FIGURES OF SPEECH FUNCTIONING IN THE LINGUO-PRAGMATIC DIMENSION

[a]VITALII KONONENKO, [b]OLEKSII VOROBETS,
[c]NATALIYA MAGAS, [d]YURIY STRUHANETS, [e]NATALIIA
SHCHERBII

[a-e]*Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57,
T. Shevchenko Str., 76018, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine*
email: [a]vitalii.kononenko@pnu.edu.ua,
[b]*oleksii.vorobets@.pnu.edu.ua,* [c]*nataliia.mahas@pnu.edu.ua,*
[d]*yurastruhanets@gmail.com,* [e]*natalia.shcherbii@pnu.edu.ua*

Abstract: The article observes issues of the figures of speech functioning in theory of trope studies. In the philosophical and philological scientific space, there are no unified criteria of selection, classification, and gradation of tropes, their differences from some other figures of speech and modes that involve figurative language. In the linguo-pragmatic dimension, the phenomenon of trope combinations, such as metaphor-simile, metaphor-symbol, metaphor-hyperbole, etc., inherent in literary discourse, appears; as a result of functional-semantic relations of concordance or contradiction such combinations between components, new linguistic and stylistic connotations arise, extended metaphorical expressions are formed, which can cover fragments of the text, and in the poetry – a whole poem. Discourse analysis involves the possibility of taking into account the vertical context that links the linearly non-intersecting means of image formation. Contextually determined shifts in the combination of two or more figurative means manifest themselves in the phenomena of coordination and opposition of the expressive meanings; as a result, complex metaphor, figurative units are forming, revealing the levels and ways of thinking, the varieties of individual author style creation.

Keywords: Figures of speech, Function, Image, Meaning, Metaphorization, Semantics, Trope, Vertical context.

1 Introduction

In the traditional philological interpretation, the study of tropes is understood as a paradigmatic construction of figurative means, based on the principle of semiotic gradation with the description of the differential features of each of these means. According to the representatives of various scientific fields and schools, the quantitative and qualitative composition of tropes varies significantly; among them, there are usually primary and secondary, additional variants and subvariants. The major figures of speech are mainly metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, the secondary ones are allegory, hyperbole, epithet, meiosis, litotes, periphrasis, irony, oxymoron, personification, the peripheral zone includes, in particular, simphora, antiphrasis, atheism, euphemism, dysphemism, dysphemism, etc. [17, 14, 19]. Symbols are considered to function as figurative means similar to tropes [5]. Discourse issues include the relationship between trope and figurative mean, image, trope formation via a single word or word and phrase, selection and delimitation of types and subtypes of tropes, like metaphor and metonymy, metaphor and simphora, allegory and symbol, etc. In our opinion, tropical means need a new understanding based on the pragmatics of modern text creation. Therefore, the purpose of our study is to analyze the functioning of figurative means in the linguopragmatic dimension.

2 Literature Review

In linguistics, the views of O. Potebnia became classic for the interpretation of figurative means. He connected the realization of semantic possibilities of the poetic word with specifics of the mental perception of linguistic signs by each nation: "Everyone understands the word in his own way, but the external form of the word is imbued with objective thought, regardless of the understanding of individuals" [12].

For a long time, scientists have been debating whether there are any sufficient grounds – if the status of some tropes is indefinable – to present a set of tropes and similar to them figurative means as a semiotic system with an internal syntagmatic mechanism and ranking? Solving this issue should be based on the doctrine of two ways of qualifying word usage: 1) when words are used "literally" (simile, oxymoron), and 2) when words are used "literally" and figuratively (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, metaphorical epithet, irony). The first case is called autology, and the second – metalogy [19]. This qualification derives from the functional-semantic analysis of the

word as a figurative mean, which does not solve the problem of systemic trope organization. However, modern researchers emphasize that in the text autology and metalogy are harmoniously combined: "Autological fragments coexist organically with metaphorical ones, realizing internal, intentional connections between semantic and verbal codes, according to which – syncretism of physical and metaphysical. Autology captures the spatio-temporal parameters of the textual situation, objectifies it, emotionally concretizes; metaphor determines the metalogicity, symbolism of the poetic code, revealing semantic correlations between real and unreal things" [9].

It is important to take into account positions of scientists on the qualification of the dichotomy at the level of "figurative mean ↔ trope" and the potential of trope formation in the monoparadigm; the renewed vision of the image fits into theoretical and philological comprehension of figurative reality creating a linguistic picture of the world.

New aspects and dimensions in the qualification of tropes are outlined in the light of the intensification of research in such areas as linguo-cognitology, linguo-culturology, linguo-pragmatics, and narratology. From the standpoint of cognitology, in particular, the theory of metaphor is viewed through elaboration of the knowledge structure as a generalized experience of human interaction with the outer world [8]; in this sense, not only grammatically designed lexical means are subject to metaphorization, but also integral fragments of the text, the metaphor becomes expanded, the simile can appear in the form of description as a logical similarity, etc. [4]; compare Ukrainian *схожий на кішку* (Eng. *like a cat*).

The collection of essays "Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads" presents the views of leading specialists in the fields of conceptual metaphor and metonymy, and conceptual integration (blending). G. Radden notes: "The distinction between the notions of metonymy and metaphor is notoriously difficult, both as theoretical terms and in their application. Thus, it is often difficult to tell whether a given linguistic instance is metonymic or metaphoric" [10]. Z. Kovecses thinks that correlation-based metaphors emerge from frame-like mental representations through a metonymic stage [7]. G. Steen in the study "Metonymy Goes Cognitive-Linguistic" notes: "Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner have developed a conceptualintegration theory, also known as blending theory, which aims to account for metonymy as a specific form of mapping between mental spaces, yielding conceptual integration in a new space called a "blend"" [15]. We share the position of scholars that there is a very shaky line between many figurative means, especially metaphor and metonymy.

3 Materials and Methods

In the linguo-cultural dimension, figurative means, in particular tropes, turn into linguistic and aesthetic signs of culture [16], national-cultural llingual components, logo-epistemas, etc., i.e., they act as semiotic units with notable historical and cultural, ethno-linguistic, mental orientations, often with in-depth structuring of the text. "The meanings in a particular language are representations of the culture of that social group" [13].

According to the linguopragmatic approach, which we emphasize in our study, to achieve figurative and expressive effects of linguistic and stylistic imagery, literary discourse includes various rhetoric means in combination with tropes, figures of speech, methods of description in their interaction, aiming to strengthen the author's standpoint and taking into account possibilities of the context, pressupositional ties, background knowledge, etc. [1].

T. Yeshchenko notes that "pragmatics of a literary text is a set of intentions of the author, realized by various linguistic means in the speech of the author and character in order to influence the

reader and designed for certain extralingual knowledge of the reader about the world" [18].

The idea of nondistinction figurative means from one another, search for transitional stages of their formation is gradually developing, and, being asserted as scientifically and pragmatically verified, provides grounds for further study.

The analysis of "intermediacy" of the tropical means, their combination in one trope, the transition from one means to another, and finally, the essence of trope studies as a set of indivisible tropes leads to conceptual and semantic fields creation with the inclusion of different figurative means, and their internal dependencies. According to the postulated paradigm, the subdivision of tropes into subtypes and varieties is observed in a new manner. This concept is the basis of our article. Discourse analysis involves the possibility of taking into account the vertical context, that links the linearly non-intersecting means of image formation.

4 Results and Discussion

Linguists are still searching for the ways to differentiate literary means, highlight the features of each of them, contrast them in texts with further ranking on the basis of various criteria – semiotic, semantic, structural, cognitive, cultural, and so on. A. Moisiienko claims that, behind every word in a work of art, there is a whole system of semantic, situational-compositional connections. At the same time, the lexical material "organizes" the system of phrases and sentences, the actual poetic constructions, the sound element. "Each of these sections, taken alone or in combination with others, serves as an apperception field in the decoding of the whole poetic fabric of certain figurative constructions" [11].

From the standpoint of linguo-pragmatics, the basic principle of these means functioning is creation of an image, that presupposes trope combinations in one contextual environment. For example, in a sentence *Смерть черкає крилом голубим* (O. Olzhych) (Eng. *Death touches with a blue wing*) metaphor is formed as a predicative construction, complicated with the image-symbol *крило* (Eng. *wing*) with sememe 'fate', metaphorical epithet *голубим* (Eng. *blue*) and associations 'unseen', 'bright', 'terrible'.

The linguistic and aesthetic effects of a simile is determined by the common semantic parameters of the two components – the subject and the object of comparison, and the condition of their logical and semantic convergence is not necessarily the figurative meaning of one or both components – the creators of associative similarity.

We adhere to the position on the inclusion of comparison in the cognitive paradigm – it opens the prospect of considering the comparison in terms of cognitive similarity of some objects, phenomena, actions to others. Simile as a cognitive unit incorporates knowledge about the subject of description in periphrastic and expressive dimension creating a figurative picture of reality, which enhances the overall metaphorization of the text, provides the potential to include the meaning of similarity in a broad context. Consider the text:

У тому городчику, де самі мальви висіяно, /
щоб тебе ніхто не розшукав поміж квітів, /
я тебе упізнав би відразу, /
якби мені довелося коли-небудь /
пройти вашою вулицею: /
поміж найпишніших мальв /
там росте одна мальва, /
на якій квіти кольору старого паперу, /
а на кожній квітці твою голівку намальовано <...>/
звідки б не подивився метеликом у той бік, /
де тебе вперше – поміж мальв – побачив

(V. Holoborodko).

Eng.:
In the dooryard where only mallows are sown, /

so that no one will look for you among the flowers, /
I would recognize you right away, /
if I ever had to /
walk down your street: /
among the most magnificent mallows /
there grows one mallow, /
on which flowers the color of old paper, /
and on each flower your head is drawn <...> /
no matter where like butterfly looked in that direction, /
where I saw you for the first time – between mallows.

In the image of the "ethnographic" mallow flower, there is a rather transparent subject of comparison – the beloved woman: she is the most magnificent, the only one; fascinated by the mallow-woman, the hero compares himself to a butterfly.

Another figure of speech – the epithet – is often thought to be at the periphery of trope study; at the same time, the epithet tends to express various linguistic and stylistic connotations providing its metaphorical meaning. Ukrainian literary critic I. Kachurovskyi cites examples of T. Shevchenko's poetry with metaphorized epithets *небо немите, заспані хвилі, море нікчемне* (Eng. *dumb sky, sleepy waves and worthless sea*) [3]. Associatively meaningful epithet-metaphor reveals the properties of the actualized word in the phrase "noun + attribute" or within an extended context. "Abstract epithet feature in contextual use, along with the denoted token becomes a certain experience, which affects the perception of a holistic expression, receives a specific denotative orientation in relation to a word" [11].

The phenomenon of metaphorized epithet is qualified through the concept of semantic assonance or dissonance, taking into account in one way or another shifted meaning. The presence of actualized epithet in the text often requires meaning decoding, inclusion of a broad context, background knowledge; in contemporary figurative discourse, the structures like *синя радість, глиняна тиша, сумна нитка, дівоча трава* (V. Holoborodko) (Eng. *blue joy, clay silence, sad thread, and maiden grass*) should be additionally decoded.

A way to strengthen the role of poetic epithet is the antithesis. Accompanying associations then arise due to the collision of related components of opposite importance. The poeticization of epithets is supported by their metaphorical potential, such as: *Візьміть маленьке золоте щастя. / Лишіть велике кам'яне лихо* (O. Irvanets). (Eng. *Take a little golden happiness / Leave the great stone disaster*). One semantic line of opposition of epithets is *little golden* with the inner meaning of 'golden, though little', the other line is *great stone* 'though great, but stone'; at the level of the "vertical context", the antonyms 'little – great' appear as a gradation with the complete superiority of the little (it is about golden happiness) over the great (it is about a stone disaster) [5]. The introduction of associative modeling of epithets into the system of education, on the one hand, makes it possible to realize the author's intentions, subjectivation of speech, on the other hand, ensures the creation of artistic reality on the basis of renewed linguistic thinking.

Contextually presupposed figurative means in their complex organization lead to various complicated figurative structures usage in a piece of text, its introduction into the general stratification of the fixed and implicitly presented meanings; at the same time, a powerful component of evaluation is provided in its connotative nuance, with the following gradation "more / less positive", "more / less negative". Words of evaluative semantics in the metaphorical context may reveal axiological connotations in their vocabulary interpretation, but more often this evaluation is created in the process of "collision" of stylistically neutral designations. For example, in I. Rozdobudko's figurative discourse, a well-dressed woman *пливе, як яхточка* (Eng. *sails like a yacht*), and "shouldering" into a vehicle, *перетворюється* на *рибальський баркас* (Eng. *she turns into a fishing launch*); evaluation markers are comparative inversion structures, devoid of connotations of evaluation out of context.

Linguistic practice of connection, crossing, confrontation of paths is not always realized in contexts with the inclusion of other artistic phenomena. In the processes of inhibiting metaphorization in a broad sense, the introduction of hidden figurative meanings, figurative discourse provides examples of quasi-trope vocabulary, usage of artificial similarity of the trope instead of figurative expression, as well as linguocreativity, semantic destruction as a stylistic phenomenons. Signs of semantic and stylistic relativity of the trope meaning distinguishing reveal, in particular, the discourse analysis manifestations of hyperbolic and quasi-hyperbolic structures, some of them tend to serve as metaphorical means, while the others create a transpositional, distorted notion of exaggeration.

The basic principle of hyperbole formation is usually a violation of logical-semantic connections between words to indicate size, weight, quality, characteristics, and, therefore, deviations from the semantic norm; quasi-hyperbolic structures denote external signs of exaggeration. However, in meaning they are "erased" metaphors, stereotypes. Notable in this sense are folk song phrases with the so-called constant epithet such as *чисте поле, сира земля, синє море, буйний вітер* (Eng. *clear field, wet land, blue sea, strong wind*), which convey conditional-associative ideas. Compare quasi-hyperbole *безмежнеє поле в сніжному завої* (I. Franko) (Eng. *boundless field in a snowdrift*), where the actualized epithet infinitely participates in the creation of an extended metaphor due to stereotype.

In the numerous variety of figurative means and closely related techniques of their formation, the central place is given to metaphor as a meaning-maker in its expressive-evaluative function. Other tropes are more or less dependent on the general processes of metaphorization of the text, conceptualization of figurative worldview. Considering the metaphor as the starting point of a conditionally defined paradigm makes it possible to describe closer or farther from the metaphor figurative means, for example, to determine the closest category of metonymy, then place simile, symbol etc.

On the other hand, the functional-semantic proximity of different figurative means to the metaphor enables identifying a range of related, shifted phenomena, outlining the concept of logical-semantic complex image, the consequences of combining one figures of speech with another, hence there are metaphor-simile, metaphor-symbol, metaphor-hyperbole, metaphor-epithet etc. For example, *рвати на собі волосся* (Eng. *to pull hair out*) is defined as a metaphor formed via metonymic shift. In some other cases, metaphor can combine several figures of speech, compare: *Дикі думки, як бур'ян, у людині проростають* (V. Shevchuk) (Eng. *Wild thoughts, like weeds, germinate in a person*), where the actually centered metaphor *думки проростають* (Eng. *thoughts germinate*) incorporates simile *як бур'ян* (Eng. *as a weed*), word-symbol *бур'ян* (Eng. *weeds*) – 'harmful', 'unnecessary', 'sin', 'garbage', connotations of negation, actualized epithet *лихий* (Eng. *mischievous*) 'threatening', 'dangerous', 'harmful'.

A combination of several metaphors in a narrow linguistic space is a variable, contextually marked phenomenon; such semantically dependent components of the expression either accomplish each other in semantic phrase, or oppose each other in the "internal form", forming a complex common image. For example, *Не можна брати істину в оренду* (L. Kostenko) (Eng. *You can't rent the truth*) conveys the complication "metaphor + metaphor", which includes two figurative means: *не можна брати істину, брати істину в оренду* (Eng. *you can't rent the truth, to rent the truth*). Finally, the extended metaphor including other figurative means can represent not only a piece of the text, but a whole text, especially poetical one. For instance, an extract from Taras Shevchenko's poetry *Реве та стогне Дніпр широкий* (Eng. *The Dnieper roars and groans wide and farther*), represents the complex metaphor with a symbolic meaning: 'freedom-loving people cannot be conquered'.

In any manifestation of metaphorical transformations in a broader or narrower textual plane, metaphors are directly or indirectly perceived as a linguistic and aesthetic phenomenon, subject to the laws of reflection of the national linguistic picture of the world. For example, in the poetic line *За мною Київ тягнеться у снах* (V. Stus) (Eng. *For me Kyiv stretches in a dreams*) metaphor based on the use of the verb stretches in the sense of 'does not let go in the mind', 'disturbs' and the word-concept *Kyiv* as the embodiment of the idea 'native land'. At a deep metaphorical level, the interpretation of the text involves the manifestation of new meanings: the author is at a considerable distance from his hometown, but his connection with his native land is not lost, the longevity of feelings and experiences is preserved, at least not through direct perception, but in dreams, but as if forever; characteristic are determined as an indicator of connection with the native land [5].

Metaphor does not exist out of context – metaphor, as O. Fedyk claims, is not a word, but a pure contextual function of the word, the origin of which is the mystery of the epistemological nature of human consciousness. Metaphorization is the realization of the spiritual incarnation of the word. The essence of the mechanism of metaphor is not in the transfer of the meaning of the word from one subject to another, but in the coverage of the impulses of the spiritual nature of language [2].

Depiction of figurative reality by the text metaphorization leads to perception of the world in its figurative interpretation, taking into account language-forming processes, with a focus on achieving the effect of expressiveness of the phrase. Isolation (on the traditional basis) of artistic figures and methods of formation is complicated by the appeal to the modern neo-style style of writing with its metaphors, encoded meaning.

Regarding the qualification of metonymy as an artistic mean, there are problems of a narrower and broader understanding of its functional-semantic explication, which affects the possibility of its convergence or differences with other artistic means. Extending the semantic structure of a metonymic name to the limits of an associatively modeled image with a possible multifaceted interpretation may contribute to the emergence of a notation close to the symbol. In such substitutes of the original naming the blurring of the semantic layer, the encoding of connotative layers, inherent in verbal symbolism, develops; the semantic parallel with this or that abstract concept is complicated by the need to comprehend subjective authorial intentions. Compare: *Тисячі добровільних вигнанців, котрі перетинають символічні європейські кордони, намагаючись за будь-яку ціну досягти солодких об'єднаних вавилонських передмість, стирають спогади, відмовляються від минулого, змінюють біографії, підписують угоди і виїздять подалі від непривітного сонця своєї безнадійної батьківщини. Ця свіжа, гаряча кров нової європейської еміграції* (S. Zhadan. "Big Mac. Reboot") (Eng. *Thousands of voluntary exiles cross the symbolic borders of Europe, trying at all costs to reach the sweet united Babylonian suburbs, erase memories, abandon the past, change biographies, sign agreements and move away from the unfriendly sun of their hopeless homeland. This is the fresh, hot blood of the new European emigration*). The word-symbol *blood* is the carrier of archetypal semantics, expresses a set of semantic indicators of 'renewal', 'hope', 'rebirth', acquires the features of a positive factor of development. At the same time, it is a metonymic way of characterizing a compound of thousands of voluntary exiles.

Synecdoche in the stream of metonymic transfers performs not only a kind of nominative and characteristic function, but also creates a figurative representation of the object or phenomenon of the original name. For example, in the following text: *– Земля – це маленька крапка, – повільно сказав господар, тарабанячи пальцями по столу. – Зовсім, зовсім мізерна… – Можливо, й так, – відгукнувся астроном. – Земля таки справді щось невеличке в цьому великому, – він провів рукою туди, де виднілися зорі <…> – А на цій крапці ми, – сказав пан Юрій, – отой порох, що сиплеться вам з-під руки* (V. Shevchuk. "House on the mountain") (Ehg. *– The earth is a small point, – the owner said slowly, drumming his fingers on the table. – Absolutely, absolutely scanty... – Probably, and so,*

– the astronomer responded. – The earth is really something small in this big – he ran his hand to where the stars were seen <...> And at this point we are, – said Mr. Yuriy – this gunpowder that falls from your hands). The metonymic designation of the earth as a dot is supported by an additional feature: small, small in this large. The impression of smallness is confirmed by synecdoche: we are this gunpowder. The expression *is a small dot* has signs of comparison.

In general, the characterization of artistic means outlined the tendency of their interpretation in the process of interaction, in determining the features of convergence and difference between them, and finally, in recognizing the relativity of the separate existence of each of the artistic means.

5 Conclusion

Figurative means form a paradigmatic structure, which consists of quantitatively and qualitatively heterogeneous tropes and other expressive means, that nowadays are not consolidated into a single system. The principles of cognitive, culturological, pragmatic approaches to the classification of trope means enable establishing the interconnections among types and varieties of figurative means, inclusion of intermediate figurative units such as metaphor-simile, metaphor-symbol, metaphor-hyperbole, metaphorical epithet, etc. to the differentiated conglomerate of depicting components of the figurative text.

The general tendency in image-forming processes is the phenomenon of metaphorization as a way of new meaning creation, which includes both the actual metaphor and other figures of speech and complex figurative inversions. Contextually determined shifts in the combination of two or more figurative means manifest themselves in the phenomena of coordination and opposition of the expressive meanings, as a result, forming complex metaphor, figurative units, revealing the levels and ways of thinking, the varieties of individual author style creation.

Literature:

1. Batsevych, F.S. (2010). *Narysy z linhvistychnoi prahmatyky* [Essays on linguistic pragmatics]. Lviv: PAIS, 336.

2. Fedyk, O. (2000). *Mova yak dukhovnyi adekvat svitu (diisnosti)* [Language as a spiritual equivalent of the world (reality)]. Lviv: Misioner, 300.

3. Kachurovskyi, I. (2008). *Promenysti sylvety* [Radiant silhouettes]. Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia, 768.

4. Kononenko, V.I. (2018). *Linhvopoetychni etiudy: monohrafiia* [Linguopoetic etudes: monograph]. Kyiv; Ivano-Frankivsk: Prykarpatskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka, 304.

5. Kononenko, V.I. (2021). *Prahmatyka khudozhnoho tekstu: poshuky novostyliu: monohrafiia* [Pragmatics of artistic text: the search for a new style: monograph]. Kyiv; Ivano-Frankivsk: Prykarpatskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka, 365.

6. Kononenko, V.I. (2013). *Symvoly ukrainskoi movy* [Symbols of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv; Ivano-Frankivsk: Prykarpatskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka, 439.

7. Kovecses, Z. (2013). The Metaphor–Metonymy Relationship: Correlation Metaphors Are Based on Metonymy. *Metaphor and Symbol, 28*(2), 75-88. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2013.768498.

8. Lakoff, G., & Johanson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 242.

9. Malenko, O.O. (2010). *Linhvo-estetychna interpretatsiia buttia v ukrainskii poetychnii movotvorchosti* (vid folkloru do postmodernu): monohrafiia [Linguistic-aesthetic interpretation of existence in Ukrainian poetic language (from folklore to postmodernism): monograph]. Kharkiv: Kharkivske istoryko-filolohichne tovarystvo, 488.

10. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective.* (2000). In A. Barcelona (Eds.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 356.

11. Moisiienko, A.K. (2006). *Slovo v apertseptsiinii systemi poetychnoho tekstu.* Dekoduvannia Shevchenkovoho virsha: monohrafiia [The word in the apperceptive system of the poetic text. Decoding Shevchenko's poem: monograph]. Kyiv: Stal, 304.

12. Potebnia, A.A. (1905). *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti: Poeziia i proza. Tropy i figury. Myshlenyie poetycheskoie i mificheskoie* [From notes on the theory of literature: Poetry and prose. Tropes and figures. Thinking poetic and mythical]. Kharkov, 625.

13. Rasouli, M., & Hereavi, R.N. (2019). *Language, Culture & Society: Sociocultural factors.* LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 64.

14. Taranenko, O.O. (2005). *Trope. Ukrainska mova: entsyklopediia* [Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia]. Kyiv: Ukr. Enciklopediya, 639-640.

15. Steen, G. (2005). Metonymy Goes Cognitive-Linguistic. *Style, 39*(1). Available at: https://www.academia.edu/70639794.

16. Yermolenko, S.Ya. (2009). *Movno-estetychni znaky ukrainskoi kultury* [Linguistic and aesthetic signs of Ukrainian culture]. Kyiv: Instytut ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy, 352.

17. Yermolenko, S.Ya., Bybyk, S.P., & Todor, O.H. (2001). *Korotkyi tlumachnyi slovnyk linhvistychnykh terminiv* [A short explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms]. Kyiv: Lybid, 224.

18. Yeshchenko, T. (2021). *Fenomen khudozhnoho tekstu: komunikatyvnyi, semantychnyi i prahmatychnyi aspekty: monohrafiia* [The phenomenon of artistic text: communicative, semantic and pragmatic aspects]. Lviv: Lvivskyi natsionalnyi medychnyi universytet imeni Danyla Halytskoho, 470.

19. Zahnitko, A. (2020). *Suchasnyi linhvistychnyi slovnyk* [Modern linguistic dictionary]. Vinnytsia: Tvory, 920.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ