Concept *Human Age* as Archetypal and Stereotypical Mental Structure in the Consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English Native Speakers

Žmogaus amžiaus sąvoka kaip archetipinė ir stereotipinė mentalinė
struktūra gimtakalbių ukrainiečių, rusų ir anglų sąmonėje

YULIIA ORLOVA, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine

NATALIYA LEMISH, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine

SVITLANA MATVIEIEVA, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

OLGA ALEKSIEIEVA, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

IRYNA VAINORENIE, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine

NATALIIA SAFONOVA, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine

Abstract

The paper offers a new complex methodology for analyzing the linguocultural concept *HUMAN AGE* as a multidimensional archetypal and stereotypical mental structure of human consciousness. To recognize the systemic essence of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers' world mapping and their cultural stereotypes, the concept *HUMAN AGE* is studied by considering its realization through lexical, phraseological, and paremiological units. The study assumes the analysis of such concept structure components as an etymological/historical layer that reflects the essential notional features of the concept, an additional layer, formed as a result of the concept in growth, and an active layer that is regarded relevant for the modern native speakers and represented by axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative stereotypes that help forward mentalizing the concept in the Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers' consciousness. The archetypal basis of the concept is identified by considering the etymology of the concept names and nominations of age stages and persons by age in the three languages. The stages of stereotyping the axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative images of the human age that reveal the

similarities (universal features) and differences (nationally specific features) in the mapping of archetypal and stereotypical images of the human age in the consciousness of Ukrainians, Russians, and the English are analyzed as well. Ultimately, the most complete set of archetypal and symbolic features (universal and nationally specific), sociocultural age stereotypes (neutral, positive, and negative), numerological, coloristic, phytomorphic, and zoomorphic metaphorical nominations of age stages and persons by age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English linguocultures is presented.

KEYWORDS: archetype, concept *HUMAN AGE*, consciousness, metaphor, seme, stereotype.

Introduction

The article aims to present the results concerning the reconstruction of mechanisms of archetypal and stereotypical mapping of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers. This aim is achieved through finding answers to such research questions as follows: What is an archetype in terms of Carl Jung's archetypal theory? How are an archetype and a stereotype defined within the context of modern linguoculturological and linguoconceptological studies? What is the archetypal basis for the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the three languages under analysis? What are the stages of stereotyping the representation of human age in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers, in particular stereotypes of the notional, figurative, and evaluative components of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the languages compared? What are the common and distinctive features reflecting the archetypal and stereotypical nature of the concept *HUMAN AGE* concept in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers?

Theoretical Background

The linguocultural concept (hereinafter – LC) as a unit reflecting the phenomena of human existence in a person's consciousness is still being much debated among scholars. Various approaches to determining the structure of LC (Kolesov, 2004; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993; Wierzbicka, 2001; Vorkachev, 2001 among others) have not been agreed yet on determining the structure of LC. In this regard, linguoconceptual studies have generally got into "the state of crisis" (Karasik, 2006; Selivanova, 2012). A perspective view on this crisis offers considering the structure of LC as a diachronic (Alefirenko, 2004; Eliade, 2005; Krasavskii & Moskovin, 2003; Krymskii, 1998; Levi-Bruhl, 1994; Osborn, 2009; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993) and synchronic mental formation (Baranov, 1989; Bartmiński, 2007; Krysin et al., 2016; Rakhilina, 2002). In recent years, archetypal and stereotypical nature of LC has been examined in a number of linguistic studies (Ageieva, 2014; Tishchenko, 2000). These studies suggest that the origin of concepts is defined as related to the content of some important ethnic notions which have accumulated the ethnoses' socially and culturally significant experiences (Kassirer, 2002; Stepanov & Proskurin, 1993), and in this respect the LC *HUMAN AGE* is regarded to be the proper one (Aries, 1962; Smelzer, 1994; Stelmakhovich, 1997). Currently, special consideration is given to understand various aspects of human representations concerning the age and age periods, such as *childhood*, *adolescence*, *youth*, *elderly age*, and *old age* through analysis of their verbalization in particular languages and in the course of comparative and contrastive studies (Kaliuzhnaia, 2007; Liubina, 2006).

An overview on the current studies proves that the LC under analysis has a complex layered structure which should be studied by reconstructing both deeply diachronic archetypal and modern stereotypical representations of ethnic groups about the human age.

Fundamentals of Carl Jung's archetypal theory

For now, the term *archetype* has firmly entered the paradigm of modern scientific knowledge (Donchenko, 2011; Krymskii, 1998, etc.). Within the framework of available approaches (anthropological (Benedict, 1934), psychological (Jung, 1996, 2001; Kant, 2020), literary (Propp, 1963), culturological (Krymskii, 1998; Meletinskii, 1991), and linguistic (Belekhova, 2015), archetype is defined as: 1) collective unconscious (psychological archetype as featured by Jung, 1988); 2) the basic element of culture that forms the norms of spiritual life (cultural archetype); 3) archetypal image that is the essence of some ideas and motives universal for the humankind (Toporov, 1999). In reviewing some current linguistic studies, it was found that the subject of any archetype research nowadays is to recognize the way that archetypes are individualized and thus given names (lingualized) (Slukhai, 2004).

It is commonly assumed that the term *archetype* was introduced into scientific use by Jung for naming *collective unconscious* that was distinguished by the psychoanalyst as one of the components in the structure of personality. We found that the fundamentals of Jung's archetypal theory can be formulated in twelve distinct but interrelated ways. Archetypes (or mental prototypes) are thus defined as follows: 1) universal initial inborn mental structures that comprise the insight of collective unconscious; 2) typical ideas and images experienced by a person as a result of inherent collective unconscious; 3) an invariably collective phenomenon that is common for entire nations and epochs; 4) a certain class of psychological quintessences coming up to the consciousness and manifesting in behaviour under a typical situation as an unconscious reaction to any object or occasion; 5) visualized in dreams as images and ideas, and in culture as symbols and repeating motives; 6) may have an infinite number in the collective unconscious; 7) there are archetypes common for the humankind that is proved by the analysis of myths (Jung, 1996); 8) functioning of archetypes of collective unconscious triggers running a person's cognitive sphere; 9) a means for interaction between conscious and unconscious; 10) correlating to instincts; 11) varying within the culture and fixed in the consciousness (Jung, 1988); 12) opposing to the "archetypal image" as the form of representation of archetype in the consciousness, as far as archetypes are not the elements of consciousness but conceptualized in the process of an individual's adaptation to the reality (Jung, 1996).

Theory of archetype within the framework of linguocultural and linguocognitive studies

In fact, within the wide scientific discourse, archetypes are referred to as universal ways for arranging individual human experiences. It is caused by the specificity of archetype to be given in to subjectification, i.e. reinterpretation through the national prism that is directly relevant to lingual adaptation. It was revealed that archetypes are common for a group of nations being a priori, although they share some traits of a certain national mentality formed under religious, psychological, geographical, and ethnic criteria. The stability of archetypal images is induced by metaphorical thinking (Meletinskii, 1991; Osborn, 2009). Archetypes are reflected in the consciousness as genetic inheritance (along with the structure of the brain) (Jung, 2009) and represented by concepts and symbols (Medvedeva, 2014). Besides, archetypes have the ability to produce such forms of culture as myth, religion, art, and literature (Jung, 1991, 1996, 2009; Monaghan, 2004). Within these spheres, archetype loses Jung's consideration and comes into use to name the universals of global culture. Among them, the myth becomes as the fundamental one, in particular the myth of world tree, river, wheel/cyclic myth (Bryniak, 2015; Kolesnikova, 2010; Lozko, 2004). In such a way, archetype is considered both a lingual and mental phenomenon (Bolshakova, 2010; Kalita, 2012; Selivanova, 2012). It is important to mention that one of the fundamental characteristics of archetype is its dichotomous structure, when essential archetypal binary oppositions come around, namely: Strong / Weak; Good (Right) / Bad (Wrong); Top / Bottom; Right / Left; Light / Darkness. These pairs are actualized by means of such particular oppositions as physical, spacial (three-dimensional), biological, psychological, and social ones (Ivanova, 2017; Kaftandzhiev, 2016; Krymskii, 1998).

Methods

To recognize the stages of archetypal and stereotypical reflecting the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers, a complex methodology was applied and carried out in four stages.

The first stage implied determining the etymology of the concept names *вік, возраст, age* and etymology of the lexemes nominating age stages and persons by age in the three languages. In addition, the method of semantic microfield (Tolstoi, 1997) was used to determine the etymology of the lexemes synonymous with the concept names.

The second stage provided building the nominative field of the concept (Popova & Sternin, 2007; Semashko, 2014) by applying the structural method, in particular the method of componential (definitional) analysis for lexemes representing the concept *HUMAN AGE*. In such a way, the stereotypical and conceptual features of the axio-notional component of the concept formed as the result of historical transformations of some archetypal images were described. The method of semantic reconstruction was applied for observing the changes in the semantic structure of the concept in diachronical aspect (Usyk, 2017).

The third stage implied the cognitive and onomasiological reconstruction of some motivating conceptual features of the concept. The method of cognitive reconstruction was used to identify the metaphorical patterns of

axio-figurative stereotyping of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers (Gibbs, 1999; Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Ortony, 1993; Teliia, 1986). Onomasiological reconstruction was also applied to identify the linguocultural codes of phraseostereotyping the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the three languages alongside with specific thematic groups of human age metaphorical nominations. The cultural and semiotic method served to analyze the linguistic means of human age metaphorical nominations as the symbols of culture and etiquette (Krasavskii & Moskovin, 2003).

The fourth stage ensured defining the sources of neutral, positive, and negative archetypal and stereotypical (axio-evaluative) ideas of the concept *HUMAN AGE* specific for Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers.

The comparative and contrastive study was applied at all the stages. For this purpose, tertium comparationis is supposed to be the etymological, semantic, and conceptual features of lexemes representing the concept *HUMAN AGE*.

Results and Discussion

Archetype as a cultural background for the process of stereotyping

Archetypes can be qualified as a manifestation of ancestral memory and formal patterns of behavior which may serve as the basis for concrete meaningful images called stereotypes of conscious human activity. To reproduce and store the ethnic traditions, the archetypal background for mentalization is transformed into stereotypes – schematized sustainable structures of collective consciousness of the representatives of different groups, in particular ethnic (Selivanova, 2012).

The term *stereotype* (from Greek *stereos* – solid, *typos* – print) was introduced into scientific use by American sociologist Lippman (1950). As Lippman (1950) stated, an individual has a clear idea about most of things before directly coming across them in reality. Such stereotyped images are formed as affected by cultural environment that an individual lives in (Lippman, 1950), as stereotypes are originated from religious images, ethnos's experiences, and authentic traditions.

The results of reviewing prior studies found that stereotypes are understood as images determined by culture, or behavior patterns resulting from adaptation to habitual and new situations appearing in the human life (Batsevych, 2004; Lippman, 1950; Semashko, 2014). As reported by Svitsova (2005), stereotypes are fixed in consciousness in the form of a mental invariant image and specifically verbalized in a particular linguoculture (Brown, 1990; Bartmiński, 2007; Eysenck, 1994; Krysin et al., 2016; Shutova, 2016). If stereotyping is a cognitive activity, stereotype is a cognitive generalization making the process of thinking easier. It comprises both negative and positive evaluation and correlates with national conceptual mapping of the world being a co-active constituent of the language worldview. In particular, in cognitive linguistics *mental stereotypes* (term proposed by Andreieva, 2001) are considered as memorized words and concepts. Doing research on the lingual objectification of stereotypes makes it possible to get into the depth of ethnos's way of life and its national values (Rozvod, 2015). The carriers of such linguocultural codes are considered to be staticodynamic (Stepanov, 2004) informative cognitive structures of collective and individual consciousness (Selivanova, 2012) called concepts (Asher, 1994; Croft, 2004; Malmkjaer, 2004; Sternin, 2001). As we suppose, the concept *HUMAN AGE* is one of the most exponential to represent its archetypal and stereotypical architectonics.

Archetypal basis for the concept HUMAN AGE
(based on Ukrainian, Russian, and English etymological dictionaries)

Studying the mechanisms for conceptualizing knowledge about the world around assumes taking into account extralinguistic knowledge (Kuprieva & Diatchenko, 2010). It is proposed to consider the means of objectivization of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the scientific world mapping in terms of logical and philosophical, historical and genetic, bio-/socio-/cultural interpretations reflecting extralinguistic reality in the consciousness of the native speakers (Apresian, 1995; Karpenko, 1994).

Philosophical legitimization of the concept under study verified the assumption that the basis for mentalization of ideas concerning human age is such archetypes as TIME, SPACE, MOVE, and archetypal situations (seasonal and calendar/religious ritualism) (Orlova, 2019). It was revealed that the prototypical pattern of the analyzed concept is experience of cyclic and linear time resulting from the following reasons: 1) the observation of such

ontological parameters of being as the rhythm of some celestial phenomena and natural cycles anthropomorphized over time; 2) the Christinization and, as a result, a new perception of time as an eschatological process (Arutiunova & Yanovskaia, 1997). The matter is that archaic consciousness, as opposed to the modern one, is characterized as a syncretic type of thinking. The extremely delicate emotionally affective sensibility of an archaic human being provoked the development of metaphorical thinking, and, consequently, consciousness got anthropomorphized. It is clearly shown by getting aware of a four-act nature's rhythm (childhood – morning – spring, youth – morning – spring, maturity – daylight – summer (autumn), old age – evening – autumn (winter) (Brogan & Simons, 2000), which was first associated with age stages by Pythagor comparing them to permanent natural phenomena – forces of nature that mentally supplied a human being with the feeling of cyclic motion and actualized the archetype of quaternity (Jung, 1988). Such a type of temporal and spatial cyclic motion is reflected in the semantics of i.-e. roots **1** *uert* "move, turn around" and **2** *per* "move forward", **3** *tere* – with the meaning "turn around", **4** *kwel* "move in a circle", **5** *(s)pen* "stretch, turn around": compare **6** Rus. *верста*, Old Rus. *въерста* "age", **7** Rus. *сверстник* "of the same age", **8** Ukr. *покоління*, **9** Rus. *поколение* "of the same cycle; generation" (Stepanov, 2004, p. 121), **10** Eng. *turn of life*, *life cycle / span*"; **11** Lat. *orbis* that develops into the following semantic chain "circle" > "the globe" > "world" > "full-year cycle" > "year", **12** Gr. αἰών "century, epoch, eternity, the lifetime, generation", and **13** Old Icelandic. *veröld* "the world of people; people" (Eng. *world*) that is the contamination of *öld* "time, century" and *verr* "a human" (OED). Cultural, historical, and biosociocultural nature of the phenomenon of human age is coherent with the idea of age symbolism appearing as a consequence of ethnoses' reflection in the process of cultural genesis that gradually formed ethnically varied normative age criteria (age periodization*)*, ascriptive age-related features and stereotypes (behaviour patterns / norms of age), symbols of age-related processes (confirmation), age-related rituals (the rituals of initiation for men and women) (Cahill, 1982; Cunningham, 1995; Dacey & Travers, 2003), subcultures (modes, teddy-boys, hipsters, styliahy (Eng. *dandy*), yuppies, emo kids) / counterculture (Cockerham, 2005; Roszak, 1969) (beat-generation, hippy (huppie), skin heads).

It was proved that sociocultural information and norms of law are represented in such formal and informal age norms as the age of starting school / school leaving, working age, age of getting identification documents (passport / driving license), voting in elections, age of puberty / consent, age limit / qualification for getting married / holding public office, buying alcoholic drinks and cigarettes, and stereotypes of **1** Ukr. *стара діва*, **2** Rus. *старая дева*, **3** Eng. *spinster;* **4** Ukr. *neroba*, **5** Eng. *idler*; stereotypes of the elderly and children under 3 years old as sexless, the elderly as "victims" of the society, stereotypes concerning age norms of human gender behavior (Eng. *dirty old man*) (Schaefer & Lamm, 1995).

It is proposed to start the approbation of a new developed complex methodology for revealing the stages of archetypal and stereotypical reflection of the concept *HUMAN AGE* by specifying the origin of concept names (Dzhenkova et al., 2003) and key nominations of age stages and persons by age given in Ukrainian, Russian, and English etymological dictionaries (Fasmer & Trubachiov, 2004; Kolesov, 2004; Liberman & Mitchell, 2007; Makovskii, 2000; Melnychuk, 1982; Chernyh, 1999; OED; Preobrazhenskii, 1958; Semenov, 2003; Shanskii & Bobrova, 1994; Tsyganenko, 1989). It implied determining the origin of such key age nominations as (Kaliuzhnaia, 2007): 1) concept names Ukr. вік, Rus. возраст, Eng. *age* (see Table 1); 2) their synonyms naming the human existence in a course of time (see Table 2) (Orlova, 2019); 3) lexemes that name the age stages and persons by age (Liubina, 2006). The formal (Stepanov, 2004) and semantic overlaps of mentioned above key nominations in other Indo-European languages were taken into consideration, too (Tolstoi, 1997).

The findings show that the following Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes denoting age stages and individuals by age are genetically related: **1** Ukr. *юний*, Rus. *юный*, Eng. *juvenile* (derived from i.-e. *iuun*), **2** Ukr., Rus. *муж(-чина)*, **3** Eng. *man* (derived from Germ. *mann* "human, man; a brave person, hero; ability to think; servant, vassal, adult male controlled by another person"); in Ukrainian and Russian: **4** Ukr. *дитина, дівчина*, Rus. *дитя, девочка, девушка* (derived from i.-e. *dhei* "breast-feeding", "suck in", *dher* "bear", "give birth"), **5** Ukr. *маля*, Rus. *мальчик* (derived from *mel > mol* "small"), **6** Ukr. *парубок*, Rus. *парень* (the origin is not exactly determined, it might be borrowed from Slav. *parę* "boy, mate, fellow")*,* **7** Ukr. *хлопець*, Rus. *хлопец* (the origin is not exactly determined, it might be borrowed from old Rus. холопъ "slave"), **8** Ukr., Rus. *отрок* (Proto-Slav. *ot(ъ) ß rokъ*, *ot(ъ)ß* "не" ("not") / + *rokъ* "говорити, казати" ("speak, say") > "that one who has no right to speak"),

9 Ukr. *молодість*, Rus. *молодость* (from i.-e. *mol-* "squeeze, rub up, make soft, gentle"), **10** Ukr. *жінка*, Rus. *женщина* (from i.-e. *gen* "give birth"), **11** Ukr. *зрілість*, Rus. *зрелость* (from Common Slav. *zьreti* "get mature, ripe); **12** Ukr. *старість*, Rus. *старость* (has no reliable etymology): 1) i.-e. *st(h)a* "stand firmly"; 2) Old H.-Germ. *stiur* "ox" (Preobrazhenskii); 3) i.-e. *ser- > *ker* "burn"; 4) Iran. *tar* "dark"; different – in Ukrainian: *немовля* (from Proto-Slav. *не мълвити* "make no sound"); **13** Rus. *ребенок* (from i.-є. *orb* "weak, helpless"), **14** Rus. *ветхий* (from Lat. *vetutus* "unreliable", Old Eng. *witan* "go" (M. Makovskiy, related to Irish *sin* "weather", Eng. *weather* > i.-e. * (k) uethor* "four" (from i.-e. *uet, *uer-(men)* "time, weather"); **15** Eng. *child* (from Germ. *kiltham* "womb"), **16** Eng. *baby* (as a result of infant gurgling / babbling), **17** Eng. *boy* (from Old Eng. *boian* "talk, chat"), **18** Eng. *infant* (from Lat. *infantem* "one who cannot talk", **19** Eng. *girl* (from Old Eng. *gierela* "women's wear"), **20** Eng. *young* (from i.-e. root *yeu* "vital force, energy, good spirit"), **21** Eng. *maturity* (from Lat. *mātūritas* "ripeness", *mātūrus* "grow ripe"), **22** Eng. *old* (from i.-e. *al* "grow up, gain in strength"), **23** Eng. *adult* (-hood) (from Lat. *adolescentum* "full of strength").

Table 1 The etymology of HUMAN AGE concept names *вік*, *возраст*, *age*

The concept name	Initial meaning of the motivators of HUMAN AGE concept
Ukr. *вік / vik*	i.-e. *uei* "strength", "action", *ueik- / uoik* "be strong", *ueik-t- або *uik-t-* "vital force", Old Slav. *věkъ* "strength; life; health"; health > Old Slav. *sъdorvъ, sъ* > Old Ind.- *su* "good" + *dorvo* "made from good tree" (Melnychuk, 1982)
Rus. *возраст / vozrast*	Old Slav. псл. *orstъ > *ord-to*, likely *взростъ / vzrost*, compared with Lat. *arbor* "tree", Irish. *ard* "tall, big", Albanian *rit* "I grow up" compared to Ukr. *рід / rid*, рос. *род / rod* (Eng. *family*) (Fasmer & Trubachiov, 2004)
Eng. *age*	i.-e. *aiw* "vital force", "life", "eternity", related to Lat. *evum* "the time of life", "eternity", "age"; *aevum* "age" > *aiw + evum*; *aetas-aevitas* "period, generation" > *aiw + evum* + Lat. *vita* "life" (OED)

Table 2 The etymology of synonyms of HUMAN AGE concept names *вік*, *возраст*, *age*

Synonyms of the concept names *вік*, *возраст*, *age*	The etymological origin of initial meaning of the motivators of HUMAN AGE
Ukr. *життя* Rus. *жизнь (life)*	Old Rus. *животъ* "life, property, animal" (Rus. *животное*)
Ukr. *чоловік* Rus. *человек (a human)*	Versions of the origin: Proto-Slav. 1) *čьlo* (has the same root with *čelьadь*) + *věkъ* ("чадо" ("child") > descendant / successor of the family; 2) *čьlo*, "higher" + *věkъ* ("strength") > "superior strength"; 3) *čьlo + věkъ* ("life") > "over life" (Tsyganenko, 1989); "an adult man" (Chernyh, 1999); "child, descendant of the family / clan" (Semenov, 2003); "one facing the eternity / talking to eternity", "human as a whole" (Body, Spirit, Soul) (Shanskii & Bobrova, 1994)
Ukr. *людина* *(a human / person)*	Old Slav. *людинъ* "a free person"
Eng. *human*	Lat. *humanus*, *homo* "a human being"
Eng. *life*	Proto-Germ. *leiban* "life, human, body"
Ukr. *час (time)*	Proto-Slav. *časъ* "cuts"
Rus. *время*	i.-e. *uert* "move, turn, spin", borrowed from Church Slav. for *веремя* "weather"

Synonyms of the concept names *вік*, *возраст*, *age*	The etymological origin of initial meaning of the motivators of HUMAN AGE
Eng. *time*	i.-e. root **da* "divide, break into pieces"
Ukr. *рік (a year)*	*Old Rus.* рокъ "age, fate"
Rus. *год (a year)*	*Old Rus.* годъ "time", "time limit"
Ukr. *літа (years)* Rus. *лета*	*Old Slav.* **lĕto* "year, season, good (time), the period of rains"
Eng. *year*	i.-e. **yer-* "season, spring" or > verb root **ei* "do, perform", apparently, "one doing a full cycle"
Ukr., Rus. *пора (period)*, *дата (date)*, Eng. *date*	Gr. πορεῖν "give; define" i.-e. **do* "give"
Ukr. *період* Rus. *период* Eng. *period*	Lat. *periods* "spinning, wheeling", Gr. *periodos* "cycle" > *peri* "around" + *hodos* "journey; way, road"
Ukr. *етап*, Rus. *етап* Eng. *stage*	i.-e. **sta-* "stand, get; be strong, reliable" Midl.-L.-Germ. *stapel* "shelter" > Fr. *étape* "going over", "stop"

Stereotypization of actual/current knowledge in the structure of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Stereotypes of the notional component of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Axio-notional images of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers about human age were studied on the basis of explanatory dictionaries (Busel, 2005; Dal, 1998; Hornby & Cowie, 1989; Krysin et al., 2016; Lopatin & Lopatina, 2013; Bilodid, 1970–1980; Shushkov, 2003) by the structural method, in particular the method of componental (definitional) analysis for lexemes representing the concept *HUMAN AGE*. It was proved that axio-notional images of human age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English are based on 19 integral semes: 1) quantity, 2) year, 3) duration, 4) life, 5) period, 6) stage, 7) growth, 8) development, 9) intelligence, 10) ripeness, 11) spirituality, 12) law, 13) responsibility, 14) cyclic nature, 15) dynamism, 16) localization, 17) sequence, 18) generation, 19) old age. On the basis of semes above, 8 common types of stereotypical conceptual features were formed: 1 – quantitative and temporal: **1** Ukr. *третяк* (Eng. *a three-year-old child*), **2** Rus. *годовалый* (Eng. *one-year-old child*), **3** Eng. *thirty-something*; 2 – spatial: **1** Ukr. *вік знижений / підвищений* (Eng. *under age limit / above age limit*), **2** Rus. *середовик* (Eng. *middle-aged*), **3** Eng. *median age*; 3 – continuous / gradual changes: **1** Ukr. *активний вік* (Eng. *active age*), **2** Rus. *возраст становлення* (Eng. *reasonable age*), **3** Eng. *rising twenty*; 4 – thinglike: **1** Ukr. *на літах / порі* (Engl. *grown up*), **2** Rus. *в / на возрасте* (Eng. *coming into age*), **3** Eng. *be in teens, the under-5s*; 5 – psycho- / anatomic- / physiological: **1** Ukr. *вік життєздатності* (Eng. *age of vitality)*, **2** Rus. *ментальный возраст* (Eng. *mental age*), **3** Eng. *fertile age*; 6 – socio-legal: **1** Ukr. *правоздатність* (Eng. *legal age*), **2** Rus. *гражданское совершеннолетие* (Eng. *lawful age*), **3** Eng. *legal (drinking) age*; 7 – socio-cultural: e.g. **1** Eng. *addresses* like **2** Ukr. *пан*(-і), панночка, **3** Rus. *молодой человек*, **4** Eng. *master, sir, madam, miss, missy*; 8 – gender: **1** Ukr. *відмолодикувати* (Eng. *become mature / adult for a male) /* **2** *віддівувати* (Eng. *become mature / adult for a female)*, **3** Rus. *юноши (парни) / девушки*, **4** Eng. *boy- / girl- / man- / womanhood*; and 1 different psycho-physiological type of stability/instability in English (*poise* "calm confidence in a person's way of behaving and balance in the way a person holds or moves their body") (Hornby & Cowie, 1989).

16 types of conceptual cohesion of HUMAN AGE with other fields within the conceptosphere *HUMAN* were established. Among them, the common ones for the three languages are as follows: appearance, body build,

gender, traits of character, way of life, mental abilities, behavior, marital status, sexual relations, stage of studies, occupation, kinship; and such different ones for Ukrainian as bad luck, murder, wedding, life/death, and for English as social status.

Stereotypes of the figurative (metaphorical) component of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

The cognitive reconstruction method was employed at this stage of the research to discover metaphorical patterns of axio-figurative stereotypes of the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the minds of representatives of Ukrainian, Russian, and English cultures.

Onomasiological reconstruction was applied to identify the linguocultural codes of phraseostereotyping the concept *HUMAN AGE* in the three languages alongside with specific thematic groups of metaphorical nominations of human age in Ukrainian, Russian, and English. The results of the study show that axio-figurative images of human age in the three languages comprise 8 basic metaphorical types (Baranov, 1989; Kravtsova, 2014): HUMAN AGE ➡ PLANT (**1** Ukr. *спіла ягода*, **2** Rus. *старый гриб / пень*, **3** Eng. *the fruit of womb*); HUMAN AGE ➡ ANIMAL (**1** Ukr. *старий вовк*, **2** Rus. *орел*, **3** Eng. *polar beaver*); INANIMATE OBJECT (**1** Ukr. *бабин смик*, **2** Rus. *jocular шпингалет*, **3** Eng. *the pinafores*); RELIGIOUS BELIEFS (**1** Ukr. *Аред*, **2** Rus. *Христова невеста*, **3** Eng. *answer to a maiden's prayer*); INANIMATE NATURE (**1** Ukr. *снігом вибілені коси*, **2** Rus. *бабье лето*, **3** Eng. *the twilight of life*); MOTION / PROCESS (**1** Ukr. *непосидько, ходульчик*, **2** Rus. *резвун* "a playful child", *за парнями побежать*, **3** Eng. *advancing / declining years*); OCCUPATION (**1** Ukr. *козак*, **2** Rus. *доказать гусара*, **3** Eng. *good sport*), LIVING BEING (MYTH / RITUAL / BIBLE / LITERATURE CHARACTER) (a person by age) ➡ LIFELESS THING (age period) / (**1** Ukr., Rus. *божич, сенектута*, **2** Eng. *harpy, dame*).

The associative constituent of this component was reconstructed by analyzing idioms, proverbs and sayings. The findings revealed 4 universal theme types of stereotypical metaphors serving as the basis for phraseological units and paroemias: natural (5 groups), biological (4 groups), social (6 groups), cultural and historical (10 groups). Quantitative calculations of thematic groups of metaphorical nominations in the three languages were also performed and revealed 22 groups in Ukrainian, 23 in Russian, and 25 in English (See Tables 3, 4, 5, 6) (Orlova, 2019).

Table 3 Associative complexes of natural sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Natural sphere	Ukrainian	Russian	English
Inanimate nature (season, part of the day)	+	+	+
Fauna	+	+	+
Flora / colour	+	+	+
Natural phenomena	+	+	+
Landscapes	+	+	+

The number of groups coincides in the three languages and equals 5.

Table 4 Associative complexes of biological sphere phrasemes nominating HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Biological sphere	Ukrainian	Russian	English
State of health / appearance	+	+	+
Body parts	+	+	+
Traits of character / habits	+	+	+
Food / drinks	+	+	+

The number of groups coincides in the three languages and equals 4.

Table 5 Associative complexes of social sphere phrasemes nominating
HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Social sphere	Ukrainian	Russian	English
Family	+	+	+
Education	+	+	+
Occupation	+	+	+
Legal culture	–	–	+
Financial activity	–	+	+
Ethical and moral values	+	+	+

The number of groups equals 4 in Ukrainian, 6 in Russian, and 7 in English.

Table 6 Associative complexes of cultural and historical sphere phrasemes nominating
HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

Cultural and historical sphere	Ukrainian	Russian	English
Historical events	+	–	+
Religion	+	+	+
Clothes / footwear	+	+	+
Weapon / trade tools	+	+	+
Utensils	+	+	+
Architecture	+	+	+
Literary / religious character	+	+	+
Proper names	+	+	+
Traditions / entertainments / music (musical instruments)	+	+	+
Territory administration units	–	+	+

Tables 3–6 demonstrate that the number of categories pertaining to the cultural and historical realm is the most numerous, totaling nine in both Ukrainian and Russian and ten in English. Comparing the results, it can also be seen that Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes and phraseological units nominating HUMAN AGE are characterized by spatial metaphor for reflecting the time arrangement. Spatial archetypes UP / DOWN; LEFT / RIGHT are anthropomorphic and determined by biological reasons, i.e. the body organization in the upper part of which the main organs – the head and the heart – are placed. To prove that, it is particularly interesting to turn to Russian words **1** *человек* (Eng. *human*) and **2** *лицо* (Eng. *face*) which are synonymous. Moreover, the up-right position of body is the factor that determines dimensional metaphors (in terms of HIGH / LOW opposition). Such oppositions as UP / DOWN, LEFT / RIGHT, and HIGH / LOW are recognized as correlating with oppositions GOOD / BAD, YOUNG / OLD, and LIFE / DEATH. It must be noted that local, horizontal, and vertical semantic and conceptual features of expressing HUMAN AGE through spatial metaphor are natural to the three languages.

Current results suggest that common semantic and conceptual features include: 1) UP movement as the symbol of growing, moving into adulthood; 2) ALONG / DOWN movement as the symbol of old age and an inevitable

death (**1** Ukr. *Молодість пне до зорі, старість гне до землі, їхати з ярмарку*, **2** Rus. *молодому – все дороги, старому – одна тропа, впадать в детство*, **3** Eng. *upcoming generation*, *be bent with years, along in years*). It was found that semantic and conceptual feature of ALONG movement as the symbol of a lack of prospects for a young male later in professional life in English differs from Ukrainian and Russian: **1** Eng. *a dead-end kid*.

It was also revealed that lexemes of metaphorical use are either common or nationally specific culture codes. Thus, floristic symbolism includes such universal symbols as *tree, flower, fruit, berry*. Tables 7 and 8 list the obtained results as for colouristic and animalistic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative lexemes nominating the *HUMAN AGE* concept.

Table 7 Colouristic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative
lexemes nominating the HUMAN AGE concept

Colour	Universal symbol	Nationally specific symbol
WHITE	OLD AGE	IMMATURITY (in the Slavic culture)
RED	VITALITY	BEAUTY (in the Slavic culture)
GOLD	the universal solar symbol PERFECTION YOUNG AGE OLD AGE	——————
YELLOW	——————	INEXPERIENCE because of young age (in the Slavic culture) DECAY DEATH (in the English culture)
SILVER	——————	RENEWAL OLD AGE (in the Slavic culture)
PINK	of childhood as a period in the life of a female	——————
GREEN	of nature, fertility, life, young age	——————

Table 8 Animalistic symbolism of Ukrainian, Russian, and English figurative
lexemes nominating the HUMAN AGE concept

Universal symbol		Nationally specific symbol
BIRDS	*CROW* *SPARROW* *DOVE* *HEN* *COCK*	*EAGLE* *FALCON* (both in the Slavic culture)

Universal symbol		Nationally specific symbol
ANIMALS	*HORSE* *DOG* *WOLF* *OX* *COW* *CALF* *RAT* *BEAR* *SHEEP*	*TIGER* *WHALE* (both in the English culture) *PIG* (in the Russian culture)

Stereotypes of the axiological component of the concept HUMAN AGE in Ukrainian, Russian, and English

This stage implied defining the sources of neutral, positive, and negative archetypal and stereotypical (axio-eval-uative) ideas of the concept *HUMAN AGE* specific for Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers.

Axio-evaluative ideas of HUMAN AGE in the three languages represent 6 regular common axiological dominant values: education and upbringing; memory of generations; good mental abilities / traits of character; obedience of children; health; parenthood; 5 specific ones for the Slavic culture: respect for elders (**1** Ukr. *слухай старих людей, то й чужого розуму наберешся, й свого не загубиш*, **2** Rus. *почитай старших – сам будешь стар*); healthy and active way of life (throughout life) (**1** Ukr. *старий, старий, але ярий*, **2** Rus. *не жаль молодца ни бита, ни ранена, жаль молодца похмельного*); following moral and religious norms throughout life (**1** Ukr. *бережи плаття знову, а честь змолоду*, **2** Rus. *в чём молод похвалишься, в том стар покаешься*); having a family, owing a private house for a newly-married couple; love (**1** Ukr. *молодим потрібен власний дім*, **2** Rus. *мужик без бабы пуще малых деток сирота*; and 1 ethnospecific that is typical for the speakers of Russian: humility for young women (**1** Rus. *девичье смиренье дороже ожерелья*). It was found that stereotypical op-positions have both similarities and differences in the three cultures: "small children (little annoyances) – adult children (big annoyances)", "children – happiness / unhappiness (burden)", "the youngsters – honest / dishon-est", "the elderly – loving / evil", "the aged are good-tempered / bad-tempered", "youth (strength) – old age (wis-dom)"; "the aged are experienced and good advisors / inexperienced, stupid"; "the aged are physically strong / weak"; "old age (experience) – youth (inexperience)" (Aerts et al., 1998).

Studying the etymology of Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes naming the concept *HUMAN AGE* and their synonyms reveals that the primary conscious images representations about the human existence over time are based on 9 common semes: strength, life, a human being / a living being, 'body', descendant / generation, turnover / circle, way / road / stop, season, define; and 21 different ones: 4 semes in Ukrainian: health (*вік*), fortune (*рік*), freedom (*людина*), cut (*час*); 2 in Russian: growth (*возраст*), time (*год, день*); 12 both in Ukrainian and Russian: property (*життя, жизнь*), animal (*життя, жизнь*), tree (*вік, возраст*), eternity (*чоловік, человек*), spirit / soul (*чоловік, человек*), the whole / a part of the whole (*чоловік, человек*), top (*чоловік, человек*), front part (*чоловік, человек*), summer (*літа, лета*), good (*літа, лета*), water (*літа, лета*), shelter (*етап, этап*); 1 both in Russian and English: time limit (*год, age*); 2 in English: spring (*year*), divide, crush (*time*).

The most essential obtained results of the current study may be presented as follows: 1) first proven genetically related Indo-European origin of the Ukrainian and English concept names *вік* (derived from **uei, *ueik- / uoik, *ueik-t- / *uik-t-* as shown in Table 1) and *age* (derived from Proto-Germanic **aiw* as shown in Table 1), and genet-ically unrelated Proto-Slavic origin from **orstъ > *ord-to-* of the concept name *возраст* in Russian; 2) common origin of key nominations of age periods in Ukrainian, Russian, and English **1** *юний, юный, juvenile, young*, **2** Ukr., Rus. *мужчина*, **3** Eng. *man*; in Ukrainian and Russian: **4** Ukr. *дитина, дівчина*, **5** Rus. *дитя, девочка, девушка*, **6** Ukr. *маля*, **7** Rus. *мальчик*, **8** Ukr. *парубок*, **9** Rus. *парень*, **10** Ukr. *хлопець*, **11** Rus. *хлопец*, **12** Ukr., Rus. *отрок, молодість, молодость*, **13** Ukr. *жінка*, **14** Rus. *женщина, зрілість, зрелость; старість, старость*, and different in

15 Ukr. *немовля*; **16** Rus. *ребенок*; **17** Eng. *baby*, *infant, child*, *boy, girl*, *young*, *adult, maturity, old*. It was proved that the archetypal (primary) semantic structure of key nominations of age periods in Ukrainian, Russian, and English are formed on nineteen common semes: vital force / health; a human / body; spirit / soul; freedom / slavery; fate; the whole / part of the whole; shelter; clan / descendant; mother / woman; man; hero; weak / helpless; small; worker/ servant /slave; space/ motion (in particular, wheeling / moving along); growth / top (up); season / the state of nature; water; eternity; speech; gender.

Further transformation of the primary archetypal meaning of the concept names *вік, возраст, age* in Ukrainian, Russian, and English was established as stereotyped in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers into such 19 integral semes as: 1) quantity, 2) year, 3) duration, 4) life, 5) period, 6) stage, 7) growth, 8) development, 9) intelligence, 10) ripeness, 11) spirituality, 12) law, 13) responsibility, 14) cyclic nature, 15) dynamism, 16) localization, 17) sequence, 18) generation, 19) old age.

It is possible to conclude that there are 8 common types of stereotypical conceptual features of human age that we classified in the following manner: *quantitative* and *temporal* (chronological, chronographic and chronometric patterns of human age), *spatial* and *orientational* (patterns of location, capacity, regularity of age periods), *continuous / gradual* (patterns of age periods as moving up / down / along), *psycho- / anatomic* and *physiological* (patterns of wisdom / unwisdom, experience / inexperience, maturity / immaturity, *thinglike* (patterns of human age as a subject of feeling / sense), *social* and *legal* (patterns of legal/illegal age), *social* and *cultural* (represented by forms of address towards males and females of young / middle / elderly years, *gender* (represented by means of binary oppositions nominating age stages through the lifespan of male and female). This consistency may come due to the single conceptual frame of the representatives of different ethnoses.

Conclusions

Consequently, twelve essential conceptual features of the concept *HUMAN AGE* key nominations as forming its archetypal basis in the consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian, and English native speakers were established. They come as follows: *human, body, strength, life, natural time, natural space, moving around, moving along, making no move, physical action of a man, physical condition of a person, the social status of a man*. The process of stereotyping the human age specific nature implies that universal axiological focuses remain constant as being the result of archetypal images getting transformed. Stereotypical conceptual features of axio-notional, axio-figurative, and axio-evaluative constituents of the concept *HUMAN AGE* are based on the sample parameters that may be summarized as follows: HUMAN AGE is revealed as a temporal / spatial / psycho-/ anatomic-/ physiological / social / legal focus; the object of feeling (aesthetic and ethical stereotypical conceptual features of human age) / sense (stereotypical conceptual features of visual, kinaesthetic, gustatory perception); the object of thought (artifactual stereotypical conceptual features).

It must be noted here that such identified stereotypical conceptual features of human age as processing, psycho-/ anatomic-/ physiological / social / legal status are binary oppositions reflecting dichotomous nature of archetype and human thinking as a whole. Besides, we conclude that there is a certain genetic similarity among the Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes naming the HUMAN AGE, viz. the prototypical structure of the concept defined as experiences of the cyclic-linear course of time (the circling and moving along the straight line) and the expansion of the semantics of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English lexemes that verbalize the concept HUMAN AGE by reframing it, based on a naturalmorphic archetypal metaphor. Phytomorphic and zoomorphic, especially ornithological, ichthyological and entomological stereotypical conceptual features are significant for semantic reconstruction of the concept *HUMAN AGE* and make up 30% of all the age nominations in the languages compared. These features were identified as belonging to the archetype of the ANIMAL and the TREE of LIFE (FLOWER).

We determined the symbolic basis of the HUMAN AGE concept nominations that are images of animals (totems), natural phenomena / forces, landscapes, physical processes / states of a person / animal, types of food, kinds of drinks, items of clothing / fibre, agricultural tools, weapon, (semi-) precious metals, colors (red, green, yellow, etc.), numerology (numbers 3, 4), relics of Slavic pagan beliefs (God Rod, Roshanytsi, Yarylo), the Christian (Bozych, Christ), mythological images (Aevum, Cronos / Chronos, Senectus), and motives (weaving on a spindle, the creation of the Universe).

Other archetypes were reconstructed: physical (Light / Darkness, Colored / White), spatial (Up / Down, Right / Left, Center / Periphery), biological (Young / Old, Healthy / Sick, Strong / Weak), psychological (Honest / Dishonest), social (Rich / Poor), cultural (Paradise / Hell), gender and socio-categorical: Man / Woman, Parents / Children, Older / Younger, Life / Death; Time (Summer / Winter, Day / Night), and the archetype of CHILD and WISE OLD MAN / WOMAN. The most typical mental and cultural archetypal and symbolic images, neutral, positive, and negative stereotypes / stereotypical oppositions were revealed in the phraseological and paremiological systems of the three languages. It was defined that their content comprises the axiological and evaluative components of the concept: a set of verbalized role models, norms, values as fixed in the society for females and males of different age groups and got developed in various figurative situational interpretations due to the unique habitats and specific historical development of the Ukrainian, Russian, and English ethnoses.

Santrauka

Yuliia Orlova, Nataliya Lemish, Svitlana Matvieieva, Olga Aleksieieva, Iryna Vainorenie, Nataliia Safonova. Žmogaus amžiaus sąvoka kaip archetipinė ir stereotipinė mentalinė struktūra gimtakalbių ukrainiečių, rusų ir anglų sąmonėje

Straipsnyje pristatoma nauja kompleksinė metodologija siekiant ištirti lingvokultūrinę žmogaus amžiaus sąvoką kaip archetipinę ir stereotipinę žmogaus sąmonės mentalinę struktūrą. Sąvoka „žmogaus amžius" tiriama analizuojant, kaip ji reiškiama leksiniuose, frazeologiniuose arba paremiologiniuose vienetuose. Taip pat analizuojami tokie sąvokos struktūros elementai kaip esminius požymius atspindintis etimologinis istorinis sluoksnis, sąvokai evoliucionuojant atsiradęs papildomas sluoksnis ir aktyvusis sluoksnis, kurį sudaro aksiologiniai prasminiai, metaforiniai ir vertinamieji stereotipai, leidžiantys mentalizuoti šią sąvoką ukrainiečių, rusakalbių ir anglakalbių sąmonėje. Nagrinėjant sąvokos pavadinimo etimologiją ir amžiaus tarpsnių bei žmonių pagal amžių įvardijimą trijose kalbose, atskleidžiamas archetipinis šios sąvokos pagrindas. Pateikiami ukrainiečių, rusų ir anglų lingvokultūroms būdingi universalūs ir nacionaliniai archetipiniai ir simboliniai bruožai, neutralūs, teigiami ir neigiami sociokultūriniai su amžiumi susiję stereotipai, numerologinės, koloristinės, fitomorfinės ir zoomorfinės metaforinės amžiaus tarpsnių ir asmenų pagal amžių nominacijos.

References

1 Ageieva, V. A. (2014). Stereotipnaia simvolika ognia i ieio otrazheniie v invariantnyh leksemah angliiskogo i ukrainskogo yazykov [Stereotypical Symbolism of Fire and its Reflection in the Invariant Lexemes of the English and Ukrainian Languages]. Nauchnaia diskussiia: voprosy filologii, iskusstvovedeniia i kulturologii: sbornik statei [Scientific Discussion: Issues of Philology, Art History and Cultural Studies: collection of articles]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyi tsentr nauki i obrazovaniia, 1(20), 149-155. (In Russian).

2 Apresian, Yu. D. (1995). Obraz cheloveka po dannym yazyka: popytka sistemnogo opisaniia [The Image of a Person according to Language: An Attempt at a Systematic Description]. Voprosy yazykoznaniia [Questions of Linguistics], 1, 3-13. (In Russian).

3 Alefirenko, N. (2004). Metodologicheskie osnovaniia issledovaniia problemy verbalizatsii kontsepta [Methodological Foundations for the Study of the Problem of Concept Verbalization]. Vestnik VGU. Seriia Gumanitarnyie nauki [Bulletin of VSU. Series Humanities], 2. Retrieved 11 February 2022 from http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru/pdf/hyman/2004/02/alefirenko.pdf (In Russian).

4 Aries, P. (1962). Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life. London: Random House USA Inc.

5 Arutiunova, N. D., & Yanovskaia, T. E. (Eds.). (1997). Vremia: modeli i metafory [Time: Models and Metaphors]. Logicheskii analiz yazyka. Yazyk i vremia [Logical Analysis of Language. Language and Time]. Moskva: Indrik, 51-62. (In Russian).

6 Baranov, A. N. (1989). Aksiologicheskie strategii v strukture yazyka (paremiologiia i leksika) [Axiological Strategies in the Language Structure (Paremiology and Lexis)]. Voprosy yazykoznaniia [Questions of Linguistics], 3, 74-89. (In Russian).

7 Bartmiński, J. (2007). Stereotypy mieszkają w języku: Studia etnolingwistyczne. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytety Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

8 Batsevych, F. S. (2004). Osnovy komunikatyvnoii linhvistyky [Basics of Commu-

nicative Linguistics]. Kyiv: Akademiia. (In Ukrainian).

9   Belekhova, L. I. (2015). Arkhetyp, arkhetypnyi smysl, arkhetypnyi obraz u linhvokohnityvnomu vysvitlenni (na materiali virshovanyh tekstiv amerykanskoii poezii) [Archetype, Archetypal Meaning, Archetypal Image in Linguistic-Cognitive Coverage (on the Material of Poetic Texts of American Poetry)]. Naukovyi visnyk DDPU imeni I. Franka. Seriia "Filolohichni nauky". Movoznavstvo [Scientific Bulletin of I. Franko DDPU. Series "Philological Sciences". Linguistics], 3, 6-16. (In Ukrainian).

10 Benedict, R. F. (1934). Patterns of Culture. Boston. New York: Houghton: Mifflin and Company.

11 Bolshakova, A. Yu. (2010). Arkhetip – kontsept – kultura [Archetype – Concept – Culture]. Voprosy filosofii [Questions of Philosophy], 12, 48-56. (In Russian).

12 Brogan, W.A., & Simons, M. (Eds.). (2000). Philosophy in body, culture, and time: selected studies in phenomenology and existential philosophy. Philosophy Today, 4. Chicago.

13 Brown, C. H. A. (1990). Survey of Category Types in Natural Language. In Meaning and Prototypes: Studies in Linguistic Categorization. Cornwall: T. J. Press, 17-48.

14 Bryniak, O. (2015). Roslynna symvolika hrestynnoi poezii ukraintsev [Plant Symbolism of Ukrainian Baptismal Poetry]. Narodoznavchi zoshyty [Ethnological Notebooks], 3(123), 632-638. (In Ukrainian).

15 Cahill, S. E. (1982). Becoming Boys and Girls: Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

16 Cockerham, W. C. (2005). The Global Society. An Introduction to Sociology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

17 Croft, W. (2004). Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864

18 Cunningham, H. (1995). Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500. New York: Longman.

19 Dacey, J. S., & Travers, J. F. (2003). Human Development across the Lifespan. McGraw-Hill College.

20 Donchenko, O. (2011). Arkhetypy – spilne v nashomu zhytti (rozpiznavannia arkhetypiv yak shliakh do unikalnosti) [Archetypes – Common in our Lives (Recognizing Archetypes as a Path to Uniqueness)]. Psyhologia osobystosti [Psychology of an Individual], 1(2), 170-181. (In Ukrainian).

21 Dzhenkova, Ye. A., Dzhenkova, S. V., Krasavskii, N. A., & Moskovin, V. P. (Eds.). (2003). Etimologicheskii analiz imeni kontsepta kak odin iz metodov lingvokulturologicheskogo issledovaniia [Etymological Analysis of the Concept Name as One of the Linguocultural Methods] Antropologicheskaja lingvistika: izuchenie kulturnih konceptov i gender [Anthropological Linguistics: The Study of Cultural Concepts and Gender]. Issue 1. Sbornik nauchnyh trudov. Volograd: "Kolledzh", 48-53. (In Russian).

22 Eliade, M. (2005). Aspekty mifa [Aspects of Myth]. Moskva: Akademicheskii proekt. (In Russian).

23 Gibbs, R. (1999). The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

24 Ivanova, M. G. (2017). Kulturnye arhetipy kak obiekt istoriko-filosofskogo analiza [Cultural Archetypes as the Object of Historical and Philosophical Analysis]. (Candidate's thesis). Moskva. (In Russian).

25 Johnson, M. (1987). The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Reason and Imagination. Chicago: Chicago University Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226177847.001.0001

26 Jung, C. G. (1988). Ob arhetipah kollektivnogo bessoznatelnogo [About Archetypes of Collective Unconscious]. Voprosy filosofii [Questions of Philosophy], 1, 131-138. (In Russian).

27 Jung, C. G. (1991). Arhetip i simvol [Archetype and Symbol]. Moskva: Renessans. (In Russian).

28 Jung, C. G. (1996). Chelovek i ego simvoly [Man and his Symbols]. Sankt-Peterburg: B.S.K. (In Russian).

29 Jung, C. G. (1996). Dusha i mif: shest arhetipov [Soul and Myth: Six Archetypes]. Kiev: Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka Ukrainy dlia yunoshestva. (In Russian).

30 Jung, C. G. (2001). Otnosheniia mezhdu Ya i bessoznatelnym [Relations between I and Unconscious]. Psihologiia bessoznatelnogo [Psychology of the Unconscious]. Moskva: AST; Kanon+, 125-240. (In Russian).

31 Jung, C. G. (2009). Soznanie i bessoznatelnoe [Conscious and Unconscious]. Moskva: Akademicheskii proekt. (In Russian).

32 Kaftandzhiev, H. (2016). Mifologicheskie arhetipy v kommunikatsii [Mythological Archetypes in Communication]. Kharkov: Gumanitarnyi centr. (In Russian).

33 Kalita, I. (2012). Fenomenologia arkhetipichnogo [Phenomenology of the Archetypal]. Retrieved 03 March 2022 from https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/bitstream/handle/11222.digilib/125514/2_NovajaRusistika_5-2012-2_6.pdf (In Russian).

34 Kaliuzhnaia, I. A. (2007). Kontsept "detstvo" v nemetskoi i russkoi lingvokulturah [The Concept "Childhood" in German and Russian Linguocultures]. (Candidate's thesis). Volgograd. (In Russian).

35 Kant, I. (2020). Sobranie sochinenii. V 4 t. T. 1: Kritika chistogo razuma [Collected Works. In 4 vols. Vol. 1: Critique of Pure Reason]. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi soiuz "Andronum". (In Russian).

36 Karpenko, M. A. (1994). Entsyklopedicheskie slovari raznyh tipov kak lingvokulturologicheskii istochnik [Encyclopedic Dictionaries of Different Types as a Linguistic and Cultural Source] (pp. 48-58). Yazyk i kultura. 3-ia mezhdunarodnaia konferentsia. Doklady I tezisy dokladov [Language and culture. 3rd international conference. Reports and abstracts]. Kyiv. (In Russian).

37 Karasik, V. I. (2006) Opredelenie i tipologia kontseptov [Definition and Typology of Concepts] (pp. 14-20). Etnokulturnaia kontseptologia: mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnyh trudov. [Ethnocultural Conceptology: Interuniversity Collection of Scientific Papers], 1. Volgograd: Elista. (In Russian).

38 Kassirer, E. (2002). Filosofia simvolicheskih form [Philosophy of Symbolic Forms]. Moskva; Sankt-Peterburg: Universitetskaia kniga. (In Russian).

39 Kolesnikova, L. L. (2010). Mifolohichni vytoky symvolichnoi odynytsi "Derevo" [Mythological Origins of the Symbolic Unit "Tree"]. Linhvistyka: zbirnyk naukovykh prats Luhanskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka [Linguistics: Collection of Scientific Works of Taras Shevchenko Luhansk State Pedagogical University], 3(21), 228-232. (In Ukrainian).

40 Kolesov, V. V. (2004). Slovo i delo: Iz istorii russkih slov [Word and Deed: from the History of Russian Words]. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatelstvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. (In Russian).

41 Krasavskii, N. A., & Moskovin, V. P. (Eds.). (2003). Nemetskaia i russkaia kontseptosfery emotsii: Rezultaty lingvokulturologicheskogo analiza [Conceptosphere of Emotions in German and Russian: Results of Linguoculturological Analysis]. Antropologicheskaia lingvistika: izuchenie kulturnyh kontseptov i gender [Anthropological Linguistics: the Study of Cultural Concepts and Gender], 1. Sbornik nauchnyh trudov. Vologard: Kolledzh, 3-24. (In Russian).

42 Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2014). Metaforicheskoe modelirovanie mira v hudozhestvennom tekste: semantiko-kognitivnyi analiz [Metaphorical Modelling of the World in Fiction: Semantic-Cognitive Analysis]. Kyiv: NPU imeni M. P. Dragomanova. (In Ukrainian).

43 Krymskii, S. B. (1998). Arhetipy ukrainskoi kultury [Archetypes of Ukrainian Culture]. Visnik Nacionalnoi Akademii nauk [Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences], 7-8, 74-87. (In Russian).

44 Kuprieva, I. A., & Diatchenko, L. Ya. (Eds.). (2010). Mentalnaia struktura "psihicheskie processy": fakultativnye komponenty [Mental Structure: "Psychological Processes": Optional Components]. Nauchnye vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriia Gumanitarnye nauki [Scientific Sheets of Belgorod State University. Series Humanities], 24(95), issue 8, 145-151. Belgorod: Izdatelstvo BelGU, (In Russian).

45 45 Lakoff, G., & Ortony, A. (Eds.). (1993). Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Metaphor and Thought, pp. 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013

46 Levi-Bruhl, L. (1994). Sverhestestvennoe v pervobytnom myshlenii [Supernatural in Primitive Thinking]. Moskva: Pedagogika-Press. (In Russian).

47 Lippman, W. (1950). Public Opinion. New York: W. W. Norton.

48 Liubina, I. M. (2006). Aksiologiia kontsepta "vozrast" v russkoi, britanskoi i amerikanskoi lingvokulturah [Axiology of the Concept "Age" in Russian, British, and American Linguocultures]. (Candidate's thesis). Krasnodar. (In Russian).

49 Lozko, H. (2004). Kolo Svarozhe. Vidrodzheni tradytsii [Svarozh Circle. Revived

Traditions]. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi pysmennyk. (In Ukrainian).

50 Medvedeva, N. V. (2014). Teoriia arkhetypiv C. G. Junga ta doslidzhennia tvorchogo spryimannia [C. G. Jung's Theory of Archetypes and Creative Perception Study]. Symbolic and Archetypic in Culture and Social Relations: materials of the IV international scientific conference on March 5-6, Prague: Vedeckovydavatelskecentrum "Sociosfera-CZ", s. 21-30. Retrieved 03 March 2022 from http://lib.iitta.gov.ua/7567/1/K-03.05.14-Medvedeva%20N.V.Jungh.pdf (in Ukrainian).

51 Meletinskii, E. (1991). Analiticheskaia psikhologia i problema proishozhdenia arkhetipicheskih siuzhetov [Analytical Psychology and the Problem of the Origin of Archetypal Plots]. Voprosy filosofii [Questions of Philosophy], 10, 41-48. (In Russian).

52 Orlova, Yu. V. (2019). Arkhetypne i stereotypne vidobrazhennia konctsptu VIK LIUDYNY u svidomosti nosiiv ukrainskoi, rosiiskoii ta anghliiskoi mov [Archetypical and Stereotypical Mapping of the Concept HUMAN AGE in the Consciousness of Ukrainian, Russian and English Native Speakers]. (Candidate's thesis). Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

53 Osborn, M. M. (2009). The Trajectory of My Work with Metaphor. Southern Comminication Journal. Jan, 74(1), 79-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940802559131

54 Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). Kognitivnaia lingvistika [Cognitive Linguistics]. Moskva: AST: Vostok - Zapad. (In Russian).

55 Propp, B. Ya. (1963). Russkie agrarnye prazdniki [Russian Agricultural Holidays]. Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskogo universiteta. (In Russian).

56 Rakhilina, Ye. V. (2002). Osnovnye idei kognitivnoi semantiki [Basic Ideas of Cognitive Semantics] (pp. 370-389). Sovremennaia amerikanskaia lingvistika: fundamentalnye napravlenia [Modern American Linguistics: Fundamental Trends]. Moskva: Editorial URSS. (In Russian).

57 Roszak, Th. (1969). The Making of a Counter Culture. New York: Anchor Books. Companies, Inc.

58 Rozvod, E. (2015). Roli stereotypiv u formuvanni ta realizacii linghvokulturnykh kontseptiv (na prykladi kontseptu SUN) [The Role of Stereotypes for Concepts Formation and Realization]. Aktualni pytannia inozemnoii filologhii. Naukovyi zhurnal [Current Issues of Foreign Philology. Scientific journal], 2, 172-178 (In Ukrainian).

59 Schaefer, R. T., & Lamm, R. P. (1995). Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill. Companies, Inc.

60 Selivanova, O. O. (2012). Svit svidomosti v movi. Mir soznaniia v yazyke [The World of Consciousness in the Language]. Cherkasy: Yu. Chabanenko. (In Russian).

61 Semashko, T. (2014). Linghvistychna arghumentaciia rozmezhuvannia poniat "stereotyp" i "prototyp" [Linguistic Reasoning for Polarization of "Stereotype" and "Prototype"]. Literaturoznavstvo. Movoznavstvo. Folklorystyka [Literary Studies. Linguistics. Folkloristics], 1(25), 31-33. Retrieved 10 February 2022 from http://papers.univ.kiev.ua/1/literaturoznavstvo_movoznavstvo_folklorystyka/articles/semashko-t-linguistic-argumentation-differentiation-concepts-stereotype-and-p_24937.pdf (In Ukrainian).

62 Slukhai, N. V. (2004). "Svitove derevo" skhidnykh slovian i vidobrazhennia uiavlen pro noho v leksytsi ta frazeolohii rosiiskoi ta ukrainskoi mov [The "World Tree" of the Eastern Slavs and the reflection of ideas about it in the vocabulary and phraseology of the Russian and Ukrainian languages]. Mova ta istoriia: zbirnyk naukovykh prats [Language and History: a Collection of Scientific Papers], 72, 6-17. (In Ukrainian).

63 Smelzer, N. (1994). Sotsiologia [Sociology]. Moskva: Feniks. (In Russian).

64 Stelmakhovich, M. H. (1997). Ukrainska narodna pedahohika [Ukrainian Folk Pedagogy]. Kyiv: IZMN. (In Ukrainian).

65 Stepanov, Yu. S., & Proskurin, S. G. (1993). Konstanty mirovoi kultury. Alfavity i alfavitnye teksty v period dvoeveriia [Constants of the World Culture. Alphabets and Alphabetic Texts over the Period of Dualism]. Moskva: Nauka. (In Russian).

66 Svitsova, A. A. (2005). Lingvokulturnaia dominant "Dom-Rodina-Chuzhbina" v russkih I angliiskih poslovitsah [Linguistic and Cultural Dominant "Home-Motherland-Foreign land" in Russian and English proverbs]. (Candidate's thesis). Kirov. (In Russian).

67 Teliia, V. N. (1986). Konnotativnyi aspekt semantiki nominativnyh edinits [Connotative Aspect of the Semantics of Nominative Units]. Moskva: Nauka. (In Russian).

68 Tishchenko, O. V. (2000). Obriadova semantyka u slovianskomu movnomu prostori [Ritual Semantics in the Slavic Language Space]. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi tsentr KDLU. (In Ukrainian).

69 Tolstoi, N. I. (1997). Vremeni magicheskii krug (po predstavleniam slavian) [Time Magic Circle (according to the Ideas of the Slavs)]. (pp. 17-27). Logicheskii analiz yazyka. Yazyk i vremia [Logical Analysis of Language. Language and Time]. Moskva: Indrik. (In Russian).

70 Toporov, V. N. (1999). Ob antropotsentrizme drevnegermanskogo kosmogonicheskogo mifa [On the Anthropocentrism of the Ancient Germanic Cosmogonic Myth] (pp. 252-261). Logicheskii analiz yazyka. Obraz cheloveka v culture i yazyk [Logical Analysis of Language. The Image of a Person in Culture and Language]. Moskva: Indrik. (In Russian).

71 Shutova, M. O. (2016). Etnokulturni stereotypy v angliiskii ta ukrainskii movakh: rekonstruktsia ta typologia [Ethnocultural Stereotypes in English and Ukrainian Languages: Reconstruction and Typology]. (Doctor's thesis). Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

72 Sternin, I. A. (2001). Metodika issledovania struktury kontsepta [Methodology for Researching the Structure of the Concept]. Metodologicheskie problemy kognitivnoi lingvistiki [Methodological Problems of Cognitive Linguistics] (pp. 58-65). Voronezh: Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. (In Russian).

73 Usyk, L. M. (2017). Kohnityvno-onomasiolohichna rekonstrukciia otsinnoho komponenta u semantytsi fitonimiv (na materiali nazv likarskykh roslyn u nimetskii, anhliiskii, rosiiskii ta anhliiskii movah) [Cognitive Onomasiological Reconstruction of Evaluative Component in the Semantics of Phytonyms (in Medicinal Plant Names in the German, English, Russian, and Ukrainian Languages)]. (Extended abstract of candidate's thesis). Kyiv: Naukovyi svit. (In Ukrainian).

74 Wierzbicka, A. (2001) Ponimanie kultury cherez posredstvo kliuchevyh slov [Understanding Culture Through Key Words]. Moskva: Yazyki skavianskoi kultury. (In Russian).

75 Vorkachev, S. H. (2001). Lingvokulturologia, yazykovaia lichnost, kontsept: stanovlenie antropotsentricheskoi paradigmy v yazykoznanii [Linguoculturology, Linguistic Personality, Concept: the Formation of an Anthropocentric Paradigm in Linguistics]. Filologicheskie nauki [Philological Sciences], 1, 64-72. (In Russian).

Dictionaries

1 Aerts, M., Molenberghs, G. M. Ryan, L., & Gey, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2 Andreieva, M. (2001). *Entsiklopedia simvolov, znakov, emblem* [*Encyclopedia of Symbols, Tokens, and Emblems*]. OOO "Izdatelstvo Astrel": "Mif". (In Russian).

3 Asher, R.E. (Ed.). (1994). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford, N. Y, Seoul, Tokyo.

4 Bilodid, I. K. (Ed.). (1970–1980). *Slovnyk ukrajinsjkoji movy v 11 tomakh* [*Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language in 11 Volumes*]. Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni AN URSR. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian).

5 Busel, V. T. (Ed.). (2005). *Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoii ukrainskoi movy* [*Large Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian*]. Kyiv, Irpin: VTF Perun. (In Ukrainian).

6 Chernyh, P. Ya. (1999). *Istoriko-etimologicheskii slovar sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [*Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language*]. Moskva: Russkii yazyk. (In Russian).

7 Dal, V. (1998). *Tolkovyi slovar zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka* [*Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*]. Moskva: Russkii yazyk, 1998. A–Z. (In Russian).

8 Eysenck, M. W. (1994). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Cognitive Psychology*. Cambridge.

9 Fasmer, M., & Trubachiov, O. N. (2004). *Etimologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Moskva: Astrel-AST. (In Russian).

10 Hornby, A. S., & Cowie, A. P. (1989). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.

11 Krysin, L. P., Grunchenko, O. M., Kuleva, A. S., Nechaeva, I. V., & Tsumarev, I. V. (2016). *Akademicheskii tolkovyi slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Academic Explanatory Russian Dictionary*]. Moskva: JaSK. (In Russian).

12 Liberman, A., & Mitchell, L. J. (2007). *An Analytical Dictionary of English Etymology*. Minneapolis, London. University of Minnesota Press.

13 Lopatin, V. V., & Lopatina, L. E. (2013). *Tolkovyi slovar sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* [*Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language*]. Moskva: Yeksmo. (In Russian).

14 Makovskii, M. M. (2000). Istoriko-etimologicheskii slovar sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka [*Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*]. Moskva: Dialog.

15 Malmkjaer, K. (Ed.). (2004). *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.

16 Melnychuk, O. S. (Ed.). (1982). *Etymologhichnyi slovnyk ukraiinskoii movy* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian).

17 Monaghan, P. (Ed.). (2004). *The Encyclopedia of Celtic Mythology and Folklore*. N. Y.: Infobase Publishing.

18 OED – *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved 20 February 2022 from www.etymonline.com.

19 Preobrazhenskii, A. G. (1958). *Etimologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Moskva: Gosizdat. (In Russian).

20 Semenov, A. V. (2003). *Etimologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Moskva: YuNVES. (In Russian).

21 Shanskii, N. M., & Bobrova, T. A. (1994). *Etimologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Moskva: Prozerpina. (In Russian).

22 Shushkov, A. A. (2003). *Tolkovo-poniatiinyi slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Explanatory Conceptual Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Moskva: OOO "Izdatelstvo Astrel": OOO "Izdatelstvo AST": OOO "Tranzitkniga". (In Russian).

23 Stepanov, Yu. S. (2004). *Konstanty. Slovar russkoi kultury* [*Constants. Dictionary of Russian Culture*]. Moskva: Akademicheskii Proekt. (In Russian).

24 Tsyganenko, G. P. (1989). *Etimologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*]. Kiev: Radianska shkola. (In Russian).

About the Authors

YULIIA ORLOVA

PhD in Philology, Assoc. prof. at the Department of Applied Language Studies, Comparative Linguistics, and Translation, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests
Applied linguistics, translation studies, linguo-cultural and linguo-cognitive studies

Address
Pyrohova st. 9, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail
yu.v.orlova@npu.edu.ua

Orcid iD
0000-0002-8237-2638

NATALIYA LEMISH

Dr. Sc. in Philology, Prof. at the Department of Applied Language Studies, Comparative Linguistics, and Translation, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests
Corpus linguistics, translation studies, comparative linguistics, intercultural communication

Address
Pyrohova st. 9, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail
n.ye.lemish@npu.edu.ua

Orcid iD
0000-0001-5321-4705

SVITLANA MATVIEIEVA

Dr. Sc. in Philology, Professor, Researcher at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

Research interests
Corpus linguistics, translation studies, comparative linguistics

Address
Mickevičiaus g. 37, LT-44244 Kaunas, Lithuania

E-mail
svitlana.matvieieva@ktu.lt

Orcid iD
0000-0002-8357-9366

OLGA ALEKSIEIEVA

PhD in Philology, Assoc. prof. at the Department of Language and Stylistics, Educational and Scientific Institute of Journalism, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests
Translation studies, corpus linguistics, language contacts in the context of globalization processes, language and identity (cultural transfer issues)

Address
Volodymyrska st. 64/13, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail
aleksyeyeva@yahoo.com

Orcid iD
0000-0003-3855-0860

IRYNA VAINORENIE

PhD in Philology, Assoc. prof. at the Department of Applied Language Studies, Comparative Linguistics, and Translation, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests
Intercultural communication, comparative linguistics, translation studies, corpus linguistics

Address
Pyrohova st. 9, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail
i.p.vainorenie@npu.edu.ua

Orcid iD
0000-0003-0198-1448

NATALIIA SAFONOVA

PhD in Philology, Assoc. prof. at the Department of Applied Language Studies, Comparative Linguistics, and Translation, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Research interests
Discourse studies, linguistic semantics, theoretical and applied lexicography

Address
Pyrohova st. 9, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail
n.m.safonova@npu.edu.ua

Orcid iD
0000-0003-2460-6173