MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERCITY

Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from the English Language

TERM PAPER

in Translation Studies

under the title: Translation of English terminology in the ecological sphere

Group PA 21-19

School of translation studies

Educational Programme:

Theory and Practice of Translation from English and Second Foreign Language

Majoring 035 Philology

Anastasiia O. Goncharova

Research supervisor:

O. O. Kurbal-Hranovska

Lecturer

Kyiv – 2023

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Факультет германської філології і перекладу

Кафедра теорії і практики перекладу з

англійської мови

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Переклад англомовної термінології у екологічній сфері

Гончарова Анастасія

студентка групи Па21-19

Керівник курсової роботи _____

(підпис)

Викладач

Курбаль-Грановська Ольга Олегівна

Київ – 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Relevance of the research topic. Today, ecology and environmental issues are amongst the most popular topics of discussion in the English-language media, governmental and non-governmental organizations, in everyday communication of native English speakers, as well as the subject of numerous studies in natural sciences and humanities. This, in turn, leads to changes in the English language - the expansion of environmental vocabulary, formation of a holistic environmental discourse in English, and changes in its composition and content. In particular, active changes are taking place in the conceptual content of the modern environmental discourse in English and in its nominal translation.

Environmental English is a relatively new discourse, as it has formed only in the last 30 years. Today, environmental discourse is a special type of social communication based on a common subject - the state of the environment and its protection. The communicative goal of this type of discourse is to convey information about the state of the environment and current environmental problems, as well as to form the recipients' value attitudes that determine the principles of their interaction with the environment.

Modern environmental English-language discourse is undergoing an active process of neologism, as seen by significant changes in its communicative translation, which occur due to the emergence of new concepts and changes in the already formed ones. These changes are influenced, first of all, by extralinguistic factors, the main of which is the search for solutions to global environmental problems of our time.

Environmental discourse has been studied by such scholars as N. O. Gudz, O. O. Zhikhareva, O. V. Ivanova, N. A. Krasilnikova, M. A. Makseva, I. S. Parakhina, 3. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin, I. N. Rogozhnikova, I. O. Rozmaritsa and others. Despite the fact that texts on environmental issues are increasingly becoming the

object of study in the humanities, in particular, linguistics and translation studies, there is a lack of research, dedicated to key concepts of environmental discourse and the nominative means of their representation in texts.

The object of the study is the nominal space of English environmental discourse.

The subject of the study is the linguistic and cognitive features of modern nominative translation of English environmental discourse.

The aim of the research is to study modern nominative translation of English environmental discourse from the point of view of cognitive linguistics.

Achieving the goal of the study requires the following **tasks:**

1) to consider discourse as a concept of modern linguistics;

2) to identify the linguistic and socio-cultural characteristics of environmental discourse in English

3) to study the methodology of the nominative translation of discourse;

4) to clarify the concept in modern linguistics and the methodology of its study;

5) to examine the content of nominative translation of modern English environmental discourse;

6) to investigate lexical and semantic aspects of nominative translation of modern English environmental discourse.

The research material was based on scientific, popular science and journalist articles on environmental issues from English-language Internet publications and websites.

The following general scientific and special linguistic research methods were used in writing the paper:

- descriptive method for studying the phenomena of discourse and concept, their description on the basis of environmental English-language discourse;
- comparative method for analyzing and comparing the nominative content of the concepts of environmental English-language discourse;
- classification method for classifying concepts and various means of their expression in the language;
- semantic analysis method to find out the lexical and semantic features of the nominative translation of modern English environmental discourse environmental discourse;
- methods of contextual analysis and typology to study the peculiarities of the use of nominative means in English environmental discourse
- method of generalization to summarize the results of the study;
- conceptual analysis to study concepts of English environmental discourse and the peculiarities of their nominal representation.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in the systematization and generalization of knowledge about environmental discourse, the concept and the nominative space of modern environmental discourse. The study also clarifies the methodology of researching discourse and its key concepts in modern linguistics.

The practical value of the study lies in the fact that the obtained theoretical positions and practical results can be used in courses on discourse theory, text linguistics, stylistics, special courses in linguacultural, eco-linguistics with the aim of forming the ecological outlook of pupils/students, as well as in practical English classes.

Structure of the work. The study consists of an introduction, three chapters, general conclusions, as well as lists of used literature, reference sources and a list of illustrative materials.

The introduction outlines the relevance of the study, the object and subject of the research, its purpose and main objectives, material and methods of the study, formulates the theoretical and practical value of the study and describes its structure.

The first chapter of the paper, "THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THE STUDY OF NOMINATIVE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH ENVIRONMENTAL DISCUSSION," describes the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of nominative translation of English environmental discourse. It clarifies the basic concepts of the study, such as "discourse", "environmental discourse", "concept", and also examines the linguistic and socio-cultural characteristics of English environmental discourse, the methodology of the study of nominal translation of discourse, as well as the methodology and methods of studying environmental concepts.

The second chapter of the work, "THE CONTENT OF NOMINATIVE TRANSLATION OF MODERN ENGLISH ENVIRONMENTAL DISCUSSION," examines the content of nominative translation of modern English environmental discourse. This chapter analyses the conceptual space of modern English environmental discourse and the nominal space of its main concepts, such as «ENVIRONMENT / ДОВКІЛЛЯ», «POLLUTION / ЗАБРУДНЕННЯ», «CLIMATE CHANGE / ЗМІНА КЛІМАТУ», «ECOLOGICAL DISASTER / ЕКОЛОГІЧНА КАТАСТРОФА», «ECONOMIC CRISIS / ЕКОНОМІЧНА КРИЗА», «ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION / ЗАХИСТ ДОВКІЛЛЯ».

The conclusion summarizes the study, describes its main results and achievements, and identifies prospects for further research on the subject matter.

CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY OF NOMINATIVE TRANSLATION OF THE ENGLISH ENVIRONMENTAL DISCOURSE

1.1. Discourse as a concept of modern linguistics

Recently, the term "discourse" has been used to denote a text studied in the pragmatic aspect, taking into account all extralinguistic factors of its functioning. Many disciplines are related to the study of discourse, for example, pedagogy, sociology, pragmalinguistics, cultural studies, psycholinguistics, law, etc. Each science and research area has its own approach to the study of discourse, depending on the specifics of the subject.

The term *discours* (French) (from the Latin *discursus* - "movement, conversation") is translated as "discourse" (less often - speech, type of speech, text, type of text). This term is considered to be one of the most difficult concepts to define, but despite this, it is often used and is a functionally convenient term.

Initially, the word "discourse" in French linguistics meant speech in general or text. The theory of discourse has its origins in the concept of E. Benveniste [7], who defined discourse as "language appropriated by the speaker". He drew a distinction between the plan of the narrative *(récit)* and the plan of the language appropriated by the person who speaks *(discours)*. An identical distinction was observed by L.V. Shcherba [52] - language as a system and as an ability, language activity and language material, texts.

Studying discourse as a subject of text linguistics and discourse analysis as one of its methods, T. M. Nikolaieva considers discourse as "a multivalent term of text linguistics used by a number of authors in almost homonymous meanings" [38] and identifies the main ones

- dialogue;

- oral and conversational form of the text;

- a group of statements related to each other in terms of content;

- coherent text;

- a work of speech as a given, oral or written.

Later on, the definition of "discourse" as a term of text linguistics was not limited to the text and began to include a list of conditions in which this text is actualised. In this case, it is relevant to recall the definition of discourse proposed by T. A. van Dijk [16], which in modern linguistics is the first to describe this phenomenon as a speech stream, language in its constant movement, which absorbs the diversity of the historical era, individual and social characteristics of both the communicator and the communicative situation in which communication takes place.

The discourse reflects the mentality and culture, both national, general, and individual, private [16, p. 112]. Therefore, "...discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, thoughts, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text" [26, p. 210]. It should be noted that this definition is the basis for numerous linguistic studies of the text of the modern period.

V. Z. Demyankov, based on works on foreign linguistics, offers a more in-depth definition of discourse, which, according to Y. S. Stepanov, is the most complete in the modern theory of linguistics: "Discourse is a discourse, an arbitrary fragment of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence. Often, but not always, a discourse is concentrated around a certain core concept; it creates a general context that describes actors, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc., determined not so much by the sequence of sentences as by the world common to the creator of the discourse and its

interpreter, which is "built" according to the code of the discourse deployment - this is the point of view of the "ethnography of language" [19, p. 80].

It should be noted that in this definition, discourse consists of features and characteristics characteristic of different disciplines - from semiotics to sociology, communication theory, modal logic, etc.

P. Serio believes that the concept of "discourse" cannot be combined with either empirical speech produced by a subject or a text. This definition has many interpretations:

1) the equivalent of the concept of "language" (according to F. de Saussure), i.e. any specific utterance;

2) a unit that is larger than a phrase;

3) the impact of a statement on its recipient, taking into account the situation of the statement;

4) conversation as the main type of utterance;

5) speech from the position of the speaker as opposed to the narrative that does not take into account such a position (according to E. Benveniste)

6) the use of language units, their linguistic actualization: language and speech (language / discourse) are opposed;

7) socially or ideologically limited type of statements, for example, feminist discourse;

8) a theoretical construct designed to study the conditions of text production [46, p. 20].

Emphasizing the interaction between the study of language formations and the analysis of social context conditions, M. Stubbs distinguishes three basic characteristics of discourse:

1) in formal terms, it is a unit of language that exceeds the sentence in length;

2) informatively, discourse is associated with the use of language in a social context;

3) in its form, discourse is interactive, i.e. dialogical [73, p. 65].

The above statements make it possible to assert that discourse is likened not only to text (oral and written) and dialogue, but also to language and speech.

Analyzing different approaches to the definition of discourse, V. Ye. Cherniavska comes to the conclusion that discourse should be understood as a text in an inseparable connection with the situational context, which includes a set of social, cultural, historical, ideological, psychological and other factors, as well as a system of communicative, pragmatic and cognitive intentions of the author, interacting with the addressee, which determines a special ordering of linguistic units of different levels when embodied in the text. Discourse characterizes the communicative process that leads to the formation of a certain formal structure - the text. Depending on the research objectives of the discourse, in some cases, it can denote a separate specific communicative event, in others, we mean a communicative event as an integrative set of certain communicative acts, which result in the content and thematic commonality of many texts [54, p. 147].

The term "discourse" is applied to a set of texts that have common pragmatic properties that arose under the influence of socio-psychological factors. For example, political discourse is distinguished, as well as journalistic, environmental, epistolary, etiquette, argumentative, etc. discourses.

V. I. Karasik speaks of institutional discourse, which characterizes the speech behavior of representatives of certain social spheres. A set of texts created by one person can be called an author's discourse. In linguistics, the term "discourse" is correlated to the term "text", and linguists have begun to look for grounds for

differentiating these terms. The following options for their differentiation have been proposed (Table 1.1):

Table 1.1.

Options for distinguishing between the terms "discourse" and "text"

Discourse	The text
oral and written dialogue and monologue unlimited in length coherence between speech acts acts immersion in social reality does not have a specific communicative task presence of non-verbal components communication	is mostly written, mostly monologue, limited in length superficial cohesion of words and sentences autonomy from the reality that that gave rise to it has a specific pragmatic task absence of a non-verbal aspect

Accordingly, discourse is a much more comprehensive concept than text. This, among other things, determines the absence of a specific, clear communicative or pragmatic goal in discourse, since discourse is a set of texts. Each text has its own purpose, whereas discourse most often does not have an expressed single purpose.

At present, there is no clear distinction between the content of the terms "discourse" and "text", although a general trend in their use can be traced: for the study of discourse, the situations in which speech activity takes place, its socio-cultural specificity, the conditionality of its content and structure by social and communicative factors, as well as the effectiveness of its influence on the addressee are more important. For text studies, the most important thing is its internal structure, means of formation, and factors that ensure the text's coherence.

Undoubtedly, the text is the basis of any discourse, but the concept of discourse is clearly broader than the concept of text. As for the effectiveness of linguistic

influence, we can only talk about the effectiveness of a text that has a specific pragmatic purpose - the effectiveness of discourse is hardly possible to talk about, since it is fundamentally infinite, being a set of texts of a certain type.

Considering the problems of discourse typology, I. S. Shevchenko and O. I. Morozova [51, p. 33-38] systematise various criteria for its allocation, which correspond to the main discourse categories in terms of the semiotic model, such as structural, functional and substantive, and propose to distinguish the following types and subtypes of discourse

1) by form - oral and written types of discourse;

2) by the type of speech - monologue and dialogue;

3) according to the target criterion - institutional and personal, as well as, in the terms of V.I. Karasik [25, p. 239], status-oriented (which may or may not be institutional) and personality-oriented, which is divided into everyday and existential (philosophical and artistic);

4) by communicative attitudes - argumentative, conflict and harmonious types of discourse;

5) according to the socio-situational parameter, different subtypes of institutional discourse are distinguished, corresponding to the areas of its functioning;

6) the individual properties of the addressee and addressee determine the allocation of discourses of certain communicators and groups according to socio-demographic, socio-political, socio-professional criteria;

7) on the basis of the functional and informative components of discourse, such types of discourse as informative (further subdivided according to the functions of language into emotive, evaluative, directive, etc.) and phatic, where metacommunicative information prevails;

8) the use of formal and substantive criteria in the functional and stylistic aspect allows us to distinguish official and informal types of discourse [6, p. 235-236].

In addition, considering discourse in the intercultural aspect, V. V. Demetska proposes to approach this phenomenon in two dimensions: horizontal and vertical, which correspond to the two main criteria for distinguishing discourse. In cases where it is analysed horizontally, the main criterion is thematic, and if the discourse is considered vertically, the place of a certain type of discourse within the entire discourse field of one culture establishes the criterion of authority [18, p. 26].

It is important to pay attention to the structure of the discourse. For example, the English linguist M. Halliday describes discourse on the basis of the parameters "participants", "topic", "method" [66, p. 108-124]. Discourse participants are communicators who are considered together with their status and role functions, social relations in which they are involved. The topic of discourse refers to the sphere of social interaction where language is the main tool of cooperation. The discourse mode is a function performed by using language to achieve a certain goal, formal and substantive organization of the text, communication channel (oral or written statement), communicative goal (explanation, persuasion, inducement, etc.) [23, p. 22-23].

German scholars D. Busse and W. Teubert understand discourse as a set of texts related thematically, semantically, chronologically, typologically, which are part of a certain communicative sphere and are determined by social, cultural, historical, political, economic and other contexts [56, p. 14]. A. Gardt defines discourse as the consideration of a topic that is reflected in statements and texts of various types, discussed by more or less large social groups, reflects and actively influences the knowledge and points of view of these groups on this topic and, as a result, is a guide for the further formation of social reality on this topic [65, p. 30].

In the context of this study, we draw attention to the linguistic and cognitive approach to understanding and studying discourse. The concept of "cognitive" is perceived as synonymous with such concepts as "mental", "intellectual", "mental". From the perspective of cognitive science, a person is studied as a system of information processing [47, p. 28].

Cognitive linguistics, which focuses on language as a general cognitive mechanism, integrates the experience of many fields of scientific knowledge: linguistics, psychology, anthropology, neuroscience, artificial intelligence, philosophy, logic, etc. Cognitive linguistics studies the mechanisms of human language acquisition, the principles of structuring these mechanisms, as well as the perception and production of discourse as a written or spoken coherent text in conjunction with its extralinguistic and paralinguistic characteristics) [3, p. 13].

One of the ways of forming, storing and presenting knowledge about the world and language in the human mind is to organise knowledge into so-called "information packages" (frames and/or concepts) [47, p. 8]. By activating the relevant situation-frames, the researcher interprets the discourse, while the adequacy of the interpretation depends on the "quality" of the chosen text processing strategies. The interpreter is considered as a "cognitive subject" (according to the cognitive tradition), and the interpretation of discourse is largely based on his/her personal knowledge, opinions, attitudes, i.e. on the components of the "knowledge base" of a particular interpreter [11, p. 40].

A person perceives the world around him or her through sight, hearing, touch, smell and taste. They are defined as perceptual modes, or modes of perception, the main ones being sight and hearing. With the help of their perceptual modes, people perceive events and objects that fall into their cognitive zone, and then lexicalise their perception of the world, i.e. reflect it in language [22, p. 70].

When processing discourse, different types of strategies are usually used, each of which pursues its own goal and performs its specific task. At the initial stage of discourse interpretation, the researcher needs to establish meaningful connections between the sentences of the discourse, i.e. to make sure that the text under analysis is coherent. The local coherence of the discourse is constructed with the help of local coherence strategies (T. van Dijk's terminology). The establishment of potential connections between parts of the discourse is based on the linear ordering of sentences [16, p. 155].

At the next stage of interpretation, macro-strategies are used to quickly analyse textual information in order to identify the main theme (macrostructure) of the discourse. Macro-strategies are particularly flexible and heuristic. There is no need to wait until the end of the discourse to understand what the text is about. The topic of the discourse can be guessed after a minimum of textual information from the first sentences. The guess can be confirmed by various information: the topic (first) sentence, topic words, knowledge about the context, participants, etc. [8, p. 20-21].

In general, the concepts of frames, concepts and cognitive strategies are the basic components of the discourse interpretation process. Such strategies of textual information processing can be applied to a specific discourse, in the context of this study - English environmental discourse.

So, based on the above, it should be noted that many scientific concepts of discourse that interact with each other are integral parts of one concept. This is evidence of the frequent use of the term "discourse" in contemporary scholarship, but at the same time it emphasises the lack of transparent boundaries and a finite number of structural components of this concept. Having analysed various approaches to the interpretation of the concept of discourse, we take as a basis the definition of discourse as a set of texts that have common pragmatic properties

that arose under the influence of socio-psychological factors. Among the various types of discourses, we focus on environmental discourse.

1.2. Environmental discourse: linguistic and socio-cultural characteristics

In this study, we turn to the concept of environmental discourse, its linguistic and socio-cultural characteristics. Considering the types of discourse, E. F. Kirov writes that there are as many types of discourse as there are types of human activity, since each type of activity generates its own type of discourse with its own vocabulary and style [27, p. 25].

Among the most common types of discourse in the scientific literature, according to the "topic" parameter, we can name the following types: pedagogical, ethical, political, legal, medical, military, religious, sports, etc. Since the topic of discourse can be any area of human activity, this list is very extensive and constantly updated.

Based on the criteria of discourse typology proposed by M. Holliday, V. I. Karasik, V. V. Krasnykh, researcher O. V. Ivanova distinguishes environmental discourse by the parameter "topic", to which she refers "a lot of texts of different functional styles and genres - from monographs to works of popular and fiction literature - as an expression of environmental topics and problems in language" [23, p. 23].

It can be assumed that the discourse of nature management and primitive ecology has existed for a long time, but the term "ecology" appeared only in 1866 (its author is Ernst Haeckel). Initially, the term had a narrowly biological meaning, but over time it became so blurred that the 5th International Environmental Congress, held in 1990, was forced to give a definition that limited the meaning of the term: "Ecology is a biological science that studies the structure and

functioning of supra-organismal systems (populations, communities, ecosystems) in space and time in natural and human-modified environments."

It is characteristic that at the same time, in the 90s of the twentieth century, such a direction as ecolinguistics appeared in Western linguistics, which includes two branches: eco-critical analysis of discourse and linguistic ecology [72, p. 25], and in the second case, an expanded understanding of the term "ecology" should be noted.

The Academic Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language [2] does not reflect the narrowing of the term, but remains within the framework of biology, defining ecology as:

1) the science of relations between plant and animal organisms and the communities they form with each other and the environment;

2) ecological system;

3) nature and the environment of all living things in general (usually their poor condition).

To analyse environmental discourse, coherent oral or written texts are used, depending on the situation of communication on environmental topics. The key concepts and topics of environmental discourse are nature and environmental protection.

With the growing importance of ecology in society, the role of the so-called environmental discourse is also growing. A new branch of linguistics, ecolinguistics, emerged in the 1970s in many countries and combines ecology and linguistics. The object of study of this science is environmental discourse. Ecolinguistics as a new scientific field in the field of linguistics studies the interaction between language, a person as a linguistic personality and the environment. At the same time, language is an integral component of the system

of relations between man (society) and nature. The functioning and development of language is presented as an ecosystem, and the world around us as a linguistic concept [13].

The concept of "language ecology" was first mentioned in the report of the American linguist A. Haugen in 1970, which initiated the study of the interaction between ecology and linguistics. In his later works, he defines language ecology as "the science of the relationship between language and its environment, where the environment of language is understood as a society that uses language as one of its codes. A language exists only in the minds of those who speak it and functions only in relations with other speakers and with their social and natural environment. The ecology of a language depends on the people who learn it, use it and transmit it to other people [69, p. 57-58].

The English linguist M. Halliday continues to study this problem, who in 1990 in his report "New Ways of Expressing Meaning: The Challenge of Applied Linguistics" raised the issue of the interaction between language and the environment. The scientist is interested in the following areas of research: to what extent language structures and text units are involved in highlighting issues related to environmental problems; whether language can make these problems more understandable, accessible and close to humans. He introduces the concept of "linguistic ecology", which considers languages and texts in terms of their "environmental friendliness" and explores the role of language in describing environmental problems [66].

Scientists R. Garre, I. Brockmeyer and P. Mühlheusler direct their efforts to develop the methodology of ecolinguistics in this vein. They consider language and language structures not as separate units, but as a system of individual structures that interact with the surrounding world, and therefore it is impossible, in their opinion, to study language in isolation from its natural and cultural environment [67, p. 91-93].

Different fields and concepts of ecolinguistics were first clearly distinguished and systematised by A. Fill in his book "Linguistic Ecology and Ecolinguistics" published in 1996 [62, p. 132-133]:

- ecolinguistics combines all the branches of research that consider the interaction of ecology and linguistics;

- ecology of language (Ökologie der Sprache) studies the interaction and historical development of different languages and seeks to preserve linguistic diversity;

- ecological linguistics applies ecological terms and principles to language (for example, the concept of ecosystem);

- linguistic or language ecology (Sprachökologie) studies the relationship between language and environmental issues.

The analysis of lexical items of a particular language helps to identify associations, images and perceptions of native speakers related to the phenomena of the surrounding reality. In her dissertation research, O. V. Ivanova summarises the experience gained in the field of ecolinguistics and develops a typology of environmental discourse based on functional and stylistic differentiation, as well as examines the metaphorical conceptualisation of natural disasters based on media texts. O. V. Ivanova defines environmental discourse as "a set of oral and written texts of different functional styles and genres, determined by the situation of communication on environmental topics" [23, p. 4].

According to M. Luhmann, when selecting language material for the study of environmental discourse, two approaches are distinguished [33]: narrow and broad. In the narrow approach, only scientific texts created by specialists (ecologists) are considered as research material. A broad approach to the selection of linguistic material includes both texts created by ecologists and other texts with environmental themes (political, legal, mass media, fiction, everyday life).

Considering environmental discourse as a special type of discourse, I. O. Rozmaritsa limits the scope of its implementation to the environmental sphere and defines environmental discourse as a set of verbal and non-verbal acts used to verbalise knowledge about the environment in order to influence public opinion on the basis of such extralinguistic and linguistic criteria as:

1) the relevance of environmental issues;

2) increased attention paid to environmental issues at all levels of society;

3) formation of the environmental sphere as a special area of human activity;

4) constant replenishment of the environmental glossary;

5) emergence of special axiological units of environmental semantics;

6) the existence of certain models of addressee-address configuration, which determine the use of certain communication strategies (persuasion and pressure strategies) in specific situations;

7) political and environmental correctness, which are the organising principles of environmental discourse [44, p. 5].

H. A. Krasilnikova understands environmental discourse as: "the language of environmental activists immersed in the political life of environmental movements" [30, p. 10], emphasising that due to the initial internationality of the environmental movement, the ratio of nationally specific and universal features in many cases is expressed in the dominance of the latter, since "environmentalists of the world speak different languages, but borrow arguments, slogans, metaphors from each other" [30, p. 8].

Environmental discourse always deals with topical social issues and problems related to ecology and environmental protection from pollution. We propose that the global goals of environmental discourse include the following objectives:

1) research - study of topical social issues and problems related to ecology and environmental pollution;

2) campaigning and informational - influencing public opinion by disseminating information about the need to protect nature as a natural habitat for all living organisms;

3) regulatory - to regulate the behaviour of people in society by establishing norms of interaction with the environment (laws, regulations, etc.);

4) activating - convincing the recipients of the need to change their behaviour and raise their environmental awareness in order to take specific actions aimed at protecting the environment [43, p. 75].

Environmental discourse is implemented in its genres, which include a journal review article, a scientific report or speech at a conference or environmental forum, a public lecture, a report on the work done, comments and points of view on the topic of published materials, appeals and interviews, discussions during official and working meetings of heads of government, letters from ordinary citizens asking for assistance in matters of violation of environmental norms. At the same time, both the level of officialdom and the channel of representation (oral or written), as well as the form of communication (monologue or dialogue) may vary [23, p. 95].

Each genre determines the selection of lexical, grammatical and stylistic means to achieve the required effect of influence, and ultimately, the peculiarity of the internal organisation of environmental discourse.

Prominent speakers, well-known public and political figures, scientists, and climatologists can act as conductors of environmental knowledge. One of the approaches to analysing environmental discourse in the genre of public speaking (i.e. its media varieties) is the strategic approach, which allows us to identify the general goals of public speaking and correlate them with specific steps or tactics

taken by the speaker to achieve them. The strategic approach also provides an opportunity to formulate the main criteria for a successful public speech, general rules of speech production, selection of lexical, grammatical and stylistic means, and to assess their acceptability and effectiveness for a particular audience [1, p. 71].

Therefore, in this study, we rely on the understanding of environmental discourse as a set of texts of different functional styles and genres, which reveal environmental topics and issues through the means of language and speech. In general, environmental discourse performs a crucial function in shaping people's attitudes towards nature. All of us are addressees of environmental discourse, as we have some information about the state of the environment, so studying how language influences environmental behaviour and public awareness is an extremely relevant issue in the context of the global environmental crisis.

1.3. Methodology of the study of nominative discourse translation

The centuries-long history of language learning demonstrates the interest of scholars in the issue of identifying the main language functions, which inevitably include the nominal one. Acting as the primary function of language [50], the nominative function implies the ability of the language system to name and distinguish fragments of reality, forming concepts about them in the form of words, combinations of words, phrases and sentences [49, p. 336].

The dynamic development of cognitive and communicative activities of human society and, as a result, the emergence of new realities, artefacts, objects of material and spiritual culture indeed define one of the main tasks of language as "providing all spheres of human life with new names" [50, p. 5].

The study of lexical nomination is carried out primarily within the lexicological field, where semiotic and onomasiological aspects of nomination are studied. In

other words, lexical nomination is considered from the point of view of its structure as a linguistic sign and its connection with a phenomenon.

Having accumulated quite a lot of experience in describing linguistic tools within the framework of the systemic-structural direction and the typological paradigm, scientists are turning to a slightly different perspective of linguistic research. Modern linguistics strives for a multidimensional description of linguistic phenomena, in particular in the field of studying such a linguistic phenomenon as nomination.

When studying the peculiarities of the study of nominalised discourse translation, it is necessary to determine the methodology of discourse research in general. Thus, if discourse is a process, not a result, then its study is possible only on the basis of contemporary texts, since it is impossible to study everything that accompanies and determines the generation of texts (social context) without witnessing this process. Thus, discourse analysis becomes a methodology that works with a limited number of texts and is defined as the analysis of spoken language in the process of its sounding. At the same time, it is clear that the analysis is carried out with an emphasis on the functioning of language (process), or rather the conditions of its functioning, i.e. phonetic / prosodic, lexical and semantic, as well as pragmatic, psychological and ethnolinguistic levels of speech activity [55, p. 34].

If discourse is a product of speech activity, then discourse analysis means the analysis of any messages/texts regardless of the time of their generation. Here, the focus is on the text itself and the conditions of its functioning that are reflected in the text. The text is seen as a certain complex (construct) built on the basis of the interaction of a number of codes (verbal and non-verbal). Accordingly, it contains a certain set of parallel functioning texts that provide textual polyphony born of the "behind-the-text" reality or social context, which can be restored or reconstructed [57, p. 332]. Thus, the focus here shifts to the pragmatic, socio-

cultural, psychological parameters of the content that enrich the text and ensure its social popularity for many years after its generation. In both cases, the text is an event. But while in one case the text is an event of interaction between real people, in the other it is an interaction between the text and the reader/viewer/listener. Thus, we can see that the text is an independent subject of communication and at the same time a phenomenon, an event that needs to be revealed, and the keys to it should be sought in the knowledge of the codes that exist both in the text and in ourselves [58, p. 16].

Among the works of contemporary Ukrainian researchers and scholars from other countries, we can distinguish a number of approaches that develop the practice and theory of discourse analysis: communicative, semiotic, cognitive-discursive, discursive-dialogical, integrative and causal-genetic. The communicative approach combines descriptive discourse analysis and pragmatic research, consistently taking into account the communicative and pragmalinguistic aspects of language interaction. Descriptive discourse analysis is derived from the classical methodology of rhetorical analysis of public speeches, text linguistics and communication theory. In modern linguistics, one of the aspects of the descriptive approach is related to the study of linguistic behaviour: language tools, rhetorical techniques and manipulative strategies. Within the framework of the descriptive direction, the situation of communication, communicative constraints imposed on the implementation of discourse, discourse genres, communicative competence, discourse strategies, and the correlation of discourse forms with communicative norms are studied [61, p. 56].

The pragmatic approach to discourse analysis includes theories that consider general knowledge and inference, and the concept of intersubjectivity plays an important role in it, which is related to the study of speech acts, conversion maxims, deixis, and discourse epistemics [64, p. 71].

Semiotic analysis of discourse understands discourse as a sign formation, studies its sign organisation, system-forming characteristics, typology of signs of different discourses. The cognitive-discourse approach combines the interest of cognitive science in the production and understanding of language with the interest of discourse analysis in the context and situation of communication. The cognitive approach allows us to move from describing the units and structures of discourse to modelling the structures of the minds of communication participants. Modelling the cognitive base of discourse is carried out through the analysis of discourse frames and concepts. The cognitive-discursive approach also has applied areas, for example, the creation of linguistic support for an algorithmic model of semantic compression of the text [68, p. 474]. The discursive-dialogical approach, following M. M. Bakhtin's ideas about the dialogism of the text, focuses on the peculiarities of the text's functioning as a discourse in dialogic socio-cultural translation, and provides for an emphasis on the actual dialogic moment of language communication. The integrative approach considers discourse, taking into account the positions of communication studies, semiotics, pragmatics, and cognitive science, as a complex phenomenon that carries different types of information and content. The causal-genetic approach considers discourse as an integrative unit of speech activity and identifies a number of types of content that make up the discourse system [50, p. 20]. Considering an individual as a representative of society and a potential communicator, it is quite appropriate to address mental models that contain information about contemporary reality, events, participants, as well as long-term knowledge about the world, which in total forms the context [14, p. 24]. According to T. A. van Dijk, such models are personal representations (episodic memory) of specific events witnessed, participated in, listened to, or read by communicators. They perform the function of personal interpretation and evaluation of events. Accordingly, when we produce or perceive language, we use our mental models as a cognitive basis for the process of discourse production or information

perception. In the process of semantic presentation of the discourse, the addressee uses contextually relevant propositions that are extracted from the set of his/her mental models [59, p. 210]. According to O. S. Kubryakova, two types of nominative processes are used in the formulation of a sentence: on the one hand, it is a propositional nomination associated with the choice of a syntactic scheme, on the other hand, it is a nomination as such associated with the designation of individual components of the situation [31, p. 97-98].

A nominative unit (word, phrase or sentence) is intended to denote the information that is in the speaker's mind, as well as to activate the corresponding information in the listener's mind [21, p. 7]. Such nomination creates a picture of the world necessary for a certain side of the communicative process, and at the same time, the information that is the meaning of the nominal unit acts as a subjective image of objective reality or, in cognitive terms, a mental construct, an interpretation of an objective fact [53, p. 163].

Cognitive and pragmatic processes are an inseparable whole, where mental models develop into intentions, gaining illocutionary power, being conceptualised and, ultimately, verbalised. Mental models always have a personal (subjective, ideologically determined) presentation of the communicative situation, which acts as a corrective element in the process of discursive practice. Accordingly, due to the dominance of the personal approach in the aspect of linguistic research, the field of further research activity is limitless, affecting not only the cognitive and pragmatic trends of modern linguistics, but also going to comparative, historical, structural analyses, which contributes to a comprehensive study of language material within a particular discourse practice.

CHAPTER 2. THE CONTENT OF NOMINATIVE TRANSLATION OF MODERN ENGLISH ENVIRONMENTAL DISCOURSE

2.1. **The conceptual space of modern English-language environmental discourse**

Considering the content of the English-language environmental discourse, it should be noted that it is filled with concepts corresponding to its subject matter and semantic content. First of all, the key concept of this discourse is the very concept of ecology - "ECOLOGY".

The role of the concept of "ECOLOGY" for modern society is determined by its place among other socially significant concepts. The word ecology is one of the 10,000 most frequently used words in the English language, and its frequency has been increasing since 1928, but especially sharply since 1967 (according to the Collins Cobuild dictionary) [75]. On the one hand, this frequency is due to the variety of definitions of the lexeme ecology:

1. A branch of science concerned with the interrelationship of organisms and their environments;

2. The totality or pattern of relations between organisms and their environment;

3. Human e.: a branch of sociology dealing especially with the spatial and temporal interrelationships between humans and their economic, social, and political organisation;

4. Environment e.: the complex of physical, chemical, and biotic factors (such as climate, soil, and living things) that act upon an organism or an ecological community and ultimately determine its form and survival [82].

The study of organisms and their relationship with the environment is a well-known and long-established meaning of the word ecology. The primacy of this meaning is also explained by its position in the list of definitions (positions 1 and 2). However, in the modern world, the term "ecology" is also used to define human relations and to reflect the current situation in the environment.

Over time, the ECOLOGY concept has become anthropocentric. The dominant position of man is due to his dominant influence on the environmental situation. At the same time, man, being the cause of environmental problems, is also the way to solve them: as a result of the negative impact of the environmental situation, people are making attempts to cope with the global catastrophe and protect the environment. Thus, the modern concept of "ECOLOGY" is based on the following chain: man (cause) - environment - man (solution).

The ECOLOGY conceptosphere consists of a number of basic environmental concepts: "WATER", "ATMOSPHERE", "ANIMALS", "NATURE" and others, for example:

As increased amounts of CO_2 dissolve from the atmosphere into the ocean, marine animals require ever higher levels of O_2 to breathe normally [90].

A person, combining these components in his/her mind, puts into the concept of "ECOLOGY" all his/her perception, cognition and reaction to the world, which are directly related to the environment [40, p. 131].

However, the term "ecology" goes beyond the ecological concept and is implemented in a number of others. A diachronic examination of the lexeme ecology reveals that the scope of its use has expanded due to the acquired meaning of its derivative ecological: "interested in preserving the environment" [79]. The component of the definition preserving gives the lexical unit a positive colouring, thus endowing the term ecological with a positive connotation.

In order to describe the global content of discourses, scholars introduce such concepts as "macrostructure" [60], "superstructure" [29], "frame" [48], "strategy" [10]. Discourse is always linked to a certain concept. Understanding a complex semantic structure is impossible without relating it to higher-level structures. Thus, the micro-structures of the macro-field "ECOLOGY" include not only

information about the essence of the problem, but also about its causes and possible consequences.

The analysis of modern English-language environmental texts allows us to identify several related concepts within the macro-field "ECOLOGY", for example (Fig. 2.1):

2.2. Nominal space of the concept "ENVIRONMENT"

Let us consider the components of the conceptual translation of the English environmental discourse. One of the most pronounced concepts in it is the concept of "ENVIRONMENT", which, due to the growing interest in environmental protection, is acquiring a whole layer of new interpretations.

The study of the conceptual component of the content structure of the concept "ENVIRONMENT" in terms of its reproduction in modern English is advisable to be carried out using the method of definitional analysis of nouns, adjectives and verbs, in the semantics of which there are appropriate markers. Let us consider the dictionary entries of various English-language explanatory dictionaries.

For example, the Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English uses the following interpretation of the concept of environment:

Environment (n): Surroundings, circumstances, influences [83].

A more detailed interpretation of this lexeme is given in the Merriam Webster Dictionary, in particular:

Environment:

1: the circumstances, objects, or conditions by which one is surrounded;

2a: the complex of physical, chemical, and biotic factors (such as climate, soil, and living things) that act upon an organism or an ecological community and ultimately determine its form and survival;

b: the aggregate of social and cultural conditions that influence the life of an individual or community;

3: the position or characteristic position of a linguistic element in a sequence;

4: a computer interface from which various tasks can be performed [82].

Let us also refer to the definition of environment given in the Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Thesaurus:

Environment: surrounding or associated matters that influence or modify a course of development. syn. Ambience, ambient, atmosphere, climate, medium, milieu, mise-en-scene, surroundings [81].

The Longman Exam Dictionary contains the following article, which reveals the lexical aspect of the concept of environment in English:

Environment: Environmental adj; environmentalist n; environmentally adv. [80].

According to the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary, the following definition and meaning of the concept of environment in English is given:

1) the air, land, and water where people, animals, and plants live;

2) the situation that you live or work in, and how it influences how you feel [77].

The analysis of English dictionaries allows us to conclude that the verbalisation of the concept "ENVIRONMENT" has been expanding over time. In particular, the development of the interpretation of this concept has gone the following way:

1) "the surroundings, the circumstances of the place you are in" in 1993;

2) "the natural world, such as land, air, water, etc., among which people, animals and plants exist" in 1998;

3) "the natural world, which includes land, water, air, plants and animals, is mainly seen as something that can be affected by human activities" in 2002;

4) "the people and things around you that affect your life" in 2004;

5) "the air, water and land on Earth that can be affected by human activities; the people and things in your life that surround you, such as the buildings you use" in 2006;

6) "the setting in which you live or work and how it affects your health" in 2011.

Thus, the interpretation of the word environment in modern English has come a long way from a simple definition of "surroundings" to a concept that includes the mutual influence, interaction between a person and the living environment surrounding him or her, and, later, the inanimate environment (buildings).

Thus, the semantic content of the concept "ENVIRONMENT" in the English language linguistic culture by 2011 was formed as a generalised concept that characterises the natural conditions in a particular place and the ecological state of this area. As a rule, the term is used to describe the natural conditions on the Earth's surface, the state of its local and global ecosystems, including inanimate nature, flora and fauna, and their interaction with humans (i.e., affecting them and, at the same time, being affected by human activity).

Being an integral part of the environment, humans cannot exist in parallel and independently; on the contrary, they significantly change the environment in the course of its economic development. In turn, the state of the environment affects human health and life processes. Often, the concept of "environment" includes elements that make up the artificial environment (residential buildings, industrial enterprises and engineering structures, etc.) [80].

is confirmed by the importance of environmental problems in the world and, in this regard, by the expansion of the lexical field of this concept in English, including through the emergence of neologisms related to environmental issues.

For example, the lexeme environmentalist (suffix -ist) and another derivative word from the name of the concept under study were formed by affixal word formation: environmentalism (suffix -ism). The abbreviation EQI (abbreviation for environmental quality index) was created. When an abbreviation appears only in writing, it is read as a full word. The absence of periods after each letter of an abbreviation is characteristic, which brings them closer to acronyms. Acronyms are pronounced as full words. For example: UNEP (United Nations Environmental Programme). They can also be used as word combinations, for example: environmentally-friendly.

In general, the analysis suggests that the value side of the concept "ENVIRONMENT" is the recognition of the environment as the most important aspect of human life and the system of priorities for human behaviour. This is one of the key concepts of environmental discourse, as it relates to the environment as the main object of study of ecology as a science.

2.3. Nominal space of the concept "POLLUTION"

One of the key concepts of the modern English-language environmental discourse is the concepts of "POLLUTION" and "CLIMATE CHANGE", which reveal the human factor as a trigger for most environmental problems. These concepts reflect the main environmental problems of our time. Let's analyse the nominal space of these concepts, starting with the environmental concept "POLLUTION".

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the lexeme pollution is interpreted as: "1) damage caused to water, air, etc. by harmful substances or waste; 2) the act of polluting, or the substances that pollute" [76]. The Merriam-Webster dictionary also provides two interpretations of this concept: "1) the action of

polluting especially by environmental contamination with man-made waste; 2) the condition of being polluted" [81].

In general, the concept of pollution in English dictionaries corresponds to such actions as the act, the action, the condition. According to the Collins English Dictionary, this list can also include the names the process, the state, and the substances, which indicates not only the action of pollution, but also the pollutants themselves: "1) the process of polluting water, air, or land, especially with toxic chemicals; 2) poisonous or dirty substances that are polluting the water, air, or land somewhere; 3) the act of polluting or the state of being polluted; 4) harmful or poisonous substances introduced into an environment" [75]. Similar definitions of the concept of pollution are also provided in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English: "1) the process of making air, water, soil, etc. dangerously dirty and not suitable for people to use, or the state of being dangerously dirty; 2) substances that make air, water, soil, etc. dangerously dirty" [79].

In general, the analysis of dictionary definitions of the name of the concept "POLLUTION" in English allows us to distinguish the following nominal units that make up this concept: nouns damage, polluting, waste, chemicals, as well as adjectives harmful, man-made, poisonous, dirty. In addition, almost all dictionary definitions indicate that the concept of pollution is closely related to the names of different types of environment (water, air, land, soil). Accordingly, the concept of "POLLUTION" is closely related to the concept of "ENVIRONMENT" and reveals one of the elements of this concept's content - environmental pollution.

In general, in the chain "Man - Pollution - Global Problems - Man", which is often mentioned by environmentalists in their studies, attention is focused on the fact that human activity has a detrimental impact on the environment by polluting it. As a link, pollution is both a consequence of human activity, i.e. an independent problem, and a cause of other global problems.

Being the first and the last link in the chain, a human being is both a source of pollution and a way to combat it, which is why human nominations are given a separate place in the nominal translation of the concept "POLLUTION". Among the lexemes of this group, lexical items that nominate people who fight against pollution problems are widespread. Some of them are formed by a typical English word formation method - affixation. For example, by adding the suffix -er to verbs, a group of words is formed that denotes the performer of an activity:

Zero waster - "someone who generates no waste whatsoever" [Merriam-Webster];

Picker - "a person who takes it upon himself to pick up litter in public places" [81].

The lexemes derived from the verbs to waste and to pick are used to refer to people who either do not produce waste at all (zero waster) or pick up litter in public places (picker).

However, the problem of pollution causes the emergence of other lexemes. In particular, the use of the component pollution in the formation of new English lexemes can express not only the pollution of water, air, and land with toxic waste, but also the pollution of a person's life translation with "information garbage", such as excessive advertising in public places, for example:

Visual pollution - "a pejorative term for advertising in public places" [78].

The problem of pollution is also reflected in neologous representations not only due to the presence of evaluative components in them, but also due to the use of units denoting colour - green, grey, white:

Green urbanism - "urban design and planning that aims to minimise a city's impact on the environment" [86];

Grey water - "water that has been used before, for example for washing, that can be stored and used again, for example in toilets" [76];

White pollution - "litter, especially plastic bags, but als papers, cups, and food containers" [85].

As for the neologisms grey water and green urbanism, the recipient can easily recognise their meaning, as the associative series fixed in the world picture coincides with the meaning of the new lexemes: green = ecological, grey = dirty. However, in the case of the neologism white pollution, there is a mismatch, since in the recipient's view white = clean. The white colour in the lexeme white pollution is used to denote plastic waste: bags, paper, disposable tableware. Therefore, in the case of this lexeme, the recipient who has not encountered it before will need the context of its use to understand it.

The metonymy underlying the expression white pollution can evoke different associations in the recipient's mind according to their cognitive picture of the world: white pollution is industrial smoke or dust after a nuclear explosion (nuclear winter). The colour analogy with plastic is achieved due to the fact that most plastic waste is made up of disposable tableware and packaging bags, which are mostly white or transparent.

Thus, the analysed nominal lexical items reflect the interaction between humans and nature. In the cycle of this interaction, such micro-fields as "Pollution" and "Global issues" were identified, which stand in a consistent relationship in this chain, indicating the cause-and-effect relationship between pollution and the emergence of global environmental problems. The human being, leading and simultaneously completing this chain, appears as the cause of natural problems and as their solution. That is why the human nomination is given a special place in a significant number of nominations of the POLLUTION concept.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the focus of this study is on a recently emerging type of discourse called environmental discourse. The research has shown that a variety of scientific concepts of discourse, which interact with each other, are integral parts of the same concept. This indicates the frequent use of the term "discourse" in contemporary science, but at the same time it emphasises the lack of transparent boundaries and a finite number of structural components of this concept. Having analysed various approaches to the interpretation of the concept of discourse, we take as a basis the definition of discourse as a set of texts that have common pragmatic properties that arose under the influence of socio-psychological factors.

The study proposes an understanding of environmental discourse as a set of texts of different functional styles and genres, which reveal environmental topics and issues through the means of language and speech. In general, environmental discourse performs a crucial function in shaping people's attitudes towards nature. All people are addressees of environmental discourse, since we have some information about the state of the environment, so studying how language affects environmental behaviour and public awareness is an extremely relevant issue in the context of the global environmental crisis.

The study of discourse in modern linguistics is based on the tools of cognitive linguistics, including the concept of concept. The analysis of concepts is very important for linguistic research; it allows us to consider some cultural values and spheres of the cultural world in more depth, as well as to identify distinctive components of associative series, peculiarities of concepts' use, and to reveal the peculiarities of the content of a mental unit, a concept, determined by the cultural and historical development of a nation. Having considered the methods of concept analysis, it was determined that the methodology of studying concepts

can include both traditional linguistic methods and research techniques (descriptive, comparative, comparative-historical, statistical analysis) and relatively new ones, in particular, conceptual analysis. In this study, conceptual analysis is interpreted as a method of describing verbal representations of a concept by building a verbal model of the concept.

The linguistic concept is always verbalised, because the act of cognition ends with the name, and verbalisation should be objectified in a stable linguistic unit that fixes the process of cognition in the form of a linguistic sign. The main means of linguistic representation of a concept can be individual lexemes, abbreviations or acronyms, phraseological or free word combinations, precedent microtexts (proverbs and sayings), sentences and texts, etc. Thus, in cognitive linguistics, a concept is understood as a semantic formation marked by linguistic and cultural specificity, which in one way or another characterises the speakers of a particular ethnoculture.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Азначеева Е. Н. К проблеме когнитивного моделирования институционального дискурса. Слово, высказывание, текст в когнитивном, прагматическом и культурологическом аспектах. Челябинск: Челяб. гос. ун-т, 2006. С. 83–84.

2. Академічний тлумачний словник української мови. URL: http://sum.in.ua/

3. Андрусь А. Семантико-когнітивний підхід у сучасних лінгвокогнітивних пошуках. Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство. 2015. № 4. С. 11–15.

4. Байдак А. В. Экспериментальные исследования концептов «жизнь» и «смерть». Известия Томского политехнического университета Известия

ТПУ. 2010. Т. 316. № 6: Экономика. Философия, социология и культурология. С. 228–232.

5. Балюта Е. Г. Нова лексика та фразеологія англійської мови сфери охорони довкілля: структурно-семантичні і функціональні параметри: автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Одеса, 2007. 352 с.

6. Безугла Л. Р. Перлокуція у дискурсі. Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен: кол. монографія. Харків: Константа, 2005. С. 118–144.

7. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. 3-е изд. Киев: Эдиториал УРСС, 2009. 448 с.

8. Богуцький В. М. Інтерпретація дискурсу як виду когнітивної діяльності людини. Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology. VI (48), Iss.: 161, 2018. С. 20–22.

9. Валюкевич Т. В. Семантико-этимологический анализ лингвокультурного концепта ВНЕШНОСТЬ. Весник Харьковского национального университета им. В. Н. Каразина. Харьков: ХНУ. Вып. 68. 2011 (1460 а). С. 155–159.

10. Варецька О. О. Стратегії критики у німецькому та українському політичному дискурсі. Міжкультурна комунікація в науковому і освітньому перекладі: Матеріали I-ої Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. Одеса, 2020. С. 56–59.

11. Васецька Л. І. Комунікативно-когнітивний підхід до навчання наукового дискурсу іноземних студентів: аналіз проблеми та перспективні напрями вирішення. Проблеми і перспективи підготовки іноземних студентів: матеріали міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. Харків: ХНАДУ. С. 39–44.

12. Гольдберг В. Б. Лексика современного английского языка в свете лингвистических парадигм: методы исследования. Тамбов, 2003. 90 с.

13. Гудзь Н. О. Екологічний дискурс в лінгвістичних описах. URL: http://www.eprints.zu.edu.ua/ 9603/1/Гудзь%204.pdf

14. Даньшина Е. В. Стратегии и тактики американского предвыборного дискурса. Вісник СумДУ. Серія «Філологія». 2007. № 1. Том 2. С. 24–28.

15. Джавахова И. Г. Фрагмент концептуального анализа лексико-семантической группы «конфлікт». Семантика языковых единиц. Москва: Альфа, 1994. С. 59–63.

16. Дейк Т. А. ван. Язык, познание, коммуникация. Москва: Прогресс, 1989. 312 с.

17. Дейк Т. А. ван, Кинч В. Стратегии понимания связного текста. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Москва, 1988. Вып. 23. С. 153–208.

18. Демецька В. В. Теорія адаптації : крос-культурні та перекладознавчі проблеми: монографія. Херсон: Норд, 2006. 378 с.

19. Демьянков В. З. Морфологическая интерпретация текста и структура словаря. Вопросы кибернетики: Общение с ЭВМ на естественном языке. Москва: Научный совет по комплексной проблеме «Кибернетика», 1982. С. 75–91.

20. Зацний Ю. А. Розвиток словникового складу англійської мови в 80-90-ті роки XX століття): дис. д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.04. Запоріжжя, 1999. 336 с.

21. Жаботинская С. А. Лингвокогнитивный подход к анализу номинативных процессов. Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Філологія». 2010. № 928. Випуск 63. С. 6–20.

22. Жихарєва О. О. Екологічний дискурс: когнітивний підхід. Взаємодія одиниць мови та мовлення: комунікативно-когнітивний, соціокультурний,

перекладознавчий і методичний аспекти: матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. Київ: НТУУ «КПІ», 2014. С. 68–71.

23. Иванова Е. В. Метафорическая концептуализация природных катастроф в экологическом дискурсе: на материале медийных текстов: дис. … канд. филол. наук. Челябинск, 2007. 219 с.

24. Илюхина Н. А. Образ в лексико-семантическом аспекте. Самара: Изд-во «Самарский ун-т», 1998. 206 с.

25. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. 477 с.

26. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. Москва: Наука, 1987. 264 с.

27. Киров Е. Ф. Язык в системе человеческой деятельности (фрагмент спекулятивной лингвистики). Теория языкознания и русистика: сборник статей по материалам международной научной конференции памяти Б. Н. Головина. Н. Новгород, 2001. С. 24–26.

28. Колесов В. В. Язык и ментальность. Санкт-Петербург: Петербургское Востоковедение, 2004. 240 с.

29. Колісник Ю. Текст і дискурс: проблеми дефініцій. Вісник Нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка». Серія «Проблеми української термінології». 2010. № 675. С. 111–114.

30. Красильникова Н. А. Метафорическая репрезентация лингвокультурологической категории СВОИ – ЧУЖИЕ в экологическом дискурсе США, России и Англии: автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.20 «Сравнительно-историческое, типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание». Екатеринбург, 2005. 24 с.

31. Кубрякова Е. С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности. Москва: Наука, 1986. 157 с.

32. Лихачев Д. С. Концептосфера русского языка. Изв. АН СССР. Сер. лит. и яз. Т. 52. Москва, 1993. № 1. С. 5–12.

33. Луман Н. Общество как социальная система. Москва: Логос, 2004. 232 с.

34. Ляпин С. Х. Концептология: к становлению подхода. Концепты. Вып. I. Архангельск, 1997. С. 11–35.

35. Макєєва, М. А. Фрейм як спосіб уявлення знань у концепті «екологія». Актуальні питання сучасної філології та журналістики. 2018. № 2 (29). С. 121–125.

36. Маслова В. А. Когнитивная лингвистика. 2-е нзд. Минск: ТетраСистемс, 2005. 256 с.

37. Нерушева, Т. В. Фреймова організація семантичного поля. Гуманітарні науки та освіта. 2013. № 2 (14). С. 95–100.

38. Николаева Т. М. Лингвистика текста. Современное состояние иперспективы. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 8: Лингвистика текста. Москва, 1978. 479 с.

39. Орлова О. В. Когнитивно-стилистический анализ текстовых концептов в контексте современных лингвоконцептологических исследований. Вестник Томского государственного университета. 2009. №326. С. 34–38.

40. Парахіна І. С. Інтерпретація концептосфери «довкілля». Сучасна наука: актуальні проблеми теорії та практики. Серія гуманітарних наук. 2018. №05/2. С. 129–131.

41. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Когнинтивная лингвистика. Москва: АСТ: Восток – Запад, 2007. 314 с.

42. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Проблема моделирования концептов в лингвокогнитивных исследованиях. Мир человека и мир языка: коллективная монография. Кемерово: ИПК «Графика», 2003. С. 6–16.

43. Рогожникова И. Н. Экологический дискурс: к проблеме определения лингвокультурологических параметров и типов текстов (на материале немецкого языка). Текст и дискурс: традиционный и когнитивно-функциональный аспекты исследования. Рязань: Рязанск. гос. пед. ун-т им. С. А. Есенина, 2002. С. 140–144.

44. Розмаріца І. О. Лінгвокогнітивні особливості комунікації у сфері екології (на матеріалі сучасної англійської мови): автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київ, 2004. 20 с.

45. Сергеева Е. Н. Понятие концепта и аспекты его изучения в современной лингвистике. Вестник ВЭГУ. №3(41). 2009. С. 72–85.

46. Серио П. Как читают тексты во Франции. Квадратура смысла: Французская школа анализа дискурса. Москва: Прогресс, 1999. С. 14–53.

47. Смаль О. В. Лінгвокогнітивні особливості моделювання знань у англомовному лекційному дискурсі: монографія. Луцьк: ІВВ Луцького НТУ, 2018. 163 с.

48. Стернин И. А. Основные компоненты структуры концепта и проблема сопоставления концептов. Язык и национальное сознание. Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та. 2008. Вып.10. С. 4–23.

49. Телия В. Н. Номинация. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. 2-е изд., доп. Москва: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2002. 709 с.

50. Уфимцева А. А. Лексическая номинация (первичная нейтральная). 2-е изд. Москва: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2010. 88 с.

51. Шевченко И. С., Морозова Е. И. Дискурс как мыслекоммуникативное образование. Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. 2013. №586. С. 33–38.

52. Щерба Л. В. Мовна система і мовленнєва діяльність. Київ, 1974. 384 с.

53. Чейф У. Роль интроспекции, наблюдения и эксперементирования в понимании мышления. Компьютеры, мозг, познание: успехи когнитивных наук. Москва, 2008. С. 162–179.

54. Чернявская В. Е. Лингвистика текста: поликодовость, интертекстуальность, интердискурсивность. Москва: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2009. 248 с.

55. Brown G. and Yule G. Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press, 1983. 288 p.

56. Busse B. Historical ecolinguistich and literary analysys. Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fransatlantic Conversations on Ecoviticism. Amsterdam and New York: Bodori, 2006. P. 131–154.

57. Charaudeau P., Maingueneau D. Dictionnaire d'Analyse du Discours. Editions du Seuil 27 rue Jacob, Paris VI, 2002. 662 p.

58. Coulthard M. An introduction to discourse analysis. London: Longman. 1977. 195 p.

59. Dijk T. Van Political discourse and ideology. Doxa communication. 2001. № 1. P. 207–225.

60. Dijk T. Van Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse and Society. 1993. Vol. 4 (2). P. 249–283.

61. Fairclough N. Language and Power. London: Longman, 1989. 259 p.

62. Fill A. Sprachökologie und Ökolinguistik. Referate des Symposiums «Sprachökologie und Ökolinguistik» an der Universität Klagenfurt. Tübingen, 1996. S. 131–148.

63. Fillmore Ch. J. Frames and semantic understanding. Quaderni di semantica. 1985. Vol. VI. 2. P. 222–224.

64. Garfinkel H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, 1997. 379 p.

65. Grand L. Encycklopedique. Librarie Larousse. Paris. 1990. T. 4. 118 p.

66. Halliday M. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Arnold, 1998. P. 108–124.

67. Harre R., Brockmeier J., Mühlhäusler P. Greenspeak. A Study of Environmental Discourse. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1999. P. 91–118.

68. Harris Z. Discourse Analysis: A sample text. Language 28, 1992. P. 474–494.

69. Haugen E. The Ecology of Language. The Ecolinguistics Reader. Language, Ecology and Environment. London, New York, 2001. P. 57–66.

70. Jung M. Ecological Criticism of Language. The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment / Ed. by A. Fill, P. Mühlhäusler. L.–N. Y.: Continuum, 2001. P. 270–285.

71. Muhlhausler P. Talking about Environmental Issues. The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment / Ed. by A. Fill, P. Mühlhäusler. L.–N. Y.: Continuum, 2001. P. 31–42.

72. Stibbe A. Animals Erased: Discourse, Ecology and Reconnection with the Natural World. Middle-town, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2012. 224 p.

73. Stubbs M. Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language. Oxford Blackwell, 1993. 272 p.

74. Trampe W. Language and Ecological Crisis: Extracts from a Dictionary of Industrial Agriculture. The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment / Ed. by A. Fill, P. Mühlhäusler. L.–N. Y.: Continuum, 2001. P. 232–241.

LIST OF REFERENCE SOURCES

75. (CC) – Collins Cobuild. URL: https://collins.co.uk/pages/elt-cobuild-reference

76. (CD) – Cambridge Dictionary. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

77. (CLD) – Cambridge Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

78. (EO) – Encyclopedia Online. URL: https://www.encyclopedia.com/

79. (LDCE) – Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English LDOCE. URL: https://www.ldoceonline.com/

80. (LED) – Longman Exam Dictionary, Pearson Longman, 2006.

81. (MWCT) – Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Thesaurus. Inc. Springfield, Massachusetts, USA, 1993.

82. (MWD) – Merriam Webster Dictionary. URL: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/

83. (OSDCE) – Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English. A. S. Hornby, 1984. 772 p.

84. (UO) – Unwords Online. URL: http://unwords.com/

85. (WO) – Wiktionary Online. URL: https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Wiktionary

86. (WSO) – Word Spy Online. URL: https://www.wordspy.com/

LIST OF SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

87. Ecological crisis. Wikipedia. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecological_crisis

88. Encyclo.com. URL: https://www.encyclo.co.uk/meaning-of-Ecological_crisis

89. Environmental protection activities. Eustat. URL: https://en.eustat.eus/documentos/elem_17798/definicion.html

90. Mondor E. B. Global Atmospheric Change and Animal Populations. URL: https://www.nature.com/scitable/knowledge/library/global-atmospheric-change-and-animal-populations-13254648/

91. Rick A. Why world leaders must step up to protect biodiversity at CBD COP15. Greenpeace, 2022. URL: https://www.greenpeace.org/international/story/56013/world-leaders-step-up-protect-biodiversity-cbd-cop15/

92. Techniques and hygiene practices in slaughtering and meat handling. FAO, 2022. URL: https://www.fao.org/3/t0279e/T0279E04.htm

93. What is a disaster? IFRC. URL: https://www.ifrc.org/our-work/disasters-climate-and-crises/what-disaster

94. What is Ecological Crisis. IGI Global. URL: https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/ecological-crisis/82452