



IGOR KOROLYOV

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
Kijevo nacionalinis Taraso Ševčenkos universitetas, Ukraina

EKOLINGVISTINĖS FORMOS: NATŪRALIOSIOS IR SOCIALINĖS DOMINANTĖS

Ecolinguistic Modes: Natural and Social Dominants

SUMMARY

The article proposes the new concept of the ecolinguistic mode for the philosophy of language, which is considered from the standpoint of its ontological and epistemological status. Particular attention is paid to the ratio of the natural and social dominants of language and speech as forms of ecolinguistic modes. These dominants function and develop in the European / world multicultural continuum in a multidimensional relationship with the environment (society). They are correlated both with biological (natural) properties, which, as a rule, are universal for mankind / *homo sapiens*, and with specific social dominants acquired during historical development, which influence the formation, protection and preservation of linguistic and cultural identity and self-identification.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje siūloma nauja kalbos filosofijos ekolingvistinė samprata nagrinėjama ontologiniu ir epistemologiniu požiūriu. Dėmesio centre yra natūralių ir socialinių kalbos bei šnekos dominančių proporcija. Analizuojamos dominantės daugiakultūriniame Europos ir pasaulio tęstume funkcionuoja kaip daugiamačių ryšių su aplinka (visuomene) turinčios ekolingvistinės formos. Ši koreliacija siejama ir su dominančių biologinėmis (natūraliosiomis) savybėmis, kurios, kalbant apie žmoniją, yra universalios, ir su jų specifinėmis socialinėmis savybėmis, kurios įgyjamos istorinės raidos metu ir kurios veikia kalbinės ir kultūrinės tapatybės bei savęs identifikavimo formavimąsi ir išsaugojimą.

INTRODUCTION

The modern globalised world with powerful informatisation of all spheres of life is driven by the rapid process of transformation or integration of national

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: ekolingvistinė forma, kalbos ekologija, natūraliosios kalbos dominantės, socialinės kalbos dominantės.
KEY WORDS: ecolinguistic mode, language ecology, natural dominants of language, social dominants of language.

discursive spaces into multicultural ones. The problem of ecolinguistics has a philosophical, culturological and sociological basis (Ogdonova 2009: 122). It generates the development of provisions for the following new directions of linguistics: ecology of language (as a state language), ecology of translation, ecological discourse studies, ecological linguo-pragmatics, ecological cultural linguistics, etc. that are associated with the processes and mechanisms of functioning of the terminological apparatus of ecology in the linguistic: *language / speech ecosystem, eco-consciousness, language / speech ecology / eco-environmental, ecological portrait of language*, etc. In this perspective, the following representatives of various scientific fields are of an active research interest: biologists and ecologists (L. L. Cavalli-Sforza), linguists (A. Fill, M. Halliday, E. Haugen, P. Mühlhäusler), psychologists and educators (J. Gibson, R. Kahn), sociologists and philosophers (A. Drengson, A. Hawley, G. Theodorson), anthropologists, cultural scientists and social communication specialists (M. Swadesh, H. Haarmann, D. Likhachev, M. McLuhan, N. Postman) et al.

The aim of the article is to focus on the definition of ecolinguistic modes, in particular on the characteristics of their natural and social status, which, in the context of the further dynamics of globalisation processes and multiculturalism, actualise the necessity of identifying, systematizing, parametrizing and modelling those natural and social dominants of language and speech that primarily contribute to the development, preservation and safety of the national language.

The relevance of the topic of the article deals with the formation of the

ideological synergetic paradigm of modern humanitarian knowledge, including linguistics, as well as it is also associated with the introduction of the concept of the ecolinguistic mode into scientific circulation that is formed by the natural and social dominants of language and speech. A suitable angle of research is of great theoretical and practical importance, because it helps the development of a system of linguo-ecological security that is aimed at multi-vector protection and development of the national language, in particular its purity, correctness, integrity and consistency in the performance of its main functions, as well as its image popularization and prestige of use in all spheres of social life.

First of all, the problem of speech ecology (ecological compatibility of texts, communicative behaviour, etc.) of the national discourse space in the context of the multicultural European / world continuum is of an applied nature. In further special studies the solution will be observed that allow avoiding the „linguo-ecological disaster“ (Likhachev 1979) and to protect against manifestations of „speech anticulture“ (Salimovskiy 2012).

The working hypothesis of the study deals with the following thesis: there are universal and specific to each ethnoculture ecolinguistic modes of discursive space that are represented by natural and social dominants of language and speech, which function and develop in the European / world multicultural continuum in a multidimensional relationship with the environment (society). Their genesis is connected both with biological properties, which, as a rule, are universal for mankind / *homo sapiens*, and with specific social domi-

nants acquired during historical development, which influence the formation (Kapranov 2017), protection and pres-

ervation of ethnic identity and linguistic and cultural self-identification of each representative.

ECOLINGUISTIC MODES AS COGNITIVE-SEMIOTIC STRUCTURES OF LANGUAGE CONSCIOUSNESS

The emergence in the 1970s of such an interdisciplinary field as ecolinguistics (see Haugen 1972) gave new impetus to the actual applied aspect of the humanities in general and linguistics in particular, because it expanded the methodological basis of research visions by purposefully establishing the transfer of knowledge and technology between humanities and natural sciences (ecology, biology, mathematics, etc.). The definition of linguistic ecology proposed by Einar Haugen became decisive for the further development of ecolinguistic / linguo-ecological studios as a separate scientific direction:

„Language ecology may be defined as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment. The definition of environment might lead one's thoughts first of all to the referential world to which language provides an index. However, this is the environment not of the language but of its lexicon and grammar. The true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes. Language exists only in the minds of its users, and it only functions in relating these users to one another and to nature, i.e. their social and natural environment. Part of its ecology is therefore psychological: its interaction with other languages in the minds of bi- and multilingual speakers. Another part of its ecology is sociological: its interaction with the society in which it functions as a medium of communication. The ecology of a lan-

guage is determined primarily by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others“ (Haugen 1972: 57).

Given the appropriate localization of research thought on a combination of biological (physiological) and social components, we propose the definition of ecolinguistic modes, which are considered to be formed under the influence of environment cognitive-semiotic structures of linguistic / communicative eco-consciousness of representatives of a certain linguaculture, who are determined by the natural and social dominants of language and speech and function in a specific discursive space.

The corresponding definition generally correlates with O. Skovorodnikov's view on ecolinguistics / linguistic ecology (the scholar does not differentiate these scientific directions) as an interdisciplinary field:

„The subject of study is the state of language as a complex semiotic system due to the quality of its environment and functioning (including social and other extralinguistic factors that negatively or positively affect the linguistic consciousness of society and, consequently, language and its speech realization), and, accordingly, the ways and means of protecting language and speech from negative influences, on the one hand, and ways of their enrichment and development – on the other“ (Skovorodnikov 2013: 207).

The epistemic status of ecolinguistics, which provides its own terminological apparatus and tools, is still in its infancy. If the basic specific terms such as *language / speech ecosystem, eco-consciousness, language / speech eco-environment, ecological portrait of language, etc.* filled the gap of episteme, then in methodological terms the set of proposed methods and techniques of analysis was borrowed from such linguistic disciplines or developed in parallel with ecolinguistics (sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, language culture, media linguistics, terminology, etc.). The introduction of the concept of ecolinguistic modes into scientific discourse allows to expand the epistemic resource of ecolinguistics as a separate humanities and sciences, in which some scholars propose to analyse “man in language” rather than “language in man” (Darginavičienė 2018; Maturana 1978; Jennings & Thompson 2012), because “language as a phenomenon is rooted in human biology, and we, as humans, exist in language” (Kravchenko 2014: 91).

The concept of ecolinguistic mode with its natural and social dominants corresponds to the functional approach to the phenomena of language, speech and discourse of M. Halliday, „in which language and speech are studied as living systems that are closely interconnected with other living systems, including society, environment and man himself as a biological species of *homo sapiens*” (Belozeroва, Labunets 2012: 46-47).

In contrast to immanent linguistics and other multidisciplinary branches of linguistic knowledge, language is considered as a system-structural formation, it has a symbolic status and it serves as a code for the communicative process,

but speech is analysed mainly in terms of its organization and efficiency, in ecolinguistics' basic. According to M. Garner, there are such principles of ecological philosophy as holistic, interactive, dynamic and situational conditionality (Garner 2004: 36), the complex of which presupposes harmonious symbiosis and variation of natural and social dominants of ecolinguistic modes.

The traditional emphasis of this humanities and natural sciences discipline is focused on „conditions and factors of (un)favourable existence and development of language as a complex multifunctional system” (Skovorodnikov 2013: 208), on multi-vector analysis of language / speech / discursive units, nature and types of relations between them. Given the tendencies of the modern world to the ecology of life in general (eco-housing, eco-products, eco-drinks, eco-transport, eco-recreation, etc.), recently research attention is increasingly focused on the natural dominants of language and speech as elements of ecolinguistic modes, with a trajectory towards „biologically oriented cognitive science of the third generation ...”, and language interactions that define and support the cognitive niche of human society as a living system are the most important environmental factor” (Kravchenko 2014: 91).

Thus, for the concept of ecolinguistic modes as cognitive-semiotic structures of language / communicative eco-consciousness, the ratio and commonality of the functional potential of language and speech dominants are important, which are actually responsible for preserving and ensuring the ecology of discursive space / environment and national language security.

NATURAL VS SOCIAL DOMINANTS OF LANGUAGE AND SPEECH ECOLOGY

The ecologisation of scientific knowledge is a natural process in the formation of ecological thinking, the essence of which is the conscious „adjustment“ of human actions to the laws of the biosphere (Polukhin 2009). In this context, the epistemic perspective of the study of natural and social ecolinguistic modes is represented by multi-vector issues related primarily to the current issues of language policy and language situation in the country as a whole and in its individual regions in diachronic and synchronic vectors (S. May), territorial and social stratification of language, bilingualism, interlingual interference (N. Hornberger). It should be noted that the modern research space is dominated by the social ecolinguistic mode, which analyses the features of terminography and onomasticon, verbalization of social values and national values (S. Barbour, H. Haarmann); specific aspects of rhetoric, stylistics and culture of language and speech, in particular in teaching methods (A. Dorni); media ecology in the context of the influence of media platforms on the mass consciousness (G. Marshall McLuhan); linguistic-ecological character of different types of discourse (A. Blackledge), as well as “hate speech” in the communicative spaces of different lingua-cultures (S. Zhabotinskaya), etc.

The natural ecolinguistic mode, the focus of which involves the consideration of „man in language“ (Kravchenko 2014) actually “dissolved” in the emphasis on the social significance of language and speech constants. It can be explained by long-term dominance in linguistics

(both immanent “internal “and “external “) principles of structuralism, anthropocentrism, functionalism, discourse-centrism, explanatory and expansionism. Instead, a separate special issue is directly or indirectly related to the biological dominants of the language and speech of the natural ecolinguistic mode. In this context, it is necessary to mention, first of all, the studies of linguistic-ecological nature, the subject of which is the factor and functions of language in solving problems of ecology, environment, ecological discourse, etc. (Fill 2006; Halliday 2001). The peculiarities of traditional intangible culture in the language-ecology-environment triad (Fill, Mühlhäusler 2001), as well as the problems of identification of cognitive-semiotic constants of language / communicative consciousness of representatives of different language cultures (Dijk van 1990, Vasko 2019; Korolyov, Domylivska 2020; Halliday 2001) form a discursive space of certain ethnolinguistic continuums, being realised in natural and social dominants of language and speech as components of ecolinguistic modes.

Modern science also offers interpretations of the natural mode of language ecology that differ from E. Haugen’s biomorphic and instrumental approaches. The latter are based primarily on the provisions of the linguosemiotic concept of the relationship between language and the natural and social environment. Thus, based on the biology of cognition as a theory of living systems (Maturana 1970), A. Kravchenko considers the ecology of language (natural mode of ecology of

language – I. K.) within the following ontological and functional perspectives:

„biocognitive function of supporting society as a living system in the unity of its cognitive (indicative language) interactions. This approach allows a deeper understanding of the impact of public language practice on the nature and features of the onto- and phylogeny of homo sapiens, given the formation of a system of values and existential trajectories in the level of the individual and society. It seems that this should be the subject area of ecolinguistics as a scientific discipline, which focuses on the nature and function of language as a means of organising a living system (society) and its role in the development of brain, thinking and consciousness“ (Kravchenko 2014: 96).

The emphasis on the natural ecolinguistic mode causes the expansion of the epistemic plane of this special field of knowledge. It can affect the epistemological aspect of the ecology of language and speech in terms of conceptual apparatus and tools, up to shifts in ontological status, if a language is considered within the biomorphic metaphor A. Schleicher's „a living organism“. As a result of the dominance of the biological component of the natural ecolinguistic mode, research visions emerge, which encourage the formation of new interdisciplinary (natural-humanitarian) scientific directions. Here it is worth mentioning biolinguistics, which V. Nechiporenko defines as the science of relationships, the relationship of material and spiritual (mental) origins in the human body, the purpose of which is to know the biological and social foundations of memory, thinking, language and speech (Nechiporenko 1984: 74). In fact, the natural dominance

of ecolinguistic modes is produced by the issue of biolinguistics, the subject of which is, in particular, the impact of language and speech not only on a particular ethnic community and man as its representative, but also on the environment. The experimental research searches of individual scientists (D. Miller) substantiate the corresponding view, according to which language „accompanies and manages human activities in society and in the natural environment“ (Shlyakhov, Nikonov 2011: 139), influencing the environment (plants, animals, water, etc.).

The corresponding locus of interaction between language and the environment can be considered according to the laws of autopoiesis (Greek autopoiesis – „self-completion“) by Humberto R. Maturana and Francisco H. Varela. The model of language is understood as cognitive activity based on interactions making modifications of one organism in the behaviour of another. Coherence and harmony in relations and interactions between members of the human social system takes place under conditions of continuous social learning, which is determined by their own social (linguistic) functioning (Maturana, Varela 2001: 177).

The social ecolinguistic mode in the conditions of multiculturalism generates a translingual direction of ecolinguistics that is connected with the study of the peculiarities of the functioning of the languages of one culture in the discursive space of another ethnolinguistic culture. Thus, according to S. Ionova, language can be considered as a means of transmitting culture within one society and between multilingual societies in intergenerational, diachronic and synchronic perspectives with emphasis on

linguistic integration, peaceful coexistence, linguistic tolerance, principles of intercultural communication and dialogue. However, the scholar sees significant potential in the natural dominants of the ecolinguistic mode, which correspond to the energy potential of language and the speech works it creates (synergetics of language and text) and biolinguistics (Ionova 2010: 90-91).

The correlation of the natural and social components of ecolinguistic modes determines the „dissolution of the primacy“ of any of them, which makes it impossible to distinguish the so-called determinants of the ecology of language and speech. Their corresponding interdependence in the context of preservation not only of the natural / biological environment, but also of the ecology of the cultural environment (Likhachev 1979), is predetermined by the eco-centric model of consciousness, which „Is based on the recognition of man not as the owner of nature and its center, but

as one of its full members ... it implies the abandonment of the hierarchical worldview in favour of its diversity, the harmonious coexistence of its variants. [...] At the same time, the concept of interaction has been interpreted by scientists as a mutual influence of language and environment, as a result of which both objects change, because they, being interconnected, form an „ecological system“ (Ionova 2010: 86-87).

Thus, the natural and social dominants of ecolinguistic modes are reflected in the signs of language / communicative eco-consciousness of representatives of a particular linguistic culture, i.e. notions, dialects, concepts, historical texts, discursive practices, etc., which, on the one hand, are semiotic under the influence of society and environment multicultural, and on the other hand, form a discursive space of a certain epoch, acting as an indicator of linguistic and cultural self-identification and influencing the preservation of national identity.

CONCLUSIONS

Ecolinguistics as an independent branch of humanities and natural science with the formed terminological apparatus today, and the developed tools actually inherited from the philosophy of language the problem of the ratio of natural and social characteristics. Given the strong tradition of studying certain aspects related to the ecology of language and speech, we can conclude that in today's globalised multicultural continuum symbiosis of natural and humanities knowledge, based on psychological-physiological and ideological-

worldview components, actually becomes the driving force of civilization.

Accordingly, there is an indisputable necessity for moral and intellectual evolution of mankind in the XXI century as the only possible way for harmonious mono- and intercultural communication, based on the principle of cooperation (Korolyova, Korolyov 2020), and to protect national languages and cultures, discursive spaces from globalisation threats at the same time. In this comprehensive approach, the stated problem of the dynamics of natural and social dom-

inants of ecolinguistic modes forms a subject area in theoretical and applied linguistics and in the humanities in general. It is focused on the study of significant sociocultural ideas for mankind, i.e. humanism, evolution, close connection with man, cooperation in the discursive space, the pursuit of truth, etc.

In the conditions of multicultural European / world continuum modelling of

ecolinguistic modes represented by natural and social dominants of language and speech of a certain discursive space will not only promote development of terminological apparatus, methodological base and methods for analysis ecolinguistics as the newest interdisciplinary formation of scientific ecology and language as an indicator of linguistic and cultural identity and self-identification.

References

- Belozerova N. N., Labunets N. V. 2012 – Белозерова Н.Н., Лабунец Н.В. 2012. *Эколингвистика: в поисках методов исследования* [Ecolinguistics: in Search of Research Methods]. Тюмень: Изд-во Тюменского гос. ун-та: 46–47 <<http://www.izdatelstvo.utmn.ru/catalog.php?section=read&book=0000521&page=0>> [accessed on 2020 08 18]
- Blackledge Adrian. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Darginavičienė Irena. 2018. The Influence of Culture and Language on the Identity of a Person, *Logos* 95. 146–153.
- Dijk van T. A. 1990. Discourse & Society: A New Journal for a New Research Focus, *Discourse & Society*. № 1: 5–16.
- Fill Alwin. 1993. *Okolinguistik. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Narr, 1993.
- Fill A., Mühlhäusler P. 2001 *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*. Ed. by Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler. London, New York: Continuum.
- Garner Mark. 2004. *Language: an ecological view*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, European Academic Publishers.
- Halliday Michael A.K. 2001. New Ways of Meaning: The Challenge to Applied Linguistics, *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*; [Edited by A. Fill, P. Muhlhausler]. London, New York: Continuum: 175–202.
- Haugen Einar. 1972. *The Ecology of Language: essays by Einar Haugen*. Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press: 57.
- Hawley Amos H. 1950. *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure*. New York: The Ronald Press Co.
- Hornberger Nancy. 2003. Afterword: Ecology and ideology in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6(3&4), 296–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050308667787> [accessed on 2020 08 18]
- Ionova Svetlana V. 2010 – Ионова С. В. 2010. Основные направления эколингвистических исследований: зарубежный и отечественный опыт [The Main Directions of Ecolinguistic Research: Foreign and Domestic Experience], *Вестник Волгоградского гос. университета. Серия 2. Языкознание*. № 1(11): 86–93.
- Jennings, R. E., Thompson J. J. 2012. The biological centrality of talk, *Cognitive Dynamics in Linguistic Interactions*, A. V. Kravchenko (ed.), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 33–63.
- Kapranov Ya. V. 2017. Antropogenesis Triad “Brain – Conscience – Language” As Cultural Determiner, *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*. Kyiv, Milenium: 62–66.
- Korolyov Igor, Domylyvska Liudmyla. 2020. Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*. 9(1), 354–364.
- Korolyova Alla, Korolyov Igor. 2020. Standardization of the Formulas of Discursive Practice Farewell in the National Cooperative Communicative Behaviour. *Valoda: nozīme un forma* 11. *Grammar and language standardization*. Kalnača, Andra, Lokmane, Ilze (eds). Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds: 77–92.

- Kravchenko Aleksandr V. 2014 – Кравченко А. В. 2014. Два взгляда на экологию языка и экологическую лингвистику [Two Views on the Ecology of Language and Environmental Linguistics], *Экология языка и коммуникативная практика*. №2: 90–99. <http://ecoling.sfu-kras.ru/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Kravchenko-A.V.pdf> [accessed on 2020 08 23].
- Likhachev Dmitry S. 1979 – Лихачев Д. С. 1979. *Экология культуры* [Ecology of Culture]. Москва. № 7: 173–179.
- Louis Jean Calvet. 2006. *Towards an Ecology of World Languages*, translated by Andrew Brown. Oxford: Polity Press, 2006.
- Maturana Humberto R. 1970. *Biology of Cognition, BCL Report 9.0. Urbana*, IL: University of Illinois.
- Maturana Humberto R. 1978. *Biology of language: The epistemology of reality, Psychology and Biology of Language and Thought*, G. Miller and E. Lenneberg (eds). New York: Academic Press: 28–62.
- Maturana Humberto R., Varela Francisco H. 2001 – Матурана У., Варела Ф. 2001. *Древо познания: биологические корни человеческого понимания* [The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding]. Москва: Прорпесс-Традиция.
- May Stephen. 2005. Language rights: Moving the debate forward, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 9(3): 319–347.
- Mühlhäusler Peter. 1996. *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. Routledge.
- Nechiporenko Vladimir F. 1984 – Нечипоренко В. Ф. 1984. *Биолингвистика в ее становлении (Биолингвистические основы системы памяти, мышления, языка и речи)* [Biolinguistics in Its Formation (Biolinguistic Foundations of the System of Memory, Thinking, Language and Speech)]. Москва: МГПИ: 74.
- Polukhin A. A. 2009 – Полухин А. А. 2009. Современное языкознание и экологическое мышление [Modern Linguistics and Ecological Thinking], *Опыты-2008: сб. науч. работ преподавателей и студентов фак. филологии*. сост. Н. М. Димитрова. Санкт-Петербург: РИО ГПА: 65–73.
- Ogdonova Tsyrena. 2009 – Огдонова Ц. Ц. 2009. Концептуальные основания лингвоэкологической парадигмы научных исследований [Conceptual foundations of the linguo-ecological paradigm of scientific research], *Альманах современной науки и образования*. Тамбов: „Грамота“, №2 (21): в 3-х ч. Ч. III: 122–124. <http://scjournal.ru/articles/issn_1993-5552_2009_2-3_46.pdf> [accessed on 2020 08 10]
- Salimovskiy Vladimir A. 2012 – Салимовский В. А. 2012. Культура речи и речевая антикультура [Culture of Speech and Speech Anticulture], *Речеведение: общие вопросы, массовая коммуникация. Электр. сборник статей*. Санкт-Петербург: 35–63. <http://jf.spbu.ru/upload/files/file_1354569365_8097.pdf> [accessed on 2020 09 01].
- Shlyakhov Vladimir I., Nikonov Aleksandr L. 2011 – Шляхов В. И., Никонов А. Л. 2011. Эколингвистика и проблема экологии языка в российском языковом пространстве [Ecolinguistics and the Problem of Language Ecology in the Russian Language Space], *Пространство и время*. 2011. № 4: 138–144 <<http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ekolingvistika-i-problema-ekologii-yazyka-v-rossiyskom-yazykovom-prostranstve>> [accessed on 2020 08 21].
- Skovorodnikov Aleksandr P. 2013 – Сковородников А. П. 2013. О предмете эколингвистики применительно к состоянию современного русского языка [About Ecolinguistics Subject in Reference to the Modern Russian Language]. *Экология языка и коммуникативная практика*. № 1: 194–222. <<http://ecoling.sfu-kras.ru/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Skovorodnikov.pdf>> [accessed on 2020 08 10].
- Vasko Roman. 2019. Reflection of the Ancient Rituals Semiotics in Cultural Etiquette Forms of Politeness. *Logos* 100. 85–94.
- Zhabotinskaya Svetlana A. 2015 – Жаботинская С. А. 2015. *Язык как оружие в войне мировоззрений. Майдан – Антимайдан: словарь-тезаурус лексических инноваций* [Language as a Weapon in the War of Ideologies. Maidan – Anti-Maidan: A Dictionary-Thesaurus of Lexical Innovation]. Kyiv: Ukrainian Association of Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics (UACLaP). <http://uaclip.at.ua/zhabotinskaja-jazyk_kak_oruzhi-wbr-wbr-e.pdf> [accessed on 2020 08 15].