

HISTORICAL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL CRITERIA FOR COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION OF YOUTH VOCABULARY (ON THE EXAMPLE OF GERMAN AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES)

Pozdniakov O. V.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages and Country Studies,
Faculty of Tourism*

Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University

Shevchenko str., 57, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine

orcid.org/0000-0001-7525-7108

dietrich_910@ukr.net

Key words: *youth vocabulary, language subcode, vocabulary subsystem, national language, standard language, socio-age group, peer group, subculture.*

The article is devoted to the comparative description of youth vocabulary on the example of German and Ukrainian languages. At the first stage of the study, the key features of youth vocabulary have been singled out. It has been established that this linguistic phenomenon is a specific lexical subsystem of the national language, which is most actively used by socio-age group “youth”. Compared to standard language, it is characterized by informality, emotional connotation, and expressiveness. A high degree of sensitivity to external influences is typical for young people. That affects the choice of the means of communication. Nominative processes in the given language subcode are determined by the search for new words and collocations that indicate the social status and social roles of their users, as well as intra-group relations and hierarchy. At the second stage of the study, criteria for comparative description of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary have been developed: interrelationship with other vocabulary subsystems, the use of specific vocabulary as a means of self-identification, amount of lexical-semantic groups, regional heterogeneity, intra-group heterogeneity, conspiracy function, features of borrowing from foreign languages, emotional connotation, the share of rude words, dependence on the mass-media impact. As a result, common and distinctive features of the given language subcodes have been found out. Both German and in Ukrainian vocabulary subsystems verbalize young people’s worldview and feelings, reflecting their try to demonstrate protest, self-identification, intra-group heterogeneity. The most important lexical-semantic groups contain a wide choice of synonyms for satisfying the above-mentioned needs. Historical, social, and cultural factors determine some differences between two studied language subcodes, mainly in the regional heterogeneity and the share of rude words. At the same time, both studied vocabulary subsystems are constantly enriched by words and collocations taken from popular mass-media sources. The growing role of American subcultures has been pointed out as well.

ІСТОРИЧНІ, СОЦІАЛЬНІ ТА КУЛЬТУРНІ КРИТЕРІЇ ДЛЯ ПОРІВНЯЛЬНОГО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ МОЛОДІЖНОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ НІМЕЦЬКОЇ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ)

Поздняков О. В.

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов і країнознавства факультету туризму
Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника
вул. Шевченка, 57, Івано-Франківськ, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0001-7525-7108
dietrich_910@ukr.net*

Ключові слова: *молодіжна лексика, мовний субкод, лексична підсистема, національна мова, літературна мова, соціально-вікова група, група однолітків, субкультура.*

Стаття присвячена порівняльному опису молодіжної лексики на прикладі німецької та української мов. На першому етапі дослідження виокремлено ключові особливості молодіжної лексики. Встановлено, що це мовне явище є специфічною лексичною підсистемою національної мови, що найактивніше використовується соціально-віковою групою «молодь». Порівняно з літературною мовою їй властиві неформальність, емоційне забарвлення, експресивність. Молодим людям притаманна висока чутливість до зовнішніх впливів, що визначає вибір засобів спілкування. Номінативні процеси в такому мовному субкоді детерміновані пошуком нових слів і виразів, які вказують на соціальний статус і соціальні ролі їхніх користувачів, а також внутрішньогрупові відносини та ієрархію. На другому етапі дослідження розроблено критерії для порівняльної характеристики німецької та української молодіжної лексики: взаємозв'язок з іншими лексичними підсистемами, використання специфічного вокабуляру як засобу самоідентифікації, кількість лексико-семантичних груп, регіональна неоднорідність, внутрішньогрупова неоднорідність, конспіративна функція, особливості процесу запозичення з іноземних мов, емоційна конотація, частка грубих слів, залежність від впливу засобів масової інформації. Як результат, виявлено спільні та відмінні риси зазначених мовних субкодів. Як у німецькій, так і в українській мовах вони служать для вербалізації світогляду та почуттів молоді, відображають спробу продемонструвати протест, самоідентифікацію, внутрішньогрупову гетерогенність. Найважливіші лексико-семантичні групи містять широкий вибір синонімів для задоволення вищезазначених потреб. Історичні, соціальні та культурні чинники визначають деякі відмінності між двома досліджуваними мовними субкодами, головним чином у регіональній неоднорідності та частці грубих слів. При цьому обидві досліджувані лексичні підсистеми постійно збагачуються словами та виразами, запозиченими із популярних медіаджерел. Також відзначається зростання ролі американських субкультур.

Formulation of the problem. At the current stage of historical, social and cultural development of our society, youth vocabulary has become an important part of people's everyday communication. This language subcode is widely used by representatives of different social and age groups in various communicative situations. Words and collocations created by young generation are considered a productive source of enrichment and development of standard vocabulary. These lexical units are characterized by emotional connotation, which determines their communicative

effectiveness. Through the active use in the mass-media, a significant share of youth vocabulary has become a part of written and spoken variants of national language.

At the same time, there is no unified definition of this language phenomenon in modern linguistics. In our opinion, it can be explained by a number of reasons, such as: lack of unified criteria for its description; high degree of dependence on social processes, which are regarded as main determinants of its formation and use; the influence of historical

development of the respective national language. These factors create prerequisites for comparative analysis of young people's vocabulary subsystems in different national languages by means of identifying their common and distinctive features.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

It can be stated that there is considerable interest of Ukrainian and foreign scientists to the issues of origin, formation, and functioning of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary subsystems. The works by germanists deal with a wide range of issues related to determining the place of the given language phenomenon in the system of German language (H. Henne, P. Schlobinski), its structure and functions (J. Androutsopoulos, S. Augenstein, E. Neuland), social and regional features (J. Beneke, H. Ehmann), interrelation with other language subcodes (J. Androutsopoulos), peculiarities of functioning in mass-media (M. Nowotnick, M. Chun), as well as lexicographical registration (M. Heinemann, M. Horx, H. Ehmann). The results of the study of Ukrainian youth vocabulary are represented by a much smaller number of works highlighting overall features of this language subcode (Yu. Mosenkis, O. Kondratiuk), its group and urban specifics (N. Shovgun, S. Martos), role as a tool for reflecting the language world-image (P. Hrabovyi), connection with the vocabulary of colloquial Ukrainian (N. Dziubyszyna-Melnyk). There is also practice of compiling specialized dictionaries (L. Stavyt'ska, S. Pyrkalo).

Scientific novelty of the article. The review of scientific papers has shown that there are works devoted to comparative study of German youth vocabulary. First of all, the publications by L. Freimane [11] and J. Zhu [18] should be mentioned. They represent description of German youth vocabulary in comparison with the same subcodes in Latvian and Chinese languages. Meanwhile, we have not found similar complex works, which contain comparative analysis of Ukrainian youth vocabulary.

The aim of the article is to find out the peculiarities of German and Ukrainian young people's language subcodes through their comparative analysis. Another purpose of the study is to establish the specifics of the influence of historical, social, and cultural factors on the origin and evolution of these lexical subsystems.

The objectives of the article include: to identify key features of youth vocabulary; to develop the criteria for its comparative analysis on the example of German and Ukrainian languages; to single out common and distinctive characteristics of the studied vocabulary subsystems taking into consideration their extralingual conditionality.

The object of research are lexical units of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary, and **its subject** includes the peculiarities of historical, social,

and cultural determinants of the origin and use of the studied language subcodes.

To achieve the objectives of the article, a number of general scientific and linguistic **methods** have been applied: descriptive method, comparative method, method of analysis and synthesis, method of word formation analysis.

The material of research are words and collocations that represent a sample from specialized dictionaries of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary [2; 5; 7; 8; 13; 15].

Results and discussion. At the first stage of the study, we have singled out the key features of youth vocabulary in general. For this purpose, we have analyzed a number of works by Ukrainian and foreign researchers (such as O. Selivanova, S. Y. Yermolenko, D. Dumas, R. Spears, O. Akhmanova and others). It has been established that the given linguistic phenomenon is a specific lexical subsystem of the national language, which is most actively used by socio-age group "youth". Compared to standard language, it is characterized by informality, emotional connotation, and expressiveness. As a rule, these words and collocations are secondary synonyms of the vocabulary of standard language. Their meaning often includes an evaluative component of the surrounding reality.

The need for self-identification, protest, creativity in verbalization of thoughts and feelings are the main factors that cause the origin and formation of youth vocabulary [10, p. 12–14]. Nominative processes are determined by the search for new words and collocations that indicate the social status and social roles of their users, as well as intra-group relations and hierarchy. Representatives of the above-mentioned socio-age group are characterized by a high degree of sensitivity to external influences [16, p. 37]. Young people often try to compensate that by using rude words or lexical units with pejorative components. The awareness of peer-group affiliation and subordination to its system of values also play an important role in choosing the means of communication [1, p. 5].

Both age and social factors determine the range of active users of the studied language subcode. At this stage, the person is between childhood and adulthood [14, p. 312]. It is important not only to achieve a certain stage of physiological development, but also to have a certain worldview. Hence, the period of active use of youth vocabulary is purely individual.

At the second stage of the study, criteria for comparative description of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary have been developed. Using these criteria, we take into consideration historical, social, and cultural determinants of semantic and stylistic features of the analyzed language subcodes.

Interrelationship with other vocabulary subsystems. Both German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary subsystems are components of the

respective national languages. According to H. Henne, young people's words and collocations represent a secondary language subsystem. Therefore, its use is possible only with the simultaneous use of grammar and vocabulary of standard language [12, p. 5]. That is why, the given communication is usually carried out through compliance with morphological and syntactic rules in German and Ukrainian (*Mann, endlich funzt das Teil!*; *Не найжджай на мене!*). This determines the close interrelation of the studied language subcode with the vocabulary of colloquial language. Young people's words and collocations are actively used by speakers of different professions, age, cultures, and social status to satisfy a wide range of routine communication needs. Thus, the common feature of both German and Ukrainian youth lexical subsystems is their informality (*Schwanzmütze* – “*Kondom*”; *грязло* – «*обличчя*»).

The use of specific vocabulary as a means of self-identification. According to J. Zinnecker, peer-group is a kind of social environment that protects its members from hostile external influences. At the same time, it is considered to be favourable for self-affirmation and achieving desirable intra-group status [19, p. 39]. Young people often express themselves through the creation of various subcultures and specific vocabulary. Such words and collocations have a typically informal stylistic marking, which ensures the expressiveness of communication [4, p. 54] (*Schmutzwurst* – “*perverse Person*”; *телевізор* – «*скляний пивбар*»).

Amount of lexical-semantic groups. The use of youth vocabulary is determined by common interests of its creators. Therefore, the amount of lexical-semantic groups of the studied language subcodes is rather limited by a range of social spheres suitable for their use. Most words and collocations of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary subsystems denote people (divided in members and non-members of a certain peer-group or subculture), assessments, feelings, communication, different kinds of leisure activities (for example, music styles or sports) and illegal things (drugs, alcohol, sexual relations etc.). Each of these groups includes a lot of synonyms (*schloten, nebeln, rußen, knörzen* – “*rauchen*”; *бухнуть, вмазати, дринькнути, забанячити* – «*випити алкогольній напій*»).

Regional heterogeneity. It is well known that there are a large number of territorial dialects in German language, which have been formed as a result of historical processes. Their lexical units are frequently preferred by German-speaking youth because of unusual morphological structure and spelling. These words and collocations give a regional connotation to the vocabulary of certain groups of young people. A more detailed description of regional differences in German youth vocabulary is provided in the work

by H. Ehmann [9] (*ribbeln (norddt.)* – “*jemanden auf den Arm nehmen*”; *rumzicken (ostdt.)* – “*Probleme machen*”). Ukrainian youth vocabulary, for its part, is considered a component of urban subculture, first of all, of the inhabitants of large cities [3, p. 240]. However, due to the general availability of the latest information technologies and universal access to modern media sources, the above-mentioned language subcode tends to spread among rural youth. These representatives of the studied socio-age group are rather users than creators of specific words and collocations (*трон* – «*унітаз*»; *нульовий* – «*абсолютно новий*»).

Intra-group heterogeneity. The socio-age group “youth” in general can be regarded as a sum of a vast number of peer-groups. Each of these groups has its own vocabulary subsystem to express the worldview and values of its members and followers. On the other hand, all of them are influenced by global subcultures spread through popular mass-media. Therefore, both compared language subcodes are characterized by intra-group heterogeneity, on one hand, and existence of an overregional and overcultural lexical subsystem, on the other. This vocabulary reflects the language of a certain generation and is inherently a dynamic, fast-changing lexical system [6, p. 56] (*Rollkabine* – “*Schulbus*”; *зуса* – «*зпови*»).

Conspiracy function. Conspiracy is one of the important functions of youth vocabulary. In the intra-group communication, young people use specific vocabulary to hide their deviant activities from non-members, first of all, from adults (parents or teachers). Both German and Ukrainian youth language subcodes include a lot of words which denote different sorts of drugs, drug dealers, drug-taking. They are used as a kind of “parole” to show the belonging to a certain peer-group or subculture. However, there are differences in the studied vocabulary subsystems. German-speaking youth prefers lexical units formed through word-building accompanied by metaphorization processes, while in Ukrainian youth vocabulary such words are mainly formed by means of semantic changes without transforming morphological structure (*volldröhnen* – “*Drogen nehmen*”; *колеса* – «*таблетки, що містять наркотики*»).

Features of borrowing from foreign languages. As mentioned above, most units of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary are secondary synonyms of the vocabulary of standard language. Therefore, they reflect historical features of the development of certain national languages, in particular, the peculiarities of borrowing processes. German-speaking youth is more likely to use loanwords from American English [17]. It can be easily explained by the origin of popular subcultural styles. A significant part of the given vocabulary is preferred to emphasize subcultural affiliation (*shred* – “*skaten*”; *räven* – “*tanzen*”). Ukrainian youth vocabulary is rich

in lexical units taken from Russian. The reason for it is that Russian is the native language of many young people in Ukraine, especially in large cities – centers of subcultural activity (*непруха* – «невдача»). However, there has also been a trend to enrich the vocabulary of Ukrainian youth with anglo-americanisms, first of all, in the field of music and computer technology. Nowadays, this trend has spread to other spheres of young people's life. Such words and collocations are widely used in different communication situations (*сейшенити* – «весело гуляти»).

Emotional connotation. Young speakers frequently use expressively marked words and collocations in the search for subjective assessment of people and things. Metaphorization plays an important role in the process of verbalizing the inner world of youth and realizing the need for emotional communication. A wide range of lexical units to denote positive and negative emotions, impressions, assessments is typical for both compared language subcodes (*Trüffel, Melone, Tomate, Kürbis* – “Корф”; *крокодил, протигаз, чума* – «негарна дівчина»).

The share of rude words. The young people's protest against the existing rules of the world of adults is sometimes realized through the use of obscene vocabulary. The creativity of German-speaking youth here is represented by the formation of metaphorical derivatives and compounds with pejorative components (*Fressbrett* – “Zunge”; *blickficken* – “dumm anschauen”). According to L. Stavytska, a significant part of Ukrainian youth vocabulary is borrowed from the language subcode of criminals [6, p. 56]. At the level of youth communication, these lexical units are semantically modified retaining some components of their original meanings (*лафа* – «безтурботне життя»; *заникати* – «заховати у потаємне місце»).

Dependence on the mass-media impact. Modern mass-media is an important tool for spreading youth vocabulary at the level of overregional and overcultural communication. Frequent use of a word in popular types of media sources with a broad target audience contributes to its further evolution in the process of becoming a component of colloquial and standard language variants. On the other hand, both German and Ukrainian vocabulary subsystems are actively enriched by words and collocations taken from favourite movie characters, actors, musicians etc. (*Topschuss* – “Person, die sehr gut aussieht”; *реальний* – «гарний, якісний»).

Conclusions and further prospects of research.

The results of the comparative analysis have proved that youth vocabulary is a historically, socially, and culturally determined language subcode. Both in German and in Ukrainian, it is used for verbalizing concepts which are of the most importance for young members of the society. These lexical units reflect the

system of values and feelings of the representatives of the given socio-age group, as well as their need for protest, self-identification, and intra-group heterogeneity. The formation of youth vocabulary in general is the result of significant media influence. In this regard, both studied lexical subsystems are characterized by emotional connotation. Further common features of German and Ukrainian youth vocabulary are limited amount of lexical-semantic groups, on one hand, and wide set of synonyms, on the other.

At the same time, a number of their distinctive features have been singled out. Trends of development of a certain national language determine peculiarities of their subsystems in terms of borrowing processes. This is illustrated by the dominance of American English loanwords in German youth vocabulary, while in Ukrainian young people's language subcode there are a lot of words borrowed from Russian (although, this trend is being changed because of the growing impact of American subcultures). Historical and social processes also determine the regional heterogeneity of German youth vocabulary, while the main difference in the use of means of communication for Ukrainians depends on their belonging to urban or rural population. Social factors influence the choice of priority sources of enrichment of youth vocabulary. For example, German-speaking young people are more inclined to word formation and creativity, while many units of Ukrainian youth vocabulary are borrowed from other language subcodes. The share of rude words is also different in the studied lexical subsystems.

Given the growing importance of youth vocabulary in modern communication process, we see the prospects of further linguistic research in clarifying the specifics of its functioning in different types of discourse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Боднар Р. В. Соціолект підлітків як субкультура сучасного лінгвосоціуму : автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Київ, 2007. 19 с.
2. Кондратюк Т. М. Словник сучасного українського сленгу. Харків : Фоліо, 2006. 350 с.
3. Мартос С. А. Молодіжний сленг як складник мови міста. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. «Філологія»*. Харків, 2004. № 632. Вип. 42. С. 240–243.
4. Масенко Л. Т. Мова і політика. Київ : Соняшник, 1999. 99 с.
5. Словник українського молодіжного сленгу / укл. С. Пиркало, за ред. Ю. Мосенкіса. Київ : АТ ВПОЛІ, 1998. 288 с.
6. Ставицька Л. О. Проблеми вивчення жаргонної лексики: соціолінгвістичний аспект. *Українська мова*. 2001. № 1. С. 55–68.

7. Ставицька Л. О. Український жаргон. Словник. Київ : Критика, 2005. 496 с.
8. Duden – Das neue Wörterbuch der Szenesprachen. Duden, 2009. 208 S.
9. Ehmann H. Jugendsprache und Dialekt: Regionalismen im Sprachgebrauch von Jugendlichen. Opladen : Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992. 252 S.
10. Ehmann H. Endgeil – Das voll korrekte Lexikon der Jugendsprache. 1. Aufl. München : C. H. Beck, 2005. 178 S.
11. Freimane L. Vergleich der deutschen und lettischen Jugendsprache der Gegenwart. *Jugendsprachen – Spiegel der Zeit. Internationale Fachkonferenz 2001 an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal*. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang, 2003. S. 211–220.
12. Henne H. Jugend und ihre Sprache: Darstellung, Materialien, Kritik. Berlin; New York : de Gruyter, 1986. 385 S.
13. Langenscheidt 100 Prozent Jugendsprache 2018 (Deutsch – Englisch). München : Langenscheidt, 2017. 160 S.
14. Oeter R., Dreher E. Jugendalter. *Entwicklungspsychologie*. Weinheim : Beltz, 1995. S. 310–395.
15. PONS Wörterbuch der Jugendsprache – Sammelband : Das Original – unzensiert. 1. Aufl. Stuttgart : PONS, 2016. 288 S.
16. Schlobinski P., Kohl G., Ludewigt J. Jugendsprache. Fiktion und Wirklichkeit. Opladen : Westdeutscher Verlag, 1993. 223 S.
17. Wehrli Ch. Anglizismen in BRAVO. Eine empirische Untersuchung mit Schülern. Zürich : Studentendruckerei, 2002. 234 S.
18. Zhu J. Jugendlicher Sprachgebrauch in kontrastiver Sicht: Deutsch-Chinesisch. *Jugendsprachen – Spiegel der Zeit: internationale Fachkonferenz 2001 an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal*. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang, 2003. S. 185–186.
19. Zinnecker J. Im Schulbunker wimmelt es nur von fiesen Hunden, Drachen und alten Knackern. *Pädagogik extra*. 1979. No. 4. S. 39.
4. Masenko, L. T. (1999) Language and politics [Mova i polityka]. Kyiv : Soniashnyk. 99 p.
5. Pyrkalo, S., Mosenkis, Yu. (Ed.) (1998) The dictionary of Ukrainian youth slang [Slovyk ukrainskoho molodizhnoho slenhu]. Kyiv : AT VIPOL. 288 p.
6. Stavtyska, L. O. (2001) Issues of studying jargon vocabulary: sociolinguistic aspect [Problemy vyvchennia zharhonnai leksyky: sotsiolinhvistychnyi aspekt]. *Ukrainska mova*. No. 1. Pp. 55–68.
7. Stavtyska, L. O. (2005) Ukrainian jargon. Dictionary [Ukrainskyi zharhon. Slovnyk]. Kyiv : Krytyka. 496 p.
8. Duden – Das neue Wörterbuch der Szenesprachen. (2009) Duden. 208 S.
9. Ehmann, H. (1992) Jugendsprache und Dialekt: Regionalismen im Sprachgebrauch von Jugendlichen. Opladen : Westdeutscher Verlag. 252 S.
10. Ehmann, H. (2005) Endgeil – Das voll korrekte Lexikon der Jugendsprache. 1. Aufl. München : C. H. Beck. 178 S.
11. Freimane, L. (2003) Vergleich der deutschen und lettischen Jugendsprache der Gegenwart. *Jugendsprachen – Spiegel der Zeit. Internationale Fachkonferenz 2001 an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal*. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang. S. 211–220.
12. Henne, H. (1986) Jugend und ihre Sprache: Darstellung, Materialien, Kritik. Berlin; New York : de Gruyter. 385 S.
13. Langenscheidt 100 Prozent Jugendsprache 2018 (Deutsch – Englisch). (2017) München : Langenscheidt. 160 S.
14. Oeter, R., Dreher, E. (1995) Jugendalter. *Entwicklungspsychologie*. Weinheim : Beltz. S. 310–395.
15. PONS Wörterbuch der Jugendsprache – Sammelband: Das Original – unzensiert. 1. Aufl. 2016. Stuttgart : PONS. 288 S.
16. Schlobinski, P., Kohl, G., Ludewigt, J. (1993) Jugendsprache. Fiktion und Wirklichkeit. Opladen : Westdeutscher Verlag. 223 S.
17. Wehrli, Ch. (2002) Anglizismen in BRAVO. Eine empirische Untersuchung mit Schülern. Zürich : Studentendruckerei. 234 S.
18. Zhu, J. (2003) Jugendlicher Sprachgebrauch in kontrastiver Sicht: Deutsch-Chinesisch. *Jugendsprachen – Spiegel der Zeit: internationale Fachkonferenz 2001 an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal*. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang. S. 185–186.
19. Zinnecker, J. (1979) Im Schulbunker wimmelt es nur von fiesen Hunden, Drachen und alten Knackern. *Pädagogik extra*. No. 4. S. 39.

REFERENCES

1. Bodnar, R. V. (2007) The sociolect of teenagers as the subculture of modern linguocommunity [Sotsiolekt pidlitkiv yak subkultura suchasnoho linhvosotsiumu] : PhD Thesis. Kyiv : Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.
2. Kondratiuk, T. M. (2006) The dictionary of modern Ukrainian slang [Slovyk suchasnoho ukrainskoho slenhu]. Kharkiv : Folio. 350 p.
3. Martos, S. A. (2004) Youth slang as a part of urban language [Molodizhnyi slenhu yak skladnyk movy mista]. *Bulletin of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Filolohiia*. Kharkiv. No. 632. Vol. 42. Pp. 240–243.