *ego-text* is (1) a text about oneself whose object is the circumstances of the author's life, and (2) the text, which is written from a subjective point of view, that is, from the point of view of egocentrism. According to the aforementioned author, both conditions set forth by him can be valid at the same time in different types of ego-texts.

Consequently, under *ego-text* we understand the text representing a personal, often intimate sphere of speech activity, in particular, the dialogue of an Ego-personality with his/her own Alter Ego or the con-

sequence of this dialogue; the ego-text represents both autoconfiguration and communication with the world; at the same time, this is a text about oneself, which is usually presented from the 1st person singular or plural; this is an egocentric speech, which, this way or another, focuses on the personality of the speaker, represents a subjective evaluation of the world in the context of its phenomenological existence in time and space and is based on personal experience and human memory.

Typical genres of *ego-texts* are diaries, memoirs, autobiography and letters, since in these speech genres the author's lingual consciousness is most consistently represented and accompanied by his / her feelings, emotions, intentions, intimate thoughts, hopes, dreams, assessments, characteristic features of speech, psychotype, character, etc.

Ego-text, like any other text, is a complex cluster of meanings, "the text in the text" (the term by Y. Lotman), since it combines everyday, colloquial speech along with professional, artistic, publicistic, philosophical and subcultural ones, highlights peculiar intertextuality, the phenomenon of the precedent and axiological paradigm. *Ego-texts* allow us to fully understand the inner world of a person, his / her worldview, outlook and world perception, and on this basis to outline a personal *"lingual biography"*, etc. [see doc.: Космеда 2015: 189–205].

According to the content, *ego-texts* represent a wide and diverse subjects, they reproduce a personal cognitive and individual lingual picture of the world at the background of cognitive and lingual pictures of the world of a certain era, in which the author of personal texts exists as a linguopersonality. *Ego-texts* describe how trifle events, situations and important everyday facts, as well as large-scale events, which a person experiences being a part of the society, are always marked with his / her subjective assessment, his / her own reflections on events, facts, personal destiny which is inseparable from the fate of the motherland, the state, the nation, humanity, reflection on one's own thoughts, disappointment, admiration, etc. *Ego-text* makes a linguopersonality to evaluate oneself, to look at oneself from the outside [see about it: Величко 2007], to objectively or subjectively characterize the facts, to express one's own thoughts, feelings and emotions, or in the case of epistolary discourse – to inform one's addressee (the category of intimization is actualized).

At present the concept of *ego-text* is expanding, in particular, the following discursive subtypes can be distinguished – *the artistic ego-text, publicistic ego-text, philosophical ego-text*, etc.

The Russian linguist S. Piskunova (Mitina) presents the term *philosophical ego-text* in the multidisciplinary analysis of this concept [see: Митина 2008; Пискунова 2012; Пискунова 2018]. According to the aforementioned scholar, *philosophical ego-text* is "a unique phenomenon of philosophical culture, a peculiar "alloy" of professional and unprofessional philosophizing in the autobiographical text, the synthesis of the genre architectonics of the "dry" scientific treatise and "confession" [Пискунова 2018: 19]. The specificity of *the philosophical ego-text* is motivated and manifested by its authors who are famous thinkers. S. Piskunova gives the following definition of the term *philosophical ego-text*: "reflexive constructing of the personality model in the process of philosophical perception, the analysis of one's own "I", based on personal experience, in the context of its phenomenological existence in culture" [Пискунова 2018: 19].

The analysis carried out in this section makes it possible to formulate a broad linguistic definition of the concept of *ego-text*: it is a personal text (discourse) constructed by the lingual and creative activity of an individual, which is created through the prism of one's own I, and is based on a dialogue (communication) with *Alter Ego*, (auto-communication – a diary, memoirs, autobiography), *Others* with simultaneous actualization of the *Alter Ego* and *one's memory* (correspondence) and is based on personal experience that has been formulated in the context of a certain culture at a certain time and in a certain space; it is an attempt of self-analysis (self-esteem, self-identification, self-identification, confession, and the like). *Ego-texts* focus on clarifying issues like: *Who am I? Why am I? What do I do? Who surrounds me? What are my virtues, achievements and drawbacks? What have I gained? What's done well and what's wrong? What are my plans? What interferes with me? How do I assess the world around? Who are my friends or who are the enemies?* and so on. Consequently, *ego text* is an attempt to understand oneself, to assess, to determine one's status in society, interpersonal relationship, etc., according to certain criteria (professional activity, social activity, moral features), gender, ethnicity, and national affiliation, spiritual qualities – a moral imperative (loyalty, betrayal, love, ideal, conscience, honor etc.) and others.

In *ego-texts* the following philosophical categories are actualized: self-awareness, self-identity, self-transcendence, self-knowledge, the linguophilosophical and linguopragmatic category of evaluation and the pragmalinguistic category of intimization.

The category of intimization attracts special attention of researchers in the Ukrainian linguistics in the late 20th – early 21st centuries. This is evidenced by a number of publications, in particular dissertations on this problem. Ukrainian linguists prefer to do the research on the material of English, French or Russian, using and elaborating the contrastive approach, which makes it possible to reveal interesting lingual (speech) facts of different lingual cultures. The research projected onto the Ukrainian literary text (discourse) and ego-text proves that Ukrainian has a perculiar arsenal of intimizing means.

The research of the category of intimization is carried out by such contemporary Ukrainian scholars as T. Anokhin, I. Horbach, S. Danylyuk, T. Dekshna, S. Denisova, M. Karpenko, A. Koroleva, A. Paliychuk, N. Futurist, A. Yaskevych etc., who have developed and deepened the description of the theory of the abovementioned universal lingual category and analyzed relevant discourse practices, which demonstrate peculiar modeling of intimization [see. about it: Анохіна 2006; Горбач 2015; Данилюк 2009; Декшна 2013; Денисова 1991; Карпенко 1983; Корольова 2002; Космеда 2006 (2), 2016; Палійчук 2009, 2011; Футурист 2011; Яскевич 1990].

Intimization, undoubtedly, should be associated with the problem of representation of a national character in a language. In view of the abovementioned, it is appropriate to quote D. Likhachev who in his work "Notes on Russian", argues that foreigners are always surprised by Russians addressing strangers as relatives. The same phenomenon is observed in the Ukrainian language. This is, of course, an expression of friendly attitude towards strangers, which is a demonstration of intimization. However, such a lingual approach can only be understood by the speaker whose culturological views are close to the mentality of a particular nation.

Thus, the intimized text is bound to contain a nationally-marked system of intimized appellations (primarily, in the epistolary), motivated by a respective linguoculture. It should be born in mind by every communicant, the author of the text, the creator of the discourse; it should seen and felt by the recipient / reader who perceives the text. This phenomenon promotes mutual understanding as a obligatiry factor of modeling intimization, which is primarily considered as a text (discursive) category, a category of ego-texts.

Essential for understanding the process of intimization are the notions of lingual and communicative competence, communicative be-

havior, communicative and pragmatic norm, manifested in the process of communication, modelled in the text (discourse), and, most distinctly, in ego-text.

It is proved that intimization is consistently traced on the background of the dichotomy *us − them*, since the orientation on *us* is the basis of modeling strategies and tactics of intimization. This category contradicts the philosophical category of *alienation*, which neutralizes intimization, and eliminates it.

As an alternative, most frequently associated with the category of intimization is the linguophilosophical category of *partnership*, which is the essential factor in the modeling process of intimization: primarily, it creates conditions, which make the speaker search for the lasting interest in a text (discourse) and realize in the text (discourse) such strategies and tactics of speech which motivate the corresponding intuitive attitude towards the text (discursive) space. This may be a reference to experience through relevant associations as well as comparison, associations, colloquial forms, speech constructions which are modeled either intentionally or occasionally.

Let us project the abovementioned statement onto the type of national linguopersonality, i.e. partners of verbalized events who are conceived in the subtext discursive space and perceive the proposed discourse, because their world outlooks and world perceptions are identical.

The term *intimization* in modern linguistics is far from being uniform, as it is applied to such linguistic concepts as *communicative form, communicative method, communicative device* (H. Pocheptsov) *means of expressing an individual* (R. Jakobson), *intimizing tactics of communication* (N. Badayev), *speech patitive means* (I. Bilodid), *speech signals of the author's image* (V. Vinogradov, M. Brander), *implicit lyricism* (T. Bulygina), *implicit publicism*(A. Shvets), *author's address* (N. Arutyunova, V. Pestunova O. Vorobyova), *dialogical signals* (N. Sulymenko), *subject-addressee relationship* (T. Radziyevska), *artistic interaction* (T. van Dijk, N. Bolotnov, Y. Kristeva, G. Balmer, V. Brenenstuhl, I. Arnold, Z. Hetman), etc., which, however, do nothing but reflect different approaches to understanding the author's narrative manner. The above terms do not contradict each other, but only point to various aspects of the process of intimization, the specificity of its modeling, indicate the complexity of the phenomenon. Thus, the use of these terms in scientific discourse is motivated by relevant research objectives and

approaches. Let us emphasize that, actually, the term *intimization* was used in the Ukrainian linguistics in the middle of 20th century by L. Bulakhovskyi.

Thus, the category of *intimization* is a universal linguistic notion, the study of which enables us to characterize individually-authored models, formulas of intimization, which are found in the structure of the corresponding communicative space, especially its text, as well as national, specific models, which are characteristic of each lingual culture. in general. However, this category, undoubtedly, has the additional status of linguophilosophical, psychological, aesthetic, linguo-cultural, linguostylistic, linguopragmatic, communicative, structural and functional-semantic one, which requires a relevant study with corresponding research perspectives actualized.

The concept of *intimization* as a universal language phenomenon is known to have appeared under the influence of general cultural and linguistic ideas of M. Bakhtin, L. Bulakhovskyi, D. Likhachev, and J. Lotman [see about this: Бахтин 1963; Булаховский 1977; Лихачев 2014; Лотман 1992].

The concept of intimization is considered in the "Encyclopedic Dictionary of Culture of the 20th century" by V. Rudnev, where the philosophical aspect of the perception of this phenomenon is emphasized, cf.: "Intimization is a philosophical theory of the process of information perception, which represents the recipient and the source of information as completely different types of consciousness according to mentality and outer world perception. […] Knowledge of another person is intimized when the other in the eyes of the recipient of the information "is raised above average", that is, it becomes not a faceless source, but its equivalent producer […], when the other becomes not like "others", when we value not only his / her own assessment of the other person, but also his / her assessment of himself / herself and other things and objects that in this case seem to be personified and receive the status of "eventfulness".

The author of the abovementioned concept, the St.-Petersburg-based researcher Boris Shifrin, writes on this subject: "Intimization is a transformation of the world when its general uniformity for everyone is questioned. Just as a certain mass distorts the space and in its own way changes its geometry, so the presence of another person with his / her own attitude to life must transform the world so that there is a sense of expansion, when it becomes unclear who is the sub-

ject of comprehending this new being, who is the instrument of this comprehension, and who is that being" [Shifrin 1989] (just as it happens in a myth). In other words, as in the quantum philosophy of Werner Heisenberg, the presence of the observer in the experiment affects the experiment, so when another person appears in one's active life, this "consciousness of the other", shifts the process of information consumption, which now will take into account this new manifestation of consciousness in order to actively influence it and be subject to its influence. The process of intimization always involves "three agents": the consciousness which perceives a deobjectivized object of perception and its subject, which is something third; it could be enjoying a flower, reading a book, looking at a window − something different from what the first consciousness sees. What is being obserbed typically remains unknown, it only provides some mystical signals that something else is likely to happen with this other consciousness, perhaps something extremely important. Participation in this important other is the intimization […] Intimization transforms […] the thing into an event. Therefore, intimization is opposed to *alienation* […], which, on the contrary, transforms an event into a thing. Man can not always be in the situation of intimization, otherwise s/he would lose his / her mind […]. Intimization and her opposite mechanism − objectification − are two mechanisms that regulate the scale of values in human existence and cultural self-knowledge" [Руднев 2001: 153–161].

In the perspective of the above theory, the most important prerequisite for intimization is the understanding, participation of the speakers, and, more broadly, successful communication. Hence, successful modeling of intimate communication is the key to its success.

The concept of intimization is closely linked with the theory of M. Bakhtin on the polyphony of literary text. The scholar offers the term *dialogical word*, arguing that dialogical approach can be projected even onto the perception of a single word, if we accept this token as a sign of someone else's position while other people's opinions are "voices of *them*" because dialogical communication can occur even in a single word which can be seen as an implicit or collapsed dialogue.

The idea of the dialogue is well projected onto the theory of intimization, because speech becomes intimate only on condition of a successful dialogue in the discursive space, in particular in the space of its text.

In the Ukrainian linguistic reference literature, in particular, in the article from the Encyclopedia "The Ukrainian Language" by S. Yermolenko it is emphasized that: "Intimization of speech (from Latin intimus – the deepest, internal) is a mixture of language means and receptions, transmitting the mood of the speaker, taking the author closer to reader as an interlocutor. Intimization of speech covers units of all language levels. Means of intimization are particles, pronouns, forms of endearment, different types of appeal, certain syntactic structures, for example, nominative representation. Main sources of intimization of speech are colloquial and folk-poetic. According to L. Bulakhovs'kyi, means of speech intimization single out the Ukrainian language among other Slavic languages. The structures of intimization have produced a variety of lingual-lyrical hybrids, such as lyrical-intimate, elegiac-solemn, epic-narrative, humorous, etc. Means of intimization are characteristic of the poetry by T. Shevchenko […] Appellations to readers and rhythmic and intonational structures of communication also subjectivize the artistic narrative. A characteristic example of speech intimization is the lead of the novel "The Swan Flock" by V. Zemlyak. Speech intimization techniques are used in the artistic style, in science fiction and in the oratory. They brighten up the style of an individual" [Українська мова 2004: 210].

This information relies on one of the most recent, thorough and authoritative Ukrainian dictionaries of linguistic terms – "Dictionary of Modern Linguistics: Concepts and Terms" compiled by A. Zahnitko. The author's contention [see: Космеда 2014] is that intimization is created by "lingual means and devicess, which transmit the mood of the speaker, bring the author closer to the reader as an interlocutor". It is also emphasized that this category is aesthetic and communicative: it is "a stylistic device in the artistic speech, when the author seeks to establish a closer communicative contact with the reader, makes him an interlocutor, appeals to him, explaining his convictions, thoughts and inviting him to follow the narrative […] She activates the narrative, description or experience, activates the reader's positive attitude to the personality of the author and to what he writes" [Загнітко 2012]. Intimization is also interpreted as a "code of individual manners" and, simultaneously, as a "stylistic device though which the author encodes the artistic information with the aesthetic intention to reproduce the effect of emotional and intellectual communication" [Корольова 2002: 9].

A. Paliychuk focuses his attention on the understanding of intimization as a "vector" within the speech behavior of a particular author, which "is realized in the choice of a system of stage-structured speech activities of addressees which lead to the reduction of the narrative distance", the relevant communicative strategy. It is emphasized that "intimization is the author's communicative strategy which creates the effect of closeness, friendship and direct emotional and intellectual communication between the author and the reader. Realized in the artistic narrative with a number of communicative tactics, intimization also helps to model oral conversation in the text and causes the illusion of reality, the synchrony of artistic communication" [see: Палійчук 2011: 132]. All the aforementioned is transparently projected onto the author's ego-texts.

The system of figurative means of verbalizing the category of intimization includes, firstly, those that bring the referent closer; and secondly, those that can appeal to the receiver who can share thoughts, feelings and emotions with the author. These stylistic devices allow us to enter the circle of mood, thoughts, intentions of the author of the text, and its receiver as if they both were a part of the live communication process [see about it: Космеда 2012; Космеда 2015; Космеда 2016].

Researchers rightly point out that during the modeling of intimization, not only verbal but also nonverbal (more broadly – paraverbal), in particular, graphic signs, play an important role, since the verbal text is primarily a graphically fixed language. A. Levchuk convincingly proves that the influence of the means of textual graphic design on the implementation of the communicative strategy of modeling of intimization, creates the effect of the reader's presence in the discourse [see: Левчук 2015].

Among the types of ego-texts one can distinguish so-called visual ego-texts. To outline this type of text, graphic modeling should be taken into account, as well as the structure of the verbal text, that is, graphic division, the usage of the system of fonts, illustrations and other visual material. The author of this visual ego-text tries to present it so that it is better perceived by the target reader and, consequently, contributes to better understanding.

Authors often use traditional means of punctuation or their repetition to transfer additional pragmatic meaning. Basic graphic tech-

niques are not independent and only enhance the means of intimization, such as rhetorical questions and statements, and so on. They pronounilize elliptic sentences, the author's comments, etc.

Ukrainian linguistics of today studies the perception of letters, types of alphabets, in particular Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, by representatives of various linguocultures. So-called "alphabet wars" have long-term tradition in Ukraine, namely, the struggle for the Cyrillic type led the refusal to replace it by Latin, namely its Czech variant. Recently it has been unequivocally proved that Latin cannot reproduce the phonetic specificity of the Ukrainian language [Космеда 2011; 2006 (1)], L. Sobol' [Соболь 2012 (1); 2012 (2)]. The aforementioned scholars as well as some others based their conclusions on the ideas of renowned Ukrainian linguists, such as I. Franko, M. Shashkevych and V. Simovych.

Thus, intimization is, first of all, an effective method of convergence in the space of ego-text, the understanding of communicants in the discursive environment of the corresponding type of communication. It implies constructing models of strategies and tactics of this convergence, setting up a positive dialogue, creating the effect of sincerity, frank conversation, partnership, mutual understanding, respect, friendly relationships or love, which can be achieved by a wide system of stylistic means and devices used to verbalize the concepts *close, native, their own, understandable, necessary, beautiful, positive*, units of all language levels, starting from sounds and ending with syntactic text units and non-verbal signs. They are used to achieve the pragmatic effect of kinship, friendship, kind attitude and so on.

Thus, lingual means of modeling intimization and its markers are the system of phonetic, lexical, phraseological, morphological, syntactic and stylistic units, as well as corresponding graphic signs (graphemes, paragraph charts). Obviously, in the system of ego-texts it is possible to distinguish the micro-system of intimate texts.

3.1.2. Main genres of ego-text or types of personal texts

The functional load of ego-texts is very broad, since these texts inform, reflect personal thoughts, accumulate individual experience, represent criticism, evaluate, perform correlation function, that is, the interaction of an individual with other people in society, the function

of confession (consecration of conscience), emotional, expressive, impressive or appellative functions, and also a culturological one, which implies lingualization of the outer and inner world of a person.

Ego-texts (personal texts) can be represented by such basic lingual genres as *diary, memoirs, autobiography, letter*, where *Ego* is actualized and described in different ways.

The **diary** has the following widespread interpretation: "1. Daily records of an individual narrator about events, facts, impressions from something, etc.; a notebook for such events; 2. Daily records of scientific observations during expeditions, studies, etc.; records of events, travel, work, etc." [Словник української мови, 11, 1980: 602]. However, this understanding is too generalized. In the Ukrainian linguistic space **the diary genre** was activated long ago when the discursive practice of Ukrainians generated *the prayer and confessional discourse*, which dates back to the time of Kyiv Rus, when the *philosophy of hesychasm* was broadly and actively used, the "*philosophy of the heart*", which characterises the Ukrainian national discourse was formed, *cardiocentrism*, which had a vivid manifestation in the literature of the era of pre-romanticiam, romanticism and sentimentalism (late 17th–19th centuries). The prevalence and relevance of the diary genre can be traced both in the 20th and early 21st century, although this genre is being modernized, with its syncretic varieties emerging, in particular, in the Internet communicative space.

As a genre, the diary is a monographic type of speech, which is intrinsically dialogical, though other people's thoughts can be taken into account [see about it too: Galant 2010; Lejeune 2010].

In the inner dialogical speech, the author of the diary disputes either with himself (auto-communication), or with an imaginary opponent (pseudo-communication), thus we have a kind of communicative activity "I" (*Ego*) and "I1" (*Alter Ego*) [see: Foltyniak 2004]. This feature is made manifest irrespective of whether the diary belongs to fiction, non-fiction, or private (semi-private) genre variety.

Thus, a *diary* is a type of a personal text, namely, a type of ego-text, which is a product of the diary activity (the term of T. Radziyevska), carried out as a result of an intimized individual (private, semi-private) or official (governmental) activity, informative factual guidance, unregulated or partially regulated (official diary) activity.

Man aspires to attract attention. Diaries realize this function in the modern society, though it is transformed into linguoattractive. In

addition, the diary performs a linguosynergic function as it an instrument of self-development of an individual [see: Космеда 2012].

A. Zahnitko provides the following definition of the diary from the point of view of communicative linguistics: "**The diary − in communicative linguistics** − is one of the speech communication genres. The diary notes are texts of the addressed spoken language, therefore, they have all stylistic features of texts conditioned by the multifactor pragmatic space. The recipient of the texts is Alter-ego, the supersubject, "the highest instance of the answer understood" (in the terminology of M. Bakhtin), which helps the author (or the narrator) express his / her thoughts, feelings and doubts. This pragmatic factor forces the author of the diary to verify the accuracy of expressions, use synonyms, concretisors, use such syntactic techniques as gradation, rhetorical questions, parenthesis, which are signals of the author's reflection; […] Diary stylistics is conditioned by all the sides of the individual (I-intellectual, I-emotional, I-spiritual etc.); depending on the dominance of one or another principle, the character of the expression changes. Diary notes are subdivided into two large groups. In the first group there are diaries where the author describes his / her day as a chronotop. It can be a translation, summary, reflection, analysis of feelings and thoughts, plans, etc. Another kind (these can be written irregularly) – is a "conversation" about oneself in time, the "stream of consciousness" with the associative sub-themes of the "main" impressions of the day. Diaries of people engaged in the creative work, represent a laboratory of creative searches and differ a little from "notebooks" and "workbooks" of prose writers and poets" [Загнітко 2012, 4: 180–181]. Thus, the theory of ego-text and the concept of a diary need some clarification.

Memoirs (memories) are interpreted as a literary text in the form of notes, written from the first person − a participant or witness of some events [Словник української мови, 4, 1973: 671]. When writing memoirs, the category of memory is updated. Linguists suggest considering *memory as an interlocutor* in the focus of the dialogue with *Alter Ego*, "*the other I*" (*I1*), representing the past (*I-the past*). Such a dialogue is qualified by N. Bragina as a dialogue with one's own soul [Брагина 2007: 90]. The researcher emphasizes that memory in this case has a voice and is able to speak and enter the *dialogue with one's soul*, trying to influence his views and position: *to assert, persuade, to say something, to answer questions, to doubt, to be a witness, a judge,*

a counselor, memory can enter into a dispute with Ego [Брагина 2007: 90–93]. N. Bragina concludes that "psychophysical properties of memory in the language are transmitted by means of speech metaphors, which "split" the "I"of a person into two participants in the dialogue: *the speaker and the listener*. The former represents the past while the latter represents the present. Communication is verbal. The contradiction between the topical present and the past perfect can be personified and expressed in the language through the cooperation of the person's "I" with his /her personal memory" [Брагина 2007: p. 93].

Memory belongs to the interdisciplinary concepts, because it manifests itself in various forms at all levels of life. Memory includes not only the processes of preserving the individual experience, but also mechanisms of transformation of hereditary information [see: Kaźmierska 2008; Tyrowicz 1988]. In psychology it is interpreted as a cognitive process, a process of memorizing, organizing, preserving, updating and forgetting acquired experience, which enable it to be reused in a future activity or returned to the realm of consciousness. Memory relates the past of the subject with its present and future and is an important cognitive function underlying development and learning. Personality (her skills, habits, hopes, desires and thoughts) exist due to memory: the collapse of memory is equivalent to the collapse of an individual. In a psychological analysis of memory it is important to consider that it is part of the integral structure of the human person. Depending on how the motivational sphere develops, caused by the needs of a person, his / her attitude to his past may change, which leads to one and the same knowledge may vary in the memory of the individual. In memory, three interrelated processes are singled out: memorization, conservation and reproduction. According to the material which is stored in memory, the latter can be divided into *cognitive, emotional and personal*. According to the modality of stored images, memory is verbally logical and figurative. Typically, the level of development of these types of memory is uneven, so it can be argued that a certain type of memory may prevail, as it is fixed in texts produced by this individual. Among the characteristic features of memory are: memory speed, volume memorized, speed of forgetting, duration of preservation, accuracy. According to the classification proposed by E. Tulving, the memory includes three types on the basis of durability: *procedural* (relationships between stimuli and reactions are maintained – reflexes, skills, etc.), *semantic* (stored systymic

knowledge about symbols and their meanings, interaction between them and rules of manipulating them), *episodic* (information about the integrity of events of an autobiographical nature and the relationship between them is preserved) [Головин 1998]. The nature of the verbal presentation is bound to depend on the actualization of a specific type of memory.

The *emotional memory*, the preservation of emotions and feelings in mind is of great importance. Vulnerability and receptiveness are pre-requisites for the formation of communicative features of the charac-ter. Emotional memory is a precondition for sympathy. It is the basis of skill for representatives of some professions, in particular for tea-chers and actors. Its absence inhibits the expression of emotion [Головин 1998]. Emotional memory is represented as a formulation of emotional concepts.

Thus, obviously, the semantics and pragmatics of ego-texts, based on the special need to actualize memory, depends on the fact that it has psychological characteristics of a linguopersonality in question.

Autobiography is a subgenre of biography; a text describing the life of a narrator and its specificity, *Ego* information about the *ego* it-self. Main features of the biographical text include its correlation with general human values and their actual parameters represented in time [see: Шампшин 1998; Mitosek 2002]. Autobiographical genres include business (has a certain pattern of presentation), scientific, popular, belletristic, artistic, philosophical and other subgenres. The multidimensional description of autobiographical texts is actively carried out by Polish researchers [see: Autobiographism 2011; Bzdawka 2002; Czermińskia 2000; Czermińska 2011]. An interesting aspect is viewed by D. Demetrio, since it refers to the "therapeutic dimension of self-writing", that is, the "confessional character" of an autobiography [Demetrio 2000], as mentioned earlier in the section on the diary discourse. S. Dubrovsky also points out the function of self-examination in the autobiography [Dubrovsky 2007].

S. Piskunova enlarges on the difference that arises between the *ar-tistic genre of autobiography* and *philosophical autobiography* [Пискунова 2018]. Firstly, the period of the life of an individual is shown against the background of his / her historical time, i.e. the author describes not only a concrete event, but also provides a detailed commentary on it. Secondly, an attempt at philosophical comprehension of oneself and one's place in the world is made. Thirdly, complex themes of

perception of the personality of the *Other* are actualized and the assessment of its contribution to human life, culture and memory of generations is carried out. Fourthly, the philosophical reading is determined in the preface: such text is targeted at the prepared reader, because it discusses philosophical problems. It seems that the most important factor is the last one, because if the biography is written by prominent thinkers, it is obviously logical that the review will be philosophical, since it is related with the author's activity. Therefore, the most important factor in determining the type of ego-text is the status of a linguopersonality – the author of the *ego-text* (creative personality – a writer, artist, sculptor, philosopher, publicist, etc., a well-known personality or the average linguopersonality). If the narrator is a writer, the *ego-text* will be artistic, if s/he is a philosopher, it is philosophic, if he is a journalist, the ego-text is bound to be journalistic, but if the narrator is an ordinary linguopersonality, the autobiography will correspond to the canons of the classical genre of autobiography as a sample of official or colloquial style.

It is worth reminding that the spiritual depth of Christianity has opened a powerful cultural tradition in the modeling of *ego-text* – that is autobiography-confession (Augustine, Abelard, Casanova, Russo, Goethe, etc.). The Renaissance is represented by the painters' writings (J. Vasari), while M. Cervantes and W. Shakespeare made the individual destiny of a man and his inner world the main categories of their narratives. The Age of Enlightenment is distinguished by the convergence of biographical literature with historical documents (Voltaire). During this period, the first biographical dictionaries came out. The era of romanticism is connected with the need for every historically or culturally significant person to have a biography. The biography as a field of study was launched based on autobiographies of prominent personalities. In the 20th century the interest in the genre of biography only increased. The study of biography which is derivative of ego-text, was done by S. Averintsev [Аверинцев 1973], O. Valevsky [Валевский 1993], G. Vinokur [Винокур 1927], and others.

Thus, the prospect of studying ego-texts implies the study of texts based on memories, memoirs, autobiographies, letters, diaries, that is, on secondary ego-texts, as they are outlined in the academic writings, in particular in Polish [see: Lubas-Bartoszyńska 1983].

The letter is traditionally understood as "written text intended to inform about something, to communicate with someone at a distance,

as well as the postal correspondence" [Словник української мови, IV: 491]. This is an ego-text that has a number of subtypes depending on the purpose of the epistolary activity and the type of linguopersonality − the creator of the episteme. It is worth focusing on the main features of this genre stylistic potential.

3.2. The genre of the letter. The discursive (stylistic) potential of the epistolary. The state of study of the problem

Letter is an old version of written messages exchanged by addressees and deprived of direct contact and direct communication. Ancient Slavs wrote letters, including intimate, love and friendly letters, letters from relatives, and business letters, on the crust of birches.

For a long time letters provided a unique chance to communicate through long distances. The letter was seen as a conversation recorded in all its varieties. The skill of writing letters was highly appreciated, since important historical events, events of private life, and so on depended on the originality, accuracy and clarity of the presentation.

Today, we observe a decrease in the popularity of private correspondence, especially intimate one: letters to family and friends are less popular, as well as correspondence on holidays, anniversaries and other personal events. Business letters, which belong to the sphere of official correspondence, though used, are subject to updating and style simplification.

Today it is commonly believed that the epistolary genre is dying, as there is an expansion of functions of oral speech, instantaneous dialogues are possible at a distance: telephone conversations, conversations on Skype etc. An electronic network, mobile communication, telefax, fax-modem make it possible to instantly share the information. Short messages are sent as spam while longer e-mails differ by type, form, purpose, etc.: letters-greetings, e-mail-greetings, and telegrams. Consequently, the possibilities of forms and means of correspondence are modified.

Business and private letters are distinguished primarily by their purpose and motives of correspondence, the epistolary language formulas, the use of linguostylistic means, "flowers" corresponding to the field of correspondence, which are bookish and conventional in business letters and colloquial in private ones, logical composition of

the text: rigid in official and loose in private letters including forms of address, signatures, etc.

The epistolary genre is interpreted as a subgenre of ego-text, which a linguopersonality targets at his / her addressee. If this addressee is the addresser's near and dear (a representative of a family or a friend, associate, beloved), the category of intimization is specifically verbalized with view of speech peculiarities of each individual linguopersonality or the corresponding lingual community − national, sociocultural, etc.

Private letters are represented by a wide range of verbal forms of establishing contact, support and termination of contacts, which are determined by the nature of the correspondents' interpersonal relationship, their mood, the subject of the message and other factors.

Private letters are traditionally classified with regard to the motives and goals of their creation, namely *greetings, sympathy, regret, reproach, justification, forgiveness, acceptance, compliment, request, advice, suggestion, gratitude, rejection, criticism, farewell*, etc. They may be distinguished according to the system of speech genres which are described in detail in linguistics, as already mentioned (see: M. Bakhtin, M. Fedosyuk, T. Shmelev et al.). These genres are rarely pure, they are hybryds. Basically, letters are texts combining several genres syncretically. According to the general tone, satirical, ironic, humorous letters, moral and didactic instructions, bullying letters, letter of motivation and so on are distinguished.

The analysis of correspondence gave birth to the term *lingual formula*. The lingual formula is a set phrase, a stereotyped expression which correlates with the purpose of the letter. A set of language formulas is quite broad. The addressers can use the system of these expressions and choose them according to their preferences and tastes, taking into account interpersonal relations with their addressees.

In the Ukrainian discursive practice letters of elite Ukrainian linguopersonalities provide vivid examples of national lingual formulas of the epistolary genre.

Private letter is a typical ego-text. The private correspondence of writers has always attracted particular attention, since letters have a great creative potential. Given the growing interest in human mental life, letters became an important research material, because they contribute to better understanding of the psyche of the creative person.

Epistolary style (discourse) has an established research tradition in the Ukrainian linguistics, in particular S. Bohdan describes idiostyles of elite Ukrainian linguopersonalities, giving account of their "epistolary behavior. The researcher argues that the epistolary legacy is undoubtedly one of the most important sources which makes it possible to reconstruct self-portraits of the addressers, stereotypes of their lingual behavior and, to a certain extent, to model the paradigm of lingual communication, its dominant features and the specificity of interpersonal relationships between well-known Ukrainians of the past. It is clear that the integral portrait of a person and the lingual paradigm of his / her representation is unlikely to be reproduced under conditions of an incomplete corpus of the epistolary, although it is still possible to learn general (and determinant) trends of such communication [Богдан 2013: 4].

The reference book "Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia" advises against distinguishing the epistolary style, since its" differential features … overlap with the signs of more generalized functional styles (official, publicist, colloquial) [Українська мова 2000: 603]. This opinion is supported by other researchers, for example, S. Antonenko, who emphasizes that the style of letters correlates with the colloquial style through the actualization of colloquial vocabulary, phraseology and colloquial syntax. In letters, the same as in other ego-texts, professional artistic features of speech are revealed, for example, variations in the structuring of the text and in the use of lingual means. This results in hybrid style speech, as the private informal correspondence of the writer approaches the colloquial, publicistic and artistic styles, while the private official correspondence move closer to the official one [Антоненко 2000: 19]. This contention seems quite objective, especially with respect to private letters, the main purpose of which is to inform, describe certain private problems, discuss daily life. Therefore, it is logical for some linguists, in particular S. Gindin [Гиндин 1989], V. Nayer [Наер 1987], T. Radziyevska [Радзієвська 1998], to believe that *epistolary speech is an inter-style phenomenon* that exists within or is based on the current system of functional styles. We agree with V. Nayer, that the epistolary form of written speech is present in all speech styles [Наер 1987: 45]. According to the scholar, epistolary texts in the linguistic plane meet the requirements of these styles, and structurally and compositionallly retain this peculiar form. Consequently, episteme are beyond any functional style, they gene-

rally conform to an invariant compositional model and are combined in a single form of speech variety, which is a specific feature of the epistolary genre. T. Zabolotna also claims that separate letters are integral parts of various functional styles, and each correspondence updates several styles of speech at once [Заболотна 2005: 13]. Among the characteristic stylistic features of the epistolary genre are the following:

(a) the use of appellations in a vocative (often intimizing) form;

(b) the presence of traditional initial and final formula;

(c) the use of various wishes, greetings, etc.;

(d) seamless selection of linguistic means;

(e) spontaneity in expressing emotions;

(f) the use of vocabulary and grammatical constructions inherent in oral colloquial speech [Українська мова 2000: 160].

To this list we may add the fluency of speech, its situationality, and also the spontaneity of communication [see: Мазоха 2007]. The letter is characterized by lingual specificity, which lies in impossibility to unambiguously define its style because communicants belong to different social strata, have different social status, write letters in different circumstances. Therefore, letters are distinguished by the form of communication, which depends on the communicative intention and the reasons that motivate the need for epistolary communication. The abovementioned specific properties of the epistome determine the genre diversity of the epistolary. V. Kuz'menko also emphasizes that some forms of correspondence are an integral part of various functional styles, and "the tissue of each letter is woven of several language styles. Consequently, the term "epistolary style" is acceptable only on the condition of interpreting the complex of different styles as an inseparable whole" [Кузьменко 1999]. Consequently, *the assumption of the polystyle principle* of writing letters is made. Authors of letters as ego-texts, especially those who are artists with their own individual style, creatively break epistolary conventions [see: Мазоха 2007].

In Polish linguistics, the episteme is studied from the angle of the specificity of the text structure, its communicative an stylistic properties, the varieties of speech genres [see, for example: Data 1989; Kałkowska 1982; Trzynadlowski 1977; Zaśko-Zielińska 2013] and others.

Ego-texts, in particular letters, are researched by Russian linguists developing certain theoretical aspects. For example, A. Akishyna ana-

lyses epistolary discourse in general, the style of the letter and the manifestation of etiquette formulas in it [Акишина 1981; Акишина 1982a; Акишина 1982b], the subgenre of business letters is outlined by N. Formanovskaya [Формановская 1988]. Of special interest is the research on negative and positive politeness actualized in letters [see: Kastler 2004]. Some issues of pragmatics and semantics of epistolary speech genres are described by O. Vinogradova [Виноградова 2005]. The generalized issue of the epistolary idiostyle in the Russian linguistics is made by L. Glinkina [Глинкина 1995]. A. Belova [Белова 2005] and A. Kuryanovich [Kuryanovich 2001] study correspondence as a special type of communication, the latter discussing the verbalization of *self-presentation category* in letters [Kuryanovich 2006] and *the graphic image of the episteme* [Курьянович 2012], as well as the specificity of the e-mail genre [Курьянович 2008] and linguopersonality of the scientist, expressed in the correspondence of V. Vernadskyi [Курьянович 2010] The findings on the study of epistolary in modern linguistics are summed up in the monograph [Курьянович 2013]. P. Veselov outlines the status of the business letter [Веселов 1990; Веселов 1993] while A. Karasev elucidates the genre status of the open letter [Карасев 1962]. O. Biletska substantiates the inter-style nature of the epistle [Билецкая 1995]. The category of the addressee, including the one actualized in letters, is thoroughly described by N. Arutyunova in her research, which is a classical work in linguistics [Арутюнова 1981]. The same issue has become the object of Kiryanova's research [Кирьянова 2007a; Кирьянова 2007b]. T. Artemyeva analyzes the speech genre of consolation, which is verbalized in letters [Артемьева 1993], I. Sergeeva writes about the genre of the argument, which appears in letters, [Сергеева 1985]; The subgenre of the friendly letter is described by N. Belunova [Белунова 2000] while the subgenre of greeting cards is in the focus of Marinin's study [Маринин 1996]. S. Gindin investigates the textual application of the episteme and the biography: the presentation of the biography in the structure of letters, the epistolary behavior of the linguopersonality in general [Гиндин 1989] while I. Gulyakova [Гулякова 2000] and V Lyapunova [Ляпунова 1994] analyse the linguopersonality of the writer as an author of letters.

The study of the episiotomy as a lingual phenomenon, the problem of the status of the epistolary genre, and the epistolary behavior of Ukrainians is far from complete, although in the Ukrainian lingui-

stics it was extensively covered (S. Bohdan, E. Baran, O. Branych, V. Bruegen, O. Bulakh, L. Vashkov, E. Vetrova, M. Voznyak, V. Halych, S. Hanzha, A. Herashchenko, V. Hladkyi, I. Hryhorenko, V. Greshchuk, I. Dashkevych, A. Doroshkevych, R. Dotsenko, V. Dudko, N. Zhuravliova, I. Zabiyaka, T. Zabolotna, L. Zaritska, S. Kiral, S. Komarova, T. Kononchuk, R. Korohodskyi, M. Kotsyubinska, V. Kuz'menko, L. Kurylo, K. Lenets, L. Lushpynska, Zh. Lyakhova, L. Marchuk, etc.). In particular, the history of the epistolary of T. Shevchenko, the textual principles of his publication, attribution, and specific comments on his letters and letters addressed to him were studied by L. Kodac'ka, J. Lyakhova, M. Kotsyubinska, and others [Коцюбинська 2008; Листи до Т. Г. Шевченка 1962; Ляхова 1994].

The case study of the correspondence of Panas Myrnyi enables I. Hryhorenko to consider the use of the epistolary speech style in the Ukrainian literary documentation of the 2nd half of the 19th century [Григоренко 2013]. Other scholars focuse on the lingual specificity and world-view aspects of the creative legacy of Panas Myrnyi, in particular M. Panfilov analyses the place of the concept "language" in the world-view conception of Panas Myrnyi [Панфілов 2005], the same problem is studied by V. Stateiyeva on the material of the letters of M. Kotsiubynsky, Lesya Ukrainka and B. Hrinchenko.

Considering the letters of Panas Myrnyi as a separate object of the linguistic research, L. Matsko [Мацько 1999] analyses the structure of the letter and the specific selection of linguostylistic units in the writer's epistolary texts. Linguostylistic features of the epistolary legacy of H. Kochur are elucidated by O. Bratanych [Братаніч 2004]. T. Zabolotna describes addressees and style of the letters of V. Vynnychenko [Заболотна 2005] while L. Kurylo [Курило 2006] – those of Oles' Honchar. M. Stepanenko [Листи до Олеся Гончара 2016] has compiled the letters of Oles Honchar and supplied them with an impressive corpus of commentaries, which are useful for the study of ego-texts. M. Kotsyubinska has elaborated the study of ego-text in ego-text in the analytical memoirs of the epistolary of Ukrainian writers, especially representatives of the 1960s movement [Коцюбинська 2009]. L. Marchuk considered the epistolary genre in the focus of the theory of linguopersonology [Марчук 2013], with the focus on the epistolary speech of I. Puluy's [Марчук 2015] and B. Hrinchenko's.

V. Kuz'menko and L. Morozova have elaborated methods of studying the epistolary style and characterized its significance in the

Ukrainian literary process of the 1920–50s [Кузьменко 1999; Моро-
зова 2007]. E. Vetrova describes etiquette units of the epistolary of
Ukrainian writers [Вєтрова 2004]. S. Hanzha in his manual elucidates
the phraseology of the epistolary legacy of Ukrainian writers of the
19–20th century [Ганжа 2010]. Ukrainian scholars focus on individual
linguistic categories which are made manifest in these texts, for
example, N. Zhuravleva analyzes the honorific forms that function in
the epistolary genre of the 19th and early 20th century [Журавльова
2005], while O. Kuvarova describes the vocative forms [Куварова 2014].
A number of works analyse connotations (A. Neirulin) [Нейрулін 2006]
and individual ornamental units in the epistolary text, for example,
S. Komarova, proves that periphrase is a means of organizing the
semantic component of the epistolary text [Комарова 1991], etc.

An author of a private letter never in advance counts on its being
made public for a wide circle of recipients, its targeted addressee
being typically a close friend. Therefore, N. Pavlik proposes to single
out epistolary writers as a separate group, because they possess
a number of inherent features discussed above. Writing letters is
a creative process for them and the letter reflects their individual au-
thorial style. The writer as an author of the letter is aware of the pos-
sibility of his epistolary being published, therefore, he writes under
the impression of being watched [Павлик 2005а: 247].

In Ukrainian linguistics the epistolary of Lesya Ukrainka has been
studied by H. Arkushyn [Аркушин 1995], S. Bohdan [Богдан 2013],
H. Kantorchuk [Канторчук 2001], I. Romanchenko [Романченко
1948], V. Svyatovets [Святовець 1981], V. Stateeva [Статєєва 1998],
L. Tomchuk [Томчук 2005] et al. There are also solid works which
outline the general features of the poet's epistolary (V. Svyatovets), as
well as its certain aspects with the focus on the anthroponymy of her
letters (G. Arkushyn, G. Kontorchuk), the perception of holiday in her
lingual consciousness (S. Bogdan), correspondence with individual
addressees (I. Romanchenko), expression of ideas on linguistics
(V. Stateiyev), etc.

The study of the epistolary discourse has a number of unexplored
aspects, and despite an impressive corpus of the Ukrainian epistolary,
there are still many "blank spots" in the research of Lesya Ukrainka's
epistolary legacy.

We will enlarge on the specificity of Lesia Ukrainka's letters as
one of the ego-text subgenres and on the speech activity of the poet

as a Ukrainian elite linguopersonality. The analysis is a case study of the epistolary output of the poet within the time-span from 1870 to 1890, including her own reflections on letters expressed in her literary texts.

3.3. Lesya Ukrainka's elite linguopersonality in the mirror of her private letters (case study of the poet's epistolary and her reflections on letters in literary texts)

Ego-texts include letters, examples of the epistolary genre, epistolary speech style, or epistolary discourse. Letters are marked with certain neutralization of functional styles: their boundaries are somewhat erased, therefore, the term "discourse" is more applicable here, which is proved convincingly by Tatiana Manokhina [Манохіна 2015: 273].

Nevertheless, in the 19th – early 20th centuries the epistolary still had a distinct specificity, including the national one. Modernism had not yet become properly disseminated, while the neutralization of functional styles is related to the modernist strategy of text formation, which was actualized in the 20th century. However, Lesya Ukrainka's letters already testify to the aforementioned process.

The dynamic development of linguistics and research neoparadigms also give rise to new aspects of the ego-text (discourse) study, including the epistolary of Lesya Ukrainka.

3.3.1. Lesya Ukrainka's attitude to the phenomenon of correspondence (some comments on letters and the process of their writing in the poet's artistic texts)

Lesya was particularly concerned with the process of generating ego-texts in the form of letters, since she left a lot of accounts about it in her artistic works. For example, in her short story "Lyst u dalechin'/A Letter to the Distance" the writer idealizes the process of writing letters, while in the essay "Huchni struny / Loud Strings" the poetess argues with her heroine, Nastya Hrytsenko, and analyses emotionally her feelings, doubts, hesitations, worries before unbosoming her soul in the letter to her beloved, for example: *"She sat down*

at the table, put a pen to paper and began to write. She sat for a long time, picking up the pen, then putting it down as if writing, but the paper remained empty and there was not word on it. She sighed, her trembling hand quietly put the pen on the table, she got up, left the house and went to the dark garden. Walking quietly along the trail, she thought about everything which was left unspoken, about unwritten thoughts; her tears had not dried out, her heart was depressed. She thought: "No, I can not write to him. What can I write to him? A heartless letter about trifles, about city news, filled with witty phrases, unobtrusive humor, − a letter to an acquaintance, not even a friendly one. But why should I do this? Why do I need this gymnastics for mind, when my soul cries and tears apart from regret? As soon as I sit down to write to him, I only think that I love him, unmeasurably, immensely, that love is a knife in my heart − you pull it out of the heart and it will bleed. (…) I have to keep silence, I have to refuse from the only comfort − letters from him, even brief indifferent notes. There is not a single friendly word in his letters, not even casually …" [Леся Українка 2015: 158–159].

Lesya Ukrainka characterizes letters and wrting manner which are typical of the epistolary behavior of the female Ukrainian linguopersonality of the 2nd half of the 19th century, outlining the features of the national character of Ukrainians, in particular the high degree of emotionality. The writer intimizes the letter by means of a string of epithets: letters are *heartless, unfriendly; brief, indifferent, only comfort*, etc. The very process of writing letters is discribed as the *gymnastics for mind*, thereby pointing to the significant role of writing letters for the Ukrainian linguopersonality in general. Ego-texts are known to help a person to overcome worries since thoughts expressed on paper are perceived differently, most important emotions are somewhat neutralized when they are entrusted to paper [see: Космеда 2012].

In the the narrative "Pryyazhn' / Affection" Lesya describes the manner of writing letters of an immature linguopersonality who does not yet have a command of the epistolary style, tactics of correspondence, therefore her character Yuzya is not as yet personally involved in this process, cf.: *Letters are not written; Yuzya somehow had no time to write to Zonya, although there was a lot to say. Yuzya wrote letters in a very childlike way, relating on the very facts, and could not stick them together, only with the words "**donoszę tobie**"*[5] *− it itself was irritating − and so no letter to Zonya was either finished or sent* [Леся Українка 2015: 274].

---

[5] I inform you (Polish).

128

So, according to the poet, real letters can be written by mature people, and the classification of letters includes extralingual factors, social parameters, age qualifications: letters of children, young people, mature linguopersonalities and letters of representatives of the older generation, undoubtedly, differ.

It seems that the artistic legacy of the poet needs a thorough study of her attitude to the process of writing letters, and of the significance of her epistolary in general.

3.3.2. Lesya Ukrainka's private letters as "a reflection" of her speech and the most intimate movements of her soul

The publication of Lesya Ukrainka's letters dates back to 1911, when Mykhailo Pavlyk published three of them. After Lesya's death, her letters came out several times [see: Енциклопедія].

Today, the epistolary legacy of Larysa Petrivna Kosach contains about 900 letters, while some more are yet to be found.

Lesya's epistolary are letters to the people who were closest family (mother, father, brothers, sisters, family of Mikhailo Drahomanov, aunt Olena Teslenko Prykhodko, etc.) and the literary environment (Ivan Franko, Mikhailo Pavlyk, Olha Kobylyanska, Vasyl Stefanyk and etc.). More than forty addressees of the writer are known and their letters are partially collected. The writer's contemporaries testify that sometimes the poet wrote up to ten letters a day. Unfortunately, Lesya did not keep letters sent to her for fear of causing trouble to their authors in the case of a search in her apartment. She destroyed all the letters, thus, and the epistolary dialogue between the writer and her correspondents is impossible to investigate.

According to Olha (Lesya Ukrainka's sister), Lesya wrote her first letter, when she was at an early age: "When she turned six, she learnt how to write the first letter in her life with the view of writing to her beloved uncle and aunt, the Drahomanovs" [see: Спогади 1971: 42].

The analysis of Lesya's epistolary makes it possible to study her "lingual biography" in more detail. The writer's letters of 1880–1890 contain a significant number of Russian words. Obviously, they indicate the appearance of *surzhyk*, the mixture of Ukrainian and Russian, in the medium of the Ukrainian lingual culture, cf.: *address to the father − papa, address to the grandmother − babushka*, as well as a number of

commonly used words, such as: *болізнь, кровать, морожене, насто-яний, пароход, письмо, пол, приятность, стакан, стул, чулки* and so on, frequent discursive words: *вообще, іменно, нарошне, послі, напрас-но*, etc., verbal forms (*вспоминаєм, кончить, кружиться, получили, совітує*, where truncated ones prevail, as in Taras Shevchenko's idio-style: *писать, ходить, їхать*), the etiquette phrases are Russified, for example: *ізвініте мене* and others.

Lesya Ukrainka actively uses polonisms, which was and still re-mains a characteristic feature of Western Ukrainians, although a lot of polonisms have entered the Ukrainian literary speech, for example: *мі, завше, тілько, скілько, хтіти, жадний, масажна курація* (*cmp.: Після тижня масажної курації нога моя розтроюдилась так, що й ступить було годі / After the week-long massage "kuratsia"*[6] *my foot hurt so much that I can not walk* (to brother Mikhailo, November 1889), *довжелезна курація / long "kuratsia"* (to M. Drahomanov, 24.12.1890), etc.

Ukrainian speech is defined by Lesya Ukrainka by means of the "intimate" adverb "*по-нашому*" / "*in our manner*": *Я говорила з перекуп-кою по-нашому / I was talking with a marketwoman in our manner* (to her mother, 07.18.1889). To characterize the Russian language of Lev Tolstoy Lesya uses the pejorative epithet "*найкацапішою*"[7] (to M. Draho-manov, June 1888). The writer openly violates grammatical rules (makes up a superlative form of a relative adjective), promoting a pragmatic norm. In addition, the writer believes that Lev Tolstoy's ouver is the incarnation of extreme "katsapshchyna" (goat-like cha-racter). Lesya did not like Moscow and wrote about it quite frankly: *Так оце ми з тобою і в Московщину поїдемо!.. Гай-гай!.. "Не к добру это!". Так чогось мені здається: нам, українцям, не щастить доля ніколи в тій Московщині. "Срежут" вони мене ще там добре. А врешті ще побачим, як там буде! Може, й не такий чорт страшний, як його малюють / So we are going to Moscow land together! Oh, my! "Nye k dobru eto!*[8]" *I feel as if we, Ukrainians, cannot find any luck in this Moskovshchyna. They will "sriezhyt"*[9] *me well there. Fine, we'll see for ourselves. The devil is not so terrible as he is painted* (to her mother, 04.03.1890).

---

[6] Treatment (Polish).

[7] Most katsap-like or most goat-like (a term of abuse used by Ukrainians of Rus-sians).

[8] It won't lead to anything good! (Russian).

[9] Flunk (Russian slang).

The urbanonym "Moscow" in Lesya's idiolect is accompanied by the intimized pronoun of a particle type (*toi / that*) with pejorative evaluation: *in that Moscow …; I would like to see them still before leaving for that Moscow!*

In a letter to M. Drahomanov from 18.12.1890 the poet uses the pejoratively-marked ethnonym "Moscovite" when inquiring about the origin of the Russian culture, cf.: *Ще хотів Миша знати вашу думку про те, чи не єсть признак монгольського впливу **на москалів** їхня орнаментика з людськими та звірячими фігурами? / And Mysha would like to know your opinion whether **Moscovites'** ornaments with human and animalistic figures is a sign of the Mongols' influence?*

In the same letter to M. Drahomanov, Lesya Ukrainka is also interested in the problem of Ukraine's unity. It is taken for granted that Lesya Ukrainka became a "unifying" bridge "between two parts of Ukraine which were torn apart" [Ольшовський 2005: 47]. She is disappointed by futile disputes of Ukrainian intellectuals about the relevance of the use of Ukrainian in everyday life and as an instrument of creative writing, comp: *…мене жаль бере, що у нас на Україні ніяк не скінчаться одвічні сії спори, та й як мають скінчитись, коли сперечники одно одного не розуміють. Мені вже самій страх обридли оці теми: **чи треба писать чисто народним чи не чисто народним складом, тенденційно чи нетенденційно, чи Галичина та Волинь все одно що Україна, чи ні, чи требаписать наукові праці по-українськи, чи краще, може, по-російськи**, і т. ін.*

*I'm sorry to hear about these never-ending old disputes in Ukraine. And how could they end if the opponents do not understand each other. I am sick and tired of these topics: **whether it is necessary to write in purely colloquial or not purely colloquial language, tendentiously or non-tendentiously, whether Galicia and Volyn' are Ukrainian territories or not, whether it is reasonable to write scientific works in Ukrainian, or better, perhaps, in Russian**, etc., etc. (18.12.1890) (bold type − T. K.).*

Compare also: *Дехто теж нарікав, що я **ховаюсь від "народних" тем і складу мови народної, лізу в літературщину та "інтелігентствую"**, але тут, певне, вся біда в тому, що я інакше розумію слова "народність", "літературність" та "інтелігенція", ніж як їх розуміють мої критики. / Some people have also complained that **I'm evading the folk themes and language of common people, that I am a highbrow with excessive intellectual and literary inclination**, but apparently, the trouble is that I understand the words "nationali-*

ty", *"literaryness" and "intellelligensia" differently from my critics* (to M. Drahomanov, 18.12.1890) (bold type – T. K.).

It seems that the poet' activity unambiguously answered such difficult questions, which do not find a uniform solution even today. Instead, we now witness the consequences of this tradition in the form of the Russian invasion, since Russia began to actively "protect" the so-called Russian-speaking population of Ukraine. Yet back in the late 19ᵗʰ century Lesya Ukrainka undertood perfectly well and demonstrated in her ego-texts the nature of this Moscow threat.

The poet expressed gratitude to her uncle M. Drahomanov, who explained to her the complex issues of the ontology of Ukraine and the Ukrainian language, cf.: *Тепер я слухаю Вашої ради і "спасаюсь від українсько-російського невежества / Now I follow your advice and "**spasayus' vid Ukrayins'ko-Rosiys'koho nieviezhestva"**[10]* (to M. Drahomanov, 18.12.1890).

Quite consciously, the writer introduces into her epistolary discourse foreign insertions from Russian, Polish, French, German, Italian, Latin, using both Cyrillic and Latin type and, thus, representing her European affiliations and intertextuality, for example: *Уліти мої їдуть (лізуть), тільки дуже-дуже помалу… "**когда-то будут!**"… А от Миші стидно, що лінується писать свою уліту, адже ж, здається, не під тропіками живе, то не повинен би так предаваться **dolce far niente**; …після того вони завели зо мною розмову, вибрали мені кавуна, "**который полутше**", – і знайомість готова* (to the mother, 18.07.1889); *Правда, я людина без діла – "**празношатающаяся**", але зате у мене єсть такі перешкоди, яких ви не маєте, і, дай боже, щоб ніколи не мали… От перша перешкода – "**moje miłe zdrowie i powodzenie**"* (to brother Mykhailo, November 1889); *От тільки одно мене бентежить, знаєш, теє "**mens sana in corpore sano**" (а мені таки все не ліпше, а либонь, чи не гірше – може, й різать прийдеться), ну, та якось-то буде; Отже, найперши треба "**привести в известность**" все, що єсть готового з перекладів і я сей переклад таки думаю у неї "**весьма очень искусно виканючить**"* (to brother Mykhailo, November 26–28, 1889); *Мама совітує назначить для одеської кна-кни Ауербаха "**Schwarzwaldergeschichten**" і що-небудь з руського… і (я, правду сказать, не маю о нім **żadnego pojęcia**) (to brother Mikhailo, 8–10.12.1889); же нічого*

_____

[10] Save myself from Ukrainian-Russian ignorance (the mixture of Ukrainian and Russian).

*робить – прийдеться "**изучить нравы общины Красного Креста**"*
(to her mother, February 15, 1890); Однаше наш cousin пише по-руськи
зовсім не згірше! … Шкода, що Лідянка не назвали Цвєтаном, хоч
*і Дмитро нічого собі ймення. Який чудний почерк у нашого **cousin'а**,*
*якийсь уже болгарський (to her mother, 1.03.1890); **Resurrexi**! От і знов*
беруся здіймати "сізіфовий камінь" догори!.. /

My "snails"[11] are moving (creeping) but very-very slowly… "**kogda-to**
budut![12]… But Mysha feels ashamed of being lazy to work on his "snail",
because he seems not to live in the tropics, so he should not overindulge in
dolce far niente; …afterwards they started talking with me, chose for me
a watermelon, "**kotoryi polutshe**[13]", – and we are acquainted already (to
her mother, 18.07.1889); The truth is, I am a person without occupation –
"**prazdnoshatayushchayasya**[14]" due to the obsticles you don't have, and
may God bless you to never have them… My first obstacle – "**moje miłe**
zdrowie i powodzenie" (to brother Mykhailo, November 1889); I have one
trouble now, you know, that "**mens sana in corpore sano**" (and I am not
feeling better, maybe even worse – perhaps I will be operated on), well, it will
be somehow. So, first of all, it is necessary "**privyezti v izvestnost'**[15]" all
translations which are ready, and I intend to "**ves'ma iskusno vykanyu-**
chit'[16]" this translation from her" (to brother Mykhailo, November 26–28,
1889); Mama advises me to send to Odessa-based kna-knas "**Schwarzwal-**
dergeschichten" by Auerbach and something from Russian… and (to tell
the truth, I have **żadnego pojęcia**) (to brother Mykhailo, 8–10.12.1889);
Nothing is to be done – I will have "**isuchit' nravy obshchiny Krasnogo**
Kryesta[17]" (to her mother, February 15, 1890); Yet our **cousin** writes in
Russian very skillfully! … I wish Lidyanka would have been named
Tsvyetan though Dmytro is not a bad name. What an odd handwriting our
cousin has, a bit Bulgarian (to her mother, 1.03.1890); **Resurrexi**! And
once again I embark on rolling up the stone of Sisyphus!.. (to brother
Mykhailo, 18.05.1890); Well, **es ist eine alte Geschichte** … (to M. Dra-
homanov, 12.1890) and others. (bold type – T. K.).

---

[11] Creative projects (a jocular word from Lesya Ukrainka's idiolect).

[12] One day they will be ready (Russian).

[13] A better one (Russian).

[14] An idler (Russian).

[15] To make public (Russian).

[16] To cadge from someone very skillfully (Russian).

[17] To learn the customs of the Red Cross community (Russian).

The writer emphasized the necessity to know Italian and English. She expressed some interesting ideas about the "fashion" for languages, for example: ***А з англійською поезією не буде ніяк, поки хто з нашого товариства не вивчиться по-англійськи.*** *Якби мене німка не збавила, то досі я б уже добре підучилась по-англійськи, ну, а так, то що ж робить!* ***Самоучкою я не можу вивчитись по-англійськи, але по-італьянськи можу***, *тільки ти як їхатимеш сюди, то купи мені італьянський словар (як нема італьянсько-руського, то італьянсько-французький) і книжку іт[альянську], одну з тих, що ви маєте перекладать. Я вже трохи знаю граматику, а для перекладів практичного знаття не треба. Леопарді "Діалоги" (в прозі) я можу вам хоч зараз перекласти, бо у мене в "Пантеоні" вони єсть і написані зовсім не трудним складом, але його вірші, так само, як і всякі інші, я наважила перекладать тільки з італьянського.*

I won't cope with the English poetry until someone from our circle learns English. *If the German had not tempted me, I would have already know English fluently, but nothing to be done!* ***I can not learn English by myself, but I can learn Italian,*** *and I ask you very much to buy me an Italian dictionary when you come here (if you fail to find an Italian-Russian dictionary, then buy an Italian-French one) and an Italian book, one of those you have to translate. I already know a little bit of grammar, and practical knowledge is not required for translation. I can without delay translate Leopardi's "Dialogues" (in prose), because I have them in "The Pantheon", they are and not at all difficult, but his poems, as well as all the others, I dare to translate only from Italian* (to brother Mykhailo, 8–10.12.1889) (bold type – T. K).

In a letter to M. Drahomanov from December 24, 1890 Lesya once again emphasized the necessity to learn English despite its lack of popularity:

Найгірш діло стоїть в нас з англійськими авторами, бо сю мову дуже мало хто знає, хоч деякі і збираються зайнятись нею. *Бувши в Одесі, я хотіла учитись по-англійськи і навіть вже знайшла собі учительку, але той проклятий масаж усе мені перебив. Тепер прийдеться учитись самій, хоч се і трудно.* ***По італьянськи я вже трохи підучилась сама*** *і коли дістану собі книжок та словаря, то, може, й про перекладання можна буде подумати. "В ожидании будущих благ"* ***надолужаю французьким та німецьким.***

The worst situation stands with English authors, because this language is very little known, though some are going to learn it.

*When in Odessa, I wanted to study English and even found a teacher, but that damned massage changed my plans. Now I have to learn by myself, although this is difficult. I **have already learned a little bit Italian on my own** and, when I get my books and dictionaries, perhaps I will think of translating. "V ozhydanyy budushchikh blag"*[18] ***I am making up for it with French and German*** (bold type − T. K.).

Compare also*: …вивчила недавно італьянську граматику і тепер для вправи читаю книжки, **хочу скоріше навчитись добре тямити по-італьянськи** …*

*I have **recently learned Italian grammar** and now I am reading books to practise, **I want to understand Italian well*** (to M. Drahomanov, 18.12.1890) (bold type − T. K.).

Thus, Lesya Ukrainka, as well as Ivan Franko, was a polyglot. Not only did she have a good lingual competence in her native Ukrainian and Russian as the language of the Russian peripheral monopoly, know Ukrainian colloquial speech, a prototype of "surzhyk", but also had a good command of Polish, Bulgarian, Czech, French, German, Italian, Latin Greek, English and mastered some rudiments of Spanish. Lesya Ukrainka used all these languages to do her remarkable translations. According to her sister Olha, the writer's gift for languages is "the most tell-tale evidence of Lesya Ukrainka's harmony with the maternal generic name" (Drahomanov's trait) [Ольшовський 2005: 30].

From the writer's letters we learn about her culturological interests, reflections, historical facts, such as aspirations of young Kyivites of the late 19th century to move close to Europe away from Moscow. The aforementioned contradicts the stereotype that at that time only Galicia was Europe-oriented. Not in the last turn was it emphasized by Ivan Franko, who in his lifetime was called a European. So, Lesya Ukrainka ruins yet another myth of the Soviet era, compare: *Миша, дознавшись, що я пишу до Вас, просить … написать Вам, що **серед киян молодих остатнього часу починає ширитись європеїзм; вони починають учити європейські мови і інтересуватись європейською літературою**.*

*Having learned that I am writing to you, Mysha asks … to inform you that **among the young Kyivites Europeanism recently has begun to disseminate; they start learning European languages and show inte-***

---

[18] In wait for future benefits (Russian).

rest in the European literature (to M. Drahomanov, December 24, 1890) (bold type – T. K.).

More than 100 years has passed, but Moscow has resumed efforts to to convince Ukrainians that they do not need the European Union because they are not Europeans

The epistolary of the poet contains information about family nicknames, in particular in a letter to Drahomanov from January 14, 1881, little Lesya writes: *I was re-named Lesya*. Her sister Olha remarked on this: *Up to 5 years Lesya was called Losya, and then she was renamed Lesya because she did not like the name of Losya* [Спогади 1971: 42]. Obviously, *Losya* is another diminutive variant of the Lo [ru] sya (the official name of the poet was Larysa). "This also explains, by the way, the children's nickname "Mysholosiye", which adults "conferred on" young Kosachivna and her beloved brother Mykhailo" [Ольшовський 2005: 35]. Another jocular nickname was Zeya. She used it to sign some letters, for example, a letter to her mother dated March 4, 1890.

Lesya Ukrainka was an extremely sincere and tender person, as evidenced by her speech, namely by forms of address her relatives, especially to her mother: *люба матуся; мамочко, голубочко, ластівочко / my dear mummy, my dearest dove*, although "the relationship of Larysa Petrivna with her mother was far from idyllic (because both were independent creative souls)" [Ольшовський 2005: 47], the writer's biographers highlight "lack of love" on the part of he mother, for whom Lesya (strangely enough, but a fact) was an undesirable child (the more so because she took after her father Petro Kosach, who, apparently, was not authoritative enough for Olha Petrivna as a husband)" [Ольшовський 2005: 50].

In letters to her brother Mykhailo, she always signed as *Lesya* or *Your sister and friend Lesya*, thus stressing that the bond between her and her brother was based merely on family ties; they were close friends. At difficult periods the writer signed *Your unlucky sister Lesya*, making hints at her heavy life burdens.

Lesya Ukrainka's letters reveal her individual authorial way of word-creation, love for a fresh word and occasionalisms. A number of lingual units are termed as *chamber ones*, since they are known to a small intimate circle of relatives, friends and the beloved. These words represent a sample of "ciphered", "encoded" speech that can not be understood without proper decoding, for example, in a letter

to M. Drahomanov, Lesya writes: *I do not know if **your drahomanets'** can speak.*

It should be explained here that on March 27, 1877 p. in Drahomanov's family daughter Ariadna (Rada) was born, so by *drahomanets' (little Drahomanov)* Lesya meant her little cousin Rada. Dmytro Shyshmanov, her nephew and a son of Lidiya and Ivan Shyshmanovs, received the nickname *Lidyk* (cf.: *I sincerely congratulate You and Lida on little **Lidyk*** (to M. Dragomanov, 24.12.1890)) while her younger sisters and brother Mykola were jocularly called *little negroes (nehryky, nehrynyata)* (cf.: *Kissing **little negroes** one more time! Goodbye, **dear little negroes**!* (to the mother, 4.03.1890); their other nickname was the composite *tyhro-nehry (tiger-negroes)*, cf.: *Kissing sincerely all **tiger-negroes*** (to the mother, 18.07.1889). These nominations generate derivative verbs *nehryat'* and *tyhryat' (to negro and to tiger)*, for example: *The Tigers (Mykos' and Oksana) have become real "gluttons" […] and now they are healthy, they are **negroing and tigering**, "as it should not be"* … (to the mother, June 26, 1980).

Ulita (snail) is a word from Lesya Ukrainka's idiolect to indicate literary ideas, works which are gestating very slowly, the humorous noun from the Russian proverb *"Ulita yedyet, kogda-to budyet / Things are moving at a snail's pace"*. Hence, the collocation ***pro ulityachu spravu / of snail's affair*** means "about literary affairs and plans"; in addition, derivatives are formed from this occasionalism, such as the verb ***ulityty, doulityty / to snail***, cf.: *Ну, та дасть біг, **доулічу** все благополучно; Що ж ти тепер робиш, чи в математику затопився, чи по Києву прохолоджуєшся, чи, може, що **улітиш**? / If God bless me, I will **snail** everything **to the end** successfully; What are you doing now, are you immersed in mathematics or lazying around Kyiv, or, perhaps, **snailing** something*?

Kna-kna derived from the baby talk of Lesya Ukrainka's brother Mykola. As a toddler, he applied this word to everything thin and long, including his brother Mykhailo. In Lesya Ukrainka's jocular idiolect this once-word was used to mark all boys, primarily students. This occasionalism was used as a productive form, for example, for the adverbial derivative ***po kna-knyachomu / in a kna-kna manner***; compare.: *Маєш "знаків запитання" досить, аби хіть одписати на їх гарненько, а не по-кна-княчому, жемчужним способом. / You have enough "question marks" to answer them properly, not in a kna-kna manner, in a pearl way* (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889).

Putsa is a sister Olha's home nickname. Her other brothers and sisters also had nicknames (*З ким там **негри** зостаються? Чи папа з ними буде? Поцілуй їх там од мене всіх, **Пуцика**, і **Уксуска**, і **Кахіню**, і **Дроздика**, нехай будуть мені здорові усі! / Who are **the Negroes** staying with there? Will the dad be with them? Kiss them all from me, **Putsik, Uksuska, and Kakhynia, and Drozdyk**, may they be healthy!* (to the mother, March 4, 1890). Besides Lesya called her younger sisters and brother ***May chafers***, as they liked these bugs very much, catching them and making May chafer-like buzzing sounds.

Sometimes Lesya's neologism derived from foreign words, for example: ***revism*** is a word artificially created from the French *rкve* (dream), compare: *Миша, що раджу: пиши-но ти уліти, бо твоя "Кушетка" проймає навіть серце, **ревізмом** пойняте способом. / Mysha, my advice is: you should write snails, because your "Couch" moves hearts through its **revism*** (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889).

Thus, Lesya Ukrainka pays great attention to the word, gives recommendations on the use of individual lexemes, carries out a comparative analysis: the poet demonstrates good knowledgee of different languages, for example, *P. S.* in a letter to her brother Mykhailo, written in November 1889: *P. S. So, that is it: in our group you turn out the best; when I come, I'll tell you off so that you may not whimper and criticise the portraits. The word "**mayatnyk**[19]", I think, can be left as it is, because the root of this word is Ukrainian. In Bulgarian **the pendulum** is **maxaltse**, in Serbian it is a **shetalytsya**, in Czech − **kywadlo**, in Polish − **wahadło**, in Galicia dialect – **pendel', kyvalo**. Choose whatever you prefer, or leave it as it is* (bold type − T. K.).

It is worth mentioning the neologism of the late 19th century ***enthusiasm*** which is a source of the verb derivative ***entuziazmuvalys' / enthusiasmize***, for example: *Біля нас на хорах стояв Павло Комаров і Циганков (кна-кни, що були торік в Одесі) і теж "**ентузіазмувались**" / Pavlo Komarov and Tsygankov (kna-knas, whom we met in Odessa last year) stood near us in the choirs and also "**enthusiasmized**"* (to the mother, 4.03.1890). The vulgar colloquialism ***zherty / devour*** produces the diminutive derivative ***zherchyky / little devourers, gluttons*** where pejorative semantics is completely neutralized, compare: *Тигри (Микось і Оксана) зробились настоящими "**жерчиками**", сьогодні докінчили останні вишні, кінчають полунички і починають порічки*

---

[19] Pendulum.

*та малину. / **The Tigers (Mikos' and Oksana) have became real "little gluttons", today they have finished last cherries, are finishing strawberries and beginning red currants and raspberries*** (to the mother, 26.06.1980 p.).

Citing a variant of her poem *Contra spem spero*!, Lesya Ukrainka calls it a ***hopelessly hopeful verse*** (to brother Mykhailo, 18.05.1890), thus representing a tautological composite and modeling a lingual play.

Lesya Ukrainka's epistolary is highly idiomatic, most of these phraseologisms being manipulated in a peculiar way, for example: *риба шука, де глибше / acorns were good till bread was found*; *чиї би телятка мичали / pot calls the kettle black*; *дай боже нашому теляті вовка піймати! / the proof in the pudding is eating*; *кебети не маю / I lack ability*; *не такий чорт страшний, як його малюють / the devil is not so terrible as he is painted*; *одна біда не йде, а копу за собою веде / trouble comes in three*; *не варт собі голови сушити / it is not worth racking one's brains*; *варити воду / putty in hands*; *надто велика честь / too much honour*; *брати у шори / to take in the fistons*.

Transforming phraseologisms, Lesya Ukrainka creates new images, cf. *Я таки остатнього часу сиділа "**на безкнижжі**" / Untill recently I had to do with "**half a book**"* (to the mother, 18.07.1889). The lingual play here lies in transformation of the phraseological unit *на безриб'ї і рак риба / half a loaf is better than no bread*.

In addition, the writer's intertextuality is seen in the use of maxims, authoritative statements, explicit and implicit quotations, reminiscences and allusions to fiction and folklore, etc., for example: ***Ой чи живі, чи здорові всі родичі гарбузові? / Are all pumpkin's relatives alive and kicking?***[20] (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889), *Першу ніч я провела тоді, **як тінь в Дантовому пеклі**, – з плачем і **скрежетом зубовним** / I spent the first night then **like a shadow in Dante's hell** – with crying and **gnashing of teeth*** (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889); *як мовить Гомер, "**що раз дано, того одбирать не годиться**" / as Homer says, "**once given, it should not be taken back**"* (to brother Mykhailo, November 26–28, 1889); *вона була "**остання могіканка**" / she was "**the last of Mohicans**"* (to M. Drahomanov, 24.12.1890); *здіймати "**сізіфовий камінь**" догори / rolling up "**the stone of Sisyphus**"* (to brother Mykhailo, 18.05.1890).

_____

[20] A well-known refrain from a Ukrainian folk nursery rhyme.

The poet also uses her relatives' precedent words or collocations, which are "chamber" speech units, for example: *Почну його перекладать, як тільки виправлю свою уліту, котра вже скінчена, але я роблю їй*, **як мама каже, вигризку** / *I will begin to translate it as soon as I correct my "snail" which is already finished, but I am* **gnawing it out**, *as mother says* (to brother Mykhailo, 26–28 November 1889); "**обо всем переговорить**", *як говорить тьотя Саша* / "**Obo vsyom peregovorit'**"[21], *as auntie Sasha says* (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889).

As an emotional linguopersonality Lesya uses a great number of exclamations and exclamatory phrases, as well as particles, for example: *От іще була б штука! / It would be something!* (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889); *Тільки що одержала твій лист і, прочитавши, зараз же за перо! / Just received your letter and as soon as I've read it, here I am, writing back to you*!; *Нема що й казать про те, що я візьмуся тепер до роботи так, що тільки ну! Що залежатиме від мене, я все зроблю, ба – що ж мені й робити, як не се! Адже, як би там не було, а література моя професія; Ага, от іще! / It goes without saying, that I will now set to work enthusiastically! I will do my best – what else should I do but this! Well, whatever it may be, literature is my profession; Yeah, indeed!* (to brother Mykhailo, November 26–28, 1889); *Ну, а так, то що ж робить! / Well, what else can I do under the circumstances!* (to brother Mykhailo, 8–10.12.1889) etc.

In personal letters authors tend to sincerely admit their mistakes, write about the shortcomings, they are critical to themselves. Lesya Ukrainka's letters also testify to her self-criticism. Larysa Kosach do not hesitate "to reveal" her allegedly negative features and analyze her drawbacks, including communicative failures. One most important proofs of the above-mentioned is found in a letter to Drahomanov written in June 1888: *Я лицем і подобою, здається, мало змінилась, хіба що не така біла, як була*, **характер мій, я сама це бачу, якийсь скритний, хоч мені й самій це не подобається,** *завжди я стараюсь бути якось щиріше, вільніше, але* **бачу сама, що все не так виходить, як би я хотіла: в мене виходить жарт тоді, коли я хочу говорити поважно, а коли я хочу говорити щиро, то це теж якось не так виходить, і від сього усього я не можу відчепитись** *навіть при розмові з мамою і Мішею, а вже з другими, то нічого й казати; я, по правді сказавши, й тепер трохи дивуюсь, що мені так легко*

---

[21] To talk about everything (Russian).

пишеться до Вас, Ви своїм листом якось привернули мене до себе ще більше, ніж перше, бо перше я таки трохи боялась писать до Вас, а тепер я бачу, що [Ви] з мене б не посміялись, якби я що й не дуже то дотепно написала, **бо Ви знаєте, що я не стільки вчилась, скільки б хотіла, та й тепер не можу як слід своєю наукою зайнятись, не дуже багато читала /** *My face and appearance do not seem to have change much, except that I am not so pale as I used to be; while **my character, as I see it, is somewhat reserved, although I do not like it myself. I am always trying to be more sincere and relaxed, but I see that, no matter how hard I try, I constantly fail: I make a joke when I want to speak seriously, and when I want to speak frankly, it also somehow does not work out. I cannot escape it** even when I am with mom and Misha, to say nothing of others. To tell the truth, even now I'm a little surprised that it is so easy for me to write to you, your letter attracted me to you even more than before, because at first I was a bit afraid to write to you, and now I see that you would not have made fun of me if I had written something senseless because, **as you might know, I haven't got the education I would like to have, even now I cannot take to my study properly, I have not read much*** (bold type – T. K).

Here Lesya is represented as a sincere, gullible and a bit naive person.

In a letter to brother Mykhailo written in May 18, 1890, the writer also expresses dissatisfaction with her character, cf. **Однак без жартів скажу** я тобі, чого найбільш мені жаль: я думаю, що того всі так не дбають про обіцянки, дані мені, бо **думають собі, що в мене така плоха вдача (знаєш славутнє слово "безхарактерность"?),** що мені не тільки можна слова не дотримати, а навіть можна й не згадувати про те слово, бо однак **я не тямлю постояти за себе.Отака думка мене дуже мучить, і надто б я хотіла, щоб се було неправда**, та вже при тому хотіла б знати причину, для чого справді ніхто мені віри не дотримав? / ***However, joking apart, I will tell*** *you what I most regret: I believe people do not keep their promises given to me because **they are sure: I am so base-spirited** (you might know the notorious collocation "**lack of character**"), that not only can they get back on their word, but also I. again, something for the first time, something for the second one. Lilia is also working hard on Turgenev, I'm glad of this because she reads a lot of nonsense, and Turgenev may change it. I cannot stop writing, but it is time to finish, because they are already hurrying me up since it may be late for the mail, and Lilia is hanging over me with the children, pulling me so-*

mewhere to go with them. So let's wait till next time, besides, I've scratched a lot already … (to M. Drahomanov, 06.1888).

Not infrequently do Lesya's letters clearly evidence of her literary talent, in particular, her unsurpassed descriptions of nature represent a whole spectre of colours and their shades. This can be exemplified by a letter to brother Mykhailo written in October 1888: *Поїхали ми собі назад у Одесу. Ну та й море ж було у той день! Певне, вже так задля нас вигладилось та причепурилось: синє-синє, з білими гребнями, з рожевими одблисками, з темно-зеленими тінями, з золотими іскрами при заході сонця. Я все стояла з того боку парохода, де не видно берега, не хотілось мені його бачити, хотіла я бачити море в цілім просторі його, у всій красі його, а земля заважала б сьому.*

So, we returned to Odessa. Well, what was the sea on that day! It must have smoothed and smartened itself up especially for us: clear blue, with white crests, pink highlights, dark green shadows and golden sparks at sunset. I was standing on the other side of the steamer, where I could not see the shore, and I did not want to see it, what I wanted to see was the indefinite space of the sea, in all its beauty, and the land would have interfered with it.

Her artistic imagination makes snow smell, cf.: *Але по обіді приходить Кох знову і заявляє: "А знаєте, надворі снігом пахне". Оксана завжди при тому заспориться, що сніг ніяк не пахне, але Микось на своєму стоїть. **А я теж думаю, що вже пахне снігом**, і помалу перебираюсь на зимовий стрій.*

*But after lunch Koch would come again and say: "You know, it smells of snow outside". Oksana would always argue that snow cannot smell, but Mykos' would stand his ground. **And I also think that it already smells of snow**, and gradually I am changing into winter clothes* (to brother Mykhailo, 09.1889) (bold type – T. K).

Lesya made interesting experiments in the epistolary genre. Some of her letters are written in the form of a verse, such as the one addressed to her brother Mykhailo in April 1890. This humourous, ironic verse is well-structured with an epilogue and an afterword, cf.: *Которогось там марта / І дев'яностий рік! / Сьогодні дням і числам / Я загубила лік. / Михайлику мій любий! / Я зважила собі / Сьогодні написати / У віршах лист тобі. / Перо й чорнило маю, / Натхнення лиш нема! / А надо мною муза / Стоїть, як стовп, німа. / В лихім гуморі муза / Так само, як і я, – / Прив'язана за ногу / Фантазія моя. / Ба, що ж робить! не всім же / На світі вільним буть, / Століття люди*

б’ються, / Щоб воленьки здобуть!.. / Коли ж принципіально / Питання розібрать, / То видно, що не варто / Над ним і сумувать. / Філософи новітні – / Ти, я та пан Максим – / Давно вже порішили / З питанням мудрим сим. / На чім тоді ми стали, / Ти знаєш сам здоров. / Отож нема потреби / Про те казати знов. / Коли мені поможе / Аполлон, ясний бог, / Зложу я на сю тему / Чудовий “тріалог”. / Вернусь на ґрунт “реальний”, / До ближчих, власних справ: / Учора мене папа / Як слід у шори вбрав! / Вночі тепер сплю мало / А ледве сліз не ллю, / А вдень зо всеї сили / Об землю лихом б’ю. / Могла б про “сміх крізь сльози” / Згадати я при сім, / Але вже сяя тема / Давно обридла всім!.. / Але переконання / Я здобула святе: / З принципів трьох найкращий / Єсть принцип – Liberte. / Тепера справоздання / З життя свого здаю: / Приїхавши, я три дні / Жила, як у раю. / Три дні мені ні в чому / Ніхто не заважав, / Була собі я вільна / Від всяких прикрих справ. / Тепер мені здається, / Що то було у сні! / Тепер мені настали / Години навісні… / Еге ж! Переписала / Я Гейнові пісні, / Сиділа, як заклята, / Над ними я три дні. / Вже можу я сказати: / Grace a Dieu c’est fini! / Бо вже та переписка / Увірилась мені. / Тепера буду мучить / Альфреда де Мюссе / І як поможуть музи, / То подолаю все. / Переклади найперше / Елегію “Lucie”, / Там “Le mie prigioni”, / А там і “Ночі” всі. / Помучитись прийдеться / З усім тим не на жарт, / Але ж “козацька слава” / Теж чого-небудь варт!.. / Коли ж на мене прийде / Годинонька така, / То мушу написати / Що-небудь для “Дзвінка”. / Ну, як же там “Плеяда”, / Як справи йдуть у нас? / Чи “Музи співодайні” / Навідують там вас? / Чи будеш ти писати / “Нечімнеє” своє? / А може, воно досі / Написане вже є? / Conseil legislatif наш – / Чи він вже де збиравсь? / І як там делегат наш / На йому пописавсь? / Однак про сеє довго / Прийшилося би писать; / Вже до твого приїзду / Прийдеться підождать. / Коли ви там зберетесь, / То там судіть-рядіть, / Для нашого видання / Обложку встановіть. / Вже мушу я кінчати, / Вже годі віршувать, / Бо починає теми / Для віршів бракувать. / Прости за schlechte Versen / Без толку, без пуття – / Тепер моє писання / Таке, як і життя. / Коли ти жірондистів / Побачиш наших де, / Скажи їм, що усіх їх / Bitа Charlotte Corde! / Тепер, мій любий брате, / Мій друже, прощавай / Та з Києва додому / Хутенько прибувай.

Твоя сестра Леся.

P. S. А ти знаєш, що недавно / Оце я утяла? / Die Armesunderblume / Таки перемогла! /

143

One day in March / 1890. / Today I've lost / The count of days. / My dear Mykhailyk! / Today I have an idea / To write a letter in verse to you. / I have a pen and ink, / But I lack inspiration! / And a muse is standing by / as dumb as a post. / The muse is in a bad mood / Exactly as I am. / My fantasy is also / Tied to the foot. / Well, what is to be done! To be completely free / Is not for everyone. / It takes centuries for people / To fight for their freedom! / But, generally speaking, / It is not worth grieving over. / Modern philosophers – / Me, you and Mr. Maksym – / Already solved this problem / long time ago. / You are well aware / Of our wise decision. / So there is no need / To discuss it again. / Some day with the help of / Apollo, a glorious god, / I will unfold this topic / In a perfect "trialogue". / To put my feet back on the ground, / Let's discuss routine affairs: / Yesterday Papa / Told me off properly. / At night I sleep but little / And can hardly keep back tears, / Yet in the daytime I do my best / To hold on and bite the bullet. / I could mention again / "Laughter through tears" / But I'm afraid that all / Are sick and tired of this truism!.. / Now my convictions are / (And I insist on this) / That the best out of three principles / Is one of Liberte. / And now I'll make an account / Of my daily life: / On my arrival here / I spent three day in a paradise. / Nobody bothered me / For three entire days, / I was absolutely free / From all sorts of troubles. / Now it seems to me / That it was nothing but a dream! / Now my time is / As wearsome as ever … / Well! I've rewritten / Heine's songs, / I was working my brains out / Over them for three days. / I can finally say: / Grace a Dieu c'est fini! / It's fine, 'cause this rewriting / Was getting on my nerves. / And now it's time to torture / Alfred de Musset, / And if muses will help me, / I will overcome everything. / I will first translate / The elegy "Lucie", / Then "Le mie prigioni", / And then finally "Nights". / It is not a joke / To cope with all this, / But the "Cossacks' glory" / Is worth the effort!.. / When time comes / (And it, surely, will) / I'll have to write something / For the journal "Dzvinok". / Well, how are our "Pleiades", / How are we going? / Do "Singing Muses" / Visit you there? / Are you going to write / Your "Nechimneye"? / Or maybe it is ready? / Has our Conseil legislatif / Had their meeting already? / And was our delegate / A success there? / But it would take long / To write about it; / We will have to wait / Till you finally arrive. / But don't forget to design, / A cover for our edition. / Fine, it's time to wind up, / With these rhymes, / For I've exhausted all the topics / For my poem. / Sorry for schlechte Versen / Deprived of any sense – / Now my writing / Is a reflecrtion of my life. / When you happen to see / Our Girondins, / Send them hearty greetings / From Charlotte Corde! /

144

Now, my dear brother, / And my friend, farewell, / And return home from Kyiv / As soon as possible.

Your sister Lesya.

P. S. Guess what I have / Recently done? / I have finally defeated / Die Armesunderblume!
The epilogue: … It's time to quit singing, − / As the singing muses / Do not inspire me any more.

This letter was written in spring 1890, when Lesya was confined to bed for two months with so-called "sticky chains", in Kolodyazhny, where she returned from Kyiv in March. Lesya's stamina did not betray her, as her letter in verse is marked with the sparkling sense of humour, bitter irony and invincible optimism.

The text demonstrates characteristic features of Lesya Ukrainka's epistolary, which include: foreign insertions, precedent names, set expressions, intertextuality, in particular, allusions (for example, "Musy Spivodayni / Singing Muses" refers to V. Samilienko's parody on the verses of Galician poets, "laughter through tears" alludes to Gogol', etc.), occasionalisms, lingual play, parody. Her epistolary speech abounds in dialecticisms, folklorisms, truncated forms of verbs, long forms of adjectives or pronouns, colloquial particles, exclamations and other discursive words used to express highly emotional speech, supported by punctuation marks (a question mark, exclamation mark, exclamation point and three dots) which represent the discursive pragmatics.

Lesya Ukrainka's epistolary legacy is used in the monoperformance *Believe me, that I loved you* [Ольшовський 2005: 46], which testifies that letters most consistently reflect intimate and most secret spectres of their author's soul.

Modern polyfunctional linguistic paradigm of knowledge promotes the actualization of new dimensions in the study of Lesya Ukrainka's epistolary discourse. The combination of linguopragmatic, sociolinguistic, communicative and cultural research approaches makes it possible to describe in detail the "lingual biography" of the poet, as well as to outline her lingual, communicative and emotional competence. It should be empasized that Lesya's linguocreativity represents a model of the elite linguopersonality of Ukrainian women in general, which contributes to the development of Ukrainian linguopersonology.

Epistolary texts are an integral part of every national culture. The private correspondence of Ukrainian writers deserves its place in the global epistolary. The style of most of these letters was determined by their non-fictional intentionality, i.e. most of them were not initially written to be published. However, due to the original and profound self-expression, the writers' epistolary have become an integral and important part of their literary heritage. Not only have these private letters turned into a literary fact, but also generated a lingual genre, which is indispensible for the research in the field of "I-linguistics", or linguistics of the ego-text.

At the turn of the 20th–21st centuries the linguistic paradigm is characterized by a special attention to different types and forms of lingual practices, including ego-texts. Types of ego-texts depend on their author as a linguopersonality, his / her multiaspectual status, the way of verbalizing personal discourse and its genre. Therefore, ego-texts can be subdivided into artistic, philosophical, publicistic, documentary, official, yet not infrequently they may have a hybrid multi-style nature. Key types of ego-texts are as follows: a diary, memoirs, autobiography, letters, although they may have subgenres or be represented as hybrid genres. Genre variety of ego-texts includes the apology, dialogue, essay, notebooks, interviews, confession, epigram and aphorism. The taxonomy of ego-texts remains open-ended, the same as the development of a corresponding theory.

Ego-texts distinctly encode the world outlook of a person as a system of his / her thoughts, judgments, beliefs, ideas, affiliations, desires and needs, which are made manifest in his / her behavior and determine his / her perception and interpretation of the world. Ego-texts reproduce affective, emotional reactions and social positions which reflect real life situations and make the person's behavior, in particular lingual one, so unique that his / her biography as a linguopersonality can be outlined on this basis.

The analysis of ego-texts makes it possible to describe a person as a linguopersonality, the author of personal texts, to define linguoculture as a complex and productive system of personal interactions and social values, to motivate the presence of an independent trend in modern linguistics − linguistics of ego-texts (or I-linguistics), which has its subject, object, material, aim and objectives, methodological foundation, special research methods and techniques.

QUALIFYING BASES OF AXIOPHRASEME PRAGMATICS

Zh. Krasnobaieva-Chorna

4.1. Axiophraseme pragmatics as a section of linguistics

Axiophrasemic pragmatics is a new research area in linguistics, which aims to create a holistic and objective model of the functioning of the evaluation in phrasemics of single-structured and multi-structured languages.

The main *tasks* of axiophrasemic pragmatics are: 1) the formation of a linguistic profile of evaluation in the axiological paradigm with a description of the evaluative component of the phrasemic meaning; 2) the development of the classification of phrasemes according to their evaluation load, which is based on the evaluative scale 'good – neutral – bad', with specific tracing of different ranges ('good / bad', 'to approve / not to approve', 'to satisfy / not to satisfy', 'valuable / not valuable', 'to interest / not to interest', 'to agree / not to agree', 'to recommend / to forbid', 'to maintain / to deny', 'to comply with / not to comply with'); 3) the description of the constitutive features of value and the axiological world's image in phrasemics; 4) the reconstruction of the phrasemic level of the axiological world's image and establishment of the structural organization of value in phrasemics; 5) the determination of the nomenclature of universal values, which is based on the initial knowledge about specific values, and verification as ethnic forms of values; 6) the description of the peculiarities of the language presentation of values at the phrasemic level of the axiological world's image (associative analysis, analysis of the secondary sign system, etc.).

The object of axiophrasemic pragmatics are the phrasemic evaluation and the value as a linguophilosophical and linguocultural category.

The subject of axiophrasemic pragmatics are phrasemes with evaluative semantics.

Methodological base of axiophrasemic pragmatics. The values in phrasemics are described by *the method of parametric analysis* of the phraseme semantic structure with accentuation of evaluative macro-component and the basic method of ideographic linguistics, *the method of thematic fields*. The basic unit of analysis is phraseme axiological opposition, regarded as a unity of two phraseme blocks: the first is formed by phrasemes, semantics of which correlates with the values, and the second is made up by phrasemes, semantics of which correlates with non-values.

The composition of the *terminology system* of axiophrasemic pragmatics: 1) phraseme meaning; denotative component of phraseme meaning; significative component of phraseme meaning; connotative component of phraseme meaning; evaluative component of phraseme meaning; 2) classification of phrasemes according to their evaluation load; positively evaluative phrasemes, negatively evaluative phrasemes, neutrally evaluative phrasemes, phrasemes with diffuse evaluation; 3) value, non-value; axiological world's image; evaluative categorization, phrasemic axiological opposition; phraseme-ideographic classification; phraseme-semantical field, phraseme-semantical groups, phraseme-semantical subgroups; cultural code; secondary sign system; associate.

4.2. The specifics of the phrasemic evaluation: theoretical and applied foundations

4.2.1. To the question of the evaluative component of the phrasemic meaning

Axiophrasemic pragmatics actualizes the study of the structure of phraseme meaning, which is characterized by a complex nature [Арнольд 1986; Арсентьева 1989; Богатырева 2015; Василенко 2010; Мелерович, Мокиенко 2008; Никипорец 2000; Пестова 2011; Терпак 2006; Яхина 2008] (Table 3.1). The qualifying features of the evaluative component of the phrasemic meaning are: 1) the possibility of selection in the denotative and connotative components of phraseme meaning (I. Chobot [Чобот 2002]); 2) the conditionality of extralinguistic factors: the logical category of evaluation, social evaluation, deontic world's image, value orientations of society, national-cultural charac-

Table 4.1.

The structure of the phraseme meaning in modern linguistics

Linguist	Denotative component of phraseme meaning	Significative component of phraseme meaning	Connotative component of phraseme meaning
I. Arnold (1986)	significative-denotative component of phraseme meaning		emotive, evaluative, expressive functional-stylistic components of phraseme meaning
O. Arsentyeva (1989)	significative-denotative component of phraseme meaning		connotative component of phraseme meaning
	basic information		additional information
G. Nikiporets (2000)		indicates on the reference potential	
M. Terpak (2006)	significative-denotative component of phraseme meaning		covers all information contained in the form above its denotative content
	nominative function		expressive and appealing functions
	intertwined		
A. Melerovich, V. Mokienko (2008)	contributes to the detection of the substantive bearing of the sign, causing a substantive representation in the human consciousness	defines the correlation of phrasemes with representations or concepts as a carrier of certain properties, qualities and has a higher degree of abstraction	
	subject-logical content		
A. Yakhina (2008)	topic for evaluative-emotive attitude		rema part
A. Vasilenko (2010)	the psychological basis for creating a evaluative attitude of the speaker		
M. Pestova (2011)	derivative		a complex of signals aimed at the emotional impact on the recipient
K. Bogaty-ryova (2015)	significative-denotative component of phraseme meaning		– emotive-evaluative – functional-stylistic components of phraseme meaning
	– subject-logical content – internal form – figurative motivation – phraseme abstraction		
	inextricable connection		

teristics (A. Yakhina [Яхина 2008]); 3) the rematic part (the denotation is a topic for an evaluative-emotive relationship) (A. Yakhina [Яхина 2008]); 4) index of semantic integrity, stability and reproducibility (O. Khabarova [Хабарова 2003]); 5) the conditionality by imagery and expressiveness (O. Khabarova [Хабарова 2003]); 6) the most important component, together with the emotive, in the semantic structure of the phrasemes (A. Vasilenko [Василенко 2010]); 7) the layer on the denotative content, which is located above it and plays the role of a strong characterizing element (A. Vasilenko [Василенко 2010]); 8) the discovery of the value relation through the prism of cultural knowledge (S. Oliynyk [Олійник 2008]); 9) the main "reason" for phrasemic nomination and image selection (S. Gabunia and R. Kairova [Габуниа, Каирова 2010]); 10) the management of the emotive-expressive component of the phrasemic meaning (S. Gabunia and R. Kairova [Габуниа, Каирова 2010]); 11) the consequence, the attribute imaginative rethinking (E. Dibrova [Диброва 2001]).

4.2.2. Typology of phrasemes according to their evaluation load

The evaluation is presented by the connotative component of the phraseme meaning and at the same time inextricably linked with the significative-denotative component [Краснобаєва-Чорна 2016: 339].

The evaluation is implemented in phrasemics of single-structured and multi-structured languages in semantic ranges 'good / bad', 'to approve / not to approve', 'to satisfy / not to satisfy', 'valuable / not valuable', 'to interest / not to interest', 'to agree / not to agree', 'to recommend / to forbid', 'to maintain / to deny', 'to comply with / not to comply with'.

The axiophrasemic pragmatics also builds and introduces into scientific use a general linguistic classification of phrasemes according to their evaluation load. This classification singles out positively evaluative, negatively evaluative, neutrally evaluative phrasemes and phrasemes with diffuse evaluation. This division in its turn allows to focus on their connection with the category of value.

4.2.2.1. Positively evaluative phrasemes

Positively evaluative phrasemes – phrasemes that correspond to the "good" area of the evaluative scale and are positioned as:

a) 'good' – Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) влитий*, зі сл. *сидіти* ('very good (about clothes)'); Ukr. *перший (conver. первий) сорт* (1) ('best, best quality'); Russ. *что надо*, vernac. (1) ('very beautiful, the best (about someone or something)'); Russ. *разлюли малина*, vernac. ('very good, great' (1); 'very beautiful, great' (2)); *everything in the garden is lovely (rosy)*, conver. ('everything is fine, everything is in the best way'); *do yeoman('s) service* ('to provide good service, support'); Germ. *gut beieinander sein*, conver. (1) ('feel good') (contexts 1–9):

(1) Ukr. *Онук якось аж неохоче вдягнув – костюм сидів на ньому як влитий* (А. Дімаров);

(2) Ukr. *– Грали ми в одному городі* [у місті], *– задумливо й дивлячись кудись у куток, заговорив він тихо і трагічно. – А знаєте, підібрав тоді трупку – первий сорт* (В. Винниченко);

(3) Russ. *Если Гавану окинуть мигом – рай-страна, страна что надо. Под пальмой на ножке стоят фламинго. Цветет колларио по всей Ведадо* (В. Маяковский);

(4) Russ. *– А ты, Пашка, оставайся, – сказал доктор, хлопая Пашку по плечу. У меня, брат, хорошо, разлюли малина!* (А. Чехов);

(5) Russ. *– Житье там* [в скитах] *разлюли малина, век бы оттоле не вышел* (П. Мельников-Печерский);

(6) *This has done me yeoman's service in the hour of necessity* (W. Scott);

(7) *I don't suppose there's anyone in Hollywood now except myself who remembers him in his prime – he did yeoman service* (E. Waugh);

(8) *'How is Love by the way? Still going strong?.. So everything in the garden's still rosy, eh?' 'Yes' – she said from habit and then paused* (M. Dickens);

(9) Germ. *"Wie geht es Ihnen?" – "Danke, seit der Kur bin ich eigentlich ganz gut beieinander!"* (MDtI);

b) 'to approve' – Ukr. *дай Боже (Бог, Господи)* (2) ('is used to express an appreciation for someone, something in terms of size, quantity, quality, degree of expression, etc.'); Ukr. *та що* (2) ('is used to express approval, conviction'); Russ. *поднимать (подымать) на щит* ('to praise, to extol'); Russ. *давно бы так!* ('finally. Expression of the approval of the action expected by someone and a long time ago'); *bring down the house (bring the house down)* ('cause a storm of applause'); Germ. j-m *Applaus spenden* ('express your approval to someone'); Germ. *j-m Beifall lachen (lächeln)* ('to smile approvingly') (contexts 10–16):

(10) Ukr. *– Те, що Оксана Кульбачка посадила, – росте дай Бог! Ось у кого нам треба вчитись…* (О. Гончар);

(11) Ukr. *У старого Лук'яна Хомутенка сімеєчка дай Боже: він з жінкою та восьмеро дітей* (Григорій Тютюнник);

(12) Ukr. [Любов:] *Риск… та що, без нього все життя людське було б одностайне, як осінній дощ. Боятись його, значить, боятися життя, бо в житті скрізь риск* (Леся Українка);

(13) Russ. *Константин Сергеевич* [Станиславский] *обратился к народно-импровизированному театру как раз в ту пору, когда стилизаторы и модернисты всех мастей поднимали на щит принципы комедии масок* (А. Дикий);

(14) Russ. [Агафья Тихоновна:] *Я никак не смею думать, чтобы я могла составить счастие… А в прочем, я согласна.* [Кочкарев:] *Натурально, натурально, так бы давно* (Н. Гоголь);

(15) *I remember the scene well. It used to bring down the house. I've never heard such applause in my life* (W. S. Maugham)

(16) *Hanged if Hampton didn't go on and give a turn, sang and danced, and by George! he brought the house down!* (A. J. Cronin);

c) 'to satisfy' – Ukr. *мати честь (щастя)*, з інфін. ('is used to express pride for something, pleasure from something; to be honored with something, with pleasure to do something'); Ukr. *з дорогою душею* ('willingly, with great pleasure, with joy'); Russ. *ухватиться [схватиться] обеими руками* ('willingly, with great desire, joy, pleasure, etc. to use something'); *as soon as look at smb.*; Russ. *за милую душу* (1) ('with great pleasure, desire, willingly'); *be all smiles* – 'have a very satisfied look' (contexts 17–23):

(17) Ukr. *– Я вже мав честь бути в вашому домі.. – почав Ломицький* (І. Нечуй Левицький);

(18) Ukr. *"Товаришу листоноша, – сказав тоді й артист. – Тоді дозвольте мені мати честь – бути вашим добрим знайомим"* (Ю. Яновський);

(19) Ukr. *А я би справді з дорогою душею зараз би до вас вибралася, дарма, що тепер північ і надворі негода* (Леся Українка);

(20) Russ. *Старуха за милую душу Оладьев тебе напекла* (С. Есенин);

(21) Russ. *– Ну, желаю успеха. Другой бы обеими руками схватился и думать не стал бы, а вы… Эх, капитан!* (Ю. Крымов);

(22) *The girl is a good worker but if you were to leave money or valuables lying about she'd steal them as soon as look at you. If he starts any of his nonsense with my daughters, boss's son or no boss's son, I'll kick him out of the house as soon as look at him;*

(23) *Lada had rushed to the door, all smiles, all welcome* (S. Heym);

d) 'valuable' – Ukr. *[i] ціни не [можна] скласти (не складеш)* ('someone, something extremely valuable, important with its features, properties, qualities'); Ukr. *на дорозі (на вулиці, на смітті і т. ін.) не валяється* ('has a fair amount of value, positive qualities, is highly valued and rarely'); Russ. *не иголка* (1) ('not a trifle, something important, meaningful'); Russ. *на вес золота* ('very expensive (appreciate, cost, etc.)' (1); 'meaningful, extremely valuable' (2); *at a premium* – 'in high demand'; *be worth one's weight in gold*, conver. – 'much appreciated'; Germ. *es kommt darauf an* (2) ('important, need') (contexts 24–33):

(24) Ukr. – *На шиї в мене було намисто з таких здорових та дорогих діамантів, що їм і ціни не скласти* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);

(25) Ukr. – *Та ж він наш Левко, а не ваш! У нього руки, що за руки – ціни їм не складеш! І розбитний же він у нас – і до плуга, і до рала* (І. Драч);

(26) Ukr. – *Пошукай, Омеляне, собі такого робітника в місті або на цукроварні. – Чортзна-що – скоро знайдеш, а такі, як Волошин, па вулиці не валяються…* (М. Стельмах);

(27) Russ. *Титану нужен великий сюжет, а такой сюжет не иголка* (Д. Писарев);

(28) Russ. *[Валентина] ценила своего старшего диспетчера на вес золота* (Г. Николаева);

(29) Russ. *В антракте, когда я стоял в проходе партера, Петр Ильич, проходя мимо меня, сказал мне: – Не правда ли, восхитительно? Как играют! А у Островского, что ни слово, то на вес золота!* (Ю. Юрьев);

(30) *In our army, back in those now-dead very far-off times, pistols were at a premium* (J. Jones);

(31) *When court reconvened at three o'clock, standing room in the court was at a premium* (E. S. Gardner);

(32) *She was known very soon to be the perfect parlourmaid… She was worth her weight in gold* (W. S. Maugham);

(33) Germ. *Nachdem ich etwas erfahren hatte, kam es mir erst vor, als ob ich gar nichts wisse, und ich hatte recht: denn es fehlte mir der Zusammenhang, und darauf kommt doch eigentlich alles an* (J. W. Goethe);

e) 'to interest' – Ukr. *розпускати (розставляти) / розпустити (розставити) вуха (уха)* (1), зі сл. *слухати* ('carefully, with curiosity, with great enthusiasm, forgetting about everything'); Ukr. *як (мов, ніби*

і т. ін.) *заворожений* (2), перев. зі сл. дивитися, слухатися ('careful, attentive, interested'); Russ. *растерять уши*, obsol. ('listen with great attention, interest; listen with delight'); *be all eyes*, conver.; *be in the limelight* – 'be the center of attention'; *be in the public eye* – 'to attract public attention, to be in the center of attention, to interest the general public'; Germ. *sein Auge auf j-m, etw. haben* ('attentively, attentively, interested in looking at someone or something'); Germ. *das Feuer schüren* (2) ('to keep up the interest') (contexts 34–42):

(34) Ukr. *Слухав той, слухав, розпустивши вуха, і відчував себе на десятому небі* (І. Цюпа);

(35) Ukr. *Слухаю його, вуха розпустила: умів, умів мене Тарас заспокоювати* (І. Муратов);

(36) Ukr. *Володька… вмочив перо в чорнильницю, застиг. Всі завмерли: дивилися як заворожені на те гостре перо, нависле над чистим поки ще папером, боялися дихнути* (А. Дімаров);

(37) Russ. *– "Я лучше недалечко тут в леску заночую". И будто я не гляжу и не вижу, что мой бурлак уши растерял, слушает и глазами светит* (Н. Кохановская);

(38) *He was all eyes as the train sped through the country* (W. S. Maugham);

(39) *But Marjorie Ferrar is frightfully in the limelight. She paints a bit; she's got some standing with the press… she goes everywhere weekending* (J. Galsworthy);

(40) *The writer has his ups and downs, and I was but too conscious that at the moment I was not in the public eye* (W. S. Maugham);

(41) Germ. *Hier war Du Guast zu schätzen… Die Zuschauer auf dem Gerüst hatten alle das Auge auf ihm* (H. Mann);

(42) Germ. *Neuerdings scheint sich unsere Jüngste für Musik zu interessieren. Was können wir tun, um das Feuer ein bißchen zu schüren* (W. Friederich);

f) 'to maintain' – Ukr. *класти / покласти голову [на плаху]* (1) ('with full responsibility to be guided by someone, something, assuring someone, to maintain something'); Ukr. *давати / дати голову* (рідше *руку) [на відруб (на відсік* і т. ін.)]) ('with full responsibility to be guided by someone, something; convincingly maintain something'); *and no mistake?*, conver.; *any day*, conver. ('with full responsibility to be guided by someone, something; convincingly maintain something; indeed, undoubtedly, without fail') (contexts 43–49):

(43) Ukr. *При мені привезено було в Львів 8 т[исяч] рублів.. Але я голову кладу, коли Львівська типографія, котру мені показано в 1876 р., варта й 1/2 тих грошей* (М. Драгоманов);

(44) Ukr. *– За Сева я даю голову. Коли тільки можливе в світі існування пари друзів, то це я і Сев* (Ю. Яновський);

(45) Ukr. *– Чи ви повірили, що справді злодії перед вами?! Та голову на одруб даю, що це чиста провокація!* (А. Головко);

(46) *A damned funny business and no mistake* (W. S. Maugham);

(47) *Time flies and no mistake* (A. Sillitoe);

(48) *You're always sneering at me… But I am as good as you any day* (J. Joyce);

(49) *He is better looking than Gil, any day, I think* (Th. Dreiser);

g) 'to agree' – Ukr. *нехай (хай) буде гречка,* playf. ('is used to express consent; ok'); Ukr. *будь ласка* (2) ('a stable form of expression of consent, a polite answer to the words of gratitude, etc.; please'); Russ. *есть такое дело!,* vernac. ('an expression of consent, a willingness to do something'); *can (will) a duck swim*? ('do you doubt my agreement'); *all right,* conver. (1) ('express consent; you can rest assured'); *come into line (fall in, into line)* ('to agree'); Germ. *zu allem ja und amen sagen*, conver. ('to agree with everyone'); Germ. *das läßt sich denken* ('it is understandable, you can agree with it') (contexts 50–57):

(50) Ukr. *– Тільки не треба про смерть. – Хай буде гречка! Не будемо про смерть* (П. Автомонов);

(51) Ukr. *– Трусити, так усіх трусити, підряд. – О, будь ласка!* (А. Головко);

(52) Ukr. [Співбесідник (до Карташова):] *Киньмо цю розмову.* [Карташов:] *Будь ласка* (О. Довженко);

(53) Russ. *– Так, значит, в двадцать тридцать, товарищ Лобачев! Есть такое дело!* (И. Егоров);

(54) *I had already trudged five miles of dreary moorland road when a lorry-driver pulled up and asked if I wanted a lift. 'Can a duck swim?' I thought to myself. 'Will you come to the hop with me if I call around for you?' 'With you Dempsey?' she stammered. 'Say – will a duck swim?'* (O. Henry);

(55) *And don't be long yourself, Doreen! All right, mam. Only ten minutes* (A. Sillitoe);

(56) *It was lucky she and Bosinney got on; she seemed to be falling into line with the idea of the new house* (J. Galsworthy);

(57) Germ. *Er* [Habs] *hatte den Vater sonst ein wenig verachtet, weil er immer zu allem ja und amen sagte…* (A. Seghers);

h) 'to recommend' – Ukr. *давати / дати рецепти* ('recommend, advise someone, suggest, how to act in a particular situation'); Russ. *замолвить [закинуть] словечко* ('to petition in front of someone, to say something in favor of someone'); Germ. *einem Antrag stattgeben*, канц. ('to satisfy the petition') (contexts 58–60):

(58) Ukr. *Чомусь дедалі частіше* [син] *.. кудись біжить, спішить, матері за всі турботи відповідає грубощами… А ти повинен ось тут давати рецепти, поради іншим…* (О. Гончар);

(59) Russ. *Я хотел… просить вас, что бы вы замолвили за меня словечко князю* (М. Салтыков-Щедрин);

(60) Germ. *Die Richter berieten flüsternd, und Sprezius verkündete: das Gericht gebe nur dem Antrage des Verteidigers statt…* (H. Mann);

i) 'to comply with' – Ukr. *знати міру* ('to adhere to certain norms, limits to anything'); Ukr. *укладатися в рамки* ('not to go beyond the norm, recognized standards, etc.'); Russ. *держать марку* ('observe the necessary standards of conduct to maintain the dignity, reputation of someone or something'); Russ. *держать себя в рамках* <*приличия*> ('follow the standards, rules of conduct'); *be on the right side of the law* ('to abide by the law'); *by the book* ('according to the rules, according to the instructions'); Germ. *das Dekorum wahren*, solemn ('comply with the rules, external rules of conduct; maintain decorum') (contexts 61–69):

(61) Ukr. *Ви вже, Іване, жартуйте там собі з дівчатками, але не зо всіма: жартуйте, але й міру знайте! – гордо обізвався Клим* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);

(62) Ukr. *Хоч і полюбляв Михей чарку, але знав міру* (М. Зарудний);

(63) Ukr. *Досі Антін здавався простим і зрозумілим. Все було в нім ясне, добре відоме, укладалося в рамки* (М. Коцюбинський);

(64) Russ. *– Начали большое дело, так выдерживайте марку до конца* (С. Бабаевский);

(65) Russ. *Все же в столовой господа офицеры держали себя в рамках и пили только для возбуждения аппетита, а уж потом, позднее, собрались на квартирах, где можно было нарезаться, не боясь начальства* (А. Гончаров);

(66) *'I suppose you're on the right side of the law?' 'I'm not murdering this week, if that's what you suggest,' said Mr. Campion with dignity* (R. Aldington);

(67) *Bill's all rigt. I won't say anything against Bill… He always did everything by the book* (J. O'Hara);

(68) *'We're running an airline', Sakowitz said, quietly. 'And we're running it by the book'* (S. Sheldon);

(69) Germ. *Das ist bereits die Klasse für den wohlhabenderen Mittelstand, den Arbeitgeber, den Geschäftsmann, den besseren Ladenbesitzer und, natürlich, den tapferen Unglücksraben, den höheren Beamten, der, ebenso wie der kleine, im Tode mehr ausgeben muß, als er im Leben verdient hat, um das Dekorum zu wahren* (E. M. Remarque).

4.2.2.2. Negatively evaluative phrasemes

Negatively evaluative phrasemes – phrasemes that correspond to the "bad" area of the evaluative scale and are positioned as:

a) 'bad' – Ukr. *як з гречки лико*, playf. ('bad, worthless (about someone)'); Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) мила ковтнув (з'їв)* ('in bad mood'); Russ. *из рук вон* (1) ('very (bad, badly)'); Russ. *дальше <ехать [идти]> некуда* ('worse that can not be'); *back the wrong horse* – 'to make a bad choice, to make a mistake in the calculations, in the choice'; *a bad character (hat, lot)*, conver. – 'a person with a bad reputation; dishonest person'; Germ. *es ist schlecht um j-n, etw. (mit j-m, etw.) bestellt; die Sache steht nicht zum besten* ('nasty things') (contexts 70–79):

(70) Ukr. *– Що ж робити? – звернувся Дорощук до виконроба. – Орієнтуйтесь, ви бригадир, – кинув той.. "З мене такий бригадир, як з гречки лико"* (М. Ю. Тарновський);

(71) Ukr. *– Чого це ти, Чіпко, як мила з'їв? – питає [Лушня]. – Чого ти журишся?* (Панас Мирний);

(72) Russ. *Играли они дурно, очень дурно, так что даже пристрастные репортеры не могли не признаться, что исполнение этих господ было из рук вон плохо* (Н. Островский);

(73) Russ. *– Матрена Кондратьевна, одолжите на минуточку мне ваш ножичек, складной, булки отрезать! – Нате, Марья Михеевна, только же он тупой у меня, дальше некуда: хотела точильщику отнесть, да в горячке такой разве поспеешь!* (С. Сергеев-Ценский);

(74) *'We shan't attempt violence. Just keep you under restraint so to speak.' 'I'm afraid you're backing the wrong horse,' said Tommy.*

'I've no intention of being kept under restraint as you call it' (A. Christie);

(75) *Lady Clavering has told me that they were not happy, and that her husband was a bad character* (W. S. Thackeray);

(76) *The hawklike man was clearly a 'a bad hat'* (J. Galsworthy);

(77) *I don't want you to do Cleopatra. She is an animal, a bad lot. Yours is a beneficent personality* (G. B. Shaw);

(78) Germ. *Zum Wochenende haben wir unseren Großvater besucht. Ich glaube, es ist gar nicht gut um ihn bestellt* (MDtI);

(79) Germ. *Aber es war für ihn zweifellos notwendig, eine neue Ehe einzugehen: seine Läden standen nicht zum besten* (B. Brecht);

b) 'not to approve'– Ukr. *хто [ж] бачив (видав)?* ('is used to express indignation over anything, condemnation of something; can not'); Russ. *этого еще не хватало [недоставало]!* ('is used to express indignation, disapproval, etc. about something unwanted'); *take a dim view of smth.* ('to be pessimistic about something, not to approve of anything, to be against something') (contexts 80–82):

(80) Ukr. *Хто ж видав, насадити таку силу сих лелій, та ще й білих?* (Леся Українка);

(81) Russ. *– А кого вместо Осьмухина бригадиром назначить?.. – Ковшова. – Этого еще не хватало! – нахмурился Лощилин* (А. Мусатов);

(82) *The doctors take a dim view of his chances of recovery. Of all the family, Jennifer had been the only one not to take a dim view of Kenneth Strang's change in career* (H. MacInnes).

Unflattering evaluation can contain the token 'disapprovingly', recorded by the dictionary (Ukr. *принести в пелені (у приполі)*, disappr. ('to give birth to an illegitimate child'); Russ. *ветряная мельница*, disappr. ('loose, frivolous, empty man'); *cry stinking fish*, conver., disappr. ('to disclose quarrels that occur between loved ones'); Germ. *glatt wie ein Aal*, disappr. ('cunning, wizard man') (contexts 83–86):

(83) Ukr. *Багачі своїми поглумками проходу не давали: – Дождалась? Ждала мати червінців таврійських, а дочка натомість байстря в пелені принесла!* (О. Гончар);

(84) Russ. [Арина Петровна] *называла мужа "ветряною мельницей" и "бесструнной балалайкой"* (М. Салтыков-Щедрин);

(85) *They can't bear any one who cries 'stinking fish', whatever his object* (J. Galsworthy);

(86) Germ. *Es ist schwer, ihm etwas nachzuweisen. Er ist glatt wie ein Aal und schlüpft aus jeder Falle wieder heraus* (MDtI);

c) 'not to satisfy' – Ukr *гнівити Бога (Господа)* ('is used to express dissatisfaction with someone'); Ukr. *їдять [його] мухи [з комарами]* (1), invect. ('is used to express dissatisfaction with someone, something, irritation, annoyance, etc.'); Russ. *входить в претензию*, obsol. ('express dissatisfaction with anything, offend someone or something'); Russ. *надулся как [будто, словно, точно] мышь на крупу*, vernac. ('very strongly offended, angry, dissatisfied with something. About a man, expressing his image of displeasure'); *(as) cross as a bear with a sore head (like a bear with a sore head)*, conver. ('very dissatisfied, angry'); *cut off one's nose to spite one's fase*, conver. , disappr. ('to act to the detriment of oneself under the influence of anger'); Germ. *auszusetzen haben* ('to criticize someone; to be dissatisfied'); Germ. *böses Blut machen* ('cause dissatisfaction (anger)') (contexts 87–95):

(87) Ukr. – *Не добрий він тобі судився, тебе їм [ним] Бог скарав. – Мамо, не гнівіть Бога, се все вже Бога гнівите! – мене дорікає дочка моя* (Марко Вовчок);

(88) Ukr. *Не гніви, Григорію, Господа, – почувся знову батюшчин голос. – Молися краще й уповай на милість його* (В. Шевчук);

(89) Ukr. – *Без мене ви тут, хлопці, нічого не зробите, їдять його мухи з комарами* (М. Зарудний);

(90) Russ. – *Вот-с, изволите видеть: господин сочинитель, то бишь студент, ..изволили в претензию войти, что я папироску при них закурил!* (Ф. Достоевский);

(91) Russ. *Миша скривил губы и уткнулся в тарелку. – Чего надулся как мышь на крупу? – сказала бабушка* (А. Рыбаков);

(92) *'Why not?' said Edith, who was the exact opposite of her sister in every respect and always seemed as cross as a bear with a sore heard* (S. Howatch);

(93) *Like a bear with a sore head, that's what I am. My girls give me a wide berth when I've got an attack of gout* (A. Christie);

(94) *Still if he refused to make any advantageous deals with Mr. George W. Stener, or any other man influential in local affairs, he was cutting off his nose to spite his face, for other bankers and brokers would and gladly* (Th. Dreiser);

(95) Germ. *Es war ihm bekannt, daß Toinettes Aufwand böses Blut in Paris machte, und nun verging kaum eine Woche, ohne daß er dem höflichen, beflissenen und mißbilligenden Necker… Order geben mußte…* (L. Feuchtwanger);

d) 'not valuable' – Ukr. *не вартий (не варт) [і] [ламаного] гроша (карбованця, [щербатої] копійки, шага, шеляга, [мідного] п'ятака) [в базарний день]* (2) ('which has no value or lost its meaning; which is not worthy of attention'); Ukr. *пустий (порожній) звук* ('worthless'); Russ. *плюнуть и [да] растереть*, vernac. ('nothing meaningful, not worthy for anyone. The fact, that it does not matter to anyone, is not worthy of attention'); Russ. *отставной козы барабанщик*, playf., ironic.('a person, who does not deserve any attention, no one needs, which are not considered'); *cut no ice* ('don't play any part, don't matter') (contexts 96–102):

(96) Ukr. [Ганна Хмельницька:] *Були вони колись князі, а тепер шага не вартий на Україні здрібнілий, та заниділий, та захуджений рід князів Соломирецьких* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);

(97) Ukr. *Звичайно, всі дурниці про вплив дядька на племінницю і про використання Богдани ворогом не варті щербатої копійки* (П. Загребельний);

(98) Ukr. *– В цій кривавій боротьбі, Папо, з поступом наук, Ти пустий сьогодні звук!* (І. Франко);

(99) Russ. *– На тросточке золотой набалдашник в сотенный билет. Дозвольте спросить, чего ему* [барину] *это стоит? Плюнуть и растереть!* (А. Эртель);

(100) Russ. *– Наслушался всяких толков, всяческих повстречал властителей, крупных и мелких, начиная от какой-нибудь станичной мелюзги, отставной козы барабанщиков и кончая… Керенским* (Н. Сухов);

(101) *Though well known for their hobbies, they 'cut no ice' whith the general public* (J. Galsworthy);

(102) Boanerges. *O, sit down, man, sit down. You're in your own house: ceremony cuts no ice with me* (G. B. Shaw);

e) 'not to interest' – Ukr. *ні холодно ні жарко* ('does anyone care; who doesn't pay attention to something'); Ukr. *живий труп* ('the one, who is deprived of any vital interests, aspirations, desires; indifferent to everything'); Russ. *душа [сердце] не лежит* ('no interest, inclination, desire, sympathy, trust in someone or something'); Russ. *ноль внимания*, vernac. ('complete indifference on the part of someone to someone or to something'); *all the same* (1) ('don't care, indifferent'); *care a bit (brass farthing, button, dam, hang, hoot, two straws, etc.)* ('not interested at all, don't care'); Germ. *etw. außer acht lassen (aus der* або *aus aller Acht lassen)* ('don't pay any attention to anything'); Germ. *sich keinen Deut machen* ('to show no interest') (contexts 103–111):

(103) Ukr. [Середа:] *Я стою за Івана – проти Яроша. [Журавель:] Але Івану від цього ні холодно ні жарко* (І. Микитенко);

(104) Ukr. *– Ти ж знаєш мій характер! – А мені від нього ні холодно ні жарко* (П. Рєсніков);

(105) Ukr. *Життя має тільки тоді смисл, коли людина діє, творить. Коли ж вона позбавлена можливості діяти, творити, така людина перетворюється на живий труп* (І. Цюпа);

(106) Russ. *Наташе совестно было ничего не делать в доме, тогда как все были так заняты, и она несколько раз с утра еще пробовала приняться за дело; но душа ее не лежала к этому делу* (Л. Толстой);

(107) Russ. [Мичман] *вычитывал из книг разные словечки, в надежде произвести эффект.., еще отчаяннее корчил англичанина и.. ноль внимания. Молодая женщина словно нарочно не замечала его оригинальности* (К. Станюкович);

(108) *As long as there's a golf course nearby, it's all the same to him where we go for our holiday;*

(109) *He's just an outlaw. He doesn't care a hand about anything* (J. Aldridge);

(110) *But I don't care a dam – pardon me, I mean – well, that's what I really do mean. I don't care a damn about tiled baths, and gas garbage-incinerators* (S. Lewis);

(111) Germ. *Zum Jahrmarkt komme ich aber nicht mit. Ich mache mir keinen Deut aus Karussellfahrten und dergleichen* (W. Friederich);

f) 'to deny' – Ukr. *як у Спасівку соловейко заспіває*, ironic. ('is used to express a complete objection to the contents of the sentence; never'); Ukr. *дідька лисого*, vulg. (1); Russ. *черта [беса] лысого*, vulg. ('nothing, nothing at all (get, give, understand, do, etc.). The expression of a strong objection to something'); *at (on, to) the Greek Calends (kalends)*, playf.; Germ. *i bewahre! (Gott bewahre!)*, conver. ('is used to express a complete denial of something; for nothing, never'); Germ. *in Abrede stellen* ('to deny, reject') (contexts 112–117):

(112) Ukr. [Марися:] *За вас я тоді вийду заміж, як у Спасівку соловейко заспіває* (І. Карпенко-Карий);

(113) Ukr. *– Хай людина створить отаке яблуко. Без землі, без повітря, без сонця. В лабораторії.. Створить? Дідька лисого!* (Л. Дмитерко);

(114) Russ. *Хорошо зарабатывают? – Кто? Рыбаки?.. Черта лысого* (В. Короленко);

(115) *'A cab was ordered to take the Signorina to the boat', he said, giving her the money. 'Well, she isn't going… Give the cabman this, and tell him he can come back at the Greek Calends.' 'When, Signore?' 'At the Greek Calends. He'll understand'* (R. Aldington);

(116) Germ. *Die Zahl der Erkrankungs-, der Todesfälle sollte sich auf zwanzig, auf vierzig, ja hundert und mehr belaufen, und gleich darauf wurde jedes Auftreten der Seuche, wenn nicht rundweg in Abrede gestellt, so doch auf völlig vereinzelte, von außen eingeschleppte Fälle zurückgeführt* (Th. Mann);

(117) Germ. *"Und daß du mir nicht alles Geld für Vergnügen ausgibst!" – "I bewahre, wo denkst du hin!"* (MDtI);

g) 'not to agree' – Ukr. *гладити (стригти) проти шерсті* ('disagree with someone, read someone'); Ukr. *ставати (становитися) / стати руба* ('resolutely protest, disagree with someone, anything'); Russ. *не даваться под лад,* obsol. ('disagree with someone else's offer'); *dig in one's heels (dig one's heels in),* conver. ('strongly oppose, to give a decisive rebuff') (contexts 118–121):

(118) Ukr. *Це все він стриже проти шерсті* (Укр. присл.);

(119) Ukr. *Настала осінь. Почали загадувати до школи. Наум гадав віддати Семена, але Наумиха стала руба і затялась, що не пустить* (М. Коцюбинський);

(120) Russ. *– Уж я ей толковал, толковал, никак, сударь, под лад не дается* (П. Мельников-Печерский);

(121) *When the parents told the headmaster they had decided to send their daughter to another school and demanded a refund of the fees, he dug his heels in and refused point blank;*

h) 'to forbid' – Ukr. *на поріг не пускати / не пустити* ('forbid anyone to come to somewhere, do not want to see someone'); Ukr. *сухий закон* (1) ('prohibition to use alcoholic beverages'); Russ. *ни шагу*[1] (2) ('expression of prohibition to go somewhere, to address someone for something'); *come off it,* conver., disappr. ('to forbid something'); *forbidden fruit;* Russ. *запретный плод* ('something tempting, desirable, but forbidden'); *forbidden ground* ('taboo topic'); Germ. *von Amts wegen untersagen (verbieten)* (2) ('to officially forbid something'); Germ. *und damit basta!* ('to forbid to talk about anything') (contexts 122–134):

(122) Ukr. *– Я б і на поріг її* [Марину] *не пустив* (Панас Мирний);

(123) Ukr. *– Колись нас сюди й на поріг не пустили б, а тепер тут, бачу, й закурити можна* (О. Гончар);

(124) Ukr. *В Малайзії – сухий закон, і його ніхто не порушує. Як виняток з винятків, у готелі гостеві можуть подати пляшку пива або келих сухого вина* (Ю. Мушкетик);

(125) Ukr. *– У штаті Бомбей – сухий закон. Пити спиртні напої заборонено* (В. Минко);

(126) Russ. *– Но только уговор лучше денег, чтобы к теще и к жене за деньгами ни шагу* (А. Писемский);

(127) Russ. *– Кабинет являлся для Шуры заколдованным царством, к которому она не смела приближаться. Но зато она постепенно завоевала все другие комнаты, которые раньше являлись запретным плодом* (Д. Мамин-Сибиряк);

(128) Russ. *О люди! все похожи вы На прародительницу Еву: ..Запретный плод вам подавай, А без того вам рай не в рай* (А. Пушкин);

(129) *Come of it, Bobbie. When you were sixteen who did you know that went to the Stork Club?* (J. O'Hara);

(130) Constance. *That's not what I need.* Pamela. *Oh, come off it, Constance, that's what we all need – love and friendship* (J. Osborne);

(131) *His father successfully prevented Galileo from even knowing that there was such a subject as mathematics until at the age of nineteen he happened, as an eavesdropper to overhear a lecture on geometry. He seized with avidity upon the subject, which had for him all the charm of forbidden fruit* (B. Russell);

(132) *'Mrs Biggs hardly comes within the categories of forbidden fruit,' tittered the Bursar* (Th. Sharpe);

(133) *Mr. B. thought he had touched on forbidden ground* (S. Lover);

(134) Germ. *Es kann einfach noch nichts da sein, und damit basta! So bist du!* (F. Wolf);

i) 'not to comply with' – Ukr. *дур заходить / зайшов у голову* ('anyone in their actions deviates from the norms of behavior, thoughtlessly, stupidly behaves'); Ukr. *переходити / перейти межу (міру, через край і т. ін.)* (1) ('do not comply with the permissible norm of anything permitted'); Russ. *брать [принимать] грех на душу* (2) ('to do some ungodly deed, to sin'); Russ. *хватить [перехватить] через край* ('having lost a sense of proportion, to do or say anything beyond the usual, permissible'); *beyond the pale* ('beyond the bounds of decency'); *fall from Grace,* taboo (2) ('sin'); Germ. *auf Abwege geraten* ('to pervert (including in a moral sense)') (contexts 135–141):

(135) Ukr. *Через тиждень-другий йому* [Рубінові] *знову заходив дур у голову* (І. Сенченко);

(136) Ukr. *Його жарти й штукарство часом переходили через край і були трохи грубуваті й навіть вульгарні* (І. Нечуй-Ле-вицький);

(137) Russ. [Марфа Борисовна:] *Татьяна Юрьевна, оставь кручи-ну! Напрасным страхом сердца не томи! Пройдет невзгодье, мирно бог устроит, И миром оградит святую Русь, Тогда Козьма Захарьич перестанет Печалиться, здоров и весел бу-дет. Не плачь, греха на душу не бери!* (Н. Островский);

(138) Russ. – *Дрязги наших двух начальников – тоже пережитки прошлых веков. – Ну, хватила девушка через край! – громко сказал Федосов* (В. Ажаев);

(139) Amanda. *I've been brought up to believe that it's beyond the pale for a man to strike a woman* (N. Coward);

(140) *He had assisted in extricating from the consequences of their folly several young girls of good family who had fallen from grace and could not otherwise be rescued* (Th. Dreiser);

(141) Germ. *Und einer von uns muß jetzt doch hier sein, weil die Leute alle nötig haben, gestachelt zu werden, um in der gehörigen Tätigkeit zu bleiben und nicht auf allerhand Flausen und Abwege zu geraten* (Engels an Marx).

4.2.2.3. Neutrally evaluative phrasemes

Neutrally evaluative phrasemes – phrasemes of the neutral area of the evaluative scale, which contains objects incompatible with "good" or "bad" signs: Ukr. *альфа і омега*, liter. (1) ('the beginning and the end of something'); *a dead end* (1) ('a street that does not have a through passage, travel'); Germ. *vor Anker gehen (sich vor. Anker legen)*, conver., playf. (2) ('to settle (to stay somewhere)') (contexts 142–144):

(142) Ukr. – *Містер Бредлі, – почав розмову управитель.., – ви знаєте, що все має початок і кінець – альфу і омегу…* (Ф. Бурлака);

(143) *Townsend Street was a dead end, and he could park there, beyond the last house* (J. Cheever);

(144) Germ. *Von Deanstreet, wo Marx' wohnten – ein paar Schritte von der Churchstreet, wo ich mich vor Anker gelegt hatte, – war gut Fünfviertelstunden* (W. Liebknecht).

4.2.2.4. Phrasemes with diffuse evaluation

Phrasemes with diffuse evaluation –phrasemes, the meaning of which contains both positive and negative evaluations; the evaluative meaning of such phrasemes determines context:

E x a m p l e 1. Ukr. *лиха (бісова, вража і т. ін.) личина* (contexts 145–149)*:*

- 'evil, insidious, etc. a person or other creature (1), invect.'
- (145) Ukr. [Личак:] *А я, розумієш, так думаю: Загуба чи не Загуба, а якась лиха личина в нашій окрузі завелася.., хтось комору запалив* (Я. Мамонтов);
- (146) Ukr. – *Ну покинь хлипати, нехай краще та вража личина хлипає, котра тебе зобидила* (Л. Письменна);
- (147) Ukr. *Хитра лукава личина. Ой, хитрюща!* (О. Ковінька);
- 'rough, is used to express dissatisfaction with anyone, disappointment, indignation at any occasion'
- (148) Ukr. [Сагайдак (зриваючи п 'явки):] *Десять років не був у вас. Тоді чи не було їх, чи не помічав. Бісові личини…* (Л. Дмитерко);
- 'is used to express pleasure, capture by someone, something, etc. (2), playf.'
- (149) – Ukr. *Люблю й я смажене сало. Держиш його на вогні, а воно, лиха личина, шкварчить, та на паляницю тільки кап, кап* (Остап Вишня);

E x a m p l e 2. Russ. *бог [Христос] с тобой [с ним, с ней, с вами, с ними])* (contexts 150–152):

- 'let it be so. Expression of consent, reconciliation, forgiveness, actions, etc.'
- (150) Russ. – *Бог с тобой, золотая рыбка! Твоего мне откупа не надо* (А. Пушкин);
- (151) Russ. *Да не нужен мне жеребец, бог с ним!* (Н. Гоголь);
  - 'As can be?! Expression of surprise, reproach, disagreement, etc.'
- (152) Russ. – *Вот собираюсь за границу пожить: для этого то имение заложу или продам… – Бог с тобой, что ты, Борюшка! Долго ли эдак до сумы дойти!* (И. Гончаров);

E x a m p l e 3. *By George!* (contexts 153–155):

- 'is used to express admiration, annoyance, surprise'
- (153) *By George, how wonderfull! What a girl!* (Th. Dreiser);
- (154) *It couldn't be, by George, that she was deceiving him* (Th. Dreiser);
- (155) *By George! – it's Grace again* (J. B. Priestley);

E x a m p l e 4. Germ. *da bleibt (blieb) kein Auge trocken*, conver., fam. (contexts 156–158):

- 'to cry' (1)
- (156) Germ. *"…Mann, was meinen Sie denn, was hier eigentlich los ist? Die Augen werden Ihnen noch Tiber gehen!" – "Ja", versicherte der Ortsgruppenleiter… "Da bleibt kein Auge trocken"* (H. H. Kirst);
- (157) Germ. *Bei der Abschiedsszene im Hafen blieb kein Auge trocken* (MDtI);
- 'laugh to tears' (2)
- (158) Germ. *Als dann der Clown auftrat, da blieb kein Auge trocken* (MDtI).

Frequencies are cases of overlapping of semantic ranges in the frameworks of positive and/or negative evaluation (contexts 159–173):

1) dissatisfaction, disapproval, assertion (Ukr. *де ж (вже) пак*, ironic.):

- 'is used to express dissatisfaction with someone, something, disapproving of something (1)'
- (159) Ukr. *– Он куди наше добро іде! Де ж пак: кріпаків обібрали, гроші.. повернули на довги* [борги] (Панас Мирний);
- (160) Ukr. *Знову невдоволення ворухнулось у серці … на Діденка. Де ж пак, було йому до цього! У нього ж бач справи державної ваги. Фігура!* (А. Головко);
- 'is used to affirm something in meaning: needless to say, of course (2)'
- (161) Ukr. *– Але ж дорого, сину, ти заплатив за їх [книжки]! Де ж пак, аж десять карбованців. Овва! Чималі гроші!* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);
- (162) Ukr. *– Де ж пак! Скільки ми таборів* [військовополонених] *врятували* (О. Гончар));

2) approval, satisfaction, dissatisfaction (indignation), surprise (Russ. *милое дело*):

- 'expression of approval, satisfaction with what is worthy, suits someone (1)'

(163) Russ. *С рассветом лодка… должна будет уйти на глубину. А глубина в шторм – самое милое дело: не мотает, не качает, можно и стол накрыть как следует, и тост сказать* (Л. Соболев);

- 'expression of indignation, surprise, etc. about something (2)'

(164) Russ. – *Товарищи из местного отделения союза писателей заказали для меня номер в гостинице, – Костя пропускает известие мимо ушей. – Милое дело! – отобрав чемодан, усмехнулся он; это его любимая присказка, в зависимости от тона и обстоятельства, в каждом отдельном случае имеет свое значение. Сейчас… оно звучит как вопрос: "А фигу не хочешь?"* (Н. Почивалин);

3) resentment, to accept, to deny (Russ. *кой [какой] черт*, vernac.):

- 'strong expression of anger, frustration, etc. (1)'

(165) Russ. – *Кой черт! – вскричал Алексей, наехав на колоду, через которую лошадь его с трудом перескочила* (М. Загоскин);

(166) Russ. *В дверь постучался кто-то. "Кой черт еще там", – подумал он и крикнул: – Кто там еще?* (Л. Толстой);

- 'nothing like that. The expression of dissent, the denial of something (2)'

(167) Russ. – *У тебя, кум, славный табак! Где ты берешь его? – Кой черт, славный!.. старая курица не чихнет!* (Н. Гоголь);

4) good and valuable *((as) good as gold)*:

- 'good, noble, decent' and 'extremely valuable, exceptional'

(168) Knox. *Of course she's a bit independent but one has to put up with that in girls nowadays. And she's as good as gold* (W. S. Maugham);

(169) *That sort of evidence was as good as gold, and passed current everywhere* (M. Twain);

(170) *'And his heart was as good as gold', my aunt used to say* (H. Lawson);

5) do not meet the norm and discontent (Germ. *Anstoß nehmen an etw. (D)*, solemn)

- 'to admit the shameful, indecent (1)'

(171) Germ. *Heute nimmt niemand mehr Anstoß an einem zweiteiligen Badeanzug* (MDtI);

- 'to be displeased, be angry, be angry at someone; be annoyed by something (2)'

(172) Germ. *Dem Sohne Konsul Krögers schien es, … als sei es dumm und gemein, daran Anstoß zu nehmen* (Th. Mann);

(173) Germ. *"Überdies", fuhr der Minister fort, "ist die Königin nervös… und nimmt Anstoß an unschuldigen Kleinigkeiten…"* (L. Feuchtwanger).

4.3. The algorithm of reconstruction of the axiological world's image in phrasemics

In modern linguistics the theoretical and practical problems of values, the human's system of values are actively developed and the research of the axiological world's image fragments becomes actual (see the works of E. Babaeva [Бабаева 2004], R. Batsuren [Батсурэн 2010], Zh. Krasnobaeva-Chorna [Краснобаева-Чёрная 2018; Краснобаєва-Чорна 2016], I. Rus-Brushinina [Рус-Брюшинина 2010], Y. Suleimanova [Сулейманова 2018], V. Teliya [Телия 1996], H. Chernenko [Черненко 2018] and others).

The axiological world's image according to V. Karasik, is the system of moral values, ethical norms and rules of conduct, reconstructed in the capacity of the interlinked value judgments which are relevant to legal, religious, moral codes, the generally accepted judgments of common sense, typical folklore and known literary subjects [Карасик 1996]. The main features of AWI in the course of the linguistic analysis according to the linguist's opinion, are: 1) the existence of universal and specific components (various appraisive ratings of the objects, the combinatorics of the values); 2) there are the relations of inclusion and associational overlapping between the value judgements, which allows to set the value paradigms of culture; 3) the AWI in the framework of one linguistic culture turns out to be non-uniform because different social groups may have different values; 4) it exists in collective and individual consciousness, etc. The important element of the axiological world's image is the evaluation – intellectual and psychic act, revealing a positive or negative feature of the subject stipulated by acceptance or rejection of a value. The values are the phenomena which were evaluated very positively.

The axiological world's image is defined as the understanding of the world by man, his fragments and the status of the human person in this world through the evaluative categorization in values and non-

values opposition. Evaluative categorization plays the dominant role in the creation of the axiological world's image. **Evaluative categorization –** the formation of values due to the evaluative understanding of environmental objects. The axiological world's image appears as a mental structure formed by blocks of evaluative categories.

The algorithm for modeling the axiological world's image[22] in phrasemics involves 8 steps:

Stage 1. The research illustrative corpus.

Stage 2. A nomenclature of universal values.

Stage 3. The level model of the axiological world's image.

Stage 4. Phrasemic axiological oppositions of values.

Stage 5. The ideographic parametrization of values.

Stage 6. The level organization of values.

Stage 7. Cultural coding of values.

Stage 8. Cultural coding of axiological world's image.

4.3.1. Stage 1. The research illustrative corpus

The material of the investigation comprises phrasemes, taken from trustworthy phraseme-graphical publications in English (ODI 2004; CID 2006), German (MDtI 1976; DI 2011), Ukrainian (СФУМ 2003) and Russian (ФСРЯ 1987). The main body of representing phrasemes of the axiological world's image is formed of 6,206 phrasemes: 1,550 English units, 1,552 German units, 1,555 Ukrainian units and 1,549 Russian units.

4.3.2. Stage 2. A nomenclature of universal values

The differential qualifying attributes of value are oppositeness and evaluativeness (determined by the mark "plus"), a choice mainly arising from norm, an ideal, the ability to be an object of desire and human aspiration. Correlation patterns of the terms "concept" and "value" are associated with correlation of processes of conceptualization and categorization, as the concept is the result of the first, and value is the product of the other. The nature of value provides for the appeal to the antinomy, thus actualizing the clash of axiological and

---

[22] See also: [Краснобаева-Чёрная 2018].

non- axiological, compatible with the binary opposition of *good – bad*. In the axiological world's image the concepts of "good" and "bad" imply the presence of each other and form a semantic space around, represented by phrasemes.

The suggested model of axiological world's image contains 13 universal values that have the largest quantitative representation in phrasemegraphical sources of Ukrainian, Russian, English and German: *money, friendship, law, health, beauty, love, peace, family, freedom, justice, success, honesty.* The thirteenth component of the axiological world's image model – the value of life – is positioned as an axiological phenomenon that enables the consideration of life as both a value of the first or second level and as a system of values.

4.3.3. Stage 3. The level model of the axiological world's image

Values are grouped into six levels:
  1) social *(freedom, family, success, love, friendship, peace);*
  2) vital *(life, health);*
  3) material *(money);*
  4) ethical *(honesty, justice);*
  5) legal *(law);*
  6) aesthetic *(beauty).*

4.3.4. Stage 4. Phrasemic axiological oppositions of values

Each of the 13 values of AWI is characterized by PhAO (Table 3.2). The PhAO hierarchy reflects the peculiarities of encoding information about human value strategies in the semantics of the phrasemes of the comparable languages. A quantitative analysis of the proportion of each PhAO in the distribution of information about the AWI of the same language showed that the first three positions occupy:

a) PhAO "Free time – working hours", "Psychological freedom – restriction of freedom as a manifestation of fear", "Mental adequacy – mental inadequacy" in Ukrainian phrasemic;

b) PhAO "Mental adequacy – mental inadequacy", "Free time – working hours", "Healthy way of life – bad habits" in Russian phrasemic;

c) PhAO "Having success – lack of success", "Psychological freedom – restriction of freedom as a manifestation of fear", "Mental adequacy – mental inadequacy" in English phrasemic;

d) PhAO "The presence of money – the lack of money", "Psychological freedom – restriction of freedom as a manifestation of fear", "Healthy way of life – bad habits" in German phrasemic.

The quantitative indicators of phrasemes-representatives of the value determine the importance of the value. Thus, the most significant values in the Russian AWI are *health* and *freedom,* in Ukrainian – *freedom* and *health*, in English – *success*, *freedom* and *health*, in German – *money*, *freedom* and *health*. In the ethnizes under consideration, social values dominate, which proves the relevance of the "human-society" format to the individual.

T a b l e 4.2.

PhAO of axiological world's image

№	Value	PhAO
1.	Freedom	Free (from oppression, power, will, influence) – dependent
		Physical freedom – deprivation of liberty as a form of punishment
		Psychological freedom – restriction of freedom as a manifestation of fear
		Free time – working hours
2.	Family	Marriage – absence of marriage
		Have a family – not have a family
3.	Success	Having success – lack of success
4.	Love	To love – not to love
5.	Friendship	To be in a friendly relationship – to quarrel
6.	Peace	Peace – war
7.	Life	Life itself – someone else's life
8.	Health	Physically healthy – physically unhealthy
		Mental adequacy – mental inadequacy
		Healthy way of life – bad habits
		Correctly eat – eat not right
9.	Money	The presence of money – the lack of money
10.	Honesty	Honest actions – dishonest actions
11.	Justice	Just actions – unfair actions
12.	Law	To act by law – to violate the law
13.	Beauty	Beautiful – ugly

The last place (in quantitative presentation) are PhAO "Peace – war" in the Ukrainian phrasemic, PhAO "Physical freedom – deprivation of liberty as a form of punishment" in Russian, PhAO "Correctly eat – eat not right" in English; PhAO "Just actions – unfair actions" in German.

4.3.5. Stage 5. The ideographic parametrization of values

The values actualize the phenomenon of personal and social significance, confirming the thesis about the unique character of value perception, its experience by an individual subject (within the study – the speaker of a particular language), filling it with the socially meaningful sense (within the study – universal one) that implements the unity of the individual and universal in the axiological world's image.

I. T h e   s o c i a l   l e v e l   of AWI is marked by the "person-society" format.

1. *Freedom* value:

1) PhAO "Free (from oppression, power, will, influence) – dependent":
- PhSSG "Be independent, have freedom of action" (Ukr. *вставати (підніматися) / встати (піднятися) з колін; Russ. вольная птица [пташка]; be out of one's hand; Germ. seine Bande zerreißen (sprengen));*
- PhSSG "Be addicted, obey" (Ukr. *під п'ятою; Russ. ходить на помочах; not be able to call one's soul one's own; Germ. einen Knüppel am Bein haben);*
- PhSSG "Give freedom of action" (Ukr. *розв'язати / розв'язувати руки* (2); Russ. *предоставлять самому себе* (1); *give a (the) green light to smb.; Germ. j-m Carte blanche geben);*
- PhSSG "Deprive freedom of action, subjugate, enslave" (Ukr. *держати (тримати) в кулаку (в кулаці); Russ. гнуть в бараний рог; have (keep) smb. on a string* (1); *Germ. j-m den Daumen aufs Auge halten (drücken, setzen; j-m den Daumen auf dem Auge halten));*

2) PhAO "Physical freedom – deprivation of liberty as a form of punishment" *(at large* (1); *Germ. j-n in Freiheit setzen* and Ukr. *за ґратами; Russ. по этапу,* obsol.; *durchs Sieb gucken,* slang; *Germ. in Nummer Sicher sitzen (auf Nummer Sicher sein)* conver., playf.);

3) PhAO "Psychological freedom – restriction of freedom as a manifestation of fear":

- PhSSG "Feel fear" (Ukr. *острах бере (обіймає, охоплює і т. ін.) / узяв (обійняв, охопив і т. ін.)*; Russ. *сердце падает [отрывается, обрывается]*; *one's blood freezes (runs cold, turns to ice)*; Germ. *das Herz geht (wackelt) ihm wie ein Lämmerschwänzchen)*;
- PhSSG "To scare, to fear" (Ukr. *наганяти (нагонити) / нагнати холоду*; Russ. *вгонять в пот* (2); *make smb.'s blood run cold*; Germ. *j-m den Teufel im Gläslein zeigen)*;
- PhSSG "Horror" (Ukr. *[аж] волосся піднімається (підіймається, встає, лізе і т. ін.) / піднялося (встало, полізло і т. ін.) вгору (догори)*; Russ. *хвататься за голову*; *curl smb.'s hair*, conver.; Germ. *das Haar steht (steigt) ihm zu Berge)*;
- PhSSG "Expose anxiety, anxiety, worry" (Ukr. *п'явки (п'явка) ссуть (ссе) за серце (під серцем)*; Russ. *кошки скребут на душе [на сердце]*; *have kittens*, conver.; Germ. *in Sorge (n) sein (stehen))*;
- PhSSG "Cause anxiety, anxiety" (Ukr. *різати око (очі)* (3); Russ. *выворачивать душу*; *keep smb. on tenterhooks*; Germ. *j-n in Unruhe versetzen)*;
- PhSSG "Be in danger" (Ukr. *висіти (повисати) / повиснути на волосинці (на волоску, на волосині)* (2); Russ. *между жизнью и смертью*; *be in deep water(s)*; Germ. *an (auf) der Kante stehen)*;
- PhSSG "To be safe" (Ukr. *у надійних руках* (1); *out of the wood*; Germ. *in guter Hut sein)*;
- PhSSG "To calm down, to stop worrying, to worry" (Ukr. *відлягло (відійшло) від серця (від душі, на серці, на душі)*; Russ. *отлегло на душе*; *smooth one's (smb.'s) ruffled (rumpled) feathers*; Germ. *nach Fassung ringen)*;
- PhSSG "Calm down, deceive, cheer" (Ukr. *гріти серце (душу)*; Russ. *отводить душу*; *lift a load from smb.'s mind*; Germ. *j-m Trost einsprechen (zusprechen))*;
- PhSSG "Courageous (brave)" (Ukr. *не [з] полохливого (лякливого, боязкого і т. ін.) десятка (роду)*; Russ. *бедовая голова (головушка)*, vernac.; *a heart of oak*; Germ. *dem Wind und Wetter trotzen)*;
- PhSSG "Frivolous (fearful, timid)" (Ukr. *не з хороброго десятка*; Russ. *заячья душа*; *get (have) the wind up*, conver.; Germ. *vor seinem (eigenen) Schatten fliehen)*;

4) PhAO "Free time – working hours":

- PhSSG "Forcing someone to work hard and work hard, get exhausted by overwork, exploit" (Ukr. *вимотувати (висотувати) / вимотати (висотати) [усі] жили* (1); Russ. *гнуть в три погибели; Germ. j-n (tüchtig) ins Joch spannen*);
- PhSSG "Tense, hard work" (Ukr. *як [божа] бджола;* Russ. *гнуть [ломать] спину [горб, хребет]; work one's fingers to the bone;* Germ. *arbeiten wie ein Pferd*);
- PhSSG "Worried" (Ukr. *і вгору глянути ніколи (нема коли, немає часу і т. ін.);* Russ. *не видеть (не видать) света <белого>* (1); *be dead on one's feet,* conver.; Germ. *viel um die Ohren haben*);

- PhSSG "To lament, to avoid labor" (Ukr. *решетом у воді зірки ловити,* playf.; Russ. *плевать в потолок; not do a hand's turn* (1); Germ. *faules Fleisch tragen,* playf.).

2. *Family* value:

1) PhAO "Marriage – absence of marriage":
- PhSSG "Court" (Ukr. *смалити (присмалювати) литки;* Russ. *строить [делать] глазки; dance attendance on smb.* (1); Germ. *um j-n her sein,* conver.);
- PhSSG "Woo" (Ukr. *брати / взяти рушники;* Russ. *предлагать руку <и сердце>; offer smb. one's hand;* Germ. *einen Antrag machen (tun)*);
- PhSSG "Consent for marriage" *(прийняти старостів;* Russ. *принимать предложение; отдавать руку,* obsol.; англ. *win smb.'s hand;* Germ. *das Jawort erhalten*);
- PhSSG "Rejection of marriage" (Ukr. *повертати / повернути хліб,* ethnogr.; Russ. *отказывать в руке,* obsol.; *give smb. his walking (-)papers (the bird, the sack)* (2); Germ. *einen Korb bekommen*);
- PhSSG "Get married" (Ukr. *стати / ставати під вінець;* Russ. *составить [сделать] партию,* obsol.; *a marriage of convenience;* Germ. *den Bund der Ehe eingehen*);
- PhSSG "Do not enter into marriage" (Ukr. *сивіти (сидіти) / посивіти (засидітися) в дівках (дівкою, в перестарках* і т. ін.); Russ. *старая дева; be on the shelf* (2); Germ. *den Anschluß verpassen,* conver.);
- PhSSG "Get a divorce" (Ukr. *розв'язати / розв'язувати руки* (1); *turn over a new leaf;* Germ. *in Scheidung liegen*);
2) PhAO "Have a family – not have a family":

174

- PhSSG "Native person" (Ukr. *своя кістка*; Russ. *кровь от крови* (1); *one's kith and kin*; Germ. *die Bande des Blutes*);
- PhSSG "Unusual person" (Ukr. *свояк з лівої щоки*, ironic.; Germ. *Geschwister von beiden Banden*);
- PhSSG "Add up" (Ukr. *прилипнути [всім] серцем ([всією] душею)*; Russ. *врастать [прирастать] корнями*; *a kindred spirit*; Germ. *verwandte Seelen treffen sich zu Wasser und zu Lande*).

3. *Success* value represented by PhAO "Having success – lack of success":

- PhSSG "Succeed" (Ukr. *далеко іти (йти) / піти*; Russ. *пробивать [прокладывать, пролагать] себе дорогу [путь]*; *go into orbit*; Germ. *auf einen grünen Zweig kommen*);
- PhSSG "Do not succeed, fail" (Ukr. *летіти (іти) / полетіти (піти) догори дном (дригом, ногами і т. ін.)*; Russ. *сломать себе шею [голову]*; *fall by the wayside*; Germ. *keine Seide bei etw. Spinnen* (2));
- PhSSG "Create the necessary conditions for someone to succeed" (Ukr. *відкривати / відкрити шлях (дорогу)*; Russ. *прокладывать [пролагать, проторять] дорогу [путь]*; *be the making of smb.* (1); Germ. *j-m (einer Sache) den Weg (die Wege) ebnen*);
- PhSSG "Prevent someone from succeeding" (Ukr. *підставляти / підставити ногу (ніжку)*; Russ. *вставлять [ставить] палки в колеса*; англ. *steal the limelight (spotlight)*; Germ. *j-m (einer Sache) in den Weg treten*).

4. *Love* value represented by PhAO "To love – not to love":

- PhSSG "Be in love" (Ukr. *тане серце*; Russ. *открывать сердце* (1); *worship the ground smb. tread (walks) on*; Germ. *sein Herz an j-m verloren haben*);
- PhSSG "Strongly to love" (Ukr. *серце сохне*; Russ. *не слышать души*, obsol.; *think no end (the world) of smb. (smth.)*; Germ. *bis über die Ohren verliebt sein*);
- PhSSG "Fall in love" (Ukr. *паморочити / запаморочити голову (розум, свідомість і т. ін.)* (2); Russ. *покорять сердце*; *win smb.'s heart*; Germ. *j-n verrückt machen*);
- PhSSG "Fool to hate" (Ukr. *накипіти / накипати на душі (у душі, на серці, у серці)*; Russ. *всеми фибрами [силами] души*; *hate smb.'s guts*, conver.; Germ. *den hab' ich gefressen*).

5. *Friendship* value actualizes PhAO "To be in a friendly relationship – to quarrel" (Ukr. *водити компанію*; Russ. *на дружеской [на короткой] ноге; (as) thick as thieves*; Germ. *dicke Freunde* and *робити (побити) глек (глека, горщик, горщика, макітру* і т. ін.*); Russ. *черная кошка пробежала [проскочила]; be at loggerheads with smb.*; Germ. *sich j-s Feindschaft zuziehen*).

6. *Peace* value represented by PhAO "Peace – war" (Ukr. *складати / скласти* (рідко *зложити) зброю* (1); Russ. *складывать [слагать] оружие; lay down (one's) arms*; Germ. *die Waffen strecken (niederlegen)* and Ukr. *піднімати (підіймати, підносити* і т. ін.) */ підняти (підійняти, піднести* і т. ін.) *зброю (меч, сокиру* і т. ін.); Russ. *бряцать [потрясать] оружием; armed to the teeth*; Germ. *das Bajonett fällen*).

I I . T h e   v i t a l   l e v e l   of AWI is encompasses a complex of medical-biological, psychological, philosophical, cultural, valeological, esoteric, religious etc. knowledge and is determined by the problem of finding ways to a balanced human existence.

1. *Life* value represented by PhAO "Life itself – someone else's life":

- PhSSG "Die" (Ukr. *стратити життя*; Russ. *найти конец [кончину, смерть, могилу]; go down in flames* (1); Germ. *sein Leben lassen müssen)*;
- PhSSG "Lose yourself life" (Ukr. *встромити голову в петлю*; Russ. *покончить с собой [с жизнью]; take one's (own) life*; Germ. *den Schierlingsbecher trinken)*;
- PhSSG "To save life, to kill someone" (Ukr. *відправити чортам на сніданок,* derog.; Russ. *решать [лишать] жизни; take smb. for a ride* (1); Germ. *j-n zu Boden strecken)*;
- PhSSG "To bring someone to death" (Ukr. *згубити з світу (з світа)*; Russ. *вгонять в гроб,* vernac.; Germ. *j-n ins Grab bringen)*.

2. *Health* value:

1) PhAO "Physically healthy – physically unhealthy":
- PhSSG "Strong, healthy" (Ukr. *[і (ще й)] довбнею (поліном) не доб'єш,* ironic.; Russ. *здоров как бык; (as) strong as a horse (as an ox)*; Germ. *Mumm in den Knochen haben,* conver.);
- PhSSG "In the prime of physical strength" (Ukr. *у цвіті [літ]*; Russ. *в <самой> поре; (as) hard as steel*; Germ. *in den besten Jahren sein*);

- PhSSG "To be sick, to be exhausted" (Ukr. *лежати трупом*; Russ. *лежать в лежку*, vernac.; *be (down) on one's back* (2); Germ. *das Bett hüten (zu Bett liegen)*);
- PhSSG "Physically weak" (Ukr. *танути / станути як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) свічка (віск [на сонці])*; Russ. *еле-еле душа в теле*, vernac.; *catch a cold*; Germ. *von Kräften kommen (an Kräften abnehmen)*);
- PhSSG "To be hopelessly ill" (Ukr. *облягти (бути, лежати і т. ін.) на смертній постілі*, obsol.; Russ. *стоять одной ногой в могиле*; *churchyard cough*; Germ. *auf den Tod krank sein*);
- PhSSG "Thin" (Ukr. *хребет чухати через живіт*, playf.; Russ. *одна кожа да кости*; *a bag of bones (skin* and *bone, bones)*; Germ. *dürr wie eine Spindel*);
- PhSSG "Recover" (Ukr. *вставати (підводитися) / встати (підвестися) з ліжка*; Russ. *набраться сил*; *be up and about* (1); Germ. *wieder auf Deck sein*);
- PhSSG "Promote recovery, cure" (Ukr. *піднімати (підіймати, зводити і т. ін.) / підняти (підійняти, звести і т. ін.) на ноги* (3); Russ. *возвратить к жизни*; Germ. *j-n auf den Strumpf (auf die Strümpfe) bringen*);

2) PhAO "Mental adequacy – mental inadequacy":
- PhSSG "In a normal mental state" (Ukr. *з розумом*; Russ. *в своем уме*; *be in one's right mind*; Germ. *seine fünf Sinne beisammen haben*);
- PhSSG "Mentally deranged, crazy" (Ukr. *з кіндратиком у голові*; Russ. *мешаться в уме [в рассудке]*, vernac.; *(as) crazy as a loon*, conver.; Germ. *im Kopf gestört sein (nicht ganz richtig im Kopf sein)*);
- PhSSG "To lose the ability to think intelligently, to really perceive reality" (Ukr. *глузд за розум завертає (завернув)*; Russ. *голова идет [ходит] кругом* (2); *come (go) all to pieces* (3); Germ. *in einem Wahn befangen sein*);
- PhSSG "Depriving someone of the ability to think normally or perceive something" (Ukr. *замакітрити голову (світ)*; Russ. *кружить голову* (1); Germ. *j-n von Sinnen bringen*);
- PhSSG "Return to the state of normal perception of the environment" (Ukr. *скидати / скинути полуду з очей*; Russ. *падать с неба на землю*; Germ. *j-m seinen Wahn abenehmen*);
- PhSSG "Mentally competent, smart" (Ukr. *голова не половою (не соломою, не клоччям і т. ін.) набита*; Russ. *иметь голову не плечах*;

have (got) one's head screwed on right (the right way); Germ. *Grütze im Kopf haben,* vernac.);

- PhSSG "Mentally limited, unthinking" (Ukr. *шкандибати на голову,* derog.; Russ. *как [будто, словно, точно] из-за угла мешком прибитый [ударенный, трахнутый]; (as) thick as two short planks,* conver., derog.; Germ. *dumm wie Bohnenstroh (wie die Sünde)*);

3) PhAO "Healthy way of life – bad habits":

- PhSSG "Be sober" (Ukr. *хміль вийшов (вилетів, вивітрився і т. ін.) / виходить (вилітає, вивітрюється і т. ін.) з голови;* Russ. *капли [маковой росинки] в рот не брать; (as) sober as a judge* (1); Germ. *den Rausch ausschlafen*);
- PhSSG "To drink" (Ukr. *убити муху (чмеля);* Russ. *по маленькой* (2); *wet one's whistle,* conver.; Germ. *sich (D) die Gurgel schmieren (spülen),* vernac.);
- PhSSG "To be in a state of alcoholic intoxication" (Ukr. *в очах замигтіли (замиготіли) [білі (веселі, грайливі і т. ін.)] метелики;* Russ. *под шефе; be in the wind,* slang; Germ. *einen Affen (sitzen) haben,* conver., vernac.);
- PhSSG "Be very drunk" (Ukr. *у свинячий писк,* derog., fam.; Russ. *до положения риз; the worse for wear* (3); Germ. *einen Haarbeutel haben (sich (D) einen Haarbeutel trinken)*);
- PhSSG "To drink, to show a passion for alcoholic beverages" (Ukr. *не розминатися / не розминутися з чаркою,* playf.; Russ. *пить горькую [мертвую]; drink like a fish;* Germ. *saufen wie ein Igel*);

4) PhAO "Correctly eat – eat not right":

- PhSSG "Get nasty enough" (Ukr. *об'їсти вуха;* Russ. *до отвала; make a hog (pig) of oneself;* Germ. *einem Magen keine Stiermutter sein,* playf.);
- PhSSG "Do not eat well" (Ukr. *підтягувати (стягувати, затягувати і т. ін.) / підтягли (стягли, затягли і т. ін.) паски (пасок, ремінці, очкурі, пояски і т. ін.);* Russ. *питаться манной небесной*);
- PhSSG "Malnutrition" (Ukr. *нічим (нема чим) ока запорошити;* Russ. *щелкать зубами,* vernac.; *live on air (on nothing);* Germ. *den Schmachtriemen umschnallen (enger schnallen, anziehen)*).

III. The material level of AWI – a level that determines the material condition of a person and actualizes a number of important problems: the possibility of achieving abundance and observance of moral and social norms, the relation between the concept "money" and human spirituality, the relationship of the system of human values

with the character of the material perspective, the influence of the level of income on the hierarchy of values, etc.

Money v a l u e represented by PhAO "The presence of money – the lack of money":

- PhSSG "Have money" (Ukr. *кишеня не сходиться*, зі сл. *грошей*; Russ. *при деньгах*; *have (got) money to burn (with money to burn)*; Germ. *dicke Mäuse haben,* slang);
- PhSSG "Not have money" (Ukr. *в кишені пусто [аж гуде]*; Russ. *тощий карман*; *a light (slender) purse*; Germ. *im Dalles sein (den Dalles haben, an Dalles leiden),* slang);
- PhSSG "Rich" (Ukr. *грошовий (золотий) мішок*, derog. (2); Russ. *тряхнуть мошной [казной, карманом]*, vernac.; *deep pockets* (2); Germ. *Kisten und Kasten (Keller) voll haben);*
- PhSSG "Poor" (Ukr. *і кішки нема чим годувати*; Russ. *беден как церковная крыса [мышь]*; *down at (the) heel(s)* (2); Germ. *Hunger und Not; blank (und bloß) sein,* conver.);
- PhSSG "Get rich" (Ukr. *вбиватися (вбиратися) / вбитися (вбратися) в силу* (2); Russ. *становиться [вставать, подниматься] на ноги* (3); *strike it rich* (2); Germ. *ein Vermögen machen);*
- PhSSG "Become impoverished" (Ukr. *залишитися (лишитися, зостатися) в одній сорочці (без сорочки)*; Russ. *в одной рубашке; not have a shirt to one's back*; Germ. *sich ins Elend stürzen);*
- PhSSG "Provide material" (Ukr. *витягти (витягнути) / витягати (витягувати) з болота (з багна, з калюжі, з грязі, з грязюки, з бруду)*; Russ. *на медные деньги*, obsol.; Germ. *j-n aus der Gosse auflesen,* conver.);
- PhSSG "Bankrupt" (Ukr. *обути (озути) в постоли (в лапті)*, obsol.; Russ. *снимать <последнюю> рубашку; knock smb. off his perch,* conver. (1); Germ. *j-n auf dem Stroh (allein) lassen);*
- PhSSG "Live on your own money" (Ukr. *мати хліб (шматок, кусок і т. ін. хліба)* (1); Russ. *сводить концы с концами; keep the pot boiling* (1); Germ. *von der Hand in den Mund leben);*
- PhSSG "To be on the content" (Ukr. *сидіти на шиї (на плечах)*; Russ. *на хлебах* (2); *be on smb. back,* conver. (2); Germ. *j-m auf dem Halse liegen (sitzen)).*

IV. T h e e t h i c a l level of AWI – the level of moral ideals, the highest principles of human life, responsible for the health of society and the safety of existence in it and supported by moral regulation.

1. *Honesty* value forms PhAO "Honest actions – dishonest actions" (Ukr. *з чистою совістю*; Russ. *стоять на своём посту*; *a genuine article* (2); Germ. *Ehre im Leibe haben* і Ukr. *замилювати / замилити очі*; Russ. *обводить вокруг пальца*; *catch old birds with chaff*; Germ. *j-m eine falsche Nachricht aufhängen*).

2. *Justice* value updates PhAO "Just actions – unfair actions" (Ukr. *судна година* (2); *a fair deal* (1); Germ. *recht und billig sein* and Ukr. *пришити справу*; Russ. *вешать собак*; *a bad deal*; Germ. *sich in den Erdboden hineinschämen*).

V. T h e l e g a l l e v e l of AWI – the level of values based on the duties and rights of members of society, governing the relationship between them through the legal basis.

Law value forms PhAO "To act by law – to violate the law" (Ukr. *з повним правом*; Russ. *по праву¹*; *be (keep) on the right side of the law*; Germ. *zu Recht bestehen* and Ukr. *гріти* (рідше *нагрівати*) / *нагріти (погріти) руки* (1); Russ. *прятать [хоронить] концы <в воду>*; *have a hand in the till*; Germ. *sich schmieren lassen*)).

V I. T h e a e s t h e t i c l e v e l of AWI – the level of values based on the synthesis of sensory and psychological assessments.

Beauty value is represented by PhAO "Beautiful – ugly":
- PhSSG "Outwardly attractive" (Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) [та] квіточка (квітка)*; Russ. *косая сажень в плечах*; *sweetness and light*; Germ. *ein netter (niedlicher, reizender) Käfer*);
- PhSSG "Beautiful" (Ukr. *як (мов, наче і т. ін.) намальований* (1); Russ. *пальчики (пальцы) оближешь* (2); *May Queen*; Germ. *aussehen wie eine Pfingstrose*);
- PhSSG "Outwardly unattractive, indescribable" (Ukr. *і глянути гидко*; Russ. *ни кожи ни рожи*; *an ugly duckling*; Germ. *ein eckiger Kerl*).

4.3.6. Stage 6. The level organization of values

The value has a three-tier structure, designed by L. Baeva [Баева 2004: 21–26] in the frame of existential axiology and adapted in the monograph to the analysis in linguistic.

The level of comprehension embodies the subject's awareness of the reason why an object is important. It found that the external objects and their properties will be a priority for the subject. The search for meaning arises as the basis of the value represented by the initial information of the *love* value from psychological, sociological and linguistic-cultural studies [Баева 2004; Маслоу 1997; Фромм 1990]:

a) moral and aesthetic sense;
b) the semantic capacity:
   • love for God;
   • love for people;
   • love for the Motherland;
   • love for art;
   • parent and son love;
   • love between man and woman, etc.;
c) unfriendly and unsurpassed desire of the object;
d) need and readiness for dedication;
e) a higher rating of the Other;
f) the continuation of his being in the being of the Other;
g) lack of rational justification;
h) spiritual, meaning-significant phenomenon;
i) antinomic essence:
   • higher freedom and slavery, captivity and burden;
   • fills life with new meaning and impoverishes life, makes it one-sided ("egoism of two");
   • knowledge in absolute completeness and subjective idealization;
   • good and pain;
   • morality and immorality;
j) emotional need (internal need in another person);
k) giving (as a way of self-realization);
l) care (as a mental response);
m) responsibility;
n) respect and knowledge (as the penetration into the essence, the "secret" of a loved one);
o) dialogue character (between me and you).

The level of significance – the level of substantive content, which is characterized by variability, due to the domination of a subjective feature. The phrasemics assumes the selection of the most typical and most consistent content features of the category of value,

which have been distinguished and recorded by native speakers. In phrasemics *love* value is presented by the PhSSG "Be in love": Ukr. *вкладати / вкласти серце; всім серцем; серце пристало; як свою душу; прикипіти до серця; прикипіти серцем (душею); прилипнути [всім] серцем ([всією] душею); серцем (душею) прирости; прихилятися / прихилитися серцем (душею); пронести в серці; перевертати / перевернути [всю] душу (серце); тане серце; серце повертається / повернулося* (1); *всією душею* (1); *душі [в собі] не чути* (1); *вхопити за серце (за душу)* (2); *зійти / сходити з ума (з розуму, з глузду)* (2); *тьохкає серце; віддати (покласти) / віддавати (покладати) [свою] душу* (4); Russ. *открывать сердце* (1); *fall in love (with); lose one's heart (to smb., smth.); worship the ground smb. tread (walks) on; love in a cottage;* Germ. *j-m gut sein (werden); sein Herz an j-m verloren haben; j-m an die Seele gewachsen sein; j-m zu tief ins Auge geschaut haben* тощо.

The infatuation is accompanied by:

a) courtship (Russ. *строить куры*, playf.; *make love (to smb.)* (1); Germ. *j-m die Cour schneiden*, conver. (obsol. *die Cour machen*)) (contexts 174–178):

(174) Russ. *И девицы, и вдовы, молодые и старые, строили ему куры, но он не захотел жениться во второй раз* (Н. Чернышевский);

(175) Russ. *Балахнов чрезвычайно любил дамское общество и, при случае, не прочь был даже строить куры* (Д. Григорович);

(176) *Julia could not tell if he knew that she was in love with him. He never made love to her* (W. S. Maugham);

(177) Germ. *Trotz seiner 70 Jahre ist der Graf immer bereit, jeder schönen Frau die Cour zu schneiden* (MDtI);

(178) Germ. *Will man aber einen intimen Freund an ihm* [John Bull] *haben, so muß man ihm wie einem Frauenzimmer die Cour machen* (H. Heine);

b) coquetry (Germ. *j-m Augen machen (drehen)* conver.; *j-m (schone) Augen machen*) (contexts 179–182):

(179) Germ. *Antonia durfte Franziskas Haus nicht mehr betreten, weil sie Alexander Augen gemacht hatte. Ach, war das eine Szene!* (B. Kellermann);

(180) Germ. *Jetzt darfst du ihm Augen machen! Balzer, ich habe ihr nämlich verraten, daß dir mal ihr Bild gefiel* (A. Seghers);

(181) Germ. [Die junge Frau:] *Bitte, gnädige Frau, dem Kleid ist nichts passiert.* [Die Gouverneursfrau:] *Weil ich dich gefaßt habe. Ich habe schon lang ein Auge auf dich. Nichts im Kopf als dem Adjutanten Augen drehen!* (B. Brecht);

(182) Germ. *Sie hat ihm so lange (schöne) Augen, gemacht, bis er sie eines Tages eingeladen hat* (MDtI);

c) interest, certain feelings (Ukr. *запалювати / запал йти душу (серце); серце привертається (горнеться, пригортається, хилиться, схиляється, прилягає) / привернулося (пригорнулося, схилилося, прилягло); обсипати (осипати) / обсипати (осипати) поглядом; покласти око; привернути серце; прийтися до серця* (рідше *по норову*); *заворушилося серце; обій-мати (обнімати) / обійняти (обняти) поглядом (оком, очима і т. ін.) (1); їсти (поїдати, жерти, пожирати і т. ін.) очима (оком) (1); добирати (доходити) / добрати (дійти) смаку (2); припасти / припадати до смаку (2); припасти серцем; серце в'яне (2); лежати на душі (на серці) (2); лягти / лягати на душу (2); пальчики облизувати / облизати,* playf. (2); Russ. *сойти [спятить, свихнуть, свихнуться] с ума* (3); *goo-goo eyes,* slang; *love at first sight;* Germ. *j-n (etw.) mit den Augen; ein Faible für j-n (etw.) haben; da möchte man sich die Finger ablecken; j-n auf dem Korn haben)* (contexts 183–185):

(183) Ukr. *– Душа вся стривожена. Серце одразу заворушилось. Яка краса в тих чорних кучерях та смуглявих рум'янцях!.. – подумала Гризельда* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);

(184) Russ. *Его носили на руках, и он сам себя баловал, даже дурачился, даже ломался; но и это к нему шло. Женщины от него с ума сходили , мужчины называли его фатом и втайне завидовали ему* (И. Тургенев);

(185) John. *Love at first sight – I never believed in it before – but now* (N. Coward);

d) temptation (Germ. *j-n (etw.) zu Fall(e) bringen* (3); *zu Fall(e) kommen* (3)).

The object of love denotes phrasemes Ukr. *дама серця; лицар серця,* playf. Freestyle, human temperament, sex-bomb (about a woman) in English are called phrasemes *a hot number,* conver. (2); *hot stuff,* conver. (3), a person, who is not subject to amusement in the German, – phrasemes Germ. *Äpfel nicht essen mögen,* playf.

Expression of love is the words *(throw oneself at smb.'s feet)* and kisses, intimate relationships (Ukr. *припасти губами; розділяти (ділити) / розділити ложе (постіль); make love* (2)) (contexts 186–189):

(186) Ukr. *Параска-Роксолана, бач, саме й мріяла про те, щоб роз-ділити свою постіль – не з осоружним Демидом, а з молодень-ким сотником, з якого вона мала намір випестувати вправ-ного коханця* (О. Ільченко);

(187) *In my bedroom we would pass the hours making love or talking and only too often quarrelling* (Gr. Greene);

The symbol of love is considered Ukr. *стрілу Амура (Купідона); Амурову (Купідонову) стрілу*, liter.; Germ. *Amors Pfeil* (або *der Pfeil Amors)*, playf.:

(188) Ukr. *"Я вже був забувся про неї, а вона знов роздратувала мене своїми очима. Оце ж то ті стріли Купідонові, про котрі торочать латинські поети!.. доведеться знов вчинити заїзд на леваду й хату цієї красуні!" – подумав Єремія* (І. Нечуй-Левицький);

(189) Germ. *Aber verlaß dich drauf, wenn ihn erst mal Amors Pfeil getroffen hat, dann wird das alles ganz anders* (MDtI).

The manipulative character of love is evidenced by PhSSG "Fall in love": Ukr. *закрутити світ; привернути серце; спопелити / спопелити серце (серця); припасти / припадати до серця (до душі)* (1); *заморочити голову* (2); *обвести (обкрутити, обернути і т. ін.) / рідше обводити (обкручувати, обертати і т. ін.) круг (навколо, довкола і т. ін.) пальця* (2); *паморочити / запаморочити голову (розум, свідомість і т. ін.)* (2); *зводити / звести з розуму (з ума)* (3); Russ. *покорять сердце; крутить голову* (1); *win smb.'s heart*; Germ. *j-m den Kopf verdrehen; j-n verrückt machen*.

T h e l e v e l o f e x p e r i e n c e assumes the predominance of sensory-emotional attitude and existential-intellectual thinking. Value is perceived subjectively in accordance with unique life experience and established through certain experiences reflected in phrasemics. Antonymic pair of phraseme-semantical subgroups represent this level of *love* value:

1) PhSSG "Strongly to love" (Ukr. *запалилося серце; серце сохне; їден дух*; Russ. *не чаять души; до смерти; не слышать души*, obsol.; *без ума* (2); *think no end (the world) of smb. (smth.); be (dead) nuts on*, conver. (2); Germ. *j-m ans Herz gewachsen sein; in j-n ganz hin sein; einen Narren an j-m (etw.) gefressen haben; bis über die Ohren (über beide Ohren); vor Liebe vergehen; (ganz) weg von j-m sein; einen Affen an j-m gefressen haben*, vernac.; *j-n zum Fressen gern haben*, fam.) (contexts 190–193):

(190) Ukr. *Та минали дні і ночі, минали місяці, а той, за ким сохло її серце, не з'являвся перед батьківський двір* (Д. Бедзик);

(191) Russ. *К чести его должно сказать, что он никогда не хвастался своими победами. В дом Марьи Дмитриевны он попал*

тотчас по приезде в О… и скоро освоился в нем совершенно. Марья Дмитриевна в нем души не чаяла (И. Тургенев);

(192) *Michael's such dead nuts on her that he's getting dull* (J. Galsworthy);

(193) Germ. *Schlicht gesagt, war unser Reisender nun also über beide Ohren in Clawdia Chauchat verliebt* (Th. Mann);

2) PhSSG "Fool to hate" (Ukr. *накипіти / накипати на душі (у душі, на серці, у серці); держати (тримати) камінь за пазухою;* Russ. *всеми фибрами [силами] души; всеми печенками; hate smb. (smth.) like poison; hate smb.'s guts,* conver.; Germ. *den hab' ich gefressen; j-n scharf haben,* conver.; *j-m aufsäss sein*) (contexts 194–198):

(194) Ukr. *Настя вчора якось сказала, що раніше з тобою гуляла, от я й вирішив поговорити… Нащо камінь за пазухою тримати?* (М. Ю. Тарновський);

(195) Russ. – *Вы сбежались посмотреть на скандал? Ну, так вот вам, глядите!.. Перед вами первый в России трагический актер, который влачит нищенское существование. Любопытно? И все-таки я презираю вас, хамы, всеми фибрами своей души* (А. Куприн);

(196) Russ. *Ее я ненавижу всеми фибрами души и не могу даже простить ее* (Л. Толстой);

(197) *Hate each other like poison, of course. Take my advice. Keep clear of them* (R. Aldington);

(198) *They hate my guts. They'd like to kill me, and now they're doing it* (J. Updike).

Love has a different degree of expression: from a warm feeling, a weakness to someone *(have a soft (warm) sport (in one's heart) for smb.),* a gentle love (Germ. *j-n lieb und teuer halten*) for an unbridled pull, a passion (Ukr. *душа поривається; як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) кіт до миші; як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) у романі; гаряче серце),* to quench the enthusiasm (Ukr. *охолодити (остудити) серце (голову, душу і т. ін.); серце стигне (холоне) / прохололо (охололо)* (1); Germ. *ein Loch krigen),* the disappearance of love (Ukr. *викинути (викреслити) з [свого] серця).*

4.3.7. Stage 7. Cultural coding of values

Phrasemics conveys most expressively and brightly the originality of culture and language, that is the reason of special attention that linguists pay to the phrasemic stock as an indicator of the specific and

the universal of every nation (the works of R. Batsouren [Батсурэн 2010], A.P. Cowie [Cowie 2001], I. Garbera [Гарбера 2018], O. Zhurkova [Журкова 2018], G. Kschizhanovska [Krzyżanowska 1999], I. Chybor [Чибор 2016] et al.). An important part in this aspect belongs to axiophrasemic pragmatics, as it establishes the degree, the identities of axiosystems of different cultures, identifying the research potential of linguistic pragmatics.

The component content of a phraseme plays a substantial part in formation and preservation of cultural and national self-consciousness of a nation and its identification as the internal form of a phraseme is but an epitome of national and cultural disposition. Every element of a phraseme is quite ponderable, full of information, it being directly connected with evaluating peculiarities of such units. On this stage the main attention was focused on the comprehensive for the axiological world's image associative components (somatisms, zoosemisms, phytocomponents, colouring, numerical and meteorological components), i.e. the lexemes, expressing links between separate phenomena, when one phenomenon causes another, having deep ethnical and cultural stratification and serving as the main source, that determines categorization of values in phrasemics [Краснобаєва-Чорна 2016: 204].

Associating components are treated in research as representing cultural codes:

a) somatisms represent somatic code of culture;

b) zoosemisms and phytocomponents represent biomorphic code, with subsequent subdivision into vegetative and zoomorphic (according to classifications by V. Krasnykh [Красных 2002: 223] and O. Selivanova [Селіванова 2004]), or into substantional with detachment of zoomorphic and phytomorphic (according to classification of L. Savchenko [Савченко 2013: 94–125]);

c) meteocomponents into natural (according to classification of L. Savchenko [Савченко 2013: 94–125]);

d) colouring components – into colorative;

e) numerical components – quantitative (according to classifications, made by G. Bagautdinova [Багаутдинова 2007: 17] and L. Savchenko [Савченко 2013: 94–125]);

f) names of food products and dishes – gastronomic (according to classification by D. Gudkov and M. Kovshova [Гудков, Ковшова 2007: 96–99]), etc.

Cultural code is understood to be a specific cultural network of division, categorization and evaluation of the world (V. Krasnykh and O. Selivanova), or a system of signs, that represents cultural senses (V. Telia, L. Savchenko). I. Chybor is quite right, saying that "as a secondary the cultural code accumulates for the culture the value sense, functioning as a way of description of the range of interests of linguistic society" [Чибор 2016: 5]. Typical of axiophraseme pragmatics is investigation of associative as a figurative stem of a phraseme in the process of determining of values.

Money value – material level of axiological world's image – PhAO "The presence of money – the lack of money"

Subject, somatic, biomorphic and gastronomic codes of culture determine the dominant metric-reference sphere, that participates in structuring the *money* value.

Subject code of culture. The *money* value reveals logical connection with the representatives of the subject code of culture:

a) names of monetary units:
- Ukr. *карбованець* (Ukr. *карбованці бряжчать* – 'to have money'; Ukr. *бити карбованцем* – 'cause material damage'; Ukr. *слизький карбованець* – 'ill-gotten money'; Ukr. *довгий карбованець* – 'the big and easy money');
- Ukr. *копійка* / Russ. *копейка* (Ukr. *без копійки; ні копійки* – 'not to have money'; Ukr. *перебиватися з копійки на копійку* – 'to live very poorly, tolerate need for'; Ukr. *свіжа (жива) копійка* – 'small monetary profit on sale, trade, etc.'; Russ. *ставить ребром последнюю копейку [грош]; до <последней> копейки (копеечки); как одну копейку (копеечку)* (1) – 'spend everything');
- Ukr. *гріш* (Ukr. *ні гроша* – 'not to have money');
- Russ. *купон* (Russ. *стричь купоны* – 'live on rent, on interest on securities');
- *penny* (*not have a penny to bless oneself with (not have a penny to one's name)* – 'not have money'; *earn (make, turn) an honest penny* – 'money, earned honestly');
- *buck* (*a fast (quick) buck* – 'money, earned quickly and easily (sometimes unfair)');
- Germ. *Pfennig* (Germ. *keinen roten Pfennig haben* – 'not to have money');

b) a receptacle for the money:

- Ukr. *кишеня* / Russ. *карман* (Ukr. *кишеня не сходиться, зі сл. грошей; повна (непорожня, набита* і т. ін.) *кишеня (калитка));* Russ. *толстый [тугой] карман; deep pockets* (2) – 'to have a lot of money' and Ukr. *[аж] свистить (гуде* і под.) *у кишені (у кишенях); в кишені пусто [аж гуде];* Russ. *тощий карман; карманная чахотка,* vernac., playf.) – 'not to have money'; Ukr. *попливти / пливти у кишеню (до кишені)* – 'easy to get to, get to someone (about money, property, etc.).)'; Ukr. *набивати (напихати) / набити і (напхати) [собі] кишеню (кишені);* Russ. *набивать карман [мошну]* – 'to be rich, to profit (transgressed by a dishonest way)');
- Ukr. *гаманець* / Germ. *Beutel* (Ukr. *набитий (повний* і т. ін.) *гаманець* – 'to have a lot of money'; Ukr. *пустий (порожній) гаманець* – 'to have a little money'; Germ. *mein Beutel hat die Schwindsucht,* playf.; Germ. *mein Beutel ist leer* – 'not to have money'; Germ. *den (seinen) Beutel füllen* – 'enrich oneself');
- Ukr. *капшук (калитка)* / Russ. *мошна* (Ukr. *потрусити калитку (калиткою, кишені* і т. ін.) – 'force someone to spend or forcibly take someone's money'; Ukr. *розв'язувати / розв'язати капшук* – 'generously pay, do not skimp on the money'; Ukr. *труснути (трусонути) калиткою* – 'spend a significant amount of money; to fork out, not sting (about money)'; Russ. *толстая мошна* (1) – 'to have money');
- Ukr. *ківш* (Ukr. *міряти мірками (міркою, ковшем) гроші* – 'be very rich, have a lot of capital'),
- Ukr. *мішок* (Ukr. *грошовий (золотий) мішок* – 'capital, wealth'),
- *purse* (*a light (slender) purse* – 'not to have money'),
- Ukr. *лопата* (Ukr. *гребти (загрібати, горнути* і т. ін.) *гроші лопатою,* derog. – 'without much labor costs to grow up very quickly; prosper');

c) clothes and shoes:

- Ukr. *сорочка* / Russ. *рубашка* / *shirt* (Ukr. *залишитися (лишитися, зостатися) в одній сорочці (без сорочки); lose one's shirt,* conver. (2); *not have a shirt to one's back* – 'to impoverish'; Russ. *снимать <последнюю> рубашку* – 'to bankrupt'),
- Ukr. *постоли (лапті)* (Ukr. *обути (озути) в постоли (в лапті),* obsol. – 'to bankrupt').

Lack of money actualizes the words Russ. *труба* (Russ. *пускать в трубу* (2)) and Germ. *Fenster* (Germ. *er wirft das Geld zum Fenster hinaus*) – 'squander money'; Ukr. *болото (багно, калюжа, грязь, грязюка, бруд)* and Russ. *грязь* (Ukr. *витягти (витягнути) / витягати (витягувати) з болота (з багна, з калюжі, з грязі, з грязюки, з бруду)*; Russ. *вытаскивать из грязи* – 'to help get rid of poverty'), Ukr. *торба* (Ukr. *іти (ходити) / піти з торбами (з торбою)* – 'to beg'; Ukr. *пустити (з торбою) з торбами [по світу]* – 'to leave without property, to bring to poverty').

S o m a t i c   c o d e   o f   c u l t u r e :

a) Ukr. *нога* / Russ. *нога* / *foot* / Germ. *Fuß* (Ukr. *стати (встати, звестися, знятися, піднятися, спинатися* і т. ін.) */ ставати (зводитися, зніматися, підніматися* і т. ін.) *на [свої (власні)] ноги* (3); Russ. *становиться [вставать, подниматься] на ноги* (3) – 'to get rich'; Russ. *на широку ногу* (1); Germ. *auf grobem Fuß* – 'luxurious, without any restrictions'; англ. *throw one's feet,* slang – 'to panhandle'; Germ. *kalte Füße haben* – 'not to have money');

b) Ukr. *рука* / *hand* / Germ. *Hand* (Ukr. *з голими (з порожніми, з пустими) руками* (3) – 'lack of livelihood'; Ukr. *гребти під (до) себе [обома руками (обіруч)],* derog. – 'be greedy, get rich (dishonest way)'; Germ. *eine offene Hand haben* – 'to be generous').

c) Ukr. *рот (горло, пелька)* (Ukr. *не лізе (не йде) в рот (у горло,* vulg. *в пельку)* (2) – 'to have a lot of money'),

d) Ukr. *сльози* (Ukr. *у сльозах* (2) – 'to live in misery, poverty');

e) Ukr. *кулак* (Ukr. *трубити в кулак,* vulg. (1) – 'to endure need, hunger');

f) Germ. *Daumen* (Germ. *einen kranken Daumen haben* (1) – 'not to have money');

g) somatic complex "Ukr. *душа / soul* **+** Ukr**.** *тіло / body*" (Ukr. *тільки душа в тілі; тільки [сама (одна)] душа залишилася (лишилася)* – 'poor'; *keep body and soul together* – 'to endure need, hunger').

The various manifestations of the material according to present somatisms:

a) Germ. *Kopf* (Germ. *bis über den Kopf in Schulden stecken* – 'blame a lot of money');

b) Germ. *Ohr* (Germ. *tief (bis über die Ohren) in Schulden stecken* – 'blame a lot of money');

c) Ukr. *горб* (Ukr. *тримати на своєму горбі* – 'financially support someone');

d) *back* (Ukr. *за спиною (2)*, зі сл. жити, бути і т. ін.; англ. *be on smb. back,* conver. (2) – 'to be on the content'; англ. *have smb. on one's back* (3) – 'financially support someone');

e) Ukr. *шия (плечі)* / Russ. *шея* / Germ. *Hals* (*на шию; сидіти на шиї (на плечах);* Russ. *садиться на шею* (1); Germ. *j-m auf dem Halse liegen (sitzen)* – 'to be on the content'; Ukr. *злазити (злізати) / злізти з шиї* – 'to live on your own money').

Biomorphic code of culture.

Phytocomponent Ukr. *липка* / Russ. *липка* (plant culture code) is actualized in Ukrainian and Russian phrasemics (Ukr. *обдерти (обідрати, облупити і т. ін.)* / *обдирати (облуплювати і т. ін.), як (мов, наче і т. ін.) [ту, молоденьку і т. ін.] липку;* Russ. *обдирать [обирать, обчищать] как липку* – 'to take someone's money, property, jewelry, etc., to bring to complete poverty; take off, rob'); phytocomponent *clover* – in English phrasemics *(be (live) in clover* – 'to live in abundance and luxury').

In German, the phraseme Germ. *ein Land, wo das Geld auf den Sträuchern wächst,* ironic.(phytocomponent Germ. *Sträuchern*) calls the country where money is asked to hand (literally 'where money grows on the bushes').

With the semantics of poverty and bankruptcy in the frame of the zoomorphic code of culture associated zoosemisms:

- Ukr. *кішка (і кішки нема чим годувати* – 'poor');
- Ukr. *білка (оббілувати (обідрати, обчистити і т. ін.), як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) білочку (білку),* ironic.– 'to take away from someone some property, wealth, money; to take away all from whom');
- *duck (a lame duck,* conver. (2) – 'a bankrupt stockbroker'; *a lame duck,* conver. (3) – 'підприємство-банкрут');
- Germ. *Hund* (Germ. *auf dem Hund sein,* conver. – 'to live in misery'; Germ. *vor die Hunde gehen (kommen),* conver. (2)) – 'to bust'; Germ. *auf dem Hund bringen,* conver. – 'to ruin').

With the semantics of wealth associated zoosemisms Ukr. *кури* / Russ. *куры* (Ukr. *[і] кури не клюють,* зі сл. грошей, а також зі словоспол. так, що; Russ. *денег куры не клюют), cock (live like a fighting cock).*

190

Zoosemisms *rat* and *mouse* in different cultures have opposite meanings when representing *money* value:

- Russ. *крыса (мышь)* (Russ. *беден как церковная крыса [мышь]* – 'very poor');
- Germ. *Ratte* (Germ. *die haben für die Ratten* – 'have enough of all');
- Germ. *Maus* (Germ. *dicke Mäuse haben,* slang – 'have money').

G a s t r o n o m i c a l   c o d e   o f   c u l t u r e. The specific character of *money* value in Ukrainian and German phrasemics can be seen in marking of the notion 'solvency' (particularly presence of big amounts of money) with names of food products and dishes:

a) *dumpling, viscous stewed fruit, butter or oil, honey, milk, lard, cheese, bread* (Ukr. *молочні ріки і киселеві (масляні) береги; як бобер у салі; як вареник у маслі (у сметані); як мед пити; як сир у маслі; медові[ї] та молочні[ї] ріки; жити [собі] та (і) хліб жувати)* in Ukrainian phrasemics;

b) *fat, bones, lard, sheesh kebab, eggs* (Germ. *Eier im Fett (Schmalz) haben; im Schmalz sitzen; leben wie Mäuse in der Speckseite*) in German phrasemics.

The most productive is the *bread* (Ukr. *хліб* **/** Russ. *хлеб* **/** Germ. *Brot*) component:

a) own earnings: 'to live on your own money' (Ukr. *свій хліб (рідше свої хліба); добувати хліб [свій]; мати хліб (шматок, кусок* і т. ін. *хліба)* (1); *earn one's bread (by);* Germ. *sein Brot; sein eigen Brot essen);*

b) material content:

- 'to be on the content' (Ukr. *переїдати / переїсти хліб; з'їсти хліба; на хлібах [на хлібі]; на харчах; їсти хліб* (2); *на хлебах* (2));
- 'to live at the expense of the state' (Ukr. *їсти казенний хліб);*
- 'to live at the expense of another' (Russ. *есть чужой хлеб; eat smb.'s bread);*
- 'to live on maintenance from their masters (about old non-working servants)' (Germ. *das Gnadenbrot bei j-m essen);*

c) availability / absence of earnings:

- 'means, necessary for subsistence, for existence' (Ukr. *хліб насущний (насушний)* (1); *daily bread;* Germ. *unser täglich Brot; das liebe Brot,* conver.);
- 'to give somebody a modest earnings' (Germ. *zu(m) Brot (zu einem Stück Brot) verhelfen);*

- 'to deprive someone of earnings' (Germ. *j-m das Brot nehmen (j-n ums Brot bringen))*;

d) ways and amount of earnings:

- 'to have a meager earnings' (Ukr. *перепадати / перепасти на хліб)*;
- 'means of livelihood, obtained easily, without much effort' (Ukr. *лежаний (лежачий) хліб)*;
- 'earnings, obtained by hard work, great effort' (Ukr. *тяжкий хліб*; Germ. *das ist ein hartes (schweres) Brot*, conver.; *(sich D) sein Brot sauer verdienen)*;
- 'good money' (Germ. *sein gutes Brot haben*, conver.);
- 'to panhandle' (Germ. *nach Brot gehen)*;
- 'earning money honestly' (Germ. *sich (D) sein Brot ehrlich erwerben)*;

e) material characteristics of life:

- 'to live in poverty, need' (Ukr. *їсти сухий хліб*; Germ. *das liebe Brot kaum haben)*;
- 'to have everything you need to live' (Ukr. *їсти хліб* (1)).

Gastronomic complexes Ukr. *"хліб (юшка) + вода (квас)"* (Ukr. *перебиватися з хліба (з юшки) на воду (на квас)*; Russ. *сидеть на хлебе и [на] воде)* and Germ. *"Brot + Salz"* (Germ. *nicht das Salz zum Brote haben)* present poor life.

4.3.8. Stage 8. Cultural coding of axiological world's image

Phraseme universals are determined by associative nature of human thought and in the axiological world's image are related to:

a) psycho-physiological characteristics of human (the structure and functioning of the human body; the same or correlative non-verbal elements and their typical interpretation in linguoculturology; mechanisms of cognitive and emotional human activity etc.);

b) the appearance, behavior and habits of animals;

c) the images of color and symbolic color connotations in international practice;

d) the typical characteristics of nature phenomena. Such determination reveals the phrasemes identical in content and internal form, as well as correlative in the external form (taking into account the specific nature of the grammatical structure of the analyzed langua-

ges) in 15 phraseme-semantical subgroups in single-structured and multi-structured languages [Krasnobaieva-Chorna 2017a]. Markers of the authenticity in phrasemes are mostly phytocomponents, onyms and numerical components, as well as pragmatic components that name household items, clothing and food, vehicles, buildings, monetary units, minerals and more.

S o m a t i c   c o d e   o f   c u l t u r e   i n   A W I. The analysis of links between 60 active phrasemic somatisms *(back, body, bones, brain, chest, face, fist, forehead, gills, guts, heel, hump, knee, larynx, lip, neck, ribs, shoulder, skin, spine, stomach, sweat, teeth, tongue)* and the number of their connotations revealed that lexemes *head, hand, blood, eye, soul, heart, ear, neck, nose, skin, throat, finger, spine* could determine five or more meanings in the analyzed languages.

Somatism *head* **/** Germ. *Kopf* **/** Ukr. *голова* **/** Russ. *голова* possesses the highest number of lexical-semantic variants (hereinafter – LSV) and transforms AWI:

1) 'to deprive of life' *(have smb.'s blood on one's hands (head);* Germ. *den Kopf für j-n (etw.) lassen müssen;* Ukr. *поплатитися життям (головою);* Russ. *класть голову [жизнь, живот])* life value;

2) anxiety' *(bother one's head about (over) smb. (smth.);* Ukr. *аж за голову взятися;* Russ. *хвататься за голову)* freedom value;

3) 'to love' (Germ. *j-m den Kopf verdrehen;* Ukr. *морочити голову* (6); Russ. *потерять голову* (3)) love value;

4) 'insane' *(not right in the head;* Germ. *ein Häkchen im Kopfe haben;* Ukr. *в голові кебета догори дриґом стала)* health value;

5) 'smart' *(a clear head;* Germ. *nicht auf den Kopf gefallen sein;* Ukr. *розумна (твереза, мудра) голова;* Russ. *с головой* (1)) health value;

6) 'stupid' *(soft (touched, weak) in the head;* Germ. *ein Brett vor dem Kopf haben;* Ukr. *дурна голова;* Russ. *пустая голова [башка])* health value;

7) 'crippled physically' *(a cold in the head;* Ukr. *голова розвалюється (лопається і т. ін.);* Russ. *голова кружится* (1)) health value;

8) 'state of drunkenness' *(go to smb.'s head* (1); Ukr. *бити / ударити в голову;* Russ. *бросаться [кидаться] в голову)* health value.

Somatisms are really original in this group of phrasemes:

a) *an eyeball (be up to one's (the) ears (eyeballs, eyebrows, eyes, neck) in smth.* – 'work time' *(freedom* values)) in English phrasemics;

b) *limbs /* Germ. *Glieder* (Germ. *der Schreck(en) sitzt ihm in den Gliedern)* and *medulla /* Germ. *Rückenmark* (Germ. *ihm gefror das Rücken-*

mark) – 'limitation of freedom as a manifestation of fear' (*freedom* value); *belly* / Germ. *Magen* (Germ. *er hat einen Schwamm im Magen* – 'bad habits' (*health* value)) in German phrasemics;

c) *neck* / Ukr. *карк* (Ukr. *скрутити* (рідше *вкрутити) в'язи (карка, карк)* (2) – 'to end a life' (*life* value); Ukr. *гнути (згинати)* / *зігнути спину (шию, карк, хребет* і т. ін.) (1) – 'work time'; Ukr. *накидати (накладати, надівати* і т. ін.) / *накинути (накласти, надіти* і т. ін.) *ярмо (петлю) [на [свою] шию (на карк, на себе)]* – 'subordinate' (*freedom* value); Ukr. *скрутити* (рідше *вкрутити) в'язи (карка, карк)* (3) – 'absence of success' (*success* value)) in Ukrainian phrasemics;

d) *crest* / Russ. *холка* (Russ. *намять холку,* vernac. (1) – 'crippled physically' (*health* value)) in Russian phrasemics.

B i o m o r p h i c   c o d e   o f   c u l t u r e   i n   A W I. In AWI of the languages under investigation nearly 60 zoosemisms *(anuran, ape, ass, bat, bea, bee, bull, bumblebee, cat, cock, cow, crocodile, crow, dog, dove, duck, fly, fox, goat, goose, hare, horse, kangaroo, lion, pig, rat, sheep, snake, sparrow, spider, wolf)* were fixed, which take part in figurative motivation of phraseme. For such zoosemisms like *hare, mouse, shivers* limitation of freedom as a sign of fear is typical in single-multi-language LSV, *bird* – 'free (from oppression, power, will, influence' *freedom* value, *crocodile* –'dishonest actions' *honesty* value, *an ox* –'healthy' *health* value. The analysis of semantics of zoosemisms reveals the peculiarities of the detonate, fixed in the language, irrespective of the degree of their correspondence to properties of the reference animal. Qualities understood to belong to one or another animal can differ in single and multi-language systems, like, for example, zoosemism *fish* / Ukr. *риба* / Russ. *рыба*:

a) Ukr. *як (мов, ніби* і т. ін.) *риба з водою* (1) – 'marriage (to get on well)' *family* value in Ukrainian phrasemics;

b) Ukr. *як риба у воді* (1); Russ. *как рыба в воде* – 'free (from oppression, authority, somebody's will or influence) *freedom* value in Ukrainian and Russian phrasemics;

c) *drink like a fish* – 'to be on drinking spree' *health* value in English phrasemics;

d) *cry stinking fish* – 'marriage' (to reveal family secrets)' *family* value in English phrasemics.

Phrasemes with phytocomponents *(beans, birch, cabbage, chestnut, daisy, lemon, lily, linden, oak, olive, pea, peony, poppy, rose, spruce, violet,*

wheat) in AWI testify greater difference (as compared to zoosemisms) both in component content and figurative substrate, comp. LSV:

1) 'mentally limited' *(birch* / Russ. *берёза* (Russ. *пень берёзовый)*, *oak* / Russ. *дуб* (Russ. *дубовая голова [башка])*, *spruce* / Russ. *ель* (Russ. *голова еловая)) health* value;

2) 'physically fit' *(daisy ((as) fresh as a daisy* (1)) *health* value;

3) 'state of drunkenness' *(violet* / Germ. *Veilchen* (Germ. *blau sein (wie ein Veilchen)) health* value;

4) 'handsome' *(lily, rose ((as) fair as a lily (as a rose)), peony* / Germ. *Pfingstrose* (Germ. *aussehen wie eine Pfingstrose)) beauty* value;

5) 'peace' *(olive (the olive branch)) peace* value;

6) 'absence of success' *(wheat* / Germ. *Weizen* (Germ. *ihm blüht kein Weizen)) success* value, whatsoever.

Comprising the same nominative components phrasemes with phytocomponents do not coincide in semantics, for example:

a) *pea* / Germ. *Erbsen* / Ukr. *горох* (Germ. *mit j-m durch einen Scheffel Erbsen verwandt sein* ('congeniality' *family* value in German phrasemics) and Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) [той] горох при дорозі* (4) ('loneliness' *family* value in Ukrainian phrasemics);

b) *lemon* / Ukr. *лимон* / Russ. *лимон* (Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) вичавлений лимон* ('physically not fit' *health* value in Ukrainian phrasemics) and Russ. *выжатый лимон* (2) ('absence of spiritual force' *health* value in Russian phrasemics).

N a t u r a l   c o d e   o f   c u l t u r e   i n   A W I. Phrasemes with meteocomponents *(cold, fog, frost, ice, snow, shower, storm, thunder, volcano, wind)* occupy a substantial place in AWI. The highest affinity in the analyzed languages show meteorological components that mean 'limitation of freedom as a manifestation of fear' (65% of the selection of meteocomponents) – *freedom* value:

a) *volcano* / Ukr. *вулкан* / Russ. *вулкан* ('danger' *(sit on a volcano;* Ukr. *як (мов, ніби і т. ін.) на вулкані;* Russ. *как на вулкане))*;

b) *ice* / Ukr. *крига* / Russ. *лёд* and *cold* / Germ. *Kälte* / Ukr. *холод* / Russ. *холод (one's blood freezes (runs cold, turns to ice);* Germ. *es überläuft mich kalt (es läuft mir kalt über den Rücken);* Ukr. *кров холоне (крижаніє, застигає) / захолола (застигла) у жилах;* Russ. *кровь стынет [леденеет, холодеет] <в жилах>)*;

c) *frost* / Ukr. *мороз* / Russ. *мороз (one's blood freezes (runs cold, turns to ice);* Ukr. *мороз хапає / вхопив за плечі* (2); Russ. *мороз по коже [по спине] дерет [подирает, продирает, пробегает, идет])*;

d) *water* / Germ. *Wasser* / Ukr. *вода (get into deep water(s); Germ. Blut (und Wasser) schwitzen* (2); Ukr. *лити холодну воду [за комір]*).

The bulk of LSV in AWI comprises the component *wind* / Ukr. *вітер* / Russ. *ветер* / Germ. *Wind:* 1) 'dire straits' (Ukr. *вітер у кишенях (у кишені) (рідко по кишенях) свистить (свище, гуде, гуляє, віє, ходить)* (1); Russ. *ветер свистит в карманах (в кармане))* and 2) 'squandering' (Ukr. *пускати / пустити на вітер зі сл. гроші, майно і т. ін.* (1); Russ. *бросать [кидать, швырять, пускать] на ветер) money* value in Ukrainian and Russian phrasemics; 3) 'free time' (Ukr. *ганяти вітер по вулицях (по світу))*; 4) 'work time' (Ukr. *дмухати (дути) проти вітру) freedom* value and 5) 'physically not fit' (Ukr. *дмухни і полетить за вітром) health* value in Ukrainian phrasemics; 6) 'solvency' *(raise the wind) money* value; 7) 'physically fit' *(sound in wind and limb)* and 8) 'state of alcoholic intoxication' *(a sheet in the wind) health* value in English phrasemics; 9) 'psychological freedom' (Germ. *dem Wind und Wetter trotzen) freedom* value in German phrasemics.

Colouring code of culture in AWI. Phrasemes with colouring components *(black, blue, gray, green, pink, white, yellow)* occupy a prominent share in formation of AWI. The following AWI are typical in single and multi-language language systems: 1) 'free (from oppression, authority, somebody's will or influence)' *freedom* value of the colouring component of *green* / Ukr. *зелений* / Russ. *зелёный (give smb. (smth.) a (the) green light;* Ukr. *зелена вулиця* (1); Russ. *зелёная улица* (1)); 2) 'aristocratic, noble, gentry' *family* value *(blue blood;* Germ. *blaues Blut;* Ukr. *блакитна кров;* Russ. *голубая кровь)* and 3) 'state of alcoholic intoxication' *health* value *(drink till all's blue;* Germ. *blau sein (wie ein Veilchen);* Ukr. *синій ніс)* of the component *blue* / Germ. *Blau* / Ukr. *блакитний* / Russ. *голубой.*

Diversified polysemy in the analyzed languages (exceeding 5 LSV) is peculiar to such colouring components like *black, blue, green* and *white.*

Quantitative code of culture in AWI. Decimal numerals are most productive in formation of phrasemes with numerical component in AWI of the analyzed languages, it showing a special role of the numbers of the first ten, like:

1) *one* ('absence of success' *(one in the eye for smb.) success* value);
2) *two* ('progeny' (Germ. *auf zwei Augen stehen (ruhen)) family* value);

3) *three* ('a distant relative or a person, having no relation at all' (Ukr. *твоя хата моїй хаті троюрідний погріб) family* value);

4) *four* ('loneliness' (Ukr. *у чотирьох стінах*, зі сл. *сидіти;* Russ. *жить [сидеть] в четырёх стенах* (1)) *family* value; or to 'infringe laws' (Germ. *vor die vier Bänke kommen) law* value);

5) *five* ('sane person' (Germ. *seine fünf Sinne beisammen haben) health* value);

6) *six and nine* ('fat' (Ukr. *шість на дев'ять (на шість)) health* value);

7) *seven* ('work time' (Ukr. *виганяти / вигнати сім потів (сьомий піт)* (1); Russ. *до седьмого пота)) freedom* value);

8) *eight* ('insolvency' (Germ. *an einem Hering acht Tage essen) money* value);

9) *tenth* ('a distant relative' (Ukr. *в десятому коліні)) family* value.

In the Ukrainian language a variance of numerical and non-numerical components in the phrasemes components 'three / seven' (Ukr. *без [третьої (сьомої)] клепки [в голові (у тім'ї)]*); 'one / three / nine' (Ukr. *не мати (однієї (третьої, дев'ятої і т. ін.] клепки [в голові]*); 'one / three / ten' (Ukr. *нема (немає, не було, не вистачає, бракує і т. ін.) [однієї (третьої, десятої і т. ін.] клепки у голові*) (*health* value); 'seven / ten' (Ukr. *десята (сьома) вода на киселі*) (*family* value); 'seven / bloody / bitter' (Ukr. *пролити [кривавий (солоний, сьомий і т. ін.] піт);* 'seven / bloody / bitter'(Ukr. *обливатися* (рідше *умиватися, обмиватися і т. ін.) / облитися (вмитися, обмитися і т. ін.) [кривавим (гірким, сьомим і т. ін.] потом*) (*freedom* value) were registered. Variance of the numeral with pronoun 'four / six / all' *(be (hit, operate, run) on all (four, six,* etc.) *cylinders* (1) – 'work time' *freedom* value) and application of a numerical complex 'one plus eight' ('bad habits' *(have one over the eight (have one too many)) health* value) were found to exist in English phrasemics.

Common LSV can have different numerical components in single and multi-system languages, e. g.: 'bad habits' *health* value (the component *three* in English phrasemics *(three sheets in the wind)* and the component *seven* in German (Germ. *halb sieben sein))*.

In the research the use of numerical components *thousand* ('limitation of freedom as manifestation of fear' (Germ. *er schwebt in tausend Ängsten) freedom* value in German phrasemics) and *million* ('good state of health' *(feel like a million dollars) health* values in English) was registered.

Axiophrasemic pragmatics is a new research area in linguistics, which aims to create a holistic and objective model of the functioning of the evaluation in phrasemics of single-structured and multi-structured languages.

The axiophrasemic pragmatics also builds and introduces into scientific use a general linguistic **classification of phrasemes according to their evaluation load**. This classification singles out **positively evaluative** ('good', 'to approve', 'to satisfy', 'valuable', 'to interest', 'to agree', 'to recommend', 'to maintain', 'to comply with'), **negatively evaluative** ('bad', 'not to approve', 'not to satisfy', 'not valuable', 'not to interest', 'not to agree', 'to forbid', 'to deny', 'not to comply with'), **neutrally evaluative phrasemes** and **phrasemes with diffuse evaluation**. This division in its turn allows to focus on their connection with **the category of value.**

The axiological world's image is defined as the understanding of the world by man, his fragments and the status of the human person in this world through the evaluative categorization in values and non-values opposition. **Evaluative categorization –** the formation of values due to the evaluative understanding of environmental objects.

The algorithm for modeling the axiological world's image in phrasemics involves 8 steps: 1) the research illustrative corpus; 2) a nomenclature of universal values; 3) the level model of the axiological world's image; 4) phrasemic axiological oppositions of values; 5) the ideographic parametrization of values; 6) the level organization of values; 7) cultural coding of values; 8) cultural coding of axiological world's image.

Differences in the meanings of associates are explained by specific character of culture, national mentality, ways of life and figurative perception of environment by the bearers of the languages analyzed. Coincidence in figurativeness of phrasemes in single and multi-system languages partially demonstrates the universal character of the transfer of associatives and their functional and semantic dynamics in representing phrasemes of *beauty, family, freedom, health, honesty, law, life, love, money, peace* and *success* values.

Universal phrasemes are characterized by associative character of human thinking and AWI they are linked with:

1) mental and physiological human peculiarities (the structure and functioning of human organism, analogous or comparable non-verbal elements and their typical interpretation in linguistics and cul-

tural science, communicative linguistics, mechanisms of mental and cognitive human activities etc.);

2) exterior, behavior and habits of animals;

3) perception of time and space;

4) perception of colour and symbolic significance of colour, fixed in the world's practice;

5) typical characteristics of phenomena and states of nature that gave an opportunity to reveal phrasemes in English, German, Ukrainian and Russian which are equal in sense and internal appearance and comparable in external appearance.

Associating components are treated in research as representing cultural codes: somatisms represent **somatic code of culture**, zoosemisms and phytocomponents **– biomorphic code of culture** (zoomorphic and phytomorphic codes of culture), meteocomponents **– natural code of culture**, colouring components **– colorative code of culture**, numerical components **– quantitative code of culture**, names of food products and dishes **– gastronomic code of culture**, etc. **Cultural code** is understood to be a specific cultural network of division, categorization and evaluation of the world, or a system of signs, that represents cultural senses.

The prospect of investigation can be in further elaboration of structuring and categorization of evaluation at different levels of single-structured and multi-structured languages and intensification of investigation of the means aspects of phrasemic level of the axiological world's image, by projecting it upon codes of culture.

CONCLUSIONS

Modern linguopersonology is based on profound concepts of the comprehension of the word meaning revealed only during communication (O. Potebnja), differentiation of language, speech and language activity ↔ speech activity, as well as models of grammar of active pattern (Yu. Karaulov), language (national-language) picture of the world (V. Karasyk), the ascertainment of the peculiarities of formation and functioning of cognitive (national-cognitive) picture of the world with its division into immediate and mediate. The first one is always obtained through recognition of the environment which is realized by concrete feelings and abstract thinking. In national consciousness such picture of the world is motivated by the methods used, so it may be rational and sentimental, materialistic and idealistic, theoretic and empiric, scientific and naive, natural-scientific and religiously mystical, physical and chemical, dialectic and metaphysic and so on. The immediate picture of the world is connected with world outlook being different only in representing of notional knowledge (knowledge in its filling). World outlook is the method or methodology of cognition, while the immediate picture of the world is the result of a corresponding cognition. It makes the principle difference between world outlook and immediate picture of the world. Both world outlook and immediate picture of the world are important for linguopersonology as in the period, for example, of ascertainment of the mono-linguoperson the primary formation of outlook benchmarks takes place, as well as the relatively complete formation of immediate picture of the world, comprising notional, conceptual knowledge about true reality, the collection of mental stereotypes as motivators of understanding and interpretation of certain phenomena, realia, objects of objective reality. Such picture of the world is a mental image of reality created by the cognition of a certain language personality (mo-

nolinguoperson) or collective language personality (polylinguoperson) and becomes cognitive. The latter is based on the collection of arranged knowledge (concept sphere) becoming the result of the cognition of the reality where the direct empiric reflection of the environment by sense organs and conscious reflexive representation of reality in mental processes are significant. Cognitive picture of the world of a monolinguoperson and/or polylinguoperson arises as a collection of concept sphere and stereotypes of consciousness programmed by the culture.

Studying of the problems of linguopersonology – its categories, units, levels, rules and regulations of language ↔ speech ↔ cognitive realization of monolinguoperson and/or polylinguoperson and others – comprises different structurations of cognitive picture of the world in the consciousness of the personality as a systemic one which influences the person's perception of objective world becoming the ground for the classification of elements of reality with the analysis of reason-result relations present between them, consideration of possible development of events). Cognitive picture of the world arranges sensual and rational experience of polylinguoperson and/or monolinguoperson.

National-cognitive picture of the world is a relatively stable value with the repetition of its main (nuclear) components in the pictures of the world of separate individuals. National-language picture of the world is a relative abstraction and, at the same time, a cognitive-psychological reality expressed in intellectual, cognitive activity of separate linguo-individuals. At the same time, national-cognitive picture of the world is represented in uniformity of physical, ethical, verbal and other behaviour. National-cognitive picture of the world is revealed in the fixed behaviour of the nation in certain stereotypical situations, in general imaginations of the nation about reality, in utterances and common views, worked-out behavioural moments, in thoughts about objective reality, proverbs, sayings, aphorisms, precedent-related statements and precedent-related phenomena.

The study of ego-text and its generic system makes it possible to deeper understand the lingual personality, its psychotype, the character of personal lingual space, specificity of lingual creativity, speech manner, communicative strategies and tactics which are realized in personal or intimate texts qualified as ego-texts. These texts most distinctly recreate spiritual dimensions of the lingual personality,

his/her inner world, erudition, ethical aspects, aspiration to reproduce knowledge about the world and himself/herself.

Ego-texts are marked with a great *functional load*, in particular, they perform such functions as: *operative* (expresses creative attitude to life, renders personal, intimate impressions, ideas and information from man to man; e.g. ego-textual genre of the letter), *appellative* and *endearing* (aspiration to actualize friendly feelings, sympathy, love, emotional and positive attitude in general), in particular *linguoappellative*, as an individual aspires to the most distinct representation of his/her Ego, self-realization through his/her text, communication with the use of various strategies and tactics; *linguosynergetic,* as I-texts stimulate self-development of an individual, in particular, realize functions which are subordinate to the key one: *autoanalytical, meditational, self-cognition, self-realization, self-assertion*, for example, in the ego-textual genre of a diary lingual personality manifests its vision and understanding of facts, events, phenomena, and makes judgments; *linguocreative*, as an individual tries to demonstrate his/her capacity to verbalize ornamental experience, to experiment with words, to model ego-textual microgenres, such as aphorisms, verbal grotesque, short speeches, epigrams etc., to create syncretic genres; *reminiscent,* which most consistently manifest itself in ego-textual genres of memoirs and autobiography when the author switches from the narration about himself to the events s/he witnesses; *autocommunicative*, as the dialogue of Ego and AlterEgo takes place in process of modeling ego-texts, which is particularly conspicuous in the ego-textual genres of the diary and memoirs. It reminds of the Christian parable according to which God told the man that the only way to achieve absolute harmony is to find Him while his secret shelter was human soul. Therefore, to achieve harmony means to know himself, his AlterEgo. Not least among other activities it can be achieved through creation and perception of the totality of specific genres of ego-texts where the man gains knowledge of himself.

The research of ego-texts is indispensible for the development of the system of humanities, such as semiotics, biographic literary studies, narratology, history, psychology, primarily to acquire information about the structure of human consciousness, in particular, lingual one (mechanism of "the work" of memory, reflection, evaluation, emotion, thinking, verbalization of experience etc.), communicative linguistics, text linguistics, lingual culturology etc. Theoretical investi-

gation of some ego-textual genres generate new independent trends of linguistics, such as linguistic diary studies or diarimology / epistolarimology. This evidences of the extension of the theory of ego-text which has derived from lingual personology. There is need to elaborate: a) *history* of its formation and development; b) *methodology of the ego-text research* (system of main postulates, methods and methodologies, metalanguage which is at the stage of being shaped and requires generalization)*;* c) *genology of ego-texts* (typology of genres and sub-genres or microgenres according to different criteria of their discrimination in line with literary and linguistic approaches); d) *ego-textual discursive practice* according to types of narrators representing corresponding sociotype (gender and age parameters, professional status etc), ethnotype, psychotype and character of lingual creative activity.

Modern linguopersonology also actualizes the necessity of studying the *axiological world's image*, which (as well as the conceptual) functions within the national-language world's image and serves as a source of knowledge about the national character and mentality through a system of values. The axiological world's image is positioned as an understanding of the world by a person, fragments of this world and the status of the human person in this world through an appraisal *categorization* of *values* and *non-values* in opposition. Value is measured in a system of "possible assessments" at different levels of language. Values have a relational character in the axiological world's image, manifested through the connection with the non-value, that is, the disclosure of the content of the value, its structural organization depends on the positive unit: the concepts of "good" and "bad" imply the presence of each other and form a semantic space around, represented by phrasemes of single-structured and multi-structured languages in the monograph.

The mediate picture of the world is formed through the fixation of concept sphere by secondary sign systems. The latter materialize, put into words the immediate picture of the world existing in the consciousness. Language and artistic pictures are the examples of such pictures of the world, where the first one represents the complex of outlooks fixed by language units, as well as nation's imaginations in a certain historic period of their development. Nation's thinking is not determined or mediated by language, but is regularly nominated, fixed, put into words, which gives the possibility to adequately investigate, study the peculiarities of thinking of polylinguoperson

and/or monolinguoperson. The language fixes and preserves, archives and systematizes the main regulations of external and internal linguoindividuations, external and internal linguoindividualizations in their different genre, territorial, temporal, ethical, aesthetic, status-role, social-corporative and other varieties. The level structuration of the language personality, the presence of acciogenic, traditional, routine and other values are also significant, these values being interpreted in corresponding discursive practices – school, medical, pedagogical and so on. Linguopersonologic studies comprise different reflections which in their multitude reflect the integral system of interpretations of values, stereotypes, acciogenes, etc. Modern linguopersonology actively develops, different theoretical studies appear within its boundaries, which correspond the challenges of modern linguistic science in its classical interpretation and interdisciplinary dimension (sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnic linguistics, computer linguistics, juridical linguistics, psychiatric linguistics, etc.) and can give the answer to information-technological, cyber knowledge and other challenges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Autobiografizm i okolice: prace ofiarowane profesor Małgorzacie Czermińskiej*, pod red. Tadeusza Sucharskiego i Bernadetty Żynis; Akademia Pomorska w Słupsku, Słupsk: Wyd-wo Naukowe Akademii Pomorskiej, 2011, 227 s.
2. Baeva L., *Values of Mediasphere and E-Culture*, in: "Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski", Olsztyn 2017, VIII/1, pp. 173–184.
3. Bart R., *Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics*, Moscow: Ripol Classic, 1994. 619 s.
4. Basaj M., *Ze spostrzezen nad jezykiem Iwana Franki*, w: *Іван Франко і світова культура*, Матер. Міжнар симпозіуму ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986 р.), Київ: Наук. думка, 1990, кн. 2. с. 146–153.
5. Bates E., MacWhinney B., *Functionalist approaches to grammar*, v: *Language Acguition: The State of the Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, p. 41–62.
6. Bzdawka U., *Autobiografia – literatura dokumentu osobistego: zestawienie bibliograficzne*, w: Poradnik Bibliograficzno-Metodyczny, 2002, Nr 4, s. 14–33.
7. Cowie A., *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications (Oxford Studies in Lexicography and Lexicology)*, New York: OUP, 2001, 272 p.
8. Czermińska M., *Miejsca autobiograficzne. Propozycja w ramach geopoetyki*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2011, Nr 5, s. 183–199.
9. Czermińskia M., *Autobiograficzny trójkąt. Świadectwo, wyznanie i wyzwanie*, Krakyw: Tow-wo Autoryw i Wydawcyw Prac Naukowych "Universitas", 2000, 343 s.
10. Data K., *Struktura tekstu listowego*, w: "Język Polski", 1989, Z. 3–5, s. 151–160.
11. Demetrio D., *Autobiografia. Terapeutyczny wymiar pisania o sobie*, przeł. A. Skolimowska; przedmowa O. Czerniawska, Kraków: Impuls, 2000, 148 s.
12. Dubrovsky S., *Autobiografia / prawda / psychoanaliza*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2007, Nr S, s. 189–203.
13. Foltyniak A., *Między "pisać Nałkowską" a Nałkowskiej "czytaniem siebie": narracyjna tożsamość podmiotu w "Dziennikach"*, Kraków: Tow-wo Autoryw i Wydawcyw Prac Naukowych "Universitas", 2004, 186 s.
14. Galant A., *Prywatne, publiczne, autobiograficzne: o dziennikach i esejach Jana Lechonia, Zofii Nałkowskiej, Marii Kuncewiczowej i Jerzego Stempowskiego*, Warszawa: Wyd-wo DiG, 2010, 212 s.
15. Hall C. S., Lindsey G., *Theories of Personality*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970, 2d. ed., 622 p.
16. Hunston S., *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: Phraseology and Evaluative Language*, New York 2011, 166 p.

17. Hurbanska S. O., *Multifunctionality of Phraseological Units in Postmodern Literary Discourse*, [in:] "Language, Individual & Society", Burgas 2014, vol. 8, pp. 344–351.

18. Jarosiński Z., *Proza dokumentu osobistego*, w: "Sporne postaci polskiej literatury współczesnej", Praca zbiorowa, pod red. Aliny Brodzkiej i Lidii Burskiej, Warszawa 1998, s. 143–153.

19. Kałkowska A., *Struktura składniowa listu*, Wrocław 1982, 142 s.

20. Kasperski E., *Problem dialogu w tworczosci Iwana Franki*, в: Іван Франко – *письменник, мислитель, громадянин*, Матер. Міжнар. наук. конф. (Львів, 25–27 вересня 1996 р.), Львів: Світ, 1998, с. 278–284.

21. Kaźmierska K., *Biografia i pamięć. Na przykładzie pokoleniowego doświadczenia ocalonych z Zagłady*, Kraków: Wyd-wo NOMOS, 2008, 240 s.

22. Kita M., *Polski dyskurs prywatności*, w: "Postscriptum Polonistyczne", 2013, Nr 1 (11), s. 93–103.

23. Kolinko E., *Tylko dzienniki. Diarystyka kobieca jako przedmiot badań w Polsce i za granicą*, w: "Przegląd Humanistyczny", 2016, Nr 4, s. 138–150.

24. Krasnobaieva-Chorna Zh., *Axiophraseme Pragmatics: Representation of Code Culture in the Axiological World's Image (on the Material of English, German, Ukrainian and Russian)*, в: "Лінгвістичні студії / Linguistic Studies", Вінниця 2017, вип. 33, с. 83–87.

25. Krasnobaieva-Chorna Zh., *Mind Value: Semantics, Structure, Pragmatics (on the Material of English, German, Ukrainian and Russian Phraseology)*, в: "Лінгвістичні студії / Linguistic Studies", Вінниця 2017, вип. 34, с. 79–87.

26. Krzyżanowska A., *Polska i francuska frazeologia śmierci*, Lublin: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 1999, 120 s.

27. Kuplowski M., *I. Franko jako krytyk literatury polskiej*, Rzeszyw: Wyd-wo Rzeszyw. Universitet, 1974, 196 c.

28. Kuplowski M., *I. Franko o literaturze polskiej*, Kraków: Wyd-wo Universitet Jagiellonski, 1979, 304 s.

29. Lejeune P., *„Drogi zeszycie…", „drogi ekranie…". O dziennikach osobistych*, przeł. A. Karpowicz, M. Rodak, P. Rodak; wybór, wstęp i oprac. P. Rodak, Warszawa: Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2010, 356 s.

30. Lejeune P., *Dziewczęce "ja": (o dziennikach panien z XIX wieku)*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2003, Nr 2/3, s. 192–211.

31. Lubas-Bartoszyńska R., *Nowsze problemy teoretyczne pisania o sobie: przykład wypowiedzi autobiograficznych pisarzy polskich ostatnich dziesięcioleci*, w: "Przestrzenie Teorii", 2006, Nr 6, s. 51–67.

32. Lubas-Bartoszyńska R., *Style wypowiedzi pamiętnikarskiej*, Kraków: Wyd-wo Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, 1983, 223 s.

33. McNeill D., *The Acquisition of Language: the Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics*, New York: Harper & Row, 1970, 201 p.

34. Mitosek Z., *Hermeneuta i autobiografia*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2002, Nr 3, s. 137–151.

35. Okulus A., *Ja autobiograficzne jako podmiot dialogiczny "Kartki z dziennika" Stefana Chwina – "odkrywanie innego"*, w: "Kwartalnik Opolski", 2009, Nr 1, s. 61–79.

36. Osgood C. E., *Lectures on Language Performance*, Charles E. Osgood. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1980, p. 276.

37. Renouvier C. B., *Le personnalisme, scientific publication*, Paris 1902, 189 p.

38. Rodak P., *Prawda w dzienniku osobistym*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2009, Nr 4, s. 23–38.

39. Rybicka E., *Antropologiczne i komunikacyjne aspekty dyskursu epistolograficznego*, w: "Teksty Drugie", 2004, Nr 4, s. 40–55.

40. Shevelov George Y., *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, Heidellberg: Winter, 1979, 809 p.

41. Szulakiewicz W., *Ego-dokumenty i ich znaczenie w badaniach naukowych*, w: Źródło elektroniczne: http://apcz.umk.pl/czasopisma/index.php/PBE/article/download/ 1835/1790 (21.10.2018).

42. Trzynadlowski J., *List i pamiętnik. Dwie formy wypowiedzi osobistej*, w: Małe formy literackie, Wrocław 1977, s. 83–84.

43. Tyrowicz M., *W poszukiwaniu siebie. Wspomnienia i refleksje*, t. 1: Pod lwowskim niebem, Lublin: Wyd-wo Lubelskie, 1988, 180 s.

44. Wundt W., *Vulkerpsychologie: Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetce von Sprache, Mythus und Sitce*, Leipzig 1911, Bd. 1: Sprache, t. 1, 695 s.; Leipzig, 1904, Bd. 2: Die Sprache, t. 2, 673 s.

45. Zaśko-Zielińska M., *Listy pożegnalne: w poszukiwaniu lingwistycznych wyznaczników autentyczności tekstu*, Wrocław: Wydział Filologiczny Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2013, 286 s.

46. Аверинцев С. С., *Плутарх и античная биография*, Москва: Наука, 1973, 279 с.

47. Акишина А. А., *Письмо как один из видов текста: Общие сведения об эпистолярном жанре*, в: "Русский язык за рубежом", 1982а, № 2, с. 57–63.

48. Акишина А. А., *Письмо как один из видов текста: Характеристика благодарственных, извинительных и поздравительных писем*, в: "Русский язык за рубежом", 1982б, № 4, с. 31–38.

49. Акишина А. А., Формановская Н. И., *Этикет русского письма*, Москва: Русский язык, 1981, 200 с.

50. Акишина А. А., Формановская Н. И. *Этикет русского письма*, 4-е изд., Москва: Русский язык, 1989, 192 с.

51. Анохіна Т. О., *Невербальні та вербальні засоби екстеріоризації силенціального ефекту в англомовному художньому дискурсі*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2006, 20 с.

52. Антоненко С. В., *Структура писем А. С. Пушкина (Лингвостилистика текста)*, Київ: О-во "Знание" Украины, 2000, 154 с.

53. Арделян О., *Проблеми дослідження ідіоматики в сучасній лінгвістиці*, в: "Наукові записки КДПУ. Серія: Філол. науки (мовознавство)", Кіровоград 2015, вип. 137, с. 40–44.

54. Аркушин Г. Л., *Варіанти імені, жартівливі прізвиська, псевдоніми та криптоніми Лесі Українки*, в: "Дивослово", 1995, № 2, с. 15–16.

55. Арнольд И. В., *Лексикология современного английского языка*, Москва: Высшая школа, 1986, 296 с.

56. Арсентьева Е. Ф., *Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц (на материале фразеологических единиц, семантически ориентированных на человека в английском и русском языках)*, Казань: Изд-во Казан. ун-та, 1989, 126 с.

57. Артемьева Т. В., *Утешительные письма. Фигуры Танатоса*, в: Тема смерти в духовном опыте человечества, Матер. I междунар. конф. (СПб, 2–4 ноября 1993 г.), Санкт-Петербург 1993, вып. 3, с. 77–85.

58. Арутюнова Н. Д., *Фактор адресата*, в: "Изв. АН СССР. Сер. лит. и яз.", т. 40, № 4, 1981, с. 356–367.

59. Арутюнова Н. Д., *Язык и мир человека*, 2-е изд., испр., Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1999, 896 с.

60. Астахова Э. И., *Внутренняя форма идиом и ее функции*, в: *Фразеография в Машинном фонде русского языка*, Москва: Наука, 1990, с. 146–152.

61. Ахутина Т. В., *Нейролингвистический анализ динамической афазии. О механизмах построения высказывания*, 3-е изд., Москва: Теревинф, 2012, 144 с.

62. Бабаева Е. В., *Лингвокультурологические характеристики русской и немецкой аксиологических картин мира*, дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Волгоград 2004, 438 с.

63. Багаутдинова Г. А., *Человек во фразеологии: антропоцентрический и аксиологический аспекты*, автореф. дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Казань 2007, 45 с.

64. Баева Л. В., *Ценности изменяющегося мира: экзистенциальная аксиология истории*, Астрахань: Изд-во АГУ, 2004, 278 с.

65. Батсурэн Р., *Отображение универсальных и этноспецифических черт языковой картины мира в фразеологических фондах английского, русского и монгольского языков*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Саратов 2010, 227 с.

66. Бахтин М. М., *Проблема речевых жанров*, в: Его же, *Собр. соч.* Москва: Русские словари, 1996, т. 5: Работы 1940–1960 гг., с. 159–206.

67. Бахтин М. М., *Проблема речевых жанров*, в: Его же, *Эстетика словесного творчества*, сост. С. Г. Бочаров, 2-е изд., Москва: Искусство, 1986, с. 250–296.

68. Бахтин М. М., *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского*, Москва: Сов. писатель, 1963, 362 с.

69. Бацевич Ф., *Лінгвокомунікативні та риторико-прагматичні виміри художнього тексту (на матер. роману Івана Франка „Перехресні стежки")*, Львів: ВЦ ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2016, 192 с.

70. Белова А. В., *Лингвопрагматическая характеристика обратимой эпистолярной коммуникации (на материале переписки Ал. П. Чехова и А. П. Чехова)*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Санкт-Петербург 2005, 22 с.

71. Белунова Н. И., *Комфорт речевого общения*, в: "Русский язык в школе", 1996, № 5, с. 80–84.

72. Белунова Н. И., *Текст дружеского письма творческой интеллигенции конца XIX – первой четверти XX века как объект лингвистического исследования (коммуникативный аспект)*, дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Санкт-Петербург 2000, 46 с.

73. Бердяев Н. А., *Я и мир объектов (Опыт философии одиночества и общения)*, Париж: Ynica-press, 1934, 187 с.

74. Билецкая О. П., *Письмо как межстилевой тип текста*, в: "Сб. науч. тр. МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза", Москва 1995, с. 95–101.

75. Білодід І. К., *Каменяр українського слова (до 110-річчя з дня народження і 50-річчя з дня смерті Івана Яковича Франка)*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1966, 67 с.

76. Білоус М. П., *До питання мовно-правописного редагування Франкових творів*, в: *Іван Франко – письменник, мислитель, громадянин*, Матер. Міжнар. наук. конф. (Львів, 22–25 вересня 1996), Львів: Світ, 1998, с. 633–637.

77. Богатырева Е. Н., *Семантическая структура и структурно-семантическая моделированность фразеологических единиц с компонентами-наименованиями воды и водоемов в современном русском языке*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Кострома 2015, 222 с.

78. Богдан С., *Вербалізація концепту свято в епістолярній поведінці Лесі Українки*, в: "Studia Ukrainica Poznanieńsia", Poznań 2013, zeszyt 1, s. 23–38.

79. Богдан С., *Епістолярна поведінка українців у XIX–XX ст.*, Луцьк: Вежа-Друк, 2013, 269 с.

80. Брагина Н. Г., *Память в языке и культуре*, Москва: Языки славянских культур, 2007, 520 с.

81. Братаніч О. В., *Лінгвостилістика епістолярію Г. П. Кочура (на матеріалі листування 60–80-х рр. ХХ століття)*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2004, 215 с.

82. Бровіньок Т. І., *Студія Івана Франка "Да дні" як новий тип ідейно-естетичної структури*, в: "Українська мова і література в школі", 1981, № 8, с. 37–43.

83. Булах О. Н., *Епістолярний стиль чи епістолярний жанр*, в: "Мовознавство", 1982, № 1 (91), с. 66–69.

84. Булаховський Л. А., *Мовні засоби інтимізації в поезії Тараса Шевченка*, в: Избр. тр: в 5 томах, Київ: Наук. думка, 1977, т. 2. 631 с.

85. Буркитбаева Г. Г., *Некоторые вопросы теории жанра в современной зарубежной лингвистике*, в: "Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики", 2005, № 2, с. 97–105.

86. Вайсгербер Й. Л., *Родной язык и формирование духа*, пер. с нем., вступ. ст. и коммент. О. А. Радченко, изд. 2-е, испр. и доп., Москва: Едиториал УРСС, 2004, 232 с.

87. Валевский А. Л., *Основания биографики*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1993, 110 с.

88. Василенко А. П., *Оценочно-эмотивное содержание русских и французских фразеологизмов*, в: "Филол. науки. Вопр. теории и практики", Тамбов 2010, № 1 (5), ч. I, с. 63–65.

89. Величко Н. В., *Самономинации и самохарактеристики в письмах А. П. Чехова ялтинского периода (сентябрь 1898 – апрель 1899 г.)*, в: "Учен. зап. Таврич. нац. ун-та им. В. И. Вернадского. Сер. «Филология»", т. 20 (59), 2007, с. 420–424.

90. Веселов П. В., *Аксиомы делового письма: Культура делового общения и официальной переписки*, Москва: ИВЦ "Маркетинг", 1993, 74 с.

91. Веселов П. В., *Современное деловое письмо в промышленности*, 3-е изд., доп., Москва: Изд-во стандартов, 1990, 160 с.

92. Вєтрова Е. С., *Семантика і функціонально-комунікативний аспект етикетних одиниць в епістолярній спадщині українських письменників XIX ст.*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Донецьк 2004, 20 с.

93. Виноградова Е. М., *Эпистолярные речевые жанры: прагматика и семантика текста*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Москва 1991, 22 с.

94. Винокур Г. О., *Биография и культура*, Москва: Государственная Академия Художественных Наук, 1927, 88 с.

95. Вихованець І. Р., *Граматика української мови. Синтаксис*, Київ: Либідь, 1993, 368 с.

96. Вихованець І. Р., *Нариси з функціонального синтаксису української мови*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1992, 222 с.

97. Возняк М., *Нариси про світогляд Івана Франка*, Львів: Вид-во Львів. ун-ту, 1955, 196 с.

98. Возняк М., *Франків розрив з польською пресою*, в: "Світ", 1926, № 11–12, с. 343–388.

99. Габуниа З. М., Каирова Р. Б., *Оценка денотата и выбор образа в русской и английской фразеологии*, в: "Cuadernos de Rusística Española", 2010, № 6, с. 13–19.

100. Гайда С., *Жанры разговорных высказываний*, в: "Жанры речи", Саратов, 1999, вып. 2, с. 103–111.

101. Ганжа С. А., *Фразеологія епістолярної спадщини (на матеріалі приватного листування українських письменників-класиків XIX – початку XX століття)*, Дніпропетровськ 2010, 92 с.

102. Гарбера І. В., *Концепт людина у фразеології східностепових українських говірок*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Вінниця 2018, 20 с.

103. Гиндин С. И., *Биография в структуре писем и эпистолярного поведения*, в: Язык и личность, Москва: Наука, 1989, с. 63–77.

104. Глинкина Л. А., *Проблема эпистолярного идиостиля в русистике*, в: *Семантика слова, образа, текста*, Тезисы междунар. конф., Архангельск 1995, с. 12–18.

105. Головин С. Ю., *Словарь практического психолога*, Минск: Харвест, 1998, 607 с., в: Электронный ресурс: http://www.klex.ru/1ql (19.08.2018).

106. Головина Т. А., *Лингвоперсонологическое функционирование частей речи: статистический аспект (на материале художественных текстов)*, автореф. … канд. филол. наук, Барнаул 2008, 21 с.

107. Гольдин В. Е., Дуброская О. Н., *Жанровая организация речи в аспекте социальных взаимодействий*, в: "Жанры речи", Саратов: Колледж, 2002, вып. 3, с. 5–18.

108. Голяк В. О., *Боротьба І. Франка за єдину загальнонаціональну українську літературну мову*, в: *Зб. студент. наук. робіт Львів. ун-ту*, Львів: Вид-во Львів. ун-ту, 1957, ч. 1. с. 53–57.

109. Горбач І., *Мовні засоби інтимізації художнього французького тексту*, в: *Сучасні дослідження з лінгвістики*, літературознавства і міжкультурної комунікації, Матер. ІІ Міжнар. наук. конф., Івано-Франківськ 2015, с. 35–37.

110. Горбач О., *Вулично-тюремні арготизми у Франковій прозі*, в: "Записки НТШ", Львів: Вид-во НТШ, 1963, т. 177, с. 197–206.

111. Горбач О., *Львівські проступницько-тюремницькі арґотизми (до 1930-х років)*, в: "Наук. зб. Укр. Вільного Університету", Мюнхен 1983, т. 10, с. 296–326.

112. Горнфельд Д., *Эпистолярная литература*, в: Электронный ресурс: http://www.referatu-institute.ru/text/016.htm (10.09.2018).

113. Грабович Г., *Іван Франко і Адам Міцкевич, Григорій Грабович*, в: *Іван Франко і світова культура*, Матер. Міжнар. симпозіуму, Київ 1990, кн. 1, с. 135–141.

114. Грабович Г., *Польсько-українські літературні взаємини: питання культурної перспективи*, в: Його ж, *До історії української літератури: дослідження, есе, полеміка*, Київ: Основи, 1997, с. 138–169.

115. Григоренко І., *Епістолярний стиль мовлення в українській літературній документалістиці другої половини XIX століття*, в: "Наук. часопис НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова. Сер. 8. Філол. науки (мовознавство)", Київ 2013, вип. 5, с. 47–54.

116. Грицютенко І. Є., *Мова в естетичній концепції Івана Франка*, в: *Іван Франко: Статті і матеріали*, 1968, вип. 5, с. 45–52.

117. Гудков Д. Б., *Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации*, Москва: Высшая школа, 2003, 288 с.

118. Гудков Д. Б., Ковшова М. Л., *Телесный код русской культуры: материалы к словарю*, Москва: Гнозис, 2007, 288 с.

210

119. Гулякова И. Г., *Личность писателя в его письмах (языковой аспект)*, в: *Язык, культура, общение в условиях краткосрочного обучения*, Санкт-Петербург, 2000, с. 100–107.

120. Гумбольдт В., *Избр. тр. по языкозн.*, пер. с нем., общ. ред. проф. Г. В. Рамишвили, послесл. А. В. Гулыги и В. А. Звегинцева. Москва: Изд. дом „Прогресс", 2000, 400 с.

121. Ґрещук В., *Роль Івана Франка у формуванні єдиної української літературної мови*, в: "Вісник Наукового товариства ім. Т. Шевченка", Івано-Франківськ, 2007, ч. 2. с. 138–152.

122. Данилюк С. С., *Використання графічних засобів у текстах електронної пошти*, в: "Наук. зап. Сер.: Філологія", Вінниця 2009, с. 216–219.

123. Данкер З. М., *Функционально-семантическая организация частного письма (ситуативная установка контакта)*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Санкт-Петербург 1992, 16 с.

124. Декшна Т. А., *Типологія засобів інтимізації в англомовних і україномовних рекламних текстах*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2013, 21 с.

125. Дементьев В. В., *Изучение речевых жанров. Обзор работ в современной русистике*, в: "Вопросы языкознания", 1977, № 1, с. 109–121.

126. Дементьев В. В., *Теория речевых жанров*, Москва: Знак, 2010, 595 с.

127. Денисова С. П., *Интимизация и лингвистические средства её выражения в русской художественной прозе конца XIX – начала XX ст.*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Киев 1991, 16 с.

128. Денисюк І., *Новаторство Франка-прозаїка*, в: "Українське літературознавство", 2008, вип. 70, с. 138–152.

129. *Диалектика текста*: в 2 томах, под ред. проф. А. И. Варшавской, Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петерб. ун-та, 1999, т. 1, 328 с.

130. Диброва Е. И., Касаткин Л. Л., Николина Н. А., Щеболева И. И., *Современный русский язык*, ч. 1. Фонетика и орфоэпия. Графика и орфография. Лексикология. Фразеология. Лексикография. Морфемика. Словообразование, Москва: Просвещение, 2001, 540 с.

131. Долженко Н. Г., Солкунова О. А., *Этикетная функция обращений в письмах А. П. Чехова*, в: "Вестник угроведения", 2013, № 3 (14), с. 38–46.

132. Домброван Т. И., *Язык в контексте синергетики*, Одесса: КП ОГТ, 2013, 343 с.

133. Домышева С. А., *Политический дискурс в пространстве дискурса реагирования*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Иркутск 2008, 188 с.

134. Драгоманов М. П., *Вибране ("…мій задум зложити очерк історії цивілізації на Україні")*, упоряд. та авт. іст.-біогр. нарису Р. С. Міщук; приміт. Р. С. Міщука, В. С. Шандри, Київ: Либідь, 1991, 688 с.

135. Дубровская О. Н., *Общаться? Тусоваться? Клубиться! К вопросу об отражении в языке и речи новых форм коммуникативного действия*, в: *Проблемы речевой коммуникации*, Саратов: Изд-во Саратов. ун-та, 2008, с. 409–416.

136. Єрмоленко С., *Фольклор і літературна мова*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1987, 245 с.

137. Жилко Ф. Т., *Роль Івана Франка в історії української літературної мови*, в: "Укр. мова в школі", 1956, № 3, с. 18–26.

138. Журавльова Н. М., *Індивідуально-авторські та оказіональні гоноративи в епістолярному стилі XIX – початку XX ст.*, в: *Лексико-грамматические инновации*

в современных славянских языках, Матер. II Междунар. науч. конф. (Депро-петровск, 14–15 апреля 2005 г.), Днепропетровск 2005, с. 149–153.

139. Журкова О. Л., *Мотивованість конотативного значення фразеологічних одиниць англійської та української мов: зіставний аспект*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2018, 201 с.

140. Заболотна Т. В., *Епістолярна спадщина В. Винниченка: адресування і стиль*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2005, 189 с.

141. Забужко О., *Notre Dame D'ukraine: Українка в конфлікті міфологій*, 3-є вид, виправл, Київ: Факт, 2007, 640 с.

142. Загнітко А. П., *Лінгвістика тексту: Теорія і практикум*, вид 2-ге, доп. і пе-рероб., Донецьк: ТОВ "Юго-Восток, Лтд", 2007, 313 с.

143. Загнітко А. П., *Мовна особистість в епістолярному дискурсі: типологія лінгвоіндивідуацій і лінгвоіндивідуалізацій*, в: "Гуманітарна освіта в технічних вищих навчальних закладах", вип. 33, Київ 2016(а), с. 58–72.

144. Загнітко А. П., *Мовносоціумна граматика: теоретичні засади. Динаміка морфологічного роду іменників*, в: "Укр. мова і літ. в школах України", 2016(б), № 7–8, с. 43–49.

145. Загнітко А. П., *Рівні та ступені міжчастиномовних трансформацій*, в: "Rossica Olomoucensia". Vol. LV: Časopis pro ruskou a slovanskou filologii. Num. 1, Olomouc 2016(в), s. 23–41.

146. Загнітко А. П., *Словник сучасної лінгвістики: поняття і терміни*, у 4 томах, Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2012, т. 1, 402 с.; т. 2, 350 с.; т. 3, 426 с.; т. 4, 388 с.

147. Загнітко А. П., *Теорія граматизації: категорійно-рівневий простір*, в: "Наук. вісник Східноєвропей. нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки: Філол. науки", 2015, № 4 (305), с. 181–187.

148. Загнітко А. П., *Теорія граматики і тексту*, Донецьк: Ноулідж (Донецьке відділення), 2014, 480 с.

149. Загнітко А. П., *Типологія категорійної семантики невідмінюваних іменників*, в: *Акцентологія. Етимологія. Семантика*, Зб. наук. праць, Київ: Наук. думка, 2013, с. 613–632.

150. Загнітко А. П., *Теоретична граматика сучасної української мови. Морфологія. Синтаксис*, Донецьк: ТОВ "ВКФ «БАО»", 2011, 992 с.

151. Загнітко А., Загнітко Н., *Функційно-комунікативний рівень лінгвоперсони: закономірності самореалізації лінгвоперсони*, в: "Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia", zeszyt 6, Poznań 2018, s. 179−188.

152. Загнітко А. П., Данилюк І. Г., Краснобаєва-Чорна Ж. В., Путіліна О. Л., Ситар Г. В. *Парадигмально-категорійні основи прикладної лінгвістики*, Вінниця: ТОВ „Нілан-ЛТД", 2015, 472 с.

153. Закревська Я. В., *Внесок Івана Франка у розвиток науки про українські діалекти*, в: *Іван Франко – письменник, мислитель, громадянин*, в: Матер. Міжнар. наук. конф. (Львів, 25–27 вересня 1996), Львів: Світ, 1998, с. 652–657.

154. Зимин В. И., *Оценочно-эмотивная амбивалентность фразеологических единиц в современном русском языке*, в: "Слово: фольклорно-диалектологический альманах: Языкознание", Благовещенск 2005, вып. 3, с. 5–9.

155. Иванов А. Ю., *Принципы текстологического анализа эго-документов XX века*, в: "Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки,

культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики", Тамбов 2014, № 1 (39): в 2-х ч., ч. II, с. 85–87.

156. Іванов В., Костенко Н., *Досвід контент-аналізу: моделі та практики*, Київ: Центр вільної преси, 2003, 200 с.

157. Кабанова Т. Н., *Эпистолярный текст частной переписки в аспекте теории речевого общения (на материале рукописных и опубликованных текстов XX века)*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Челябинск 2004, 24 с.

158. Каирова Т. С., *Особенности коммуникативной направленности эпистолярного текста*, в: *Коммуникативные единицы и система языка (французский язык)*, в: "Сб. науч. тр.", Москва: Москов. гос. пед. ин-т иностр. языков, 1986, вып. 269, с. 87–103.

159. Канторчук Г. К., *Антропоніми в листах Лесі Українки*, в: "Вісник Житомир. держ. пед. ун-ту", Житомир 2001, № 7, с. 66–68.

160. Карасев П. С., *Открытое письмо – публицистический жанр*, в: Проблемы газетных жанров, сб. статей, Ленинград 1962, с. 39–55.

161. Карасик В. И., *Дискурсивная персонология*, в: Язык. Коммуникация и социальная среда, Сб. науч. труд., Воронеж: Изд-во Волгоград. гос. ун-та, 2007, вып. 7, с. 78–86.

162. Карасик В. И., *Культурные доминанты в языке*, в: "Языковая личность: культурные концепты", Волгоград-Архангельск: Перемена, 1996, с. 3–16.

163. Карасик В. И., *О типах дискурса*, в: Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс, Сб. науч. тр., Волгоград 2000, с. 5–20.

164. Карасик В. И., *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурсы,* Волгоград: Перемена, 2002, 477 с.

165. Караулов Ю., *Русский язык и языковая личность*, Москва: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2010, 264 с.

166. Карпенко М. А., *Текстообразующие и стилеобразующие элементы в художественной речи*, в: "Русское языкознание", Київ 1983, № 6, с. 100–108.

167. Каруник К., *Між Харковом і Мюнхеном: "переходова" наук. праця Юрія Шевельова*, в: Шевельов Ю., До питання про генезу й природу називних речень, Харків: Харків. істор.-філол. тов-во, 2012, с. 3–18.

168. Кастлер Л., *Негативная и позитивная вежливость*, в: Агрессия в языке и речи, Москва: РГГУ, 2004, с. 9–18.

169. Кецба Л. Н., *Место эпистолярного стиля в системе функциональных стилей*, в: "Изв. АН АзССР. Сер. «Литература»", 1971, № 3–4, с. 73–80.

170. Кибрик А. А., *Модус, жанр и другие параметры классификации дискурсов*, в: "Вопросы языкознания", 2009, № 2, с. 3–21.

171. Кирьянова А. П., *Адресант эпистолярия в аспекте языковой оценки (на материале писем М. И. Цветаевой)*, в: "Известия РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена", 2007(а), № 40, с. 124–129.

172. Кирьянова А. П., *Адресант эпистолярия в аспекте языковой оценки: на материале писем М. И. Цветаевой*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Череповец 2007(б), 188 с.

173. Ковалева Н. А., *Речевые стереотипы эпистолярного текста*, в: Текст. Структура и семантика, Докл. VIII Междунар. конф., Москва 2001, т. I. с. 231–240.

174. Ковалева Н. А., *Русское частное письмо XIX века: Коммуникация. Жанр. Речевая структура*, автореф. дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Москва 2002(а), 52 с.

175. Ковалева Н. А., *Русское частное письмо XX века. Коммуникация. Жанр. Речевая структура*, дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Москва 2002(б), 537 с.

176. Ковтунова И. И., *Некоторые направления эволюции поэтического языка в XX веке*, в: *Очерки истории языка русской поэзии XX века. Поэтический язык и идиостиль. Общие вопросы. Звуковая организация текста*, Москва: Наука, 1990, с. 23–46.

177. Колшанский Г. В., *Коммуникативная функция и структура языка*, Москва: Наука, 1984, 174 с.

178. Комарова С. И., *Перифраза как средство организации смыслового компонента эпистолярного текста*, в: *Семантика и грамматика в речевой коммуникации*, Сб. науч. тр., Днепропетровск 1991, с. 41–47.

179. Корнієнко Н. П., *Роль Івана Франка в боротьбі за утвердження в Галичині української літературної мови на загальнонародній основі*, в: "Укр. мова в школі", 1956, № 5, с. 17–23.

180. Корольова А. В., *Лінгвопоетичний і наративний коди інтимізації в художньому тексті (на матеріалі української та російської прози другої половини XIX – першої половини XX століть)*, автореф. дис. … д-ра філол. наук, Київ 2003, 35 с.

181. Корольова А. В., *Типологія наративних кодів інтимізації в художньому тексті*, Київ: Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2002, 267 с.

182. Космеда Т., *Аксіологічні аспекти прагмалінгвістики: формування і розвиток категорії оцінки*, Львів: ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2000, 350 с.

183. Космеда Т., *Василь Симоненко – "інтимний поет": ідіостильові засоби моделювання категорії інтимізації*, в: Горнятко-Шумилович А., Космеда Т., *Феномен креативності Василя Симоненка: літературознавчий та лінгвістичний аспекти*, за заг. ред. проф. Т. Космеди, Poznań: Wyd. Instytut Filologii Rosyjskiej i Ukraińskiej Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2016, s. 137–224.

184. Космеда Т. А., *Ego і Alter Ego Тараса Шевченка в комунікативному просторі щоденникового дискурсу*, Дрогобич: Коло, 2012, 372 с.

185. Космеда Т. А., *Его-тексти Степана Руданського: відтворення комунікативної компетенції та фактів його "мовної біографії"*, в: Космеда Т. А., Осіпова Т. Ф., Піддубна Н. В., *Степан Руданський: феномен моделювання "живого" мовлення українців*, за ред. Т. А. Космеди, Харків-Познань-Дрогобич: Коло, 2015, с. 189–205.

186. Космеда Т., *Збагачення української лінгвістичної термінологічної лексикографії*, Рец. на словник: Загнітко А. П. *Словник сучасної лінгвістики: поняття і терміни*, в: "Лінгвістичні студії", Донецьк 2014, вип. 28, с. 194–198.

187. Космеда Т. А., *Комунікативна компетенція Івана Франка: міжкультурні, інтерперсональні, риторичні виміри*, Львів: ПАІС, 2006, 326 с.

188. Космеда Т., *Лингвокалейдоскоп: живые речевые процессы*, Саарбрюккен: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2017, 308 с.

189. Космеда Т., *Лінгвокреативність Лесі Українки в її его-текстах (на матеріалі епістолярію поетеси (1870–1890) та її роздумів про листи в художніх текстах)*, в: "Roczniki Humanistyczne. Słowianoznawstwo", red. A. Woźniak, tom LXII, zesz. 7, Lublin 2018, s. 91–109.

190. Космеда Т., *Мовознавча наука на службі у журналістики: До питання про вивчення категорії інтимізації (аналіз наукової розвідки А. В. Корольової)*, в: "Учен. зап. Таврич. нац. ун-та им. В. И. Вернадского. Сер. «Филология»", Симферополь 2005, т. 18 (57), № 3, с. 69–73.

191. Космеда Т. А., *Потенціал сучасної лексикографії і прагмалінгвістики в осмисленні статусу кононативних графем*, в: "Слово и словарь. Vocabulum et vocabularium", Сб. науч. тр. по лексикографии, под ред. В. В. Дубичинского и Т. Ройтера, Харьков 2011, вып. 12, с.123–127.

192. Космеда Т. А., Осіпова Т. Ф., Піддубна Н. В., *Степан Руданський: феномен моделювання "живого" мовлення українців*. Харків-Познань-Дрогобич: Коло, 2015, 312 с.

193. Коцюбинська М., *Зафіксоване і нетлінне. Роздуми про епістолярну творчість*, Київ: Дух і Літера, 2001, 300 с.

194. Коцюбинська М., *Листи і люди: Роздуми про епістолярну творчість*, Київ: Дух і Літера, 2009, 584 с.

195. Коцюбинська М., *Шевченкові листи*, в: "Слово і Час", наук.-теорет. журнал, 2008, № 7, с. 15–23.

196. Красавский Н. А., *Концепт "ZORN" в пословично-поговорочном фонде немецкого языка*, в: "Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика", вып. 2. Язык и социальная среда, Воронеж 2000, с. 78–89.

197. Краснобаева-Чёрная Ж. В., *Аксиологическая специфика общеоценочных и конкретнооценочных фразем*, в: "Славянские чтения", Кишинэу 2016(а), № 7 (13), с. 98–114.

198. Краснобаева-Чёрная Ж. В., *Аксиологическое пространство фразеологических единиц с положительной оценкой*, в: "Гуманитарный вектор. Серия «Филология. Востоковедение»", Чита 2015, № 4 (44), с. 83–90.

199. Краснобаева-Чёрная Ж. В., *Опыт осмысления ценностной картины мира во фразеологии: структурная организация (на материале русского, украинского, английского и немецкого языков)*, в: "Вестник Томского гос. ун-та. Филология", Томск 2018, № 54, с. 98–116.

200. Краснобаева-Чёрная Ж. В., *Семантический диапазон "соблюдать норму – не соблюдать норму" в оценочных фразеологических единицах*, в: "Веснік Гродзенскага дзяржаўнага ўніверсітэта імя Янкі Купалы. Серыя 3. Філалогія. Педагогіка. Псіхалогія", Гродна 2016(б), № 1, с. 44–50.

201. Краснобаєва-Чорна Ж. В., *Вторинна семіотична система цінності "гроші" у фраземіці (на матеріалі одно- та різносистемних мов)*, в: "Одеський лінгвістичний вісник", Одеса 2017, вип. 10, с. 83–87.

202. Краснобаєва-Чорна Ж. В., *Лінгвофраземна аксіологія: парадигмально-категорійний вимір*, Вінниця: ТОВ «Нілан-ЛТД», 2016, 416 с.

203. Краснобаєва-Чорна Ж. В., *Семантичний простір оцінної фраземіки*, в: "Мовознавство", Київ 2015, № 5, с. 39–51.

204. Красных В. В., *Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология: Курс лекций*, Москва: Гнозис, 2002, 284 с.

205. Кубрякова Е. С., *О термине "дискурс" и стоящей за ним структуре знания*, в: Язык. Личность. Текст, Сб. ст. к 70-летию Т. М. Николаевой, отв. ред. В. Н. Топоров, Москва: Языки славянских культур, 2005, с. 23–33.

206. Кубарова Е. К., *Типология русского эпистолярного вокатива*, Днепропетровск: Новая идеология, 2014, 380 с.

207. Кузьменко В. І., *Дифірамб чи епітафія жанрові? Написане лишається*, в: "Слово і Час", наук.-теорет. журнал, 1997, № 1, с. 72–77.

208. Кузьменко В. І., *Письменницький епістолярій в українському літературному процесі 20–50-х років ХХ ст.*, автореф. дис. … д-ра філол. наук, Київ 1999, 36 с.

209. Курило Л. О., *Епістолярій Олеся Гончара і творча індивідуальність письменника*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2006, 200 с.

210. *Курс сучасної української літературної мови*, у 2 томах, за ред. Л. А. Булаховського, Київ: Радянська школа, 1951, т. ІІ. Синтаксис, 408 с.

211. Курьянович А. В., *Когнитивная сущность речевого жанра самопрезентация в эпистолярном дискурсе М. И. Цветаевой*, в: "Вестн. Томского гос. пед. ун-та", Томск 2006, вып. 5 (56), с. 144–150.

212. Курьянович А. В. *Коммуникативные аспекты слова в эпистолярном дискурсе М. И. Цветаевой*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Томск 2001, 227 с.

213. Курьянович А. В., *Прагматика графического образа эпистолярного текста (на примере писем представителей русской творческой интеллигенции первой половины ХХ века)*, в: "Вестн. Томского гос. пед. ун-та", Томск 2012, вып. 1 (116), с. 223–228.

214. Курьянович А. В., *Теоретические вопросы изучения эпистолярия в современной лингвистике*, Томск: Изд-во Томского гос. пед. ун-та, 2013, 220 с.

215. Курьянович А. В., *Электронное письмо как функционально-стилевая разновидность эпистолярного жанра в пространстве современной коммуникции*, в: "Вестн. Томского гос. пед. ун-та", Томск 2008, вып. 2 (76), с. 44–46.

216. Курьянович А. В., *Языковая личность ученого – носителя элитарной речевой культуры (на материале эпистолярного дискурса В. И. Вернадского)*, в: "Сибир. филол. журнал", 2010, № 1, с. 188–197.

217. Ларин Б. А., *О разновидностях художественной речи*, в: Русская словесность, Москва: Наука, 1997, с. 152–176.

218. Левчук А., *Засоби графічного оформлення тексту та їх вплив на інтимізацію*, в: "Актуальні питання іноземної філології. Науковий журнал", 2015, № 2, с. 122–127.

219. Ленець К. В., *Епістолярний стиль в історії нової літературної мови*, в: Ленець К. В., Пилинський М. М., *Жанри і стилі в історії української літературної мови*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1989, с. 160–198.

220. Леткина Н. В., *Эпистолярный текст как объект лингвистического изучения*, в: *Лингвистические и экстралингвистические основы коммуникации: теоретические и прикладные аспекты*, Межвуз. сб. науч. тр., Саранск 2008, вып. 6, с. 20–24.

221. Лихачев Д. С., *Заметки о русском*, в: Электронный ресурс: http://likhachev.lfond.spb.ru/Articles/zam.htm (12.06.2016).

222. Лихачев Д. С., *Мысли о жизни: воспоминания*, Санкт-Петербург: Азбука, Азбука-Аттикус, 2017, 480 с.

223. Лотман Ю. М., *Феномен культуры*, в: Лотман Ю. М., *Избр. ст.*: в 3 томах, Таллин: Александра, 1992, т. 1 *Статьи по семиотике и типологии культуры*, 479 с.

224. Лурия А. Р., *Язык и сознание*, Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 1998, 416 с.

225. Ляпунова В. Е., *Частное письмо как жанр русского литературного языка (на материале писем А. П. Чехова)*, в: *Исследования языка художественных произведений*, Матер. XVII зональной конф. кафедр рус. яз. Среднего

и Нижнего Поволжья, посвящ. памяти проф. В. А. Малаховского (Куйбышев, 20–22 мая 1974 г.), Куйбышев 1975, с. 33–37.

226. Ляхова Ж. Т., *Сергій Єфремов – дослідник листування Т. Шевченка*, в: *Зб. матер. тридцять першої наук. Шевченк. конф*, Київ 1994, с. 82–85.

227. Мазоха Г. С., *Жанрово-стильові модифікації українського письменницького епістолярію другої половини ХХ століття*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2007, 38 с.

228. Майборода Н. Г., *Епістолярій Д. І. Яворницького як відображення його індивідуально-мовної картини світу*, в: "Наукові праці: Філологія. Мовознавство", Миколаїв 2010, вип. 106, т. 119, с. 26–30.

229. Манохіна Т. В., *Народництво, модернізм і постмодернізм у лінгвістиці*, Миколаїв: Вид-во ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили, 2015, 273 с.

230. Маринин Ю. Н., *Речекомплекс "поздравление" (на материале текста поздравительной открытки)*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Волгоград 1996, 22 с.

231. Марчук Л., *Епістолярний стиль як чинник формування мовної особистості*, в: "Наук. праці Кам'ян.-Поділь. нац. ун-ту ім. Івана Огієнка: Філол. науки", Кам'янець-Подільський, 2013, вип. 34, с. 183–188.

232. Марчук Л., *Мовна особистість Івана Пулюя за матеріалами епістолярію*, в: "Іван Огієнко і сучасна наука та освіта. Сер. істор. та філол.", Кам'янець-Подільський 2015(а), вип. XII, с. 204–208.

233. Марчук Л., *Мовні засоби перекладу Біблії Іваном Пулюєм (за збіркою листів) та Іваном Огієнком (за публікаціями в журналі "Віра й культура", Вінніпег)*, в: *Матер. VI всеукр. міжконф. християн. наук.-практ. конф., присв. 1025-річчю хрещення Київської Русі*, засн.: Духовна Рада представників християнських церков і релігійних організацій (м. Кам'янець-Подільський), Кам'янець-Подільський 2015(б), с. 18–23.

234. Марчук Л., *Ціннісні домінанти в епістолярії Бориса Грінченка*, в: "Лексикографічний бюлетень", Київ 2014, вип. 23, с. 24–30.

235. Маслоу А., *Психология бытия*. Москва; Киев: Педагогика, 1997, 304 с.

236. Матвіяс І. Г., *Діалектна основа мови в творах Івана Франка*, в: "Мовознавство", 2003, № 1, с. 11–16.

237. Мацько Л. І., *Лінгвостилістика епістолярію Панаса Мирного*, в: "Зб. наук. пр. Полтав. держ. пед. ін-ту ім. В. Г. Короленка. Сер. «Філол. науки»", Полтава 1999, вип. 2 (6), с. 108–116.

238. Медведєв Ф. П., *Боротьба Івана Франка за єдину українську літературну мову*, в: "Уч. зап. Харків. ун-ту", т. 74 "Труди філол. фак-ту", т. 4, Зб. ст. до 100-річчя з дня народж. І. Я. Франка, 1956, с. 65–74.

239. Мелерович А., Мокиенко В., *Семантическая структура фразеологических единиц современного русского языка*, Кострома: Изд-во КГУ, 2008, 484 с.

240. Мельник Я., *"Поет зради" Івана Франка. Голоси польської преси: pro і contra*, в: "Парадигми", 2009, вип. 4, с. 237–242.

241. Мельничук О. С., *Розвиток структури слов'янського речення*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1966, 324 с.

242. Мерло-Понті М., *Феноменология восприятия*, Санкт-Петербург: Ювента, Наука, 1999, 605 с.

243. Миллер Т. А., *Античные теории эпистолярного стиля*, в: Античная эписто-лография: Очерки, Москва: Наука, 1967, с. 5–25.

244. Митина С. И., *Философский эго-текст: бытие в культуре*, дисс. … д-ра филос. наук, Саранск 2008, 290 с.

245. Михеев М. Ю., *Дневник как эго-текст (Россия, XIX–XX)*, Москва: Водолей Publishers, 2007, 264 с.

246. *Місцями життя і діяльності Івана Франка на Прикарпатті*, в: Електронний ресурс: http://lib.if.ua/franko/1310568978.html (18.09.2016).

247. Морозова Л. І., *Письменницький епістолярій у системі літературних жанрів*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2007, 24 с.

248. Мунье Э., *Манифест персонализма*, пер. с франц. И. С. Вдовиной, Москва: Республика, 1999, 560 с.

249. Мунье Э., *Надежда отчаявшихся. Мальро. Камю. Сартр. Бернанос*, пер. с франц. И. С. Вдовиной, Москва: Искусство, 1995, 238 с.

250. Мунье Э., *Персонализм*, в: Бергсон А., Мунье Э., Мерло-Понти М. *Французская философия и эстетика XX века*, предисл. П. Морель, коммент. А. В. Густырь, И. С. Вдовина, Москва: Искусство, 1995, с. 105–214.

251. Мунье Э., *Что такое персонализм?*, пер. с франц. И. С. Вдовиной, Москва: Искусство, 1994, 128 с.

252. Мушинка М., *Взаємини Івана Франка з Володимиром Гнатюком*, в: Іван Франко: *дух, наука, думка, воля*, Матер. Міжнар. наук. конгресу, присвяч. 150-річчю від дня народж. І. Франка (м. Львів, 27 вересня – 1 жовтня 2006 р.), Львів: Вид-во ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2008, т. 1, с. 945−953.

253. Наер В. Л., *К проблеме жанра в системе функционально-стилистической дифференциации язика*, в: "Стилистические аспекты устной и письменной коммуникации", Сб. науч. тр., вып. 286, Москва: МГПИИЯ, 1987, с. 39–47.

254. Нейрулін А. О., *Епістолярій Михайла Коцюбинського в історії української літературної мови (особливості конотації епістолярію письменника)*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Луганськ 2006, 19 с.

255. Нерознак В. П., *Лингвистическая персонология*, в: Функциональная лингвистика: проблемы и перспективы, Матер. конф., Симферополь: Таврич. ун-т им. В. И. Вернадского, 1995, с. 12–14.

256. Нерознак В. П., *Лингвистическая персонология: к определению статуса дисциплины*, в: Язык. Поэтика, Сб. науч. тр., Москва: Москов. гос. лингвист. ун-т, 1996, с. 112–116.

257. Нижникова Л. В., *Письмо как тип текста*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Одесса 1991(а), 18 с.

258. Нижникова Л. В., *Письмо как тип текста*, дисс. … канд филол. наук, Одесса 1991(б), 159 с.

259. Никипорец Г. Ю., *Фразеологические единицы русского языка в прагматическом аспекте*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Москва 2000, 213 с.

260. Никитина А. Ю., *Вербально-семантический уровень языковой личности Екатерины II (на матер. "Собственноручных записок императрицы Екатерины II)*, в: "Вестник Чувашского университета", Сб. науч. тр., 2013, вып. 4, с. 248–252.

261. Олійник С. В., *Оцінні фразеологічні одиниці в англійській та українській мовах: лінгвокогнітивний аспект*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Донецьк 2008, 22 с.

218

262. Ольшовський І., *Леся Українка. Містика імені й долі*, Луцьк: Терен, 2005, 68 с.

263. Онишкевич М. Й., *Полонізми і діалектизми (бойкізми) та їх коментування в творах Івана Франка*, в: "Питання слов'янського мовознавства", Львів: Вид-во Львів. ун-ту, 1963, кн. 9, с. 36–51.

264. Оципко І. Й., *Праця Франка над вдосконаленням мови своїх творів*, в: "Допов. та повідомл. Львів. ун-ту", 1957, вип. 7, ч. 1, с. 78–81.

265. Павлик Н. В., *Специфіка епістолярного жанру як міжстильового явища*, в: "Лінгвістика", Луганськ 2005(а), с. 241–248.

266. Павлик Н. В., *Типологія дискурсивних одиниць в українському епістолярному мовленні*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Донецьк 2005(б), 20 с.

267. Палійчук А. Л., *Графічні засоби інтимізації в англомовному художньому дискурсі*, в: "Наук. вісн. Волин. нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки", 2009, № 5 (ч. 2), с. 102–105.

268. Палійчук А. Л., *Коефіцієнт ефективності інтимізації у комунікативних блоках тексту*, в: *Сучасні проблеми та перспективи дослідження романських та германських мов і літератур*, Матер. XI міжвуз. конф. молодих вчених (26–27 січ. 2011 р.), Донецьк 2011, с. 132–134.

269. Палійчук А. Л., *Наративний код інтимізації (на матеріалі англомовного художнього дискурсу)*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Харків 2011, 253 с.

270. Панина Т. Г., Хомкова Л. Р., *Фразеологическая номинация как способ актуализации языковой оценки по признаку "значимый/незначимый" (на материале современного немецкого языка)*, в: "Вестник ТвГУ. Серия: Филология", Тверь 2017, № 2, с. 132–138.

271. Панфілов М. П., *Концепт мова у світогляді Панаса Мирного*, в: "Наук. вісн. Ізмаїл. держ. гуманіт. ун-ту", Ізмаїл 2005, вип. 19, с. 172–175.

272. Панько Т. І., *Мова і нація в естетичній концепції Івана Франка*, Львів: Світ, 1992, 190 с.

273. Пестова М. С., *Составляющие коннотации дисфемистичных фразеологических единиц, построенных на гиперболе, в английском и русском языках*, в: Электронный ресурс: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42053111.pdf (13.05.2018).

274. Пешковский А. М., *Русский синтаксис в научном освещении*, предисл. Ю. Д. Апресяна, Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2001, 510 с.

275. Пискунова С. И., *Личность и эпоха в зеркале философского эго-текста*, Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та, 2012, 104 с.

276. Пискунова С. И., *Философский эго-текст в интермедиальном пространстве культуры*, в: "Контекст и рефлексия: философия о мире и человеке", 2018, том 7, № 3, с. 18–25.

277. Плесовских Т. С., *Лингвоперсонология в контексте антропологического похода*, в: "Science Time", 2014, № 4, с. 173–179.

278. Плотникова С. Н., *Языковое, дискурсивное и коммуникативное пространство*, в: "Вестник Иркут. гос. лингв. ун-та", 2008, № 1, с. 131–136.

279. Пожидаєва І. В., *Лінгвопрагматичний аспект маніпулятивного дискурсу блогосфери (на матеріалі англійської, російської, французької й української мов)*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2013, 374 с.

280. Полюга Л. М., *Слово у поетичному тексті Івана Франка*, Київ: Наук. думка, 1977, 165 с.

281. Попкова М. В., *Фразеология мемуарных текстов Георгия Иванова (структурно-семантический и функциональный аспекты)*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Омск 2008, 305 с.

282. Потебня А. А., *Из записок по русской грамматике*, Москва: Учпедгиз, 1958, т. 1–2, 536 с.

283. Прата С., *Язык программирования*, 5-е изд., Москва; Санкт-Петербург; Киев: ООО «И. Д. Вильямс», 2007, 1184 с.

284. Приходько Г., *Етнокультурний складник фразеологічних одиниць*, в: "Наук. вісник Дрогоб. держ. пед. ун-ту імені Івана Франка. Сер.: Філол. науки (мовознавство)", Дрогобич 2016, № 5 (2), с. 76–78.

285. Прохоров Е. И., *Издание эпистолярного наследия*, в: "Принципы издания эпистолярных текстов. Вопросы текстологи", Москва 1964, вып. 3, с. 6–72.

286. Прохоров Ю. Е., Стернин И. А., *Русские: коммуникативное поведение*, испр. и доп., 2-е изд, Москва: Флинта; Наука, 2006, 238 с.

287. Радбиль Т. Б., *Основы языкового менталитета*, Москва: Флинта; Наука, 328 с.

288. Радзієвська Т. В., *Текст як засіб комунікації*, Київ: Вид-во НАН України, 1998, 194 с.

289. Романченко І. С., *Михайло Драгоманов і Леся Українка в їх листуванні*, в: "Наук. зап. Львів. пед. ін-ту", Львів 1948, т. II, с. 172–189.

290. Руднев В. П., *Энциклопедический словарь культуры XX века*, Москва: Аграф, 2001, 608 с.

291. Рудницький Л., *Іван Франко й німецькомовний світ – значення середовища для поета*, в: Українська література, Матер. I конгресу Міжнар. асоціації україністів, Київ 1995, с. 159–206.

292. Рус-Брюшинина И. В., *Особенности языковой концептуализации духовных ценностей социума: лингвокультурный и лингвострановедческий аспекты: на материале испанского и русского языков*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Ставрополь 2010, 196 с.

293. Савченко Л. В., *Феномен етнокодів духовної культури у фразеології української мови: етимологічний та етнолінгвістичний аспекти*, Сімферополь: Доля, 2013, 600 с.

294. Салимовский В. А., *Есть ли у жанроведения границы в пределах коммуникативной лингвистики?*, в: "Жанры речи", Саратов 2002, вып. 3, с. 52–62.

295. Сапожникова Н. В., *Философско-антропологическая природа эпистолярного дискурса*, автореф. дисс. … д-ра фил. наук, Екатеринбург 2005, 42 с.

296. Святовець В. Ф., *Епістолярна спадщина Лесі Українки*, Київ: Вища школа, 1981, 183 с.

297. Седов К. Ф., *Анатомия жанров бытового общения*, в: "Вопросы стилистики", Саратов 1998, вып. 27, с. 9–20.

298. Седов К. Ф., *О жанровой природе дискурсивного явления языковой личности*, в: "Жанры речи", Саратов 1999, вып. 2, с. 13–26.

299. Седов К. Ф., *Психолингвистические аспекты изучения речевых жанров*, в: Жанры речи, Сб. научн. ст., Саратов 2002, вып. 3, с. 40–52.

300. Селіванова О. О., *Нариси з української фразеології (психокогнітивний та етнокультурний аспекти)*, Київ-Черкаси: Брама, 2004, 258 с.

301. Семашко Т. Ф., *Фразеологізми як знаки вторинної мовної номінації*, в: “Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Сер.: Філологія”, Харків 2011, вип. 61, с. 77–81.

302. Сербенська О., *Мовний світ Івана Франка*, Львів: ВЦ Львів. нац. ун-ту ім. І. Франка, 2006, 371 с.

303. Сергеева И. Ф., *Письмо ждет ответа: книга размышлений, споров и доказательств*, Москва: Молодая гвардия, 1985, 207 с.

304. Сидорова М. Ю., *Грамматика художественного текста*, Москва: Ин-т рус. яз. РАН, 2000, 416 с.

305. Сиротинина О. Б., *Некоторые размышления по поводу терминов „речевой жанр” и „риторический жанр”*, в: “Жанры речи”, Саратов 1999, вип. 2, с. 26–30.

306. *Словник синонімів української мови*, у 2 томах, Київ: Наук. думка, 1999.

307. *Словник української мови*: в 11 томах, засн.: АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства, за ред. І. К. Білодіда, Київ: Наук. думка, 1970–1980.

308. Соболь Л. І., *Латинський алфавіт як наслідок міжкультурної взаємодії*, в: *Мова. Культура. Взаєморозуміння*, Зб. наук. пр., за наук. ред. Т. А. Космеди, Дрогобич 2012, вип. II, с. 73–81.

309. Соболь Л. І., *Літери як наслідок взаємодії лінгвокультур різних народів: узагальнення діахронічного аналізу*, в: “Вісн. Житомир. держ. ун-ту”, Житомир 2012, вип. 65, с. 210–213.

310. *Спогади про Лесю Українку*, 2-ге вид., Київ: Дніпро, 1971, 484 с.

311. Ставицька Л., *Естетика слова в українській поезії 10–30 рр. XX ст.*, Київ: Правда Ярославичів, 2000, 156 с.

312. Статєєва В. І., *Українські письменники про проблеми літературної мови та мовознавства кінця XIX – початку XX ст. (на матеріалі спадщини М. Коцюбинського, Лесі Українки, Б. Грінченка та ін.)*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Ужгород 1997, 441 с.

313. *Стежками Франкового тексту (когнітивні, лінгвосеміотичні та лінгвостатистичні виміри прози)*, Ф. С. Бацевич (відп. ред.), С. Н. Бук, Л. М. Процик, А. Ю. Сдаричевська, О. В. Ясіновська, Львів: ЛНУ імені І. Франка, 2013, 504 с.

314. Стернин И. А., *Коммуникативное поведение и проблемы его исследования*, в: *Русское и финское коммуникативное поведение*, Сб. науч. тр., Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. гос. тех. ун-та, 2002, вип. 1, с. 4–21.

315. Стернин И. А., *Понятие коммуникативное поведение и проблемы его исследования*, в: *Русское и финское коммуникативное поведение*, Сб. науч. труд., Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. гос. тех. ун-та, 2000, вип. 1, с. 4–20.

316. Сулейманова Я. О., *Аксіологічна семантика паремій з компонентами на позначення природних стихій: вода, вогонь, повітря і земля (на матеріалі англійської, німецької, української та російської мов)*, дис. … канд. філол. наук, Одеса 2018, 283 с.

317. Тарасенко Т. В., *Этикетные речевые жанры: опыт описания (на примере описания жанра поздравления)*, в: “Жанры речи”, Саратов 2002, вип. 3, с. 282–289.

318. Татаринцева Е. Н., *Лингвоперсонологическое функционирование принципов русской орфографии*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Барнаул 2007, 21 с.

319. Телия В. Н., *Русская фразеология: Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты*, Москва: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996, 287 с.

320. Терпак М. А., *Английский лингвокультурный концепт "семья" и способы отра- жения его коннотативного содержания в языке: на материале семантического поля "Родственные отношения"*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Самара 2006, 204 с.

321. Тичер С., Мейер М., Водак Р., Веттер Е., *Методы анализа текста и дискурса*, Харьков: Гуманит. центр, 2009, 245 с.

322. Толстой Н. И., *Язык и народная культура. Очерки по славянской мифологии и этнолингвистике*, Москва: Индрик, 1995, 509 с.

323. Томчук Л. В., *Нові аспекти дослідження епістолярію Лесі Українки*, в: "Філо- логічні студії", Луцьк 2005, № 3–4, с. 118–123.

324. Трубецкой Н. С., *К проблеме русского самопознания*, Собр. ст., Париж: Евразий. книж. изд-во, 1927, 101 с.

325. *Українська мова. Енциклопедія*, Київ: Вид-во "Укр. енциклопедія ім. М. П. Ба- жана", 2000, 752 с.

326. *Українська мова: Енциклопедія*, 2-ге вид., випр. і доп., Київ: вид. "Укр. енци- клопедія ім. М. П. Бажана", 2004, 824 с.

327. Федосюк М. Ю., *Нерешенные вопросы речевых жанров*, в: "Вопросы языкоз- нания", 1997, № 5, с. 49–57.

328. Фесенко О. П., *Комплексное исследование фразеологии дружеского эпистолярного дискурса первой трети XIX века*, дисс. … д-ра филол. наук, Томск, 2009, 451 с.

329. Филлмор Ч., *Основные проблемы лексической семантики*, в: "Новое в зарубеж- ной лингвистике", Москва 1987, вып. 12, с. 74–122.

330. Формановская Н. И., *Этикет делового письма*, Москва: Русский язык, 1988, 168 с.

331. Франко З. Т., *Засоби художньої експресії у мові творів Івана Франка*, в: "Укр. мова і літ. в школі", 1979, № 12, с. 17–25.

332. Франко З. Т., *Мова творів Івана Франка*, в: *Курс історії української літературної мови*, Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1958, т. 1, с. 476–519.

333. Франко З. Т., *Мовні засоби історизму у прозі Івана Франка*, в: "Українське літературознавство", 1983, вип. 40, с. 46–59.

334. Фромм Э., *Искусство любви*, Минск: Полифакт, 1990, 80 с.

335. Футурист Н. П., *Лінгвокультурні особливості інтимізації в англійських та українських фольклорних текстах (на матеріалі казок про тварин)*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2011, 19 с.

336. Хабарова О. Г., *Роль ФЕ в национально-культурной картине мира*, в: *Актуальные проблемы преподавания гуманитарных дисциплин в школе и вузе*, Мичуринск 2003, с. 180–182.

337. Цветкова Л. С., *Афазия и восстановительное обучение*, Москва: Просвещение, 1988, 207 с.

338. *Цілком невідоме: Івано-Франківська обласна універсальна наукова бібліотека*, в: Режим доступу: http://lib.if.ua/franko/1312287818.html (17.09.2016).

339. Ціхоцький І., *Мова прози Івана Франка (стилістичні новації)*, Львів: Вид. центр ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2006, 290 с.

340. Черненко Г. А., *Аксіологічні пропозиційні структури в українсько- та російсько- мовному мас-медійному дискурсі України*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Київ 2018, 36 с.

341. Чибор І. С., *Репрезентація міфологічного етнокоду культури в українській фразео-логії*, автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук, Чернівці 2016, 20 с.

342. Чигридова Н. Ю., *Речевое поведение коммуниканта в жанре деловых эпистолярий (на материале немецкого языка)*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Ростов-на-Дону 1999, 224 с.

343. Чобот І. В., *Оцінка як функціонально-семантична категорія*, в: "Нова філологія", Запоріжжя 2002, № 3, с. 130–137.

344. Шампшин Л. Б., *Биография*, в: *Культурология XX века: энциклопедия*: в 2-х томах, Санкт-Петербург: Университетская книга, 1998, с. 72–74.

345. Шахматов А. А., *Синтаксис русского языка*, 2-е изд., Ленинград: Учпедгиз, 1941, 620 с.

346. Шаховский В. И., *Категоризация эмоций в лексико-семантической системе языка*, Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 1987, 192 с.

347. Шацкая Е., *Большая книга стервы. Полное пособие по стервологии*. Москва: Астрель, 2007, 560 с.

348. Шевельов Ю., *До питання про генезу й природу називних речень*, Харків: Харків. істор.-філол. тов-во, 2012(a), 135 с.

349. Шевельов Ю. *Історична фонологія української мови*, перекл. з англ. С. Вакулен-ка та А. Даниленка, Харків: Акта, 2002, 1066 с.

350. Шевельов Ю., *Нарис сучасної української літературної мови та інші лінгвістичні студії (1947–1953 рр.)*, Київ: Темпора, 2012(б), 664 с.

351. Шевельов Ю., *Чому общерусский язик, а не вібчоруська мова? З проблем східно-слов'янської глотогонії. Дві статті про постання української мови*. Київ: Вид. дім «KM Academia», 1994, 33 с.

352. Шелер М., *Положение человека в космосе*, в: Избр. произв., пер. с нем. А. В. Де-нежкина, А. Н. Малинкина, А. Ф. Филлипова, под ред. А. В. Денежкина, Москва: Гнозис, 1994, 413 с.

353. Шифрин Б., *Интимизация в культуре*, в: "Даугава", 1989, № 8, с. 88–94.

354. Шмелева Т. В., *Модель речевого жанра*, в: *Антология речевых жанров*, Москва: УРСС, 1997, с. 81−90.

355. Шмелева Т. В., *Речеведение. Теоретические и прикладные аспекты*, Новгород: Новгород. ун-т, 1996, 223 с.

356. Штерн В. Л., *Дифференциальная психология и ее методические основы (Die diffe-rentielle Psychologie in ihren methodischen Grundlagen)*, пер. с нем. и послесл. А. В. Брушлинского и др., Москва: Наука, 1998, 335 с.

357. Юнг К. Г., *Психологические типы*, пер. с нем. под общ. ред. В. В. Зелинского, Минск: ООО "Попури", 1998, 656 с.

358. Якоби Ф. Г., *О трансцедентальном идеализме*, пер. с нем. Ф. Г. Якоба, в: "Новые идеи в философии", Санкт-Петербург: Образование, 1912, № 12: *К истории теории познания*, с. 1−14.

359. Якубець М., *Із спостережень над мовою та стилем творів Івана Франка, писаних польською мовою*, в: *Іван Франко і світова культура*, Матер. Міжнар. симп. ЮНЕСКО (Львів, 11–15 вересня 1986 р.), Київ: Наук. думка, 1990, кн. 1, с. 129–134.

360. Яремко Я. І., *Концептуальні поняття сучасної політології: лінгвокогнітивний аспект*, дис. … д-ра філол. наук, Дрогобич 2015, 617 с.

361. Яскевич О. К., *Особенности использования лексических средств интимизации в современном английском языке*, автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Київ 1990, 15 с.

362. Яхина А. М., *Оценочность как компонент значения фразеологических единиц в русском, английском и татарском языках (на материале глагольных фразеологических единиц, обозначающих поведение человека)*, дисс. … канд. филол. наук, Казань 2008, 226 с.

List of sources

1. *Cambridge Idioms Dictionary*, Cambridge: CUP, 2006, 505 p.

2. *Deutsche Idiomatik: Wӯrterbuch der deutschen Redewendungen im Kontext,* Hans Schemann, Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 2011, 1040 s.

3. Friederich W., *Moderne Deutsche Idiomatik*, Mӯnchen: Mӯnchen, Hueber, 1976, 265 s.

4. *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*, ed. by J. Siefring, Oxford: OUP, 2004, 340 p.

5. Бибик С. П., Єрмоленко С. Я., Пустовіт Л. О., *Словник епітетів української мови*, за ред. Л. О. Пустовіт, Київ: Довіра, 1998, 431 с.

6. *Большой англо-русский фразеологический словарь,* состав. А. В. Кунин, Москва: Русский язык, 1998, 944 с.

7. Вусик О. С., *Словник українських синонімів*, за ред. А. М. Поповського, Дніпропетровськ: Січ, 2003, 424 с.

8. *Енциклопедія життя і творчості Лесі Українки. Листи Лесі Українки*, в: Електронний ресурс: http://www.l-ukrainka.name/uk/Corresp.html (10.04.2016).

9. Караванський С., *Практичний словник синонімів української мови*, Київ: Кобза, 1993, 469 с.

10. Коцюбинська М., *Мої обрії*, у 2 томах, Київ: Дух і Літера, 2004, т. 1, 336 с.; т. 2, 384 с.

11. Леся Українка, *Голосні струни*, в: Її ж, *З людської намови: Проза*, Київ: Академія, 2015, с. 58–159.

12. Леся Українка, *Приязнь*, в: Її ж, *З людської намови: Проза*, Київ: Академія, 2015, 274 с.

13. *Листи до Олеся Гончара*, у 2 кн., упор., автор передм., прим. і ком. М. Степаненко, Київ: Сакцент Плюс, 2016, кн. 1, 736 с.; кн. 2, 736 с.

14. *Листи до Т. Г. Шевченка: 1840–1861*, ред. Є. П. Кирилюк, Л. Ф. Козацька, Київ: [б. в.], 1962, 331 с.

15. *Листи Юрія Шевельова до Олекси Ізарського*, автор і упоряд. М. Степаненко, Полтава: ПП Шевченко Р. В., 2014, 388 с.

16. *Немецко-русский фразеологический словарь*, сост. Л. Э. Бинович, Москва: Аквариум, 1995, 768 с.

17. *Посмішка чорного кота: гобі, забобони, анекдоти*, упорядн. М. Слабошпицький, Київ: Ярославів Вал, 2011, 548 с.

18. *Словник поетичної мови Василя Стуса. Рідковживані слова та індивідуально-авторські новотвори*, уклад. Л. В. Оліфіренко, Київ: Абрис, 2003, 90 с.

19. *Словник фразеологізмів української мови*, уклад. В. М. Білоноженко, І. С. Гнатюк, В. В. Дятчук, Київ: Наук. думка, 2003, 1104 с.

20. Стус В., *Най будем щирі*, в: Його ж. *Твори*, у 4 томах, т. 4: *Повісті та оповідання, незакінчені твори, сценарії, літературна критика, заяви, публіцистичні листи та звернення, з таборового зошита*, Львів : ВС "Просвіта", 1994, с. 173–189.

21. Стус В., *Твори*, у 4 томах, 6 книгах, Львів: ВЦ "Просвіта", 1994–1997.

22. *Фразеологический словарь русского языка*, ред. А. И. Молотков, Москва: Русский язык, 1987, 543 с.

23. Франко І. Я., *Двоязичність і дволичність*, в: Його ж. *Мозаїка. Із творів, що не ввійшли до Зібрання творів у 50 томах*, упоряд. З. Т. Франко, М. Г. Василенко, Львів: Каменяр, 2001, с. 263–278.

24. Франко І. Я., *Зібр. тв.*, у 50 томах, Київ: Наук. думка, 1976–1986.

25. Франко І., *"Розвивайся ти, високий дубе…"*, в: Його ж *Із творів, що не ввійшли до Зібрання творів у 50 томах*, упоряд. З. Т. Франко, М. Р. Василенко, Львів: Каменяр, 2001, 22 с.

26. Хамітов Н., Крилова С., *Філософський словник. Людина і світ*, Київ: КНТ, Центр навч. літ., 2007, 264 с.

27. Шевельов Ю., *Я – мене – мені… (І довкруги). Спогади*. ч. 1 "В Україні", Харків; Нью-Йорк: М. П. Коць, 2001, 409 с.

28. Шестов Л. И., *Сочинения*, в 2 томах, Москва: Наука, 1993, т. 1: "Власть ключей", 668 с.; т. 2: "На весах Иова (Странствования по душам)", 560 с.

29. Щурат В., *Іван Франко в 1895–1897 роках*, в: *Іван Франко у спогадах сучасників*, Львів, 1956, с. 267–281.

Bibliography [References]

1. *Autobiografizm i okolice:* prace ofiarowane profesor Małgorzacie Czermińskiej. Pod red. Tadeusza Sucharskiego i Bernadetty Żynis; Akademia Pomorska w Słupsku. Słupsk. 2011. 227 s.

2. Baeva, L. *Values of Mediasphere and E-Culture*. Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski. Olsztyn. 2017. VIII/1. pp. 173–184.

3. Bart, R. *Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics*. Moscow. 1994. 619 s.

4. Basaj, M. *Ze spostrzezenna djęzykiem Iwana Franki*. Ivan Franko and world culture: Materials of the International symposium of UNESCO (L'viv, 11–15 September 1986). Book 2. Kyiv. 1990. Pp. 146–153.

5. Bates, E., MacWhinney, B. F*unctionalist approaches to grammar. Language Acguition: The State of the Art*. Cambridge. 1982. P. 41–62.

6. Bzdawka, U. *Autobiografia – literatura dokumentu osobistego: zestawienie bibliograficzne*. Poradnik Bibliograficzno-Metodyczny. 2002. Nr 4. S. 14–33.

7. Cowie, A. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications (Oxford Studies in Lexicography and Lexicology)*. New York. 2001. 272 p.

8. Czermińskia, M. *Autobiograficzny trójkąt. Świadectwo, wyznanie i wyzwanie*. Kraków. 2000. 343 s.

9. Czermińska, M. *Miejsca autobiograficzne. Propozycja w ramach geopoetyki*. Teksty Drugie. 2011. Nr 5. S. 183–199.

10. Data, K. *Struktura tekstu listowego*. Język Polski. 1989. Z. 3–5. S. 151–160.

11. Demetrio, D. *Autobiografia. Terapeutyczny wymiar pisania o sobie.* Przeł. A. Skoli-mowska; przedmowa O. Czerniawska. Kraków 2000. 148 s.

12. Dubrovsky, S. *Autobiografia / prawda / psychoanaliza.* Teksty Drugie. 2007. Nr 4. S. 189–203.

13. Foltyniak, A. *Między "pisać Nałkowską" a Nałkowskiej "czytaniem siebie": narracyjna tożsamość podmiotu.* Dziennikach. Kraków. 2004. 186 s.

14. Galant, A. *Prywatne, publiczne, autobiograficzne: o dziennikach i esejach Jana Lechonia, Zofii Nałkowskiej, Marii Kuncewiczowej i Jerzego Stempowskiego.* Warszawa. 2010. 212 s.

15. Hall, C. S., Lindsey, G. *Theories of Personality.* 2d. ed. New York. 1970. 622 p.

16. Hunston, S. *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: Phraseology and Evaluative Language.* New York. 2011. 166 p.

17. Hurbanska, S. O. *Multifunctionality of Phraseological Units in Postmodern Literary Discourse.* Language, Individual & Society. Burgas. 2014. Vol. 8. Pp. 344–351.

18. Jarosiński, Z. *Proza dokumentu osobistego.* Sporne postaci polskiej literatury współ-czesnej, praca zbiorowa pod red. Aliny Brodzkiej i Lidii Burskiej, Warszawa. 1998. S. 143–153.

19. Kałkowska, A. *Struktura składniowa listu.* Wrocław 1982. 142 s.

20. Kasperski, E. *Problem dialogu w tworczosci Iwana Franki.* Ivan Franko as a writer, thinker, citizen: Materials of the International scientific conference (L'viv, 25–27 September 1996). L'viv. 1998. Pp. 278–284.

21. Kaźmierska, K. *Biografia i pamięć. Na przykładzie pokoleniowego doświadczenia ocalo-nych z Zagłady.* Kraków. 2008. 240 s.

22. Kita, M. *Polski dyskurs prywatności.* Postscriptum Polonistyczne. 2013. Nr 1 (11). S. 93–103.

23. Kolinko, E. *Tylko dzienniki. Diarystyka kobieca jako przedmiot badań w Polsce i za gra-nicą.* Przegląd Humanistyczny. 2016. Nr 4. S. 138–150.

24. Krasnobaieva-Chorna, Zh. *Axiophraseme Pragmatics: Representation of Code Culture in the Axiological World's Image (on the Material of English, German, Ukrainian and Russian).* Linguistic Studies. Vinnytsya. 2017(a). Vyp. 33. S. 83–87.

25. Krasnobaieva-Chorna, Zh. *Mind Value: Semantics, Structure, Pragmatics (on the Ma-terial of English, German, Ukrainian and Russian Phraseology).* Linguistic Studies. Vinnytsya. 2017(b). Vyp. 34. S. 79–87.

26. Krzyżanowska, A. *Polska i francuska frazeologia śmierci.* Lublin. 1999. 120 s.

27. Kuplowski, M. I. *Franko jako krytyk literatury polskiej.* Rzeszów. 1974. 196 s.

28. Kuplowski, M. I. *Franko o literaturze polskiej.* Kraków. 1979. 304 s.

29. Lejeune, P. *„Drogi zeszycie…", „drogi ekranie…". O dziennikach osobistych.* Przeł. A. Karpowicz, M. Rodak, P. Rodak ; wybór, wstęp i oprac. P. Rodak. Warszawa 2010. S. 39–42.

30. Lejeune, P. Dziewczęce "ja": (o dziennikach panien z XIX wieku); przeł. M. Ro-dak, P. Rodak. Teksty Drugie. 2003. Nr 2/3. S. 192–211.

31. Lubas-Bartoszyńska, R. *Nowsze problemy teoretyczne pisania o sobie: przykład wypo-wiedzi autobiograficznych pisarzy polskich ostatnich dziesięcioleci.* Przestrzenie Teorii. Nr 6. 2006. S. 51–67.

32. Lubas-Bartoszyńska, R. *Style wypowiedzi pamiętnikarskiej.* Kraków. 1983. 223 s.

33. McNeill, D. *The Acquisition of Language: the Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics*. New York. 1970. 201 p.

34. Mitosek, Z. *Hermeneuta i autobiografia*. Teksty Drugie. 2002. Nr 3. S. 137–151.

35. Okulus, A. *Ja autobiograficzne jako podmiot dialogiczny "Kartki z dziennika" Stefana Chwina – "odkrywanie innego"*. Kwartalnik Opolski. 2009. Nr 1. S. 61–79.

36. Osgood, C. E. *Lectures on Language Performance*. New York. 1980. 276 p.

37. Renouvier, C. B. *Le personnalisme, scientific publication*. Paris. 1902. 189 p.

38. Rodak, P. *Prawda w dzienniku osobistym*. Teksty Drugie. 2009. Nr 4. S. 23–38.

39. Rybicka, E. *Antropologiczne i komunikacyjne aspekty dyskursu epistolograficznego*. Teksty Drugie. 2004. Nr 4. S. 40–55.

40. Shevelov, George Y., A *Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*. Heidellberg. 1979. 809 p.

41. Szulakiewicz, W. *Ego-dokumenty i ich znaczenie w badaniach naukowych*. Electronic resource*:* http://apcz.umk.pl/czasopisma/index.php/PBE/article/download/1835/1790 (21.10.2018).

42. Trzynadlowski, J. *List i pamiętnik. Dwie formy wypowiedzi osobistej. Małe formy literackie*. Wrocław. 1977. S. 83–84.

43. Tyrowicz, M. *W poszukiwaniu siebie*. Wspomnienia i refleksje. T. 1: Pod lwowskim niebem. Lublin. 1988. 180 s.

44. Wundt, W. *Vųlkerpsychologie: Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetce von Sprache, Mythus und Sitce.* Leipzig. 1911. Bd. 1: Sprache. T. 1, 695 s.; Leipzig. 1904. Bd. 2: Die Sprache. T. 2. 673 s.

45. Zaśko-Zielińska, M. *Listy pożegnalne: w poszukiwaniu lingwistycznych wyznaczników autentyczności tekstu*. Wrocław. 2013. 286 s.

46. Averincev, S. S. Plutarx i antichnaya biografiya *(Plutarch and antique biography)*. Moskva. 1973. 279 s.

47. Akishina, A. A. Pis'mo kak odin iz vidov teksta: Obshhie svedeniya ob e'pistolyarnom zhanre *(Letter as one type of text: General information about the epistolary genre)*. Russkij yazyk za rubezhom. 1982a. № 2. S. 57–63.

48. Akishina, A. A. Pis'mo kak odin iz vidov teksta: Harakteristika blagodarstvennyh, izvinitel'nyh i pozdravitel'nyh pisem *(Letter as one type of text: Characteristic of thank-you notes, excuses and greeting letters)*. Russkij yazyk za rubezhom. 1982b. № 4. S. 31–38.

49. Akishina, A. A., Formanovskaya, N. I. E'tiket russkogo pis'ma *(Russian writing etiquette)*. Moskva. 1981. 200 s.

50. Akishina, A. A. Formanovskaya N. I. E'tiket russkogo pis'ma *(The etiquette of Russian letter)*. 4-e izd. Moskva. 1989. 192 s.

51. Anokhina, T. O. Neverbalni ta verbalni zasoby eksterioryzatsii sylentsialnoho efektu v anhlomovnomu khudozhnomu dyskursi *(Non-verbal and verbal means of exteriorization silenceing effect in the English fiction discourse)*: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2006. 20 s.

52. Antonenko, S. V. Struktura pisem A. S. Pushkina (Lingvostilistika teksta) *(The structure of A. S. Pushkin's letters (Linguistic stylistics of the text))*. Kyiv. 2000. 154 s.

53. Ardelyan, O. Problemy doslidzhennya idiomatyky v suchasnii linhvistytsi *(Research problems of the study of idiomatic in modern linguistics)*. Naukovi zapysky

KDPU. Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). Kirovohrad. 2015. Vyp. 137. S. 40–44

54. Arkushyn, H. L. Varianty imeni, zhartivlyvi prizvyska, psevdonimy ta kryptonimy Lesi Ukrainky *(Name variants, comic nicknames, aliases and kryptonites of Lesya Ukrainka)*. Dyvoslovo. 1995. № 2. S. 15–16.

55. Arnol'd, I. V. Leksikologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka (The English Word) *(Lexicology of modern English (The English Word))*. Moskva. 1986. 296 s.

56. Arsent'yeva, Ye. F. Sopostavitel'nyj analiz frazeologicheskix edinits (na materiale frazeologicheskix edinits, semanticheski orientirovannyx na cheloveka v anglijskom i russkom yazykax) *(Comparative analysis of phraseological units (on the material of phraseological units, semantically oriented to the person in English and Russian))*. Kazan'. 1989. 126 s.

57. Artem'eva, T. V. Uteshitel'nye pis'ma. Figury Tanatosa *(A comforting letter. The Figure of Thanatos)*. Tema smerti v duxovnom opyte chelovechestva: materialy I mezhdunar. konf. (S.-Peterburg, 2–4 noyabrya 1993 g.). SPb. 1993. Vyp. 3. S. 77–85.

58. Arutyunova, N. D. Faktor adresata *(The recipient factor)*. Izv. AN SSSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka. T. 40. № 4. 1981. S. 356–367.

59. Arutyunova, N. D. Yazyk i mir cheloveka *(Language and human world)*. Moskva. 1999. 896 s.

60. Astakhova, E. I. Vnutrennyaya forma idiom i ee funkcii *(Internal form of idioms and its functions)*. Frazeografiya v Mashinnom fonde russkogo yazyka. Moskva. 1990. S. 146–152.

61. Ahutina, T. V. Nejrolingvisticheskij analiz dinamicheskoj afazii. O mexanizmax postroeniya vyskazyvaniya *(Neurolinguistic analysis of dynamic aphasia. About the mechanisms of making utterance)*. 3-e izd. Moskva. 2012. 144 s.

62. Babaeva, Ye. V. Lingvokul'turologicheskie xarakteristiki russkoj i nemetskoj aksiologicheskix kartin mira *(Linguoculturological characteristics of Russian and German axiological pictures of the world)*: diss. … d-ra filol. nauk. Volgograd. 2004. 438 s.

63. Bagautdinova, G. A. Chelovek vo frazeologii: antropotsentricheskij i aksiologicheskij aspekty *(Man in phraseology: anthropocentric and axiological aspects)*: avtoref. diss. … d-ra filol. nauk. Kazan'. 2007. 45 s.

64. Bayeva, L. V. Cennosti izmenyayushchegosya mira: e'kzistentsial'naya aksiologiya istorii *(Values of a changing world: the existential axiology of history)*. Astrakhan'. 2004. 278 s.

65. Batsuren, R. Otobrazhenie universal'nyx i e'tnospetsificheskix chert yazykovoj kartiny mira v frazeologicheskix fondax angliyskogo, russkogo i mongol'skogo yazykov *(Display of the universal and ethnospecific features of the linguistic picture of the world in the phraseological foundations of the English, Russian and Mongolian languages)*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Saratov. 2010. 227 s.

66. Bahtin, M. M. Problema rechevyx zhanrov *(The problem of speech genres)*. Ego zhe, Sobranie sochinenij. Moskva. 1996. T. 5: Raboty 1940–1960 gg. S. 159–206.

67. Bahtin, M. M. Problema rechevyx zhanrov. E'stetika slovesnogo tvorchestva *(The problem of speech genres. Aesthetics of verbal creativity)*. Sost. S. G. Bocharov. 2-e izd. Moskva. 1986. S. 250–296.

68. Bahtin, M. M. Problemy poe'tiki Dostoevskogo *(Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics)*. Moskva. 1963. 362 s.

69. Batsevych, F. Linhvokomunikatyvni ta rytoryko-prahmatychni vymiry khudozhnoho tekstu (na mater. romanu Ivana Franka „Perekhresni stezhky") *(Linguo-communicative and rhetoric-pragmatic dimensions of belletristic text (based on novel Crossing paths by Ivan Franko)).* L'viv. 2016. 192 s.

70. Belova, A. V. Lingvopragmaticheskaya harakteristika obratimoj e'pistolyarnoj kommunikacii (na materiale perepiski Al. P. Chehova i A. P. Chehova) *(Linguo-pragmatic characteristic of reversible epistolary communication (by the material of al correspondence Al. P. Chekhov and A. P. Chekhov)):* avtoref. diss. kand. … filol. nauk. SPb. 2005. 22 s.

71. Belunova, N. I. Komfort rechevogo obshheniya (Druzheskoe pis'mo) *(The comfort of speech communication (Informal letter)).* Russkij yazyk v shkole. 1996. № 5. S. 80–84.

72. Belunova, N. I. Tekst druzheskogo pis'ma tvorcheskoj intelligencii konca XIX – pervoj chetverti XX veka kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya (kommuni-kativnyj aspekt) *(The text of the friendly letter of the creative intelligentsia of the late XIX – the first quarter of the XX century as an object of linguistic research (communicative aspect)):* diss. d-ra filol. nauk. SPb. 2000. 46 s.

73. Berdyaev, N. A. Ya i mir ob'ektov. Opyt filosofii odinochestva i obshheniya *(I and the world of objects. The experience of philosophic loneliness and communication).* Paris. 1934. 187 s.

74. Bileckaya, O. P. Pis'mo kak mezhstilevoj tip teksta *(Letter as between style type text).* Sbornik nauchnyx trudov MGPIIYa im. M. Toreza. Moskva. 1995. S. 95–101.

75. Bilodid, I. K. Kameniar ukrainskoho slova (Do 110-richchia z dnia narodzhennia i 50 richchia z dnia smerti Ivana Yakovycha Franka) *(The Stonemason of the Ukrainian word (To 110th anniversary of birthday and 50th anniversary of death of Ivan Yakovych Franko)).* Kyiv. 1966. 67 s.

76. Bilous, M. P. Do pytannia movno-pravopysnoho redahuvannia Frankovykh tvoriv *(To the question of language and spelling correction of Franko's works).* Ivan Franko – pysmennyk, myslytel, hromadianyn: materialy Mizhnar. nauk. konf. (L'viv, 22–25 veresnia 1996). L'viv. 1998. S. 633–637.

77. Bogatyreva, E. N. Semanticheskaya struktura i strukturno-semanticheskaya mo-delirovannost' frazeologicheskix edinic s komponentami-naimenovaniyami vody i vodoemov v sovremennom russkom yazyke *(Semantic structure and structural-semantic modeling of phraseological units with components-names of water and water bodies in modern Russian):* diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Kostroma. 2015. 222 s.

78. Bohdan, S. Verbalizatsiia kontseptu sviato v epistoliarnii povedintsi Lesi Ukrain-ky *(Verbalization of the holiday concept in the epistolary behavior of Lesya Ukrainka).* Studia Ukrainica Poznanieńsia. 2013. Zeszyt 1. S. 23–38.

79. Bohdan, S. Epistoliarna povedinka ukraintsiv u XX st. *(Epistolary behavior of Ukrainians in the XIX–XX centuries).* Navch. posib. dlia stud. vyshch. navch. zakl. Lutsk. 2013. 269 s.

80. Bragina, N. G. Pamyat' v yazyke i kul'ture *(Memory in language and culture).* Moskva. 2007. 520 s.

81. Bratanich, O. V. Linhvostylistyka epistoliariiu H. P. Kochura (na materiali lystuvannia 60–80-kh rr. XX stolittia) *(Linguistic stylistics epistolary G. P. Kochura (based on the correspondence 60-80 years of the XXth century)):* dys. … kand filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2004. 215 s.

82. Brovin'ok, T. I. Studiia Ivana Franka „Da dni" yak novyi typ ideino-estetychnoi struktury *(Studying of Ivan Franko At the Bottom as a new type of structure of idea and esthetics)*. Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli. 1981. № 8. S. 37–43.

83. Bulakh, O. N. Epistoliarnyi styl chy epistoliarnyi zhanr *(The epistolary style or the epistolary genre)*. Movoznavstvo. 1982. № 1 (91). S. 66–69.

84. Bulakhovskyi, L. A. Movni zasoby intymizatsii v poezii Tarasa Shevchenka *(Language means of intimization in Taras Shevchenko's poetry)*. Izbrannye trudy: v 5 t. Kyiv. 1977. T. 2. 631 s.

85. Burkitbaeva, G. G. Nekotorye voprosy teorii zhanra v sovremennoj zarubezhnoj lingvistike *(Some questions of genre theory in contemporary foreign linguistics)*. Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki. 2005. № 2. S. 97–105.

86. Vajsgerber, J. L. Rodnoj yazyk i formirovanie duxa *(Native language and spirit formation)*. Per. s nem., vstup. st. i komment. O. A. Radchenko. Izd. 2-e, ispr. i dop. Moskva. 2004. 232 s.

87. Valevskij, A. L. Osnovaniya biografiki *(Basis of biography)*. Kyiv. 1993. 110 s.

88. Vasilenko A, P. Ocenochno-e'motivnoe soderzhanie russkix i francuzskix frazeologizmov *(Evaluative-emotive content of Russian and French idioms)*. Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. Tambov. 2010. № 1 (5). Ch. I. S. 63–65.

89. Velichko, N. V. Samonominacii i samoxarakteristiki v pis'max A. P. Chexova yaltinskogo perioda (sentyabr' 1898 – aprel' 1899 g.) *(Self-nominations and self-characteristics in A. P. Chekhov's letters of the Yalta period (September 1898 – April 1899 year))*. Uchenye zapiski Tavricheskogo nacional'nogo universiteta im. V. I. Vernadskogo. Ser. "Filologiya". T. 20 (59). 2007. S. 420–424.

90. Veselov, P. V. Aksiomy delovogo pis'ma: Kul'tura delovogo obshheniya i oficial'noj perepiski *(Axioms of business writing: Culture of business communication and official correspondence)*. Moskva. 1993. 74 s.

91. Veselov, P. V. Sovremennoe delovoe pis'mo v promyshlennosti *(A modern business letter in industry)*. 3-e izd., dop. Moskva. 1990. 160 s.

92. Vietrova, E. S. Semantyka i funktsionalno-komunikatyvnyi aspekt etyketnykh odynyts v epistoliarnii spadshchyni ukrainskykh pysmennykiv XIX st. *(Semantics and functional-communicative aspect of etiquette units in the epistolary heritage of Ukrainian writers of the XIX century): avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk.* Donetsk. 2004. 20 s.

93. Vinogradova, E. M. E'pistolyarnye rechevye zhanry: pragmatika i semantika teksta *(Epistolary speech genres: the semantics and pragmatics of the text): avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk.* Moskva. 1991. 22 s.

94. Vinokur, G. O. Biografiya i kul'tura *(Biography and culture)*. Moskva. 1927. 88 s.

95. Vykhovanets, I. R. Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys *(Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Syntax)*. Kyiv. 1993. 368 s.

96. Vykhovanets, I. R. Narysy z funktsionalnoho syntaksysu ukrainskoi movy *(Outline of functional syntax of the Ukrainian language)*. Kyiv. 1992. 222 s.

97. Vozniak, M. Narysy pro svitohliad Ivana Franka (*The essays about outlook of Ivan Franko*). L'viv. 1955. 196 s.

98. Vozniak, M. Frankiv rozryv z polskoiu presoiu *(Franko's rupture with Polish press. World)*. Svit. 1926. N 2. S. 11–12.

99. Gabunia, Z. M. Kairova, R. B. Ocenka denotata i vybor obrazav russkoj i anglijskoj frazeologii *(Evaluation of the denotation and the choice of the image in Russian and English phraseology)*. Cuadernos de Rusística Española. 2010. № 6. S. 13–19.

230

100. Gayda, S. Zhanry i razgovornyix vyskazyvanij *(Genres of colloquial utterances)*. Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 1999. Vyp. 2. S. 103–111.

101. Hanzha, S. A. Frazeolohiia epistoliarnoi spadshchyny (na materiali pryvatnoho lystuvannia ukrainskykh pysmennykiv-klasykiv XIX – pochatku XX stolittia) *(The phraseology of the epistolary heritage (based on the private correspondence of Ukrainian classical writers of the XIX – early XX century))*. Navchalnyi posibnyk. Dnipropetrovsk. 2010. 92 s.

102. Harbera, I. V. Kontsept *lyudyna* u frazeolohii skhidnostepovykh ukrayinskykh hovirok *(Concept is a man in the phraseology of the Eastern steppe Ukrainian dialects)*: avtoref. dys … kand. filol. nauk. Vinnytsya. 2018. 20 s.

103. Gindin, S. I. Biografiya v strukture pisem i e'pistolyarnogo povedeniya. Yazyk i lichnost' *(Biography in the structure of letters and epistolary behavior. Language and personality)*. Moskva. 1989. S. 63–77.

104. Glinkina, L. A. Problema e'pistolyarnogo idiostilya v rusistike *(The problem of the epistolary author's style in Russian studies)*. Semantika slova, obraza, teksta: tezisy mezhdunarodnoj konferencii. Arxangel'sk. 1995. S. 12–18.

105. Golovin, S. Yu. Slovar' prakticheskogo psixologa *(Dictionary of practical psychologist)*. Xarvest; Minsk. 1998. 607 s. Electronic resource: http://www.klex.ru/1ql (19.08.2018).

106. Golovina, T. A. Lingvopersonologicheskoe funkcionirovanie chastej rechi: statisticheskij aspekt (na materiale xudozhestvennyx tekstov) *(Linguopersonologic functioning of the parts of speech: statistical aspect (based on belles-lettres texts))*: avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Barnaul. 2008. 21 s.

107. Gol'din, V. Ye, Dubroskaya, O. N. Zhanrovaya organizaciya rechi v aspekte socialnyx vzaimodejstvij *(Genre organization of speech in the aspect of social interactions)*. Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 2002. Vyp. 3. S. 5–18.

108. Holiak, V. O. Borotba I. Franka za yedynu zahalnonatsionalnu ukrainsku literaturnu movu *(The struggle of Ivan Franko for single common national Ukrainian literary language)*: zb. studentskykh nauk. robit L'viv. un-tu. L'viv. 1957. Ch. 1. S. 53–57.

109. Horbach, I. Movni zasoby intymizatsii khudozhnoho frantsuzkoho tekstu *(Language means of intimacy the art of the French text)*. Suchasni doslidzhennia z linhvistyky, literaturoznavstva i mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii: mater. II Mizhnar. nauk. konf. Ivano-Frankivsk. 2015. S. 35–37.

110. Horbach, O. Vulychno-tiuremni argotyzmy u Frankovii prozi *(Street and prison argot in Franko's prose)*. Zapysky NTSh. L'viv. 1963. T. 177. S. 197–206.

111. Horbach, O. L'vivski prostupnytsko-tiuremnytski argotyzmy (do 1930-kh rokiv) *(L'viv criminal and prison argot (up to 1930-ies)*: nauk. zb. Ukr. Vilnoho Universytetu. Miunkhen. 1983. T. 10. S. 296–326.

112. Gornfel'd, D. E'pistolyarnaya literatura *(Epistolary literature)*. Electronic resource: http://www.referatu-institute.ru/text/016.htm (10.09.2018).

113. Hrabovych, H. Ivan Franko i Adam Mitskevych *(Ivan Franko and Adam Mickiewicz)*. Ivan Franko i svitova kultura: materialy mizhnarodnoho sympoziumu. Kyiv. 1990. Kn. 1. S. 135–141.

114. Hrabovych, H. Polsko-ukrainski literaturni vzaiemyny: pytannia kulturnoi perspektyvy *(Polish-Ukrainian literary relationships: the problem of cultural perspective)*.

Hrabovych, H. H., Do istorii ukrainskoi literatury: doslidzhennia, ese, polemika. Kyiv: Osnovy, 1997, S. 138–169.

115. Hryhorenko, I. Epistoliarnyi styl movlennia v ukrainskii literaturnii dokumentalistytsi druhoi polovyny XIX stolittia *(Epistolary style of speech in Ukrainian literary documentaries of the second half of the XIX century).* Naukovyi chasopys NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova. Seriia 8. Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). 2013. Vyp. 5. S. 47–54.

116. Hrytsiutenko, I. Ye. Mova v estetychnii kontseptsii Ivana Franka *(Language in esthetic conception of Ivan Franko).* Ivan Franko: Statti i materialy. 1968. Vyp. 5. S. 45–52.

117. Gudkov, D. B. Teoriya i praktika mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii *(Theory and practice of intercultura8l communication).* Moskva. 2003. 288 s.

118. Gudkov, D. B., Kovshova, M. L. Telesnyj kod russkoj kul'tury: materialy k slovaryu *(Body code of Russian culture: materials to the dictionary).* Moskva. 2007. 288 s.

119. Gulyakova, I. G. Lichnost' pisatelya v ego pis'mah (yazykovoj aspekt) *(The writer's personality in his letters (the linguistic aspect)).* Yazyk, kul'tura, obshhenie v usloviyah kratkosrochnogo obucheniya. SPb. 2000. S. 100–107.

120. Gumbol'dt, V. Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu *(Selected papers on linguistics).* Per. S nem., obshh. red. prof. G. V. Ramishvili, poslesl. A. V. Gulygi i V. A. Zveginceva. Moskva. 2000. 400 s.

121. Greshchuk, V. Rol Ivana Franka u formuvanni yedynoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy *(The role of Ivan Franko in the formation of common Ukrainian literary language).* Visnyk Naukovoho tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka. Ivano-Frankivsk. 2007. Ch. 2. S. 138–152.

122. Danyliuk, S. S. Vykorystannia hrafichnykh zasobiv u tekstakh elektronnoi poshty *(The use of graphical tools in the texts of the e-mail).* Naukovi zapysky. Seriia: Filolohiia. Vinnytsia. 2009. S. 216–219.

123. Danker, Z. M. Funktsyonalno- semanticheskaya organyzatsyia chastnogo pys'ma (sytuatyvnaia ustanovka kontakta) *(Functional and semantic organization of private letter (situational establishment of the contact)):* avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Sankt-Peterburg. 1992. 16 s.

124. Dekshna, T. A. Typolohiia zasobiv intymizatsii v anhlomovnykh i ukrainomovnykh reklamnykh tekstakh *(Typology of tools of intimacy in English-language and Ukrainian-language advertising texts):* avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2013. 21 s.

125. Dement'ev, V. V. Izuchenie rechevyx zhanrov. Obzor rabot v sovremennoj rusistike *(The studying of speech genres. The survey of the works in contemporary Russian studies).* Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 1977. № 1. S. 109–121.

126. Dement'ev, V. V. Teoriya rechevyx zhanrov *(The theory of speech genres).* Moskva. 2010, 595 s.

127. Denisova, S. P. Intimizaciya i lingvisticheskie sredstva eyo vyrazheniya v russkoj xudozhestvennoj proze konca XIX – nachala XX st. *(Intimization and linguistic means of its expression in Russian artistic prose of the late XIX – early XX centuries):* avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 1991. 16 s.

128. Denysiuk, I. Novatorstvo Franka-prozaika *(Novelty of Franko as prose writer).* Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo. 2008. Vyp. 70. S. 138–152.

129. Dialektika teksta *(The dialectic of the text)*: v 2 t. Pod red. prof. A. I. Varshavskoj. SPb. 1999. T. 1. 328 s.

130. Dibrova, Ye. I., Kasatkin, L. L., Nikolina, N. A., Shcheboleva, I. I., Sovremennyj russkij yazyk *(Modern Russian)*. Ch.1. Fonetika i orfoe'piya. Grafika i orfografiya. Leksikologiya. Frazeologiya. Leksikografiya. Morfemika. Slovoobrazovaniye. Moskva. 2001. 540 s.

131. Dolzhenko, N. G., Solkunova, O. A. E'tiketnaya funkciya obrashhenij v pis'mah A. P. Chehova *(Etiquette function of address in letters of A. P. Chekhov)*. Vestnik ugrovedeniya. 2013. № 3 (14). S. 38–46.

132. Dombrovan, T. I. Yazyk v kontekste sinergetiki *(Language in the context of synergy)*. Odessa. 2013. 343 s.

133. Domysheva, S. A. Politicheskij diskurs v prostranstve diskursa reagirovaniya *(Political discourse in the scope of discourse reacting):* diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Irkutsk. 2008. 188 s.

134. Drahomanov, M. P. Vybrane («…mii zadum zlozhyty ocherk istorii tsyvilizatsii na Ukraini») *(Selected («…my intention to make up an outline of the history of civilization in Ukraine»))*. Uporiad. ta avt. ist.-biohr. narysu R. S. Mishchuk; prymit. R. S. Mishchuka, V. S. Shandry. Kyiv. 1991. 688 s.

135. Dubrovskaya, O. N. Obschat'sya? Tusovat'sya? Klubit'sya! K voprosu ob otrazhenii v yazyike i rechi novyix form kommunikativnogo dejstviya *(To communicate? To hang out? To club! To the question of reflection of new forms of communicative action in language and speech)*. Problemy rechevoj kommunikacii. Saratov. 2008. S. 409–416.

136. Yermolenko, S. Folklor i literaturna mova *(Folklore and literary language)*. Kyiv. 1987. 245 s.

137. Zhylko, F. T. Rol Ivana Franka v istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy *(The role of Ivan Franko in the history of the Ukrainian literary language)*. Ukr. mova v shkoli. 1956. № 3. S. 18–26.

138. Zhuravlova, N. M. Indyvidualno-avtorski ta okazionalni honoratyvy v epistoliarnomu styli XIX – pochatku XX st. *(Individual author's and occasional lectures in the epistolary style of the XIX-early XX centuries)*. Leksiko-grammaticheskie innovacii v sovremennyh slavyanskih yazykah: materialy II Mezhdunar. nauch. konf. (Dnepropetrovsk, 14–15 aprelya 2005 g.). Dnepropetrovsk. 2005. S. 149–153.

139. Zhurkova, O. L. Motyvovanist konotatyvnoho znachennya frazeolohichnykh odynyts anhliyskoyi ta ukrayinskoyi mov: zistavnyi aspekt *(The motivation of the connotative meaning of the phraseological units of the English and Ukrainian languages: the comparative aspect)*: dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2018. 201 s.

140. Zabolotna, T. V. Epistoliarna spadshchyna V. Vynnychenka: adresuvannia i styl *(Epistolary heritage of V. Vinnichenko: addressing and style):* dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2005. 189 s.

141. Zabuzhko, O. Notre Dame D'ukraine: Ukrainka v konflikti mifolohii (*Notre Dame D'ukraine: Ukrainka in the conflict of mythologies)*. 3-ye vyd. vypravlene. Kyiv. 2007. 640 s.

142. Zahnitko, A. P. Linhvistyka tekstu: Teoriia i praktykum *(Linguistics of text: Theory and training)*. Vyd 2-he, dop. i pererob. Donetsk. 2007. 313 s.

143. Zagnitko, A. P. Movna osobystist v epistolyarnomu dyskursi: typologiya lingvo-indyviduacij i lingvoindyvidualizacij *(Language personality in the epistolary discourse: typology of linguoindividuation and linguoindividualization).* Gumanitarna osvita v tehnichnyh vyshchyh navchalnyh zakladah. Vyp. 33, Kyiv. 2016(a). S. 58–72.

144. Zagnitko, A. P. Movnosociumna gramatyka: teoretychni zasady. Dynamika mor-fologichnogo rodu imennykiv *(Language and social grammar: theoretical foundations. Dynamics of morphological gender of nouns).* Ukrayins`ka mova i literatura v shkolah Ukrayiny. 2016(d). №7–8. S. 43 – 49.

145. Zagnitko, A. P. Rivni ta stupeni mizhchastynomovnyh transformacij *(The levels and extent michelinman transformations between parts of speech).* Rossica Olomoucensia. Vol. LV: Časopis pro ruskou a slovanskou filologii. Num. 1. Olomouc. 2016(c). S. 23–41.

146. Zahnitko, A. P. Slovnyk suchasnoi linhvistyky: poniattia i terminy *(Dictionary of modern linguistics: concept and terms):* u 4 t. Donetsk. 2012. t. 1. 402 s.; t. 2. 350 s.; t. 3. 426 s.; t. 4. 388 s.

147. Zagnitko, A. P. Teoriya gramatyzaciyi: kategorijno-rivnevyj prostir *(Grammatization theory: category-level space).* Naukovyj visnyk Shidnoyevropejskogo nacional-nogo universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrayinky: Filologichni nauky. 2015. № 4 (305). S. 181–187.

148. Zahnitko, A. P. Teoriia hramatyky i tekstu *(The theory of grammar and text).* Donetsk. 2014. 480 s.

149. Zahnitko, A. P. Typolohiia katehoriinoi semantyky nevidminiuvanykh imennykiv *(Typology of categorical semantics of indeclinable nouns).* Aktsentolohiia. Etymolohiia. Semantyka: zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv. 2013. S. 613–632.

150. Zahnitko, A. P. Teoretychna hramatyka suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy. Morfolohiia. Syntaksys *(Theoretic grammar of the Ukrainian language. Morphology. Syntax).* Donetsk. 2011. 992 s.

151. Zagnitko, A., Zagnitko, N., Funkcijno-komunikatyvnyj riven` lingvopersony: zakonomirnosti samorealizaciyi lingvopersony *(Functional-communicative level linguoperson: patterns of self-realization linguoperson).* Studia Ukrainica Posnanieńsia. Zeszyt 6. Poznań. 2018. S. 179–188.

152. Zahnitko, A. P., Danyliuk, I. H., Krasnobaieva-Chorna, Zh. V., Putilina, O. L., Sytar, H. V. Paradyhmalno-katehoriini osnovy prykladnoi linhvistyky *(Paradigm and categorical foundations of applied linguistics).* Vinnytsia. 2015. 472 s.

153. Zakrevska, Ya. V. Vnesok Ivana Franka u rozvytok nauky pro ukrainski dialekty *(The contribution of Ivan Franko into the development of science about Ukrainian dialects).* Ivan Franko – pysmennyk, myslytel, hromadianyn: Materialy Mizhnar. nauk. konf. (L'viv, 25–27 veresnia 1996). L'viv. 1998. S. 652–657.

154. Zimin, V. I. Ocenochno-e'motivnaya ambivalentnost' frazeologicheskix edinits v sovremennom russkom yazyke *(Evaluative-emotive ambivalence of phraseological units in the modern Russian).* Slovo: fol'klorno-dialektologicheskij al'manax: Yazy-koznanie. Blagoveshchensk. 2005. Vyp. 3. S. 5–9.

155. Ivanov, A. Yu. Principy tekstologicheskogo analiza e'go-dokumentov XX veka *(Principles of textual analysis of ego-documents of the XX century).* Istoricheskie, filo-sofskie, politicheskie i yuridicheskie nauki, kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. Tambov. 2014. № 1 (39): v 2-x ch. Ch. II. S. 85–87.

156. Ivanov, V., Kostenko, N. Dosvid kontent-analizu: modeli ta praktyky *(Experience of content analysis: models and practices)*. Kyiv. 2003. 200 s.

157. Kabanova, T. N. E'pistolyarnyj tekst chastnoj perepiski v aspekte teorii rechevogo obscheniya (na materiale rukopisnyx i opublikovannyx tekstov XX veka) *(Epistolary text of private letters in the aspect of the theory of speech communication (based on published and hand-written texts of the XX century)):* avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Chelyabinsk. 2004. 24 s.

158. Kairova, T. S. Osobennosti kommunikativnoj napravlennosti e'pistolyarnogo teksta *(The peculiarities of the communicative orientation of the epistolary text).* Kommunikativnye edinicy i sistema yazyka (francuzskij yazyk): sb. nauch. tr. Moskva. 1986. Vyp. 269. S. 87–103.

159. Kantorchuk, H. K. Antroponimy v lystakh Lesi Ukrainky *(Antroponymy in letters of Lesja Ukrainka).* Visnyk Zhytomyr. derzh. ped. un-tu. 2001. № 7. S. 66–68.

160. Karasev, P. S. Otkrytoe pis'mo – publicisticheskij zhanr *(An open letter – the journalistic genre).* Problemy gazetnyx zhanrov: sb. statej. Leningrad. 1962. S. 39–55.

161. Karasik, V. I. Diskursivnaya personologiya *(Discursive personology).* Yazyk. Kommunikaciya i social'naya sreda: Sb. nauch. trud. Voronezh. 2007. Vyp. 7. S. 78–86.

162. Karasik, V.I. Kul'turnye dominanty v yazyke *(Cultural dominants in language).* Yazykovaya lichnost': kul'turnye kontsepty. Volgograd-Arkhangel'sk. 1996. S. 3–16.

163. Karasik, V. I. O tipax diskursa *(About the types of discourse).* Yazykovaya lichnost': institucional'nyj i personal'nyj diskurs: sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd. 2000. S. 5–20.

164. Karasik, V. I. Yazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskursy *(Language circle: personality, concepts, discourses).*Volgograd. 2002. 477 s.

165. Karaulov, Yu. Russkij yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost' *(The Russian language and language personality).* Moskva. 2010. 264 s.

166. Karpenko, M. A. Tekstoobrazuyushhie i stileobrazuyushhie e'lementy v xudozhestvennoj rechi *(Text-forming and style-forming elements in artistic speech).* Russkoe yazykoznanie. Kijev. 1983. № 6. S. 100–108.

167. Karunyk, K. Mizh Kharkovom i Miunkhenom: "perekhodova" nauk. pratsia Yuriia Shevelova *(Between Kharkiv and Munich: "transitional" scientific work of Yu. Shevelov)* Shevelov, Yu. Do pytannia pro henezu y pryrodu nazyvnykh rechen. Kharkiv. 2012. S. 3–18.

168. Kastler, L. Negativnaya i pozitivnaya vezhlivost'. Agressiya v yazyke i rechi *(Negative and positive politeness. Aggression in language and speech).* Moskva. 2004. S. 9–18.

169. Kecba, L. N. Mesto e'pistolyarnogo stilya v sisteme funktsional'nyx stilej *(The place of epistolary style in the system of functional styles).* Izv. AN AzSSR. Ser. «Literatura». 1971. № 3–4. S. 73–80.

170. Kibrik, A. A. Modus, zhanr i drugie parametry klassifikacii diskursov *(Modus, genre and other parameters of qualification of discourses).* Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 2009. № 2. S. 3–21.

171. Kir'yanova, A. P. Adresant e'pistolyariya v aspekte yazykovoj ocenki (na materiale pisem M. I. Cvetaevoj) *(The epistolary recipient in the aspect of language assessment (on the material of the letters M. I. Tsvetaeva)).* Izvestiya RGPU im. A. I. Gercena. 2007(a). № 40. S. 124–129.

172. Kir'yanova, A. P. Adresant e'pistolyariya v aspekte yazykovoj ocenki: na materiale pisem M. I. Cvetaevoj *(The epistolary recipient in the aspect of language assessment: on the material of the letters M. I. Tsvetaeva):* diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Cherepovec. 2007(b). 188 s.

173. Kovaleva, N. A. Rechevye stereotipy e'pistolyarnogo teksta *(Speech stereotypes of epistolary text).* Tekst. Struktura i semantika: Doklady VIII Mezhdunarodnoj konferencii. Moskva. 2001. T. I. S. 231–240.

174. Kovaleva, N. A. Russkoe chastnoe pis'mo XIX veka: Kommunikaciya. Zhanr. Rechevaya struktura *(Russian private letter of the XIX century: Communication. Genre. Speech structure):* avtoref. diss. … d-ra filol. nauk. Moskva. 2002(a). 52 s.

175. Kovaleva, N. A. Russkoe chastnoe pis'mo XX veka. Kommunikaciya. Zhanr. Rechevaya struktura *(Russian private letter of the XX century. Communication. Genre. Speech structure):* diss. … d-ra. filol. nauk, Moskva. 2002(b). 537 s.

176. Kovtunova, I. I. Nekotoryie napravleniya zvolyucii poeticheskogo yazyika v XX veke *(Some directions of the evolution of poetic language in the XX century).* Ocherki istorii yazyka russkoj poe'zii XX veka. Poe'ticheskij yazyk i idiostil'. Obshhie voprosy. Zvukovaya organizaciya teksta. Moskva. 1990. S. 23–46.

177. Kolshanskij, G. V. Kommunikativnaya funkciya i struktura yazyka *(Communicative function and language structure).* Moskva. 1984. 174 s.

178. Komarova, S. I. Perifraza kak sredstvo organizacii smyslovogo komponenta e'pistolyarnogo teksta *(Periphrase as a means of organizing the semantic component of an epistolary text).* Semantika i grammatika v rechevoj kommunikacii: sb. nauch. tr. Dnepropetrovsk. 1991. S. 41–47.

179. Korniienko, N. P. Rol Ivana Franka v borotbi za utverdzhennia v Halychyni ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy na zahalnonarodnii osnovi, N. P. Korniienko *(The role of Ivan Franko in the struggle for establishment of the Ukrainian literary language on the general national base in Galicia).* Ukr. mova v shkoli. 1956. № 5. S. 17–23.

180. Korolova, A. V. Linhvopoetychnyi i naratyvnyi kody intymizatsii v khudozhnomu teksti (na materiali ukrainskoi ta rosiiskoi prozy druhoi polovyny XIX – pershoi polovyny XX stolit) *(Linguopoetic and narrative codes of intimization in the literary text (by the material of Ukrainian and Russian prose of the second half of XIX-first half of XX centuries)):* avtoref. dys. … d-ra filoloh. nauk. Kyiv. 2003. 35 s.

181. Korolova, A. V. Typolohiia naratyvnykh kodiv intymizatsii v khudozhnomu teksti *(Typology of narrative codes of intimization in a literary text).* Kyiv. 2002. 267 s.

182. Kosmeda, T. Aksiolohichni aspekty prahmalinhvistyky: formuvannia i rozvytok katehorii otsinky *(Axiological aspects of pragmalinguistics: formation and development of the evaluation category).* L'viv. 2000. 350 s.

183. Kosmeda, T. Vasyl Symonenko – "intymnyi poet": idiostylovi zasoby modeliuvannia katehorii intymizatsii *(Vasyl Symonenko – "private poet": idiostyle modeling tools of category intimacy).* Horniatko-Shumylovych A., Kosmeda T. Fenomen kreatyvnosti Vasylia Symonenka: literaturoznavchyi ta linhvistychnyi aspekty. Za zah. red. prof. T. Kosmedy. Poznań. 2016. S. 137–224.

184. Kosmeda, T. A. Ego i Alter Ego Tarasa Shevchenka v komunikatyvnomu prostori shchodennykovoho dyskursu *(Ego and Alter ego of Taras Shevchenka in communicative space of diary discourse).* Drohobych. 2012. 372 s.

185. Kosmeda, T. A. Ego-teksty Stepana Rudanskoho: vidtvorennia komunikatyvnoi kompetentsii ta faktiv yoho "movnoi biohrafii" *(Ego-texts of Stepan Rudansky: reproduction of communicative competence and facts of his "language biography")*. Kosmeda, T. A., Osipova, T. F., Piddubna, N. V. Stepan Rudanskyi: fenomen modeliuvannia "zhyvoho" movlennia ukraintsiv. Kharkiv-Poznan. 2015. S. 189–205.

186. Kosmeda, T. Zbahachennia ukrainskoi linhvistychnoi terminolohichnoi leksykohrafii *(Enrichment of Ukrainian linguistic terminological lexicography)*. Rets. na slovnyk: Zahnitko, A. P. Slovnyk suchasnoi linhvistyky: poniattia i terminy. Linhvistychni studii. 2014. Vyp. 28. S. 194–198.

187. Kosmeda, T. A. Komunikatyvna kompetentsiia Ivana Franka: mizhkulturni, interpersonalni, rytorychni vymiry *(Communicative competence of Ivan Franko: cross-cultural, interpersonal, rhetorical dimensions)*. L'viv. 2006. 326 s.

188. Kosmeda, T. Lingvokalejdoskop: zhivye rechevye processy *(Linguistic kaleidoscope: live speech processes)*. Saarbryukken, 2017. 308 s.

189. Kosmeda, T. Linhvokreatyvnisť Lesi Ukrainky v yii ego-tekstakh (na materiali epistoliariiu poetesy (1870–1890) ta yii rozdumiv pro lysty v khudozhnikh tekstakh) *(Lesia Ukrainka's Linguistic Creativity in Her Ego-texts (based on the poetess's epistolary works (1870–1890) and her reflections on the letters in fiction texts)*. Roczniki Humanistyczne. Słowianoznawstwo, red. A. Woźniak. Tom LXII. Zeszyt 7. Lublin. 2018. S. 91–109.

190. Kosmeda, T. Movoznavcha nauka na sluzhbi u zhurnalistyky: Do pytannia pro vyvchennia katehorii intymizatsii (analiz naukovoi rozvidky A. V. Korolovoi) *(Linguistic science in the service of journalism: To the issue of studying the category of intimization (analysis of scientific research A. V. Koroleva))*. Uchenye zapiski Tavricheskogo nacional'nogo universiteta im. V. I. Vernadskogo. Ser. "Filologiya". Simferopol'. 2005 (2). T. 18 (57). № 3. S. 69–73.

191. Kosmeda, T. A. Potentsial suchasnoi leksykohrafii i prahmalinhvistyky v osmyslenni statusu kononatyvnykh hrafem *(The potential of modern lexicography and pragmalinguistics in understanding the status of cononative graphemes)*. Slovo i slovar'. Vocabulum et vocabularium: sb. nauch. tr. po leksikografii. Pod red. V. V. Dubichinskogo i T. Rojtera. Har'kov. 2011. Vyp. 12. S. 123–127.

192. Kosmeda, T. A., Osipova, T. F., Piddubna, N. V. Stepan Rudanskyi: Fenomen modeliuvannia "zhyvoho" movlennia ukraintsiv *(Stepan Rudansk: the Phenomenon of modeling "live" speech of Ukrainians)*. Kharkiv-Poznań-Drohobych. 2015. 312 s.

193. Kotsiubynska, M. Zafiksovane i netlinne. Rozdumy pro epistoliarnu tvorchist *(Fixed and imperishable. Thinking about epistolary works)*. Kyiv. 2001. 300 s.

194. Kotsiubynska, M. Lysty i liudy: Rozdumy pro epistoliarnu tvorchist *(Letters and people: Reflections on epistolary creativity)*. Kyiv. 2009. 584 s.

195. Kotsiubynska, M. Shevchenkovi lysty *(Shevchenko's letters)*. Slovo i Chas: nauk.-teoret. zhurn. 2008. № 7. S. 15–23.

196. Krasavskij, N. A. Koncept "ZORN" v poslovichno-pogovorochnom fonde nemeckogo yazyka *(The concept "ZORN" in the proverbial fund of the German)*. Teoreticheskaya i prikladnaya lingvistika. Vyp. 2. Yazyki social'naya sreda. Voronezh. 2000. S. 78–89.

197. Krasnobayeva-Chernaya, Zh. V. Aksiologicheskaya specifika obshcheotsenochnyx i konkretnootsenochnyx frazem *(Axiological specificity of generally evaluative*

and specifically evaluative phrasemes). Slavyanskie chteniya. Kishineu. 2016(a). № 7(13). S. 98–114.

198. Krasnobayeva-Chernaya, Zh. V. Aksiologicheskoe prostranstvo frazeologicheskix edinic s polozhitel'noy ocenkoy *(The axiological space of phraseological units with a positive valuation)*. Gumanitarnyj vektor. Seriya "Filologiya. Vostokovedenie". Chita. 2015. № 4 (44). S. 83–90

199. Krasnobayeva-Chernaya, Zh. V. Opyt osmysleniya cennostnoj kartiny mira vo frazeologii: strukturnaya organizaciya (na materiale russkogo, ukrainskogo, an- glijskogo i nemetskogo yazykov) *(Experience of Understanding the Axiological World's Image in Phraseology: a Structural Organization (Based on Russian, Ukrainian, English and German))*. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filolo- giya. Tomsk. 2018. № 54. S. 98–116.

200. Krasnobayeva-Chernaya, Zh. V. Semanticheskij diapazon "soblyudat' normu – ne soblyudat' normu" v otsenochnyx frazeologicheskix edinitsax *(The semantic range "to comply with the norm – not to comply with the norm" in the evaluation phraseological units)*. Веснік Гродзенскага дзяржаўнага ўніверсітэта імя Янкі Купалы. Серыя 3. Філалогія. Педагогіка. Псіхалогія. Гродна. 2016. № 1. S. 44–50.

201. Krasnobayeva-Chorna, Zh. V., Vtorynna semiotychna systema tsinnosti "hroshi" u frazemitsi (na materiali odno- ta riznosystemnykh mov) *(Secondary semiotic sys- tem of "money" values in phrasemic (on the material of single-structured and multi- structured languages))*. Odeskyi linhvistychnyi visnyk. Odesa. 2017. Vyp. 10. S. 83–87.

202. Krasnobayeva-Chorna, Zh. V. Linhvofrazemna aksiolohiia: paradyhmalno-kate- horiynyi vymir *(Linguaphrasemic Axiology: Paradigmal-Categorical Dimension)*. Vin- nytsya. 2016. 416 s.

203. Krasnobayeva-Chorna, Zh. V. Semantychnyi prostir otsinnoi frazemiky *(The seman- tic space of evaluative phrasemic)*. Movoznavstvo. Kyiv. 2015. № 5. S. 39–51.

204. Krasnyh, V. V. E'tnopsixolingvistika i lingvokul'turologiya: Kurs lekcij *(Eth- nopsiholinguistics and lingvoculturology: Course of lectures)*. Moskva. 2002. 284 s.

205. Kubryakova, E. S. O termine «diskurs» i stoyashhej za nim strukture znaniya *(About the term "discourse" and the structure of knowledge behind it)*. Yazyk. Lichnost'. Tekst: sb. statej k 70-letiyu T. M. Nikolaevoj, otv. red. V. N. Toporov. Moskva. 2005. S. 23–33.

206. Kuvarova, E. K. Tipologiya russkogo e'pistolyarnogo vokativa *(Typology of Rus- sian epistolary Vocative)*. Dnepropetrovsk, 2014. 380 s.

207. Kuzmenko, V. Dyfiramb chy epitafiia zhanrovi? Napysane lyshaietsia *(Difiramb or epitaph genre? Written remain)*. Slovo i chas: nauk.-teoret. zhurn. 1997. № 1. S. 72–77.

208. Kuzmenko, V. I. Pysmennytskyi epistoliarii v ukrainskomu literaturnomu protse- si 20–50-kh rokiv XX st. *(Writing epistolary in the Ukrainian literary process of 20–50 years XX century):* avtoref. dys. … d-ra filol. nauk. Kyiv. 1999. 36 s.

209. Kurylo, L. O. Epistoliarii Olesia Honchara i tvorcha indyvidualnist pysmennyka *(Epistolary Oles Gonchar and creative personality of the writer):* dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2006. 200 s.

210. Kurs suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy *(The course of the modern Ukrainian literary language. Syntax)*. U 2 tomakh. Za red. L. A. Bulakhovskoho. Kyiv. 1951. T. II. Syntaksys. 408 s.

211. Kur'yanovich, A. V. Kognitivnaya sushhnost' rechevogo zhanra samoprezenta-ciya v e'pistolyarnom diskurse M. I. Cvetaevoj *(Cognitive essence of the speech genre self-presentation in the epistolary discourse of M. I. Tsvetaeva)*. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2006. Vyp. 5 (56). S. 144–150.

212. Kur'yanovich, A. V. Kommunikativnye aspekty slova v e'pistolyarnom diskurse M. I. Cvetaevoj *(Communicative aspects of the word in the epistolary discourse of M. I. Tsvetaeva)*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Tomsk. 2001. 227 s.

213. Kur'yanovich A. V. Pragmatika graficheskogo obraza e'pistolyarnogo teksta (na primere pisem predstavitelej russkoj tvorcheskoj intelligencii pervoj poloviny XX veka) *(Pragmatics of the graphic image of the epistolary text (by the example of letters of representatives of the Russian creative intelligentsia of the first half XX century))*. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2012. Vyp. 1(116). S. 223–228.

214. Kur'yanovich, A. V. Teoreticheskie voprosy izucheniya e'pistolyariya v sovremennoj ligvistike *(Theoretical questions of studying epistolary in modern linguistics)*. Tomsk. 2013. 220 s.

215. Kur'yanovich, A. V. E'lektronnoe pis'mo kak funkcional'no-stilevaya raznovidnost' e'pistolyarnogo zhanra v prostranstve sovremennoj kommunikcii *(E-mail as a functional and stylistic variety of the epistolary genre in the space of modern communication)*. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2008. Vyp. 2 (76). S. 44–46.

216. Kur'yanovich, A. V. Yazykovaya lichnost' uchenogo – nositelya e'litarnoj rechevoj kul'tury (na materiale e'pistolyarnogo diskursa V. I. Vernadskogo) *(Language personality of the scientist – the carrier of elite speech culture (by the material of epistolary discourse V. I. Vernadsky))*. Sibirskij filologicheskij zhurnal. 2010. № 1. S. 188–197.

217. Larin, B. A. O raznovidnostyah hudozhestvennoy rechi *(About varieties of artistic speech)*. Russkaya slovesnost'. Moskva. 1997. S. 152–176.

218. Levchuk, A. Zasoby hrafichnoho oformlennia tekstu ta yikh vplyv na intymizatsiiu *(Means of graphic design of the text and their influence on intimization)*. Aktualni pytannia inozemnoi filolohii. Naukovyi zhurnal. № 2. 2015. S. 122–127.

219. Lenets, K. V. Epistoliarnyi styl v istorii novoi literaturnoi movy *(Epistolary style in the history of the new literary language)*. Lenets, K. V., Pylynskyi, M. M. Zhanry i styli v istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy. Kyiv. 1989. S. 160–198.

220. Letkina, N. V. E'pistolyarnyj tekst kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo izucheniya *(Epistolary text as an object of linguistic study)*. Lingvisticheskie i e'kstralingvisticheskie osnovy kommunikacii: Teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty. Mezhvuz. sb. nauch. tr. Saransk. 2008. Vyp. 6. S. 20–24.

221. Lihachev, D. S. Zametki o russkom *(Notes about Russian)*. Electronic resource: http://likhachev.lfond.spb.ru/Articles/zam.htm (12.06.2016).

222. Lihachev, D. S. Mysli o zhizni: vospominaniya *(Thoughts about life: memories)*. SPb. 2017. 480 s.

223. Lotman, Yu. M. Fenomen kul'tury *(Cultural phenomenon)*. Lotman, Yu. M. Izbrannye stat'i: v 3 t. Tallinn, 1992. T. 1: Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury. S. 402–479 s.

224. Luriya, A. R. Yazyk i soznanie *(Language and consciousness)*. Rostov-na-Donu, 1998. 416 s.

225. Lyapunova, V. E. Chastnoe pis'mo kak zhanr russkogo literaturnogo yazyka (na materiale pisem A. P. Chexova) *(Private writing as a genre of Russian literary language (by the material of A. P. Chekhov's letters)).* Issledovaniya yazyka xudozhestvennyx proizvedenij: Materialy XVII zonal'noj konferencii kafedr russkogo yazyka Srednego i Nizhnego Povolzh'ya, posvyashhennoj pamyati professora V. A. Malaxovskogo. Kujbyshev, 20–22 maya 1974 g.). Kujbyshev. 1975. S. 33–37.

226. Lyakhova, Zh. T. Serhii Yefremov – doslidnyk lystuvannia T. Shevchenka *(Sergey Efremov is a scholar of the correspondence of T. Shevchenko).* Zbirnyk materialiv Trydtsiat pershoi nauk. Shevchenk. konf. Kyiv. 1994. S. 82–85.

227. Mazokha, H. S. Zhanrovo-stylovi modyfikatsii ukrainskoho pysmennytskoho epistoliariiu druhoi polovyny XX stolittia *(Genre and style modifications of the Ukrainian writer's epistolary of the second half XX century):* avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2007. 38 s.

228. Maiboroda, N. H. Epistoliarii, D. I. Yavornytskoho yak vidobrazhennia yoho indyvidualno-movnoi kartyny svitu *(Epistolary of D. I. Yavornitsky as a reflection of his individual language picture of the world).* Naukovi pratsi: Filolohiia. Movoznavstvo. Vyp. 106. T. 119. Mykolaiv. 2010. S. 26–30.

229. Manokhina, T. V. Narodnytstvo, modernizm i postmodernizm u linhvistytsi *(Populism, modernism and postmodernism in linguistics).* Mykolaiv. 2015. 273 s.

230. Marinin, Yu. N. Rechekompleks "pozdravlenie" (na materiale teksta pozdravitel'noj otkrytki) *(Speech complex "congratulations" (on the material of the text of the greeting card)):* avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Volgograd. 1996. 22 s.

231. Marchuk, L. Epistoliarnyi styl yak chynnyk formuvannia movnoi osobystosti *(Epistolary style as a factor of language personality formation).* Naukovi pratsi Kamianets-Podilskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Ohiienka: Filolohichni nauky. Vyp. 34. Kamianets-Podilskyi. 2013. S. 183–188.

232. Marchuk, L. Movna osobystist Ivana Puliuia za materialamy epistoliariiu *(Ivan Puluj's linguistic personality based on epistolary materials).* Zb. nauk. pr. Ivan Ohiienko i suchasna nauka ta osvita. Seriia istorychna ta filolohichna. Vyp. XII. Kamianets-Podilskyi. 2015 (a). S. 204–208.

233. Marchuk, L. Movni zasoby perekladu Biblii Ivanom Puliuiem (za zbirkoiu lystiv) ta Ivanom Ohiienkom (za publikatsiiamy v zhurnali "Vira y kultura", Vinnipeh) *(Language means of Bible translation by Ivan Puliuy (behind the collection of letters) and Ivan Ogienko (on publications in the magazine "Faith and Culture", Winnipeg)).* Materialy VI vseukrainskoi mizhkonfesiinoi khrystyianskoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii, prysviachenoi 1025-richchiu khreshchennia Kyivskoi Rusi / zasn.: Dukhovna Rada predstavnykiv khrystyianskykh tserkov i relihiinykh orhanizatsii (m. Kamianets-Podilskyi). Kamianets-Podilskyi. 2015(b). S. 18–23.

234. Marchuk, L. Tsinnisni dominanty v epistoliarii Borysa Hrinchenka *(Value dominants in Boris Grinchenko's epistolary).* Leksykohrafichnyi biuleten. Vyp. 23. Kyiv. 2014. S. 24–30.

235. Maslou, A. Psixologiya bytiya *(The psychology of being).* Moskva; Kiev. 1997. 304 s.

236. Matviias, I. H. Dialektna osnova movy v tvorakh Ivana Franka (Dialect foundations of the language in the woks of Ivan Franko). Movoznavstvo. 2003. № 1. S. 11–16.

237. Matsko, L. I. Linhvostylistyka epistoliariiu Panasa Myrnoho *(Linguistic stylistics of the epistolary of Panas Mirny)*. Zb. nauk. prats Poltavskoho derzhavnoho pedaho-hichnoho instytutu imeni V. H. Korolenka. Seriia "Filolohichni nauky". Poltava, 1999. Vyp. 2 (6). S. 108–116.

238. Medvediev, F. P. Borotba Ivana Franka za yedynu ukrainsku literaturnu movu *(Ivan Franko's struggle for the single Ukrainian literary language)*. Uch. zap. Kharkiv. un-tu. T. 74. Trudy filolohichnoho fakultetu. T. 4: Zb. statei do 100-richchia z dnia narodzhennia I. Ya. Franka. 1956. S. 65–74.

239. Melerovich, A., Mokienko, V. Semanticheskaya struktura frazeologicheskix yedi-nic sovremennogo russkogo yazyka *(Semantic structure of phraseological units of modern Russian)*. Kostroma. 2008. 484 s.

240. Melnyk, Ya. "Poet zrady" Ivana Franka. Holosy polskoi presy: pro i contra *(Ivan Franko's «The Poet of Treason». The voices of Polish press)*. Paradyhmy. 2009. Vyp. 4. S. 237–242.

241. Melnychuk, O. S. Rozvytok struktury slovianskoho rechennia *(The development of the structure of Slavic sentence)*. Kyiv. 1966. 324 s.

242. Merlo-Ponti, M. Fenomenologiya vospriyatiya *(The phenomenology of perception)*. Sankt-Peterburg. 1999. 605 s.

243. Miller, T. A. Antichnye teorii e'pistolyarnogo stilya. Antichnaya e'pistolografiya: Ocherki *(Antique theories of epistolary style. Antique Epistolography: Essays)*. Moskva. 1967. S. 5–25.

244. Mitina, S. I. Filosofskij e'go-tekst: bytie v kul'ture *(Philosophical ego text: being in culture):* diss. … d-ra filos. nauk. Saransk. 2008. 290 s.

245. Miheev, M. Yu. Dnevnik kak e'go-tekst (Rossiya, XIX–XX) *(Diary as an ego text (Russia, XIX–XX))*. Moskva. 2007. 264 s.

246. Mistsiamy zhyttia i diialnosti Ivana Franka na Prykarpatti *(Along the places where Ivan Franko lived and worked in Prykarpattia)*. Electronic resource: http://lib.if.ua/franko/1310568978.html (18.09.2016).

247. Morozova, L. I. Pysmennytskyi epistoliarii u systemi literaturnykh zhanriv *(Writing epistolary in the system of literary genres):* avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2007. 24 s.

248. Mun'e, E. Manifest personalizma *(The manifesto of personalism)*. Per. s franc. I. S. Vdovinoj. Moskva. 1999. 560 s.

249. Mun'e, E. Nadezhda otchayavshixsya. Mal'ro. Kamyu. Sartr. Bernanos *(The hope of the desperate. Malraux. Camus. Sartre. Bernanos)*. Per. s franc. I. S. Vdovinoj. Moskva. 1995. 238 s.

250. Mun'e, E. Personalizm *(Personalism)*. Bergson, A., Mun'e, E., Merlo-Ponti, M. Fran-cuzskaya filosofiya i e'stetika XX veka. Predisl. P. Morel', komment. A. B. Gustyr', I. S. Vdovina. Moskva. 1995. S. 105–214.

251. Mun'e, E'. Chto takoe personalizm? *(What is personalism?)*. Per. s franc. I. S. Vdo-vinoj. Moskva. 1994. 128 s.

252. Mushynka, M. Vzaiemyny Ivana Franka z Volodymyrom Hnatiukom *(Ivan Fran-ko's relations with Volodymyr Hnatiuk)*. Ivan Franko: dukh, nauka, dumka, volia: Materialy Mizhnarod. nauk. konhresu, prysviach. 150-richchiu vid dnia na-rodzhennia I. Franka (m. L'viv, 27 veresnia−1 zhovtnia 2006 r.). L'viv. 2008. T. 1. S. 945−953.

253. Naer, V. L. K probleme zhanra v sisteme funkcional'no-stilisticheskoj differenciacii yazyka *(To the problem of the genre in the system of functional and stylistic differentiation of language)*. Stilisticheskie aspekty ustnoj i pis'mennoj kommunikacii. Moskva. 1987. S. 39–47.

254. Neirulin, A. O. Epistoliarii Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho v istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy (osoblyvosti konotatsii epistoliariiu pysmennyka) *(Epistolary of Mikhail Kotsyubinsky in the history of the Ukrainian literary language (features of the connotation of the writer's epistolary))*: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Luhansk. 2006. 19 s.

255. Neroznak, V. P. Lingvisticheskaya personologiya *(Linguistic personology)*. Funkcional'naya lingvistika: problemy i perspektivy: Mater. konferencii. Simferopol'. 1995. S. 12–14.

256. Neroznak, V. P. Lingvisticheskaya personologiya: k opredeleniyu statusa discipliny *(Linguistic personology: to the determination of the status of the discipline)*. Yazyk. Poe'tika: Sb. nauch. trud. Moskva. 1996. S. 112–116.

257. Nyzhnykova, L. V. Pismo kak tip teksta *(Letter as a type of text)*: avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Odessa. 1991(a). 18 s.

258. Nizhnikova, L. V. Pis'mo kak tip teksta (Letter as text type): diss. … kand filol. nauk. Odessa. 1991(b). 159 s.

259. Nikiporec, G. Yu. Frazeologicheskie edinicy russkogo yazyka v pragmaticheskom aspekte *(Phraseological units of the Russian language in the pragmatic aspect)*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Moskva. 2000. 213 s.

260. Nikitina, A. Yu. Verbal'no-semanticheskij uroven' yazykovoj lichnosti Ekateriny II, na mater. "Sobstvennoruchnyx zapisok imperatricy Ekateriny II" *(Verbal-semantic level of the language personality of Catherine II (based on "autographic notes of empress Catherine II"))*. Vestnik Chuvashskogo universiteta: sb. nauch. tr. 2013. Vyp. 4. S. 248–252.

261. Oliynyk, S. V. Otsinni frazeolohichni odynytsiv anhliyskii ta ukrayinskii movakh: linhvokohnityvnyi aspekt *(Evaluative phraseological units in the English and Ukrainian: linguocognitive aspect)*: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Donetsk. 2008. 22 s.

262. Olshovskyi, I. Lesia Ukrainka. Mistyka imeni y doli *(Lesya Ukrainka. Mystic name and fate)*. Lutsk. 2005. S. 30 50.

263. Onyshkevych, M. Yo. Polonizmy i dialektyzmy (boikizmy) ta yikh komentuvannia v tvorakh Ivana Franka *(Polonisms and dialectisms and their commenting in the works of Ivan Franko)*. Pytannia slovianskoho movoznavstva. L'viv. 1963, Kn. 9. S. 36–51.

264. Oshchypko, I. Yo. Pratsia Franka nad vdoskonalenniam movy svoikh tvoriv *(Franko's work in order to perfect the language of his works)*. Dop. ta povidoml. L'viv. un-tu. 1957. Vyp. 7. Ch. 1. S. 78–81.

265. Pavlyk, N. V. Spetsyfika epistoliarnoho zhanru yak mizhstylovoho yavyshcha *(Specificity of the epistolary genre as an inter-structure phenomenon)*. Linhvistyka. Luhansk. 2005(a). S. 241–248.

266. Pavlyk, N. V. Typolohiia dyskursyvnykh odynyts v ukrainskomu epistoliarnomu movlenni *(The typology of discursive units in Ukrainian epistolary speech)*: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Donetsk. 2005(b). 20 s.

267. Paliichuk, A. L. Hrafichni zasoby intymizatsii v anhlomovnomu khudozhnomu dyskursi *(Graphic means of intimization in English-language art discourse)*. Naukovyi visnyk Volyn. nats. un-tu im. Lesi Ukrainky. № 5 (Ch. 2). 2009. S. 102–105.

268. Paliichuk, A. L. Koefitsiient efektyvnosti intymizatsii u komunikatyvnykh blokakh tekstu *(The coefficient of effectiveness of intimization in communicative text blocks)*. Suchasni problemy ta perspektyvy doslidzhennia romanskykh ta hermanskykh mov i literatur. Materialy XI mizhvuz. konf. molodykh vchenykh (26–27 sich. 2011 r.). Donetsk. 2011(a). S. 132–134.

269. Paliichuk, A. L. Naratyvnyi kod intymizatsii (na materiali anhlomovnoho khudozhnoho dyskursu) *(Narrative code of intimization (based on the material of the English language art discourse))*: dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kharkiv. 2011(b). 253 s.

270. Panina, T. G., Homkova, L. R. Frazeologicheskaya nominatsiya kak sposob aktualizacii yazykovoj ocenki po priznaku "znachimyj / neznachimyj" (na materiale sovremennogo nemeckogo yazyka) *(Phraseological nomination as a method of actualization of language assessment on the basis of "significant / insignificant" (by the material of the modern German))*. Vestnik Tvgu. Seriya: Filologiya. Tver'. 2017. № 2. S. 132–138.

271. Panfilov, M. P. Kontsept mova u svitohliadi Panasa Myrnoho *(Concept language in the worldview of Panas Mirny)*. Nauk. visnyk Izmailskoho derzh. humanitarnoho universytetu. Izmail. 2005. Vyp. 19. S. 172–175.

272. Pan'ko, T. I. Mova i natsiia v estetychnii kontseptsii Ivana Franka *(Language and nation in esthetic concept of Ivan Franko)*. L'viv. 1992. 190 s.

273. Pestova, M. S. Sostavlyayushchie konnotacii disfemistichnyx frazeologicheskix edinic, postroyennyx na giperbole, v anglijskom i russkom yazykax *(Components of connotations of dysphemistic phraseological units constructed on hyperbole in English and Russian)*. Electronic resource: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42053111.pdf.

274. Peshkovskiy, A. M. Russkij sintaksis v nauchnom osveshhenii *(Russian language in scientific elucidation)*. Predisl. Yu. D. Apresyan. Moskva. 2001. 510 s.

275. Piskunova, S. I. Filosofskij e'go-tekst v intermedial'nom prostranstve kul'tury *(Philosophical ego-text in the intermedial space of culture)*. Kontekst i refleksiya: filosofiya o mire i cheloveke. 2018. T. 7. № 3. S. 18–25.

276. Piskunova, S. I. Lichnost' i e'poxa v zerkale filosofskogo e'go-teksta *(Personality and Epoch in the Mirror of the Philosophical Ego-Text)*. Saransk. 2012. 104 s.

277. Plesovskih, T. S. Lingvopersonologiya v kontekste antropologicheskogo poxoda *(Linguopersonology in the context of anthropologic approach)*. Science Time. 2014. № 4. S. 173–179.

278. Plotnikova, S. N. Yazyikovoe, diskursivnoe i kommunikativnoe prostranstvo *(Language, discursive and communicative scope)*. Vestnik Irkutskogo gos. lingvisticheskogo un-ta. 2008. № 1. S. 131−136.

279. Pozhydaieva, I. V. Linhvoprahmatychnyi aspekt manipuliatyvnoho dyskursu blohosfery (na materiali anhliiskoi, rosiiskoi, frantsuzkoi y ukrainskoi mov) *(Linguopragmatic aspect of manipulative discourse of blog sphere (based on the English, Russian, French and Ukrainian languages))*: dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2013. 374 s.

280. Poliuha, L. M. Slovo u poetychnomu teksti Ivana Franka *(Word in poetic text of Ivan Franko)*. Kyiv. 1977. 165 s.

281. Popkova, M. V. Frazeologiya memuarnyx tekstov Georgiya Ivanova (strukturno-semanticheskij i funkcionalnyiy aspekty) *(The phraseology of memoir texts of Georgii*

Ivanov (structural-semantic and functional aspects)): diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Omsk. 2008. 305 s.

282. Potebnja, A. A. Iz zapisok po russkoy grammatike (From the notes on Russian grammar). Moskva. 1958. T. 1–2. 536 s.

283. Prata, S. Yazyk programmirovaniya *(The language of programming)*. 5-e izd. Moskva; Sankt-Peterburg; Kiev. 2007. 1184 s.

284. Prykhodko, H. Etnokulturnyy skladnyk frazeolohichnykh odynyts *(Ethno-cultural component of phraseological units)*. Naukovyi visnyk Drohobytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Ser.: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). Drohobych. 2016. № 5 (2). S. 76–78.

285. Prokhorov, Ye. I. Izdanie e'pistolyarnogo naslediya *(Publishing of epistolary herita-ge)*. Principy izdaniya e'pistolyarnyx tekstov. Voprosy tekstologi. Moskva. 1964. Vyp. 3. S. 6–72.

286. Proxorov, Yu. E., Sternin, I. A. Russkie: kommunikativnoe povedenie *(Russian communicative behaviour)*. 2-e izd, ispr. i dop. Moskva. 2006. 238 s.

287. Radbil', T. B. Osnovy yazykovogo mentaliteta *(The foundations of language mentali-ty)*. Moskva. 328 s.

288. Radziievska, T. V. Tekst yak zasib komunikatsii *(Text as a means of communication)*. Kyiv. 1998. 194 s.

289. Romanchenko, I. S. Mykhailo Drahomanov i Lesia Ukrainka v yikh lystuvanni *(Mikhail Drahomanov and Lesya Ukrainka in their correspondence)*. Naukovi zapysky L'viv. ped. in-tu. 1948. T. II. S. 172–189.

290. Rudnev, V. P. E'nciklopedicheskij slovar kul'tury XX veka *(Encyclopedic dictionary of culture of the XX century)*. Moskva. 2001. S. 153–161.

291. Rudnytskyi, L. Ivan Franko y nimetskomovnyi svit – znachennia seredovyshcha dlia poeta *(Ivan Franko and German-speaking world – the importance of background for the poet)*. Ukrainska literatura: Materialy I konhresu Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv. Kyiv. S. 159–206.

292. Rus-Bryushinina, I. V. Osobennosti yazykovoy konceptualizatsii duxovnyx cen-nostej sociuma: lingvokul'turnyj i lingvostranovedcheskij aspekty: na materiale ispanskogo i russkogo yazykov *(Features of language conceptualization of spiritual va-lues of society: linguocultural and linguistic geography aspects: on the material of Spanish and Russian)*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Stavropol'. 2010. 196 s.

293. Savchenko, L. V. Fenomen etnokodiv dukhovnoi kultury u frazeolohii ukrayin-skoi movy: etymolohichnyi ta etnolinhvistychnyi aspekty *(The phenomenon of eth-nocods of spiritual culture in the phraseology of the Ukrainian: etymological and ethno-linguistic aspects)*. Simferopol'. 2013. 600 s.

294. Salimovskiy, V. A. Est' li u zhanrovedeniya granicy v predelax kommunikativnoj lingvistiki? *(Does the theory of genres have boundaries within communicative lingui-stics?)*. Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 2002. Vyp. 3. S. 52–62.

295. Sapozhnikova, N. V. Filosofsko-antropologicheskaya priroda e'pistolyarnogo diskursa *(Philosophic and anthropologic nature of epistolary discourse)*: avtoref. diss. … d-ra fil. nauk. Ekaterinburg. 2005. 42 s.

296. Sviatovets, V. F. Epistoliarna spadshchyna Lesi Ukrainky *(Epistolary heritage of Lesya Ukrainka)*. Kyiv. 1981. 183 s.

297. Sedov, K. F. Anatomiya zhanrov byitovogo obshheniya *(The anatomy of genres of everyday communication).* Voprosy stilistiki. Saratov. 1998. Vyp. 27. S. 9–20.

298. Sedov, K. F. O zhanrovoj prirode diskursivnogo yavleniya yazyikovoj lichnosti *(About genre nature of discursive phenomenon of language personality).* Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 1999. Vyp. 2. S. 13–26.

299. Sedov, K. F. Psixolingvisticheskie aspekty izucheniya rechevyx zhanrov *(Psycho-linguistic aspects of the study of speech genres).* Zhanry rechi: sb. nauchn. stat. Saratov. 2002. Vyp. 3. S. 40–52.

300. Selivanova, O. O. Narysy z ukrayinskoi frazeolohii (psykhokohnityvnyj ta etno-kulturnyj aspekty) *(Essays on Ukrainian phraseology (psycho-cognitive and ethno-cultural aspects)).* Kyiv-Cherkasy. 2004. 258 s.

301. Semashko, T. F. Frazeolohizmy yak znaky vtorynnoi movnoi nominatsii *(Phraseological units as signs of the secondary language nomination).* Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. V. N. Karazina. Ser.: Filolohiia. Kharkiv. 2011. Vyp. 61. S. 77–81.

302. Serbenska, O. Movnyi svit Ivana Franka *(Language world of Ivan Franko).* L'viv. 2006. 371 s.

303. Sergeeva, I. F. Pis'mo zhdet otveta: kniga razmyshlenij, sporov i dokazatel'stv *(The letter is waiting for an answer: a book of reflections, disputes and evidence).* Moskva. 1985. 180 s.

304. Sidorova, M. Yu. Grammatika xudozhestvennogo teksta (*Grammar of artistic text*). Moskva. 2000. 416 s.

305. Sirotinina, O. B. Nekotoryie razmyishleniya po povodu terminov «rechevoj zhanr» i «ritoricheskij zhanr» *(Some thoughts about terms "speech genre" and "rhetoric genre").* Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 1999. Vyp. 2. S. 26–30.

306. Slovnyk synonimiv ukrainskoi movy *(Dictionary of synonyms of the Ukrainian language).* U 2 tomakh. Kyiv. 1999.

307. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy *(Dictionary of the Ukrainian language):* v 11 tomakh. Zasn.: AN URSR. Instytut movoznavstva; za red. I. K. Bilodida. Kyiv. 1970–1980.

308. Sobol', L. I. Latynskyi alfavit yak naslidok mizhkulturnoi vzaiemodii *(Latin alphabet as a result of intercultural interaction).* Mova. Kultura. Vzaiemorozuminnia: zb. nauk. pr., za nauk. red. T. A. Kosmedy. Drohobych. 2012. Vyp. II. S. 73–81.

309. Sobol', L. I. Litery yak naslidok vzaiemodii linhvokultur riznykh narodiv: uzahal-nennia diakhronichnoho analizu *(Letters as a result of the interaction of linguistic cultures of different nations: synthesis of diachronic analysis).* Visnyk Zhytomyr. derzh. un-tu. Vyp. 65. Zhytomyr. 2012. S. 210–213.

310. Spohady pro Lesiu Ukrainku *(Memories of Lesja Ukrainka).* Kyiv. 1971.

311. Stavytska, L. Estetyka slova v ukrainskii poezii 10–30 rr. XX st. *(Word esthetics in Ukrainian poetry of the 10-30-ies of the XX century).* Kyiv. 2000. 156 s.

312. Statieieva, V. I. Ukrainski pysmennyky pro problemy literaturnoi movy ta movoznavstva kintsia XIX – pochatku XX st. (na materiali spadshchyny M. Kotsiubynskoho, Lesi Ukrainky, B. Hrinchenka ta in.) *(Ukrainian writers on the problems of literary language and linguistics of the late XIX-early XX century (based on the heritage of M. Kotsyubinsky, Lesya Ukrainka, B. Grinchenko, etc.)).* Uzhhorod. 1997. 441 s.

313. Stezhkamy Frankovoho tekstu (kohnityvni, linhvosemiotychni ta linhvostatys-tychni vymiry prozy) *(Along the paths of Franko's text (cognitive, linguosemiotic and linguostatistical prose dimensions)*. F. S. Batsevych (vidp. red.), S. N. Buk, L. M. Prot-syk, A. Yu. Sdarychevska, O. V. Yasinovska. L'viv. 2013. 504 s.

314. Sternin, I. A. Kommunikativnoe povedenie i problemy ego issledovaniya *(Com-municative behaviour and the problems of its studying)*. Russkoe i finskoe kommuni-kativnoe povedenie: Sb. nauch. trud. Voronezh. 2002. Vyp. 1. S. 4–21.

315. Sternin, I. A. Ponyatie kommunikativnoe povedenie i problemy ego issledovaniya *(The notion of communicative behaviour and the problems of its studying)*. Russkoe i finskoe kommunikativnoe povedenie: Sb. nauch. trud. Voronezh. 2000. Vyp. 1. S. 4–20.

316. Suleymanova, Ya. O. Aksiolohichna semantyka paremii z komponentamy na poznachennia pryrodnykh stykhii: voda, vohon', povitria i zemlia (na materiali anhliyskoi, nimetskoi, ukrayinskoi ta rosiiskoi mov) *(Axiological semantics of pare-mias with components for the designation of natural elements: water, fire, air and earth (by the material of English, German, Ukrainian and Russian languages))*: dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Odesa. 2018. 283 s.

317. Tarasenko, T.V. E'tiketnye rechevye zhanry: opyt opisaniya (na primere opisaniya zhanra pozdravleniya) *(Etiquette speech genres: the description experience (based on the example of congratulation genre description))*. Zhanry rechi. Saratov. 2002. Vyp. 3. S. 282–289.

318. Tatarinceva, E. N. Lingvopersonologicheskoe funkcionirovanie principov russkoj orfografii *(Linguopersonologic functioning of the principles of Russian orthography)*: avtoref. … kand. filol. nauk. Barnaul. 2007. 21 s.

319. Teliya, V. N. Russkaya frazeologiya: Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij I lingvo-kul'turologicheskij aspekty *(Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocul-tural aspects)*. Moskva. 1996. 287 s.

320. Terpak, M. A. Angliyskij lingvokul'turnyj koncept "sem'ya" i sposoby otrazhe-niya ego konnotativnogo soderzhaniya v yazyke: na materiale semanticheskogo polya "Rodstvennye otnosheniya" *(English linguocultural concept "family" and ways to reflect its connotative content in the language: on the material of the semantic field "Family relationship")*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Samara. 2006. 204 s.

321. Ticher, S., Mejer, M., Vodak, R., Vetter, E. Metodyi analiza teksta i diskursa *(The methods of text and discourse analysis)*. Kharkov. 2009. 245 s.

322. Tolstoy, N. I. Yazyk i narodnaya kul'tura. Ocherki po slavyanskoj mifologii i e'tnolingvistike *(Language and folk culture. Essays on Slavic mythology and ethnolin-guistics)*. Moskva. 1995. 509 s.

323. Tomchuk, L. V. Novi aspekty doslidzhennia epistoliariiu Lesi Ukrainky *(New aspects of the study of the epistolary Lesia Ukrainka)*. Filolohichni studii. Lutsk. 2005. № 3–4. S. 118–123.

324. Trubeckoj, N. S. K probleme russkogo samopoznaniya *(To the problem of Russian self-cognition)*. Parizh. 1927. 101 s.

325. Ukrainska mova. Entsyklopediia *(Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia)*. Kyiv. 2000. 752 s.

326. Ukrainska mova: Entsyklopediia *(Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia)*. 2-he vyd., vypr. i dop. Kyiv. 2004. 824 s.

327. Fedosyuk, M. Yu. Nereshennye voprosyi rechevyx zhanrov *(Unsolved problems of speech genres)*. Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 1997. № 5. S. 49–57.

328. Fesenko, O. P. Kompleksnoe issledovanie frazeologii druzheskogo e'pistolyarnogo diskursa pervoy treti XIX veka *(Complex study of phraseology of friendly epistolary discourse of the first third of the XIX century):* diss. … d-ra filol. nauk, Tomsk, 2009, 451 s.

329. Fillmor, Ch. Osnovnye problemy leksicheskoj semantiki *(The main problems of lexical semantics)*. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Moskva. 1987. Vyp. 12. S. 74–122.

330. Formanovskaya, N. I. E'tiket delovogo pis'ma *(Business letter etiquette)*. Moskva. 1988. 168 s.

331. Franko, Z. T. Zasoby khudozhnoi ekspresii u movi tvoriv Ivana Franka *(The means of artistic expression in the language of works of Ivan Franko)*. Ukr. mova i literatura v shkoli. 1979. № 12. S. 17–25.

332. Franko, Z. T. Mova tvoriv Ivana Franka *(The language of works of Ivan Franko)*. Kurs istorii ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy. Kyiv. 1958. T. 1. S. 476–519.

333. Franko, Z. T. Movni zasoby istoryzmu u prozi Ivana Franka *(Language means of historism in the prose of Ivan Franko)*. Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo. 1983. Vyp. 40. S. 46–59.

334. Fromm, E'. Iskusstvo lyubvi *(Art of love)*. Minsk. 1990. 80 s.

335. Futuryst, N. P. Linhvokulturni osoblyvosti intymizatsii v anhliiskykh ta ukrainskykh folklornykh tekstakh (na materiali kazok pro tvaryn) *(Linguistic and cultural peculiarities of intimization in English and Ukrainian folklore texts (based on animal stories)):* avtoref. dys … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2011. 19 s.

336. Khabarova O., G. Rol' FE v natsional'no-kul'turnoj kartine mira *(The role of phraseological units in the national cultural picture of the world)*. Aktual'nye problemy prepodavaniya gumanitarnyx distsiplin v shkole i vuze. Michurinsk. 2003. S. 18.

337. Tsvetkova, L. S. Afaziya i vosstanovitel'noe obuchenie *(Aphasia and reconstructive education)*. Moskva. 1988. 207 s.

338. Tsilkom nevidome: Ivano-Frankivska oblasna universalna naukova biblioteka *(Completely unknown: Ivano-Frankivsk regional universal scientific library)*. Electronic resource: http://lib.if.ua/franko/1312287818.html (17.09.2016).

339. Tsikhotskyi, I. Mova prozy Ivana Franka (stylistychni novatsii) *(The language of prose of Ivan Franko (stylistic novations))*. L'viv. 2006. 290 p.

340. Chernenko, H. A. Aksiolohichni propozytsiini struktury vukrayinsko- ta rosiyskomovnomu mas-mediinomu dyskursi Ukrainy *(Axiological propositional structures in Ukrainian and Russian mass-media discourse of Ukraine)*: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv. 2018. 36 s.

341. Chybor, I. S. Reprezentatsiya mifolohichnoho etnokodu kultury v ukrayinskii frazeolohii *(Representation of mythological ethnocode of culture in Ukrainian phraseology):* avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk. Chernivtsi. 2016. 20 s.

342. Chigridova, N. Yu. Rechevoe povedenie kommunikanta v zhanre delovyx e'pistolyariy (na materiale nemeckogo yazyka) *(Speech behaviour of communicant in business epistolary genre (based on the material of the German language)):* diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Rostov-na-Donu. 1999. 224 s.

343. Chobot, I. V. Otsinka yak funktsionalno-semantychna katehoriia *(Evaluation as a functional semantic category)*. Nova filolohiia. Zaporizhzhia. 2002. № 3. S. 130–137.

344. Shamshin, L. B. Biografiya. Kul'turologiya XX veka: e'nciklopediya *(Biography. Cultural studies of the 20th century: encyclopedia):* v 2-x tomax. SPb. 1998. S. 72–74.

345. Shaxmatov, A. A. Sintaksis russkogo yazika *(Syntax of the Russian language)*. 2-e izd. Leningrad. 1941. 620 s.

346. Shahovskiy, V. I. Kategorizatsiya e'motsij v leksiko-semanticheskoj sisteme yazyka *(Categorization of emotions in the lexical-semantic system of language)*. Voronezh. 1987. 192 s.

347. Shackaya, E. Bol'shaya kniga stervy. Polnoe posobie po stervologii (The big book of bitches. Full benefit stervologiya). Moskva. 2007, 560 s.

348. Shevelov, Yu. Do pytannia pro henezu y pryrodu nazyvnykh rechen *(About origin and nature of nominative sentences)*. Kharkiv. 2012(a). 135 s.

349. Shevelov, Yu. Istorychna fonolohiia ukrainskoi movy *(Historical phonology of the Ukrainian language)*. Perekl. z anhl. S. Vakulenka ta A. Danylenka. Kharkiv. 2002. 1066 s.

350. Shevelov, Yu. Narys suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy ta inshi linhvistychni studii (1947–1953 rr.) *(An outline of modern Ukrainian literary language and other linguistic studies (1947–1953))*. Kyiv. 2012(b). 664 s.

351. Shevelov, Yu. Chomu obshcherusskyi yazyk, a ne vibchoruska mova? Z problem skhidnoslovianskoi hlotohonii. Dvi statti pro postannia ukrainskoi movy *(Why the common Russian language and not vibchoruska mova?)*. Kyiv. 1994. 33 s.

352. Sheler, M. Polozhenie cheloveka v kosmose *(Person's location in space)*. Izbr. proizv., per. s nem. A. V. Denezhkina, A. N. Malinkina, A. F. Fillipova, pod red. A. V. Denezhkina. Moskva. 1994. 413 s.

353. Shifrin, B. Intimizaciya v kul'ture *(Intimization in culture)*. Daugava (Riga). 1989. № 8. S. 88–94.

354. Shmeleva, T. V. Model' rechevogo zhanra *(The model of speech genre)*. Antologiya rechevyh zhanrov. Moskva. 1997. S. 81−90.

355. Shmeleva, T. V. Rechevedenie. Teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty *(Speech linguistics. Theoretical and applied aspects)*. Novgorod. 1996. 223 s.

356. Shtern, V. L. Differencial'naya psixologiya i ee metodicheskie osnovy *(Differential psychology and its methodological foundations)*. Per. s nem. i poslesl. A. V. Brushlinskogo i dr. Moskva. 1998. 335 s.

357. Jung, K. G. Psixologicheskie tipy *(Psychological types)*. Per. s nem. pod obshh. red. V. V. Zelinskogo. Minsk. 1998. 656 s.

358. Yakobi, F. G. O transcedental'nom idealizme *(About transcendental idealism)*. Per. s nem. Fridrixa Genri Yakoba. Novye idei v filosofii. Sankt-Peterburg. 1912. № 12: „K istorii teorii poznaniya". S. 1−14.

359. Yakubets, M. Iz sposterezhen nad movoiu ta stylem tvoriv Ivana Franka, pysanykh polskoiu movoiu *(About observations on language and style of Ivan Franko's works written in Polish)*. Ivan Franko i svitova kultura: Materialy Mizhnar. sympoziumu YuNESKO (L'viv, 11–15 veresnia 1986 r.). Kyiv. 1990. Kn. 1. S. 129–134.

360. Yaremko, Ya. I. Kontseptualni poniattia suchasnoi politolohii: linhvokohnityvnyi aspekt (Conceptual notions of modern politology: linguocognitive aspect): dys. … d-ra filol. nauk. Drohobych. 2015. 617 s.

361. Yaskevich, O. K. Osobennosti ispol'zovaniya leksicheskih sredstv intimizacii v sovremennom anglijskom yazyke *(Features of the use of lexical means of intimization in modern English)*: avtoref. diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Kyiv, 1990. 15 s.

362. Yaxina, A. M. Ocenochnost' kak komponent znacheniya frazeologicheskix edinic v russkom, anglijskom i tatarskom yazykax (na materiale glagol'nyx frazeologicheskix edinic, oboznachayushchix povedenie cheloveka) *(Evaluation as a component of the meaning of phraseological units in the Russian, English and Tatar (on the material of verbal phraseological units denoting human behavior))*: diss. … kand. filol. nauk. Kazan'. 2008. 226 s.

List of sources [References]

1. *Cambridge Idioms Dictionary*. Cambridge. 2006. 505 p.

2. *Deutsche Idiomatik: Wцrterbuch der deutschen Redewendungen im Kontext*. Hans Schemann. Berlin / Boston. 2011. 1040 s.

3. *Moderne Deutsche Idiomatik*. Wolf Friederich. Mьnchen. 1976. 265 s.

4. *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*. Ed. by J. Siefring. Oxford. 2004. 340 p.

5. Bybyk, S. P., Yermolenko, S. Ya., Pustovit, L. O. Slovnyk epitetiv ukrainskoi movy *(The dictionary of epithets of the Ukrainian language)*. Za red. L. O. Pustovit. Kyiv. 1998. 431 s.

6. Bol'shoj anglo-russkij frazeologicheskij slovar' *(Large English-Russian phraseological dictionary)*. Sostav. A. V. Kunin. Moskva. 1998. 944 s.

7. Vusyk, O.S. Slovnyk ukrainskykh synonimiv *(The dictionary of Ukrainian synonyms)*. Za red. A. M. Popovskoho. Dnipropetrovsk. 2003. 424 s.

8. Entsyklopediia zhyttia i tvorchosti Lesi Ukrainky. Lysty Lesi Ukrainky *(Encyclopedia of life and work of Lesya Ukrainka. Letters of Lesya Ukrainka)*. Electronic resource: http://www.l-ukrainka.name/uk/Corresp.html (data zvernennia: 10.04.2016).

9. Karavanskiy, S. Praktychnyi slovnyk synonimiv ukrainskoi movy *(Practical dictionary of the synonyms of the Ukrainian language)*. Kyiv. 1993. 469 s.

10. Kotsiubynska, M. Moi obrii *(My horizons)*. U 2 tomakh. Kyiv. 2004. T. 1, 336 s. T. 2. 384 s.

11. Lesya Ukrayinka. Holosni struny *(Vowel strings)*. Lesya Ukrayinka. Z lyuds'koyi namovy: Proza. Kyiv 2015. S. 58–159.

12. Lesya Ukrayinka. Pryyazn' *(Friendship)*. Lesya Ukrayinka. Z lyuds'koyi namovy: Proza. Kyiv 2015. S. 274.

13. Lysty do Olesya Honchara *(Letters to Oles Gonchar)*: u 2 kn. Upor., avtor peredm., prym. i kom. Mykola Stepanenko. Kyiv 2016. Kn. 1. 736 s.; Kn. 2. 736 s.

14. Lysty do T. H. Shevchenka: 1840–1861 *(Letters to T. Shevchenko: 1840–1861)*. AN URSR; In-t l-ry im. T. H. Shevchenka. Red. Ye. P. Kyrylyuk, L. F. Kozats'ka. Kyiv. 1962. 331 s.

15. Lysty Yuriia Shevelova do Oleksy Izarskoho *(The letters Yurii Shevelov to Oleksa Izarsky)*. Avtor i uporiadnyk M. Stepanenko, Poltava. 2014. 388 s.

16. Nemetsko-russkij frazeologicheskij slovar' *(German-Russian phraseological dictionary)*. Sost. L. E. Binovich. Moskva. 1995. 768 s.

17. Posmishka chornoho kota: hobi, zabobony, anekdoty *(The smile of black cat: hobbies, superstition, anecdotes)*. Uporiadn. M. Slaboshpytskyi. Kyiv. 2011. 548 s.
18. Slovnyk poetychnoi movy Vasylia Stusa. Ridkovzhyvani slova ta indyvidualno-avtorski novotvory *(Dictionary of poetic language of Vasyl Stus. Rarely occurring and individual and author's neologisms)*. Uklad. L. V. Olifirenko. Kyiv. 2003. 90 s.
19. Slovnyk frazeolohizmiv ukrayinskoi movy *(Dictionary of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language)*. Uklad. V. M. Bilonozhenko, I. S. Hnatiuk, V. V. Diatchuk. Kyiv. 2003. 1104 s.
20. Stus, V. Nai budem shchyri *(Let us be sincere)*. Stus, V. Tvory. U 4 tomakh. T. 4: povisti ta opovidannia, nezakincheni tvory, stsenarii, literaturna krytyka, zaiavy, publitsystychni lysty ta zvernennia, z taborovoho zoshyta. L'viv. 1994. S. 173–189.
21. Stus, V. Tvory *(Selections)*. U 4 tomakh, 6 knyhakh. L'viv. 1994–1997.
22. Frazeologicheskij slovar' russkogo yazyka *(Phraseological dictionary of the Russian language)*. Red. A. I. Molotkov. Moskva. 1987. 543 s.
23. Franko, I. Ya. Dvoiazychnist i dvolychnist *(Bilinguality and bipersonality)*. Franko I. Ya. Mozaika. Iz tvoriv, shcho ne vviishly do Zibrannia tvoriv u 50 tomakh. Uporiad. Z. T. Franko, M. H. Vasylenko. L'viv. 2001. S. 263–278.
24. Franko, I. Ya. Zibrannia tvoriv *(Selections)*. U 50 tomakh. Kyiv. 1976–1986.
25. Franko, I. "Rozvyvaisia ty, vysokyi dube…" *(«Grow, a high oak…»)*. Franko, I. Ya. Mozaika. Iz tvoriv, shcho ne vviishly do Zibr. tv. u 50 tomakh. Uporiad. Z. T. Franko, M. R. Vasylenko. L'viv. 2001. 22 s.
26. Khamitov, N. Filosofskyi slovnyk. Liudyna i svit *(Philosophic dictionary. A person and a world)*. Kyiv. 2007. 264 s.
27. Shevelov, Yu. Ya – mene – meni… (I dovkruhy). Spohady. *(I – of me – to me… (And all around). Reminiscences)*. Ch. 1. "V Ukraini". Kharkiv; Niu-York. 2001. 409 s.
28. Shestov, L. I. Sochineniya *(Selections)*. V 2 tomax. Moskva. 1993. T. 1: „Vlast' klyuchej". 668 s.; T. 2: „Na vesax Iova (Stranstvovaniya po dusham)". 560 s.
29. Shchurat, V. Ivan Franko v 1895–1897 rokakh *(Ivan Franko in 1895–1897)*. Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv. L'viv. 1956. S. 267–281.

ESSAYS ON LINGUOPERSONOLOGY
AND LINGUOAXIOLOGY

S u m m a r y

The introduction reveals the importance of linguopersonology and linguoaxiology for modern linguistics, formulates the purpose and tasks of the monograph, and its fundamental principles, structuring, approaches and research perspectives.

The first section, **Categories, Levels and Units of Linguopersonology**, the research terminology and conceptual apparatus, in particular *the categories of person, linguopersons, mono- and polylinguopersons, personalism*, are established. *A linguistic person* is regarded as a collection of all language abilities and realizations. It has two basic conceptual dimensions – monopersonological and polypersonological. The first represents a separate linguistic personality in its manifestations – temporal, spatial, evolutionary, cultural-aesthetic, social, and others. In its formation, the linguistic person goes through two stages of *linguistic and individualist manifestations*: *external-personological intrapersonological*. In linguopersonology, what are functionally relevant are *the principle of systemicity* and *the principle of contrastability*. Linguopersonological studies cover the consideration of the regularities of implementation in the verbal and nonverbal communicative practice. It is emphasized that in the framework of linguopersonology, it is necessary to distinguish the *general linguopersonology*, *linguocultural and linguocognitive personology, social linguopersonology, linguopersonology of self-realization and self-affirmation*, each of which has a common theoretical and conceptual apparatus and its own categories, units and levels.

The second section, **The Theory of Linguopersoneme: the Typology of Linguoindividuations and Linguoindividualizations,** contains a typology of linguopersons. A description of these is also presented – samples of convincing discursive illustrations with the application of texts of the iconic Ukrainian linguistic characters of Ivan Franko, Yuriy Shevelov and Vasyl Stus are offered, which makes it possible to draw conclusions concerning the universal characteristics of linguopersonem, and with regard to its characteristics of

national origin. The author suggests a psycho-linguistic model of the linguuoperson in a categorical-level dimension.

In the third, **Ego-Text Linguistics: Theoretical Outline Aspectual Approaches to the Private Letter Analysis**, the work of modern linguists in the field of the theory of Ego-text are summarized, definitions of the concepts of *linguistics of ego-text* are provided, the characteristic features of ego-text (syncretism of documentary and artistic, updating the system of ways of factualizing and modeling reality, the transformation of the author's image, mobility of discourse, structural heterogeneity, genre heterogeneity, etc.) are distinguished and the system of genres of such a text is described. Particular attention is paid to the main genres of ego-text – diaries, memoirs, autobiography and letters, in which the category of ego has a particular appearance with the peculiarities of implementation in the communication process. The concept of the linguistic personality is based on considering the totality of a person's speech abilities. The latter predetermines the possibility of creating texts about oneself that has a bearing on the verbalization of a subjective author's point of view. In psychology, ego is regarded as a complex entity with a wide variety of emotions peculiar to personality, as well as its mental expression, thoughts and reflections, which interact constantly and are peculiarly intertwined with the corresponding features of verbalization. The discursive features of the epistolary, made on the basis of the analysis of Lesya Ukrainka's private letters, are discussed in detail, as are the writer's reflections.

The fourth section, **Qualifying Bases of Axiophraseme Pragmatics**, is devoted to the main issues of a new trend in linguistics, which aims to create a coherent and objective model of how evaluation in the phraseology of single- and multi-system languages functions.

This section presents a linguistic profile of the assessment in the axiological paradigm with an outline of the estimated component of phrasemic meaning; phrasem-classification by the nature of evaluation, description of the qualification attributes of value and value picture of the world in phrasemics; the algorithm for the reconstruction of the value picture of the world in phrasemics (research illustrative package, the nomenclature of the universal human values, the levels of the value picture of the world, the phraseological axiological values of the opposition, the ideographic parametrization of values, the level organization of values (on the example of the value of "love"), cultural encoding of values (using the example of value "money"), cultural coding of the value picture of the world).

The conclusions generalize and outline holistically the significance of the theory presented here for the development of modern linguopersonology and linguoaxiology, which testify to the achievements of modern linguists in the actualized scientific domain; at the same time, the features of discursive practice and / or discursive practices in terms of the above-mentioned theory

with abilities in the nominative-existential scientific linguistic paradigm are described.

Key words: linguopersonology, linguoaxiology, linguopersonem, linguistic personality, axiophrasemics, ego-text, episteme, genres of ego-text, pragmatics.