

sandr Savych Melnychuk i suchasne movoznavstvo (zb. naukovykh prats do 90-richchia z dnia narodzhennia). K.: Vydavnychi dim Dmytra Buraho, pp. 27–32 [in Ukrainian].

Glushchenko V. A. (2017). Porivnialno-istorychnyi metod v ukrainskomu ta rosiiskomu movoznavstvi XIX st. — 30-kh rr. XX st. [The comparative-historical method in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics of the 19th century — 30s of the 20th century]: monohrafiia. Sloviansk : Vyd-vo B. I. Matorina [in Ukrainian].

Melnichuk A. S. (1970). The Concept of the System and Structure of Language in the Light of Dialectical Materialism. *Topics in the Study of Language*. № 1, pp. 19–32.

Melnichuk A. S. (1988). Peredmova [The Preface]. *Metodologichni problemy movoznavstva* / [ed. A. S. Melnychuk]. K. : Naukova dumka, pp. 3–16 [in Ukrainian].

Melnichuk A. S. (1990). Methodology. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. M. : SE, pp. 299–300.

Melnichuk O. S. (2000a). Metodolohiia u movoznavstvi [Methodology in linguistics]. *Ukrainska mova: entsyklopediia* / NAN Ukrainy, In-t movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni, In-t ukrainskoi movy, Vyd-vo «Ukrainska entsyklopediia» im. M. P. Bazhana. K.: Ukrainska entsyklopediia, pp. 311–312 [in Ukrainian].

Melnichuk O. S. (2000b). Synkhroniia i diakhroniia [Synchrony and diachrony]. *Ukrainska mova: entsyklopediia* / NAN Ukrainy, In-t movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni, In-t ukrainskoi movy, Vyd-vo «Ukrainska entsyklopediia» im. M. P. Bazhana. K.: Ukrainska entsyklopediia, p. 551 [in Ukrainian].

Postovalova V. I. (1978). Historical Phonology and its Foundations: the Experience of Logical and Methodological Analysis. M. : Science.

Rusanivskiy V. M. (1967). Metody doslidzhennia hramatychnoho materialu i teoriia hramatyky [Methods of researching grammatical material and grammar theory]. *Movoznavstvo*. K.: Naukova dumka. T. 1. URL: <https://litmisto.org.ua> (дата звернення: 06.04.2023) [in Ukrainian].

Rusanivskiy V. M. (1980). Marksystsko-leninska metodolohiia vvychennia linhvistychnykh obiektiv [Marxist-Leninist methodology of studying linguistic objects]. *Movoznavstvo*. № 6, pp. 3–11 [in Ukrainian].

Rusanivskiy V. M. (1983). Metodolohichni osnovy linhvistychnykh doslidzen [The methodological foundations of linguistic research]. *Marksystsko-leninska metodolohiia vvychennia linhvistychnykh obiektiv*. K. : Naukova dumka, pp. 5–17 [in Ukrainian].

Zhuravlev V. K. (1986). Diachronic Phonology. M. : Science.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 05.06.2023

УДК 811.161.2.81

<https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2023-36-5>

BASIC CONCEPTS OF THE THEORY OF REAL MONOIDIOM DESCRIPTION

Tetiana V. Hromko

Doctor of Philological Sciences

e-mail: hromkot@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4661-4302>

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the description of the linguistics of speech and its theoretical justification can be based on the main conceptual principles of the metalanguage of monosyllabic description, which includes the main concepts of the theory of real description. Metalanguage is used in applied linguistics to describe other natural languages, and, in the author's opinion, individual utterances as well. In idiomology as a science of speech, linguistic data constitute a certain monosyllabic language, which distinguishes the metalanguage of its description from dialectological or other types of linguistic terminology, thereby positioning the specificity of describing speech as a real language system in the context of highly organized conceptual approaches to the language system. The problems of metalanguage monosyllabic description are outlined, which are in the lens of modern theoretical and methodological linguistic paradigms, because metalanguage is also considered the language of linguistics, which is characterized by a complete set and classification of linguistic knowledge. At the same time, the concept of metalanguage is expanded in dialectology and specified in the context of linguistics, focusing on the monosyllabic description of speech. The novelty of the speech description lies in the fact that it is based on a monosyllabic language, which is a complex process of scientific and cognitive activity in the modern linguistic paradigm. The metalanguage of monosyllabic description needs to update the system of basic principles and special methods of linguistic research, the methodology of speech description according to a clearly planned organization and research apparatus. The emphasis on the importance of the analysis of colloquialism lies in the composition of the metalanguage of the monosyllabic description, which contains central and universal categories that can be used in the study of various language systems: general linguistic terms and concepts (speaker, colloquial speaker), as well as supplemented and clarified methodological concepts of the monosyllabic linguistic description: spoken community, spoken com-

munication, spoken language. A complete presentation of the metalanguage of the monolingual description of the linguarium can be seen in the glossary of the metalanguage of the description for the speech language system.

Key words: *linguistics, metalanguage, dialectology, speech, speech communication, linguarium, monosyllabic description.*

Introduction. Meta-language is a special language used to describe and analyze another language. In the scientific paradigm, a meta-language is used to describe natural human language as a subject of linguistic research, i.e. to interpret language as a system. At the same time, a meta-language can be seen as a formal system that is studied for its internal properties or as a model of external phenomena.

In the linguistic terminology, the concept of a meta-language is used to position a special subject language to describe a particular language system. A meta-language allows us to interpret natural human language not lacunarily but fluminarily, i.e. with the help of a system of meta-language units of linguistics (Тищенко, 2021: 4).

The meta-language of applied linguistics is based on the same units as the language as an object of linguistics, and it is used to describe and analyze different language systems. The main property of a meta-language as a linguistic phenomenon is its binarity: it is a component and a means of describing a natural language. The natural language tools of a broader language grouping can form the basis of a meta-language for learning another natural language, for example, dialect systems. This is what determines **topicality** of suggested study.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The problems of the description meta-language belong to the theoretical and methodological problems of linguistics. They are described in the works of such linguists as O. S. Gerd (Gerd, 2004), N. B. Gvishiani (Gvishiani, 1990), A. P. Zahnitko (Загнітко, 2012; Загнітко, 2020), V. L. Ivashchenko (Івашченко, 2006), O. S. Melnychuk (Мельничук, 1987), R. A. Trifonov (Трифонов, 2014), O. O. Selivanova (Селіванова, 2006; Селіванова, 2008) and others (Лінгводидактика, 2010). O. S. Gerd distinguishes the elements of a meta-language among the existing forms of sign representation of scientific knowledge: «1) a code for recording the content of knowledge in the form of symbols, words, phrases, sentences, signs of their connection, etc.; 2) different types of texts in which scientific knowledge in a particular language is presented; 3) logical and conceptual system of knowledge;

4) terminology system» (Gerd, 2004: 30). Modern linguists generally understand a meta-language as a «second-order» language, secondary, that is, one that describes an object language, the object of which is the content and expression of another language (Алексюк, 2002: 441; Gvishiani, 1990: 297).

This range of different interpretations of the meta-language confirms the importance of emphasizing its use in the study of a particular language system as a unified terminological apparatus in linguistics. The study of dialectography actualized in dialectological descriptions requires the improvement of the research corpus in the direction of descriptive analysis of a particular language system, and the meta-language of description requires the use of general linguistic terminology, which also requires careful distinction between the conceptual names of dialect units, because the terms may depend on the researcher's concept and, depending on this, can be interpreted differently. For example, the problem of using terminology in linguistics, in particular in dialectology, was once raised by Professor I. H. Matviyas (Матвіяс, 1987), who noted that the study of a real language system contributes to the «unification of the description» of the system of linguistic concepts, and an in-depth study of dialects may reveal that a dialectal territorial unit, which has so far been considered a dialect, actually consists of several dialects. Qualifying an idiom as a dialect microsystem, «international — microdialect» and a dialect as a subdialect in the hierarchy of dialect territorial units, Ukrainian linguists traditionally define an idiom only in the context of the Ukrainian dialect system. The scientist noted that «the practice of scientific work generally requires distinguishing between general linguistic and dialectological terminology» (Матвіяс, 1987: 3). Such qualifications of linguistic concepts lead to the opposition of free interpretation of terms and their codification in the scientific literature. The scholar points out the need to distinguish between general linguistic terminology and dialectological terminology, since the use of certain terms by a researcher to denote territorial dialect units «may depend on the author's scientific concept» (Матвіяс, 1987: 6).

The need for a detailed and comprehensive study of the meta-language, i.e. the language used to describe the idiom as a unit of dialectology, and at the same time the real language system (linguistics) of one particular language group in the context of linguistics, which studies various language-system variants (Глущенко, Ледняк, Овчаренко, Рябініна, 2011: 8).

Nowadays, the issue of the importance of a detailed and comprehensive study of the description meta-language is moving into the realm of the need for a thorough and comprehensive study of linguistic data, which is periodically discussed in academic circles, in particular in the field of dialectology (Загнітко, 2012; Загнітко, 2020; 23; Селіванова, 2008). Thus, Professor P. Yu. Hrytsenko substantiated the basic principles of systematic and detailed study of the language-object of dialectological research in his report «Ukrainian Dialect Lexics: Reality and Description (Some Aspects)» at the International Scientific Conference «Dialect Lexics: Lexicological, Lexicographic and LinguoGeographical Aspects» at Hlukhiv Pedagogical University (Гриценко, 2005) — established a strategy of specialization in the field of scientific research, taking into account the variety of scientific methods and introduced a systematic approach to the specifics of dialectological research. Київ) (Ткачук, 2018: 156) — convincingly argued the basic principles of systematic detailing of the language-object of research in the field of dialectology, in particular, he defined the strategy of specialization of studies, the variability of scientific methods and research paradigms, systematic approach to the study of dialect and further interpretation of dialectal material (Ганич, Олійник, 1985; Українська мова, 2011; Громко, 2020_а). Such an impetus to revise the meta-language of the research apparatus and scientific experience in interpreting idiom is important for research in dialectology and linguistics in general.

The purpose of this study is to examine the concept of meta-language in the context of a monolingual description of an idiom as a real language system. This study depends on the availability of relevant meta-language units in linguistic science, since the meta-language is an important tool for linguistic description and analysis of various linguistic phenomena. The problem lies in the lack of previous research in this area, i.e., in the fact that the meta-language of monolingual description is considered as a fundamentally new aspect of the study.

Results. The compendium of the definition of a meta-language is reduced to the following points: 1) it is a special type of language used to describe, analyze and explain the properties of a particular language system, as well as to describe the system of languages in general (Літературознавча енциклопедія, 2007; Мала філологічна енциклопедія, 2007); 2) a meta-language contains general linguistic terms that are used in different

languages, as well as special narrowly focused linguistic terms (Голянич, Стефурак, 2011; Трифонов, 2014).

Such principles prompted us to emphasize the meaning of the meta-language concept and verify its application based on the materials of the study of the dialect linguarium. Great importance is attached to the use of a unified terminological apparatus in linguistics, as well as the need for a clear distinction between meta-language units, which can contribute to the improvement of scientific research in the field of both dialectology and linguistics in general. According to F. S. Batsevych, «the meta-language for describing linguistic phenomena should be unified and comprehensive» (Бацевич, 2010: 42). The description of a language system is usually based on linguistic terminology, which is a typical metalinguistic phenomenon.

The meta-language is based on the fundamental concepts of description and has a separate meta-language branch that covers up linguistic terminology and methodological concepts of monographic linguistic description. The meta-language of description takes into account and rethinks not only the achievements of linguists in this field, but also updates the analysis of the main trends in terminological thought and linguistic and methodological principles of studying language systems. The main goal of the description meta-language is to create a single, comprehensive glossary for the idiom language system, which will contain all the necessary linguistic terms and methodological concepts for a complete monographic study of the idiom (Громко, 2020_а).

In the scientific paradigm, the functional purpose of a meta-language is to describe natural human language as a subject of linguistic research, i.e. to interpret language as a system, and thus to interpret it meta-linguistically. Axiomatic in such a linguistic as linguistic-systems interpretation of a meta-language is its initial mathematical definition based on logical interpretation: a formal system can be formulated and studied for its internal properties or it can be intended as a description (i.e., a model) of external phenomena. Therefore, a meta-language can be considered as a formal system that can be studied for its internal properties or as a model of external phenomena.

A meta-language in linguistics is a formalized sign system used to describe spoken and written language. This concept was introduced by representatives of the formal school and used by R. Jakobson and poststructuralists. Without the use of a meta-language, it is impossible to automate

language operations, i.e. it is a necessary «object of cognitive and computer linguistics, which are based on the concept of mental language formulated by R. Descartes, developed by M. Marx, J. Wilkins, G. Leibniz, discovered by N. Chomsky and his students (J. Fodor, X. Simon, etc.), reflected in M. Minsky's frames, F. Bartlett's schemas, D. Watz's scenes, etc.» (Літературознавча енциклопедія, 2007).

Today, a meta-language is a necessary tool for automating language operations and it is an object of cognitive and computational linguistics. The meta-language is interpreted as an intermediary between the target language and the base language, which is the basis for linguistic interpretation. At the same time, the meta-language and the language-object of linguistic description are not opposed but coexist on equal terms. A meta-language can be considered a language of linguistics, which is characterized by a complete set and classification of linguistic knowledge. The binary opposition «language-object — language-subject» makes it possible to compare concepts in language and ideographic linguistic concepts, language-object and meta-language of linguistics, which gives grounds to consider the meta-language a sufficient tool for linguistic analysis, for example, of a certain natural speech as a phenomenon.

In other words, in the study of natural languages, the meta-language is interpreted as an intermediary between the language under study and the base language, which is the basis for linguistic interpretation. At the same time, the meta-language and the language-object of linguistic description are not opposed, but coexist on equal terms. A meta-language can be considered a language of linguistics, which is characterized by a complete set and classification of linguistic knowledge. For example, the meta-language of philological research is a certain literary language both as a language-object and as a subject of a number of linguistic studies, for example, dialectological ones. Such a binary opposition «language-object — language-subject» makes it possible to compare concepts in language and ideographic linguistic concepts, language-object and meta-language of linguistics, which gives grounds to consider meta-language a sufficient tool for linguistic analysis, for example, of a certain natural speech as a phenomenon.

The emergence of a meta-language leads to the destruction of the stable reference of word meanings in traditional linguistic postulates, the update of positions of identity and variation of a word within the materially fluctuating vocabulary of a particular idiom or stratum of language, etc.

According to O. O. Selivanova, a meta-language is a formalized semiotic code used to describe the semantics and syntax of natural languages (Селіванова, 2006: 314). The pragmatics of modern meta-language research is to use symbolic codes of logic and mathematics, as well as codes of mental objects and situations, such as frames and conceptual graphs.

Researchers distinguish several types of correlation between a meta-language vocabulary and an language object. The first type of relationship is identical to the traditional interpretations in the source language, i.e. the meta-language uses the same words and interpretations as the natural language. The second type has an intersection of meaningful units and interpretations, i.e., the meta-language uses partially shared vocabulary with the natural language, but uses it differently. The third type is a fragmentary representation of natural language and meta-language concepts. And finally, the fourth type of correlation is the absence of common elements between the target language and the meta-language (Ганич, Олійник, 1985; Голянич, Стефурак, 2011; Іващенко, 2006; Мала філологічна енциклопедія, 2007).

A meta-language is a tool for describing language and is based on the philosophy of logical language analysis. Its concepts constitute the linguistic composition of linguistic signs and are used to solve philosophical problems, linguistic methodology, interdisciplinary linguistic research, the linguistic picture of the world and other problematic aspects of modern linguistics. It is also noted that the ideographic classification of the linguistic composition of linguistic signs is still in its infancy. Elements of the meta-language, such as general linguistic and special narrow-sector linguistic terms, are used to describe language, including the Ukrainian language.

The concept of a meta-language is actualized in the linguistic terminology as the positioning of a special subject or object language to describe a particular language system. The linguistic meta-language allows us to interpret natural human language not lacunarily, but fluminarily, which is determined by the corresponding system of meta-language units of linguistics. The meta-language of applied linguistics is largely built on the basis of the same units as the language-object of linguistics. The main property of the meta-language as a linguistic phenomenon is a kind of binary: it is both a component and a means of describing natural language. Thus, the means of a natural language of a broader language grouping (literary stratum) can

form the basis of a meta-language for studying another natural language, for example, dialect systems.

In the linguistic terminology, the concept of a meta-language is used to position a special subject language to describe a particular language system. The meta-language allows us to interpret natural human language not according to lacunar approaches, but according to the modern flumenar (comprehensive) vision of the scientific picture of the world, i.e., using the system of meta-language units of linguistics in the context of the modern scientific paradigm.

The meta-language of applied linguistics is based on the same units as the language-object of linguistics, and it is used to describe and analyze various language systems. The main property of a meta-language as a linguistic phenomenon is its binarity: it is a component and a means of describing a natural language. The natural language tools of a broader language grouping can form the basis of a meta-language for learning another natural language, such as dialect systems.

According to I. G. Matviyas (Матвіяс, 1987: 6), the use of terminology in linguistics, in particular in dialectology, for the study of a real language system contributes to the “unification of the description” of the system of linguistic concepts, and an in-depth study of dialects is provided by an arbitrary interpretation of terms and their codification in the scientific literature. We adhere to the position that it is necessary not to distinguish between general linguistic terminology and dialectological terminology, but rather to unite meta-languages into a general linguistic cluster dedicated to the description of language systems. The basis of this metalinguistic approach is not the separation of dialectology, but the statement of its inseparability from linguistics, which is one of its layers. In the field of linguistics, the names of dialectological units cannot depend only on the author’s scientific concept, but are subject to general scientific linguistic codification.

In the context of our study (Громко, 2021_b), idiomology focuses on the study of language in the format in which it is actually used in the spoken language of a community that has its own specific localization or belongs to a particular social group. The main goal of idiomology is to reveal the linguistic features of specific dialectal language systems: studying their system and structure, lexical and grammatical phenomena, phraseological expressions, etc. — everything, that characterizes an idiom as an independent linguistic phenomenon. Idiomology, introduced by us into scientific circu-

lation (Громко, 2021_b: 71), is a scientific discipline aimed at a complete, language-systemic study of a dialect — its linguistics, consisting of language and speech units that exist in the oral ontological representation of idiom communication.

Our study (Громко, 2021_a) is based on a monoidiom linguarium to describe language data. A monoidiom lingual is a systematic description of a real language, which includes lexical, grammar and other linguistic characteristics used within a particular monoidiom corpus (Громко, 2020_a; Ткачук, 2018). Therefore, in the presented experience, the idiomological aspect focuses on a detailed analysis of the linguistics of a real idiom, which is a typical linguistic expression for a particular social-cultural community, the smallest territorial association of speakers. Our verification of research in this area includes the collection and analysis of speech samples, observation of communicative situations, and the application of linguistic analysis methods to identify both the features of the idiom and model its lingual based on the reflection of the multifaceted linguistic variations that occur at different language levels or depending on the socio-cultural context. Awareness of the various aspects of the idiom studied in idiomology contributes to a deeper understanding of linguistic phenomena, the development of linguistic theories, and makes an important contribution to the general science of language.

The terminological system of idiomology differs from other linguistic disciplines, which explains the focus on specific linguistic features of the idiom that may differ from other language forms. The meta-language of monoidiom description allows, for example, dialectologists to use the theory of real descriptive analysis in context of the theory of complete and accurate description of linguistic features of an idiom, thus extending dialectographic description to idiomatic description. The latter helps to preserve the distinction between language forms in different localities and among different groups of people. In this vein, idiomology as a science of idiom uses the meta-language of monoidiom description to accurately describe the linguistic features of the idiom and preserve the differences between different linguistic forms.

The meta-language used in the context of idiomology is used to describe in detail the linguistic characteristics of the idiom and to preserve the differences between different linguistic forms. Therefore, the meta-language arsenal of concepts contributes to the accurate description of both differ-

ent language forms and narrow-lingual features of the idiom that preserve the differences between different linguistic and speech forms of its expression. Within the framework of idiomology, the meta-language of monoidiom description is used to understand and describe dialect linguals as integral, unique and internally consistent linguistic formations. This allows us to identify and consider the usage features of the idiom that distinguish it from the standard language or other dialects. The meta-language of monoidiom description uses the so-called special language system, which allows us to consider a dialect as an independent language system with all its features and characteristics. A detailed linguistic analysis of a dialect allows us to identify its unique features and differences from the standard language, as well as to determine the specific features inherent in this particular type of lingual.

The use of the meta-language of monoidiom description helps to achieve accuracy and detail in the description of the idiom and preserve the peculiarities of this language form in comparison with other language variants. It allows you to consider the idiom as an independent language system with its own grammatical, lexical, and phonetic features. A meta-language helps to avoid generalizations and simplifications that can arise when describing a dialect in general linguistic terms and allows you to focus on specific features and differences.

Thus, the essence of the meta-language of real monoidiom descriptive analysis is that it helps to reveal the uniqueness and peculiarities of an idiom as a language form, preserving its identity and distinguishing it from other language variants. Using a meta-language to study an idiom allows us to understand and explore its deep structure and its various linguistic resources. The idiomatic terminological system as a whole in terms of descriptive linguistic data (as compared to dialectographic and monographic description) has its own specificity, which distinguishes its meta-language, on the one hand, from descriptive dialectological and Ukrainian linguistic terminology, on the other hand, as an element of the meta-language for describing the Ukrainian language, as well as a sub-element of the meta-language of linguistics. Based on the theory of real descriptive analysis of a natural language system, the meta-language of monoidiom description directs the narrow-sectoral vector of idiomology to the positioning of the dialect lingual. A monoidiom lingual is a systematic description of a real language, which includes lexics, grammar and other linguistic characteristics used within a certain monoidiom corpus.

The description of an idiom is based on monoidiom lingual, which is a complex process of scientific and cognitive activity in the modern linguistic paradigm. The meta-language of monoidiom descriptive analysis requires updating the system of basic principles and special methods of linguistic research, methodology of idiom description with a clearly planned organization and research apparatus.

The meta-language of monoidiom description contains central and universal categories that can be used in studies of different language systems. Thus, the meta-language is an important tool for language research and can be used to analyze various linguistic phenomena. The meta-language includes general linguistic terms and concepts that help to describe the language system of a dialect.

Nowadays, linguistic science needs a meta-language as a set of special terminology classified in a certain way, which corresponds to the methods and theoretical approaches used in research. Dialectology is dominated by certain linguistic paradigms that determine the subject of research and its methods. In general, the linguistic scientific paradigm needs to update its meta-language in such a way that, in accordance with linguistic theories and approaches, it would be able to present in a certain glossary the research apparatus and methodological nominations of a set of theoretical principles of analysis, as well as methods, techniques for processing the analyzed material, names of language units, etc. Unfortunately, due to a number of methodological problems, its components have not yet been definitively determined either numerically or qualitatively.

The main linguistic paradigms used by dialectologists are descriptive, comparative, structural, functional, cognitive and the paradigm of synergistic determinism (Зеленько, 2008: 134). In addition, each of them within the dialectological doctrines of a national scientific doctrine or a separate linguistic school is represented by «a set of linguistic categories that define the subject, and hence the problem of research, and a set of research and operational procedures» (Зеленько, 2010: 313). In Ukrainian dialectology, the synchronic and linguo-geographical aspects have always been dominant, and in some cases the diachronic aspect, sometimes combined with the area one.

The dialectographic approach to the description of a dialect is being rethought in terms of its newest positioning as a separate language system. This means that the study of the idiom is aimed at a complete monographic

description rather than at a differential representation of its linguistic units and phenomena in the language system in accordance with dialectological traditions.

Originality. Ukrainian dialectological terminology does not always ensure the completeness of the meta-language and the descriptive characterization of all language levels. This approach helps to describe the dialect in detail at all language levels. Therefore, a complete monographic description of an idiom requires complementary linguistic terminology and methodological concepts of monographic linguistic description:

Idiom is a local variety of a language that is used in a community of speakers limited to a single locality and has specific ethnographic features. An idiom is a real unit of linguistic and ethnographic division and describes a set of linguistic and ethnographic boundaries on a map. The idiom has systemic features similar to a language system and is organized at the language level with a hierarchical structure.

Idiom community is a society of idiom speakers that is closely interconnected and has a holistic linguistic picture of the world.

Idiom speaker is a linguistic personality who is a member of a dialect community of a geographically limited idiom society and has peculiarities of role behavior and an epistemological base consisting of traditional knowledge of the villager and experience of rural life.

Idiom communication is communication within the framework of the idiom discourse, which includes universal, general language, as well as oral and dialectal features.

Idiom language is the complete composition of the language of a particular idiom, represented in the speech of its speakers, which includes both common and various linguistic features, phenomena, and units.

Language of idioms is a generalized set of idiom features, phenomena, and units as a representation of individual idioms within a dialect language. However, any dialectal phenomenon that has a reliable certification (an indication of the idiom in which it is recorded) can be qualified not as a general dialectal phenomenon, but as one that has an idiom-specific address. Within the framework of evidential linguistics, such a scientific requirement will not allow the introduction of empirical material with the generalized label “dialectal” when it comes to a specific idiom language.

These basic concepts show that the meta-language of monoidiom description has a multidimensional complexity. With the help of linguistic theory, it

is possible to evaluate the speech and language repertoire of the idiom lingual with greater accuracy, reliability, and validity. Idiom is a functional language system that has its own peculiar phonetic, grammatical, word-formation, and lexical features. Each level has its own significance in its hierarchical structure. On the other hand, an idiom is a systemic unit of language that has contrasts and correlations that are manifested only in the speech of speakers of one idiom. Dialectologists often study idioms as an object of research, considering linguistic phenomena against the background of other idioms of the region.

Idiom lingual is a set of elements of the language system used by the speakers of that idiom. Each element of the idiom lingual has its own self-sufficient significance and can be used in a certain segment of the utterance, taking into account its environment and position relative to other elements. For example, if a certain word is used in the idiom, it means that in a certain context this word has its own meaning and function in speech. For a more accurate description of the dialect linguistics, researchers analyze the distribution of elements, i.e., they observe in which contexts and with which other elements they are used. This allows us to better understand the structure and function of speech elements within a given idiom.

Conclusions. A meta-language is a special type of language used to describe and explain the properties of a particular language system, as well as to describe the language system as a whole. A meta-language contains general linguistic terms that are used in different languages, as well as special narrowly focused linguistic terms.

The description of a language system is usually based on linguistic terminology, which is a typical metalinguistic phenomenon. The meta-language is based on the fundamental concepts of descriptions and has a separate meta-language branch that covers linguistic terminology and methodological concepts of monographic linguistic description.

The meta-language takes into account and rethinks not only the achievements of linguists in this field, but also updates the analysis of the main trends in terminological thought and linguistic and methodological principles of studying language systems. The main goal of the meta-language is to create a single, comprehensive glossary for the idiom language system, which will contain all the necessary linguistic terms and methodological concepts for a complete monographic study of the idiom.

The meta-language is intended to describe not only the system of a particular language, but also serves as a tool for descriptive analysis of the

properties of a separate language system — an idiom. In general, there is no obvious difference between the meta-language of a monoidiom description and the language system of another idiom: its elements are general linguistic and special narrow-sector linguistic terms. The basis of the composition of the elements of the meta-language of any descriptor is linguistic terminology, which is a typical metalinguistic phenomenon in terms of the concepts of the theory of real descriptors. The meta-language of monolingual description, represented by the fundamental concepts of descriptive analysis, appears as a separate meta-language branch of the presentation of linguistic terminology, as well as a group of methodological concepts of monographic linguistic description. The formation of a meta-language, which is a tool for a complete monographic study of a dialect, in the totality of its linguistic elements takes into account and rethinks not only the achievements of linguists in this field, but also actualizes the analysis of the main trends in terminological thought in the paradigmatic aspect and the linguistic and methodological foundations of the study of language systems. We see the prospect of theoretical comprehension of the meta-language of the idiom lingual in the compilation of a glossary of the meta-language of description for the idiom language system.

REFERENCES

- Aleksiuk I. (2002). Ob'iektna mova/metamova [Object language/metalinguage]. *Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk* [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]. K. : Instytut filosofii imeni Hryhoriia Skovorody NAN Ukrainy : Abrys, 742 [in Ukrainian].
- Batsevych F. S. (2010). Narysy z lnhvistychnoi prahmatyky [Essays on Linguistic Pragmatics]. Lviv : PAIS [in Ukrainian].
- Hanych D. I., Oliinyk I. S. (1985). Slovnyk lnhvistychnykh terminiv [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. K. : Vyscha shkola [in Ukrainian].
- Hlushchenko V. A., Ledniak Yu. V., Ovcharenko V. M., Riabinina I. M. (2011). Mova yak systema [Language as a system]. K. : Tsentr uchbovoi literatury [in Ukrainian].
- Holianych M. I., Stefurak R. I., Babii I. O. (2011). Slovnyk lnhvistychnykh terminiv: leksykologhiia, frazeologhiia, leksykohrafiia [Dictionary of linguistic terms: lexicology, phraseology, lexicography]. Ivano-Frankivsk : Holiney O. M. [in Ukrainian].
- Hrytsenko P. Yu. (2005). Ukrainska dialektna leksyka: realnist i opys (deiaki aspekty) [Ukrainian dialect vocabulary: reality and description (some aspects)]. *Dialektna leksyka: leksykologichnyi, leksykohrafichnyi ta lnhvoehorafichnyi aspekty*. [Dialectal Vocabulary]. Hlukhiv, pp. 5–33 [in Ukrainian].
- Hromko T. V. (2020). Systema hovirkovykh yavlyshch v monodialektnykh opysakh [System of speech phenomena in monodialect descriptions]. *Naukovyi visnyk Skhidnoievropeiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Seriya: Filolohichni nauky* [Sci-

- entific Bulletin of EEU named after Lesia Ukrainka]. Vol. 3 (407). Lutsk, pp. 24–28 [in Ukrainian].
- Hromko T. V. (2020). Metamova hovirkovoi onomastychnoi leksykohrafichnoi orhanizatsii: osnovni parametry [Metalinguage of spoken onomastic lexicographic organization: main parameters]. *Rozvytok naukovoi dumky postindustrialnoho suspilstva: suchasnyi dyskurs* [Development of the Scientific Thought of the Postindustrial Society: Proceedings of the Conference]. T. 3. Mykolaiv : MTsND, pp. 91–92 [in Ukrainian].
- Hromko T. V. (2021). Metodolohiia leksyko-hramatychnoi deskryptsii lnhvariuiu hovirky [Methodology of lexical and grammatical description of the idiom lingual] : Doctor dissertation (Ukrainian language). Odesa [in Ukrainian].
- Hromko T. V. (2021). Metodolohiia ta dosvid deskryptsii hovirky [Methodology and experience of speech description]. Dnipro : [in Ukrainian].
- Zahnitko A. (2012). Slovnyk suchasnoi lnhvistyky : poniattia i terminy [Dictionary of modern linguistics: concepts and terms]. Donetsk : DonNU [in Ukrainian].
- Zahnitko A. (2020). Suchasnyi lnhvistychnyi slovnyk [Modern linguistic dictionary]. Vinnytsia : TVORY [in Ukrainian].
- Zelenko A. S. (2008). Aspekt, metod, pryiom, protsedura u dialektolohii [Aspect, method, technique, procedure in dialectology]. *Suchasni problemy movoznavstva ta literaturoznavstva* [Modern Issues of Linguistics and Literature Studies]. Vol. 12, 134–137 [in Ukrainian].
- Zelenko A. S. (2010). Zahalne movoznavstvo [General linguistics]. K. : Znann'a [in Ukrainian].
- Ivashchenko V. (2006). Materialy do Slovnyka-minimumu osnovnykh terminoponiat kontseptualnoi semantyky [Materials for the Minimum Dictionary of Basic Terms of Conceptual Semantics]. *Leksykohrafichnyi biuleten* [Lexicographic Bulletin]. K. : In-t ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy. Vol. 14, pp. 148–162 [in Ukrainian].
- Sokolova S. V. (Ed.) Lnhvodydaktyka profesora Stepana Pylypovycha Bevzenka : slovnyk-dovidnyk z ukrainskoi movy [Language Didactics of Professor Stepan Pylypovych Bevzenko : dictionary-reference of the Ukrainian language]. K. : Vyd-vo NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova [in Ukrainian].
- Kovaliv Yu. I. (Ed.) (2007). Literaturoznavcha entsyklopediia [Literary encyclopedia]. T. 2. K. : Akademiia [in Ukrainian].
- Skopnenko O. I., Tsybaliuk T. V. (Ed.) (2007). Mala filolohichna entsyklopediia [Small Philological Encyclopedia]. Kyiv : Dovira, 478 [in Ukrainian].
- Matviias I. H. (1987). Deiaki pytannia terminolohii v ukrainskii dialektolohii [Some issues of terminology in Ukrainian dialectology]. *Ukrainska dialektna leksyka*. K. : Naukova dumka, 3–9 [in Ukrainian].
- Melnychuk O. S. (1987). Metodolohichni problemy analizu spivvidnoshen idealnoho y materialnoho v sferi movy [Methodological problems of the analysis of ideal and material relationships in the sphere of language]. *Movoznavstvo* №1, pp. 3–14 [in Ukrainian].
- Selivanova O. O. (2006). Suchasna lnhvistyka: terminolohichna entsyklopediia [Modern linguistics: a terminological encyclopedia]. Poltava : Dovkillia-K [in Ukrainian].
- Selivanova O. O. (2008). Suchasna lnhvistyka: napriamy ta problemy [Modern linguistics: directions and problems]. Poltava : Dovkillia-K [in Ukrainian].
- Tyshchenko K. M. (2021). Metateoriia movoznavstva u svoiemu chasi y sotsiumi [Metatheory of linguistics in its time and society]. *Movoznavstvo*. №3, pp. 3–24 [in Ukrainian].

Tkachuk M. (2018). Dialektolohiia u strukturі linhvistychnykh znan : pro pidsumky Mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferentsii [Dialectology in the structure of linguistic knowledge: about the results of the International Scientific Conference]. *Ukrainska mova* [Ukrainian Language]. №2, pp. 155–159 [in Ukrainian].

Tryfonov R. A. (2014). Metamova: teoretichni aspekty doslidzhennia [Metalanguage: theoretical aspects of research]. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriya: Filolohiia* [Bulletin of Kharkov National University named after V. N. Karazin]. № 1107. Vyp. 70, pp. 27–36 [in Ukrainian].

Muromtsev I. V. (Ed.) (2011). *Ukrainska mova. Entsyklopediia* [Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia]. K. : Maister-klas [in Ukrainian].

Gerd A. S. (2004). Metalanguage of modern lexicography. *Bulletin of VGU: Humanitarian Sciences*. №2, pp. 33–40.

Gvishiani N. B. (1990). Metalanguage. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. M. : Progress, pp. 297–298.

ОСНОВНІ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ ТЕОРІЇ РЕАЛЬНОГО МОНОГОВІРКОВОГО ДЕСКРИБУВАННЯ

Тетяна В. Громко

доктор філологічних наук
e-mail: hromkot@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4661-4302>

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті йдеться про дескрипцію лінгварію говірки та про її теоретичне обґрунтування, яке може ґрунтуватися на основних концептуальних засадах метамови моноговіркового опису, який включає основні концепти теорії реального дескрибування. Метамова застосовується в прикладній лінгвістиці для опису інших природних мов, а, на думку автора, й окремих говірок. В ідіомології як науці про говірку мовні дані становлять певний моноговірковий лінгварій, що відрізняє метамову його опису від діалектологічної чи іншого типу лінгвістичної термінології й цим самим позиціонує специфіку дескрибування говірки як реальної мовної системи в контексті високоорганізованих концептуальних підходів до системи мови. Окреслено проблеми метамовного моноговіркового опису, які знаходяться в об'єктиві сучасних теоретичних та методологічних лінгвістичних парадигм, адже метамовою вважається й мова лінгвістики, якій властива повна сукупність та класифікація мовознавчих знань. При цьому поняття метамови розширюється в діалектології та конкретизується в контексті мовознавства, зосереджуючись на моноговірковому описі говірки. Новизна опису говірки полягає в тому, що він заснований на моноговірковому лінгварії, який є складним процесом науково-пізнавальної діяльності в сучасній лінгвістичній парадигмі. Метамова моноговіркового

дескрибування потребує оновлення системи вихідних принципів і спеціальних методів лінгвістичного дослідження, методології опису говірки за чітко спланованою організацією та дослідницьким апаратом. Акцент на важливості аналізу говірколінгварію полягає при цьому на укладанні метамови моноговіркового опису, яка містить центральні та універсальні категорії, що можуть бути використані в дослідженнях різних мовних систем: загальнолінгвістичні терміни та поняття (говірка, говірконосії), а також доповнені та увиразнені методологічні концепти моноговіркового лінгвоопису: говіркова спільнота, говіркова комунікація, говіркова мова. Повна презентація метамови моноговіркового опису лінгварію бачиться в глянцевій метамові опису для мовної системи говірки.

Ключові слова: лінгвістика, метамова, діалектологія, говірка, говіркова комунікація, лінгварій, моноговіркова дескрипція.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Алексюк І. Об'єктна мова/метамова. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник* / [гол. ред. В. І. Шинкарук]. К. : Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України ; Абрис, 2002. 742 с.

Бацевич Ф. С. Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики. Львів : ПАІС, 2010. 336 с.

Ганич Д. І., Олійник І. С. Словник лінгвістичних термінів. К. : Вища школа, 1985. 360 с.

Гвишиани Н. Б. Метаязык [в:] *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва, 1990. С. 297–298.

Герд А. С. Метаязык современной лексикографии. *Вестник ВГУ. Серия : Гуманитарные науки*. 2004. № 2. С. 33–40.

Глушенко В. А., Ледняк Ю. В., Овчаренко В. М., Рябініна І. М. Мова як система : навч. посіб. К. : Центр учбової літератури, 2011. 132 с.

Голянич М. І., Стефурак Р. І., Бабій І. О. Словник лінгвістичних термінів: лексикологія, фразеологія, лексикографія. Івано-Франківськ : Видавець Голіней О. М., 2011. 268 с.

Гриценко П. Ю. Українська діалектна лексика: реальність і опис (деякі аспекти). *Діалектна лексика: лексикологічний, лексикографічний та лінгвогеографічний аспекти*. Матеріали доповідей Міжнародної наукової конференції. Глухів, 2005. С. 5–33.

Громко Т. В. Система говіркових явищ в монодіалектних описах. *Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Серія: Філологічні науки*. 2020. Вип. 3(407). С. 24–28.

Громко Т. В. Метамова говіркової ономастичної лексикографічної організації: основні параметри. *Розвиток наукової думки постіндустріального суспільства: сучасний дискурс: матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції*. 13 листопада, 2020 рік. Миколаїв : МЦНД, 2020. Т. 3. С. 91–92.

Громко Т. В. Методологія лексико-граматичної дескрипції лінгварію говірки: дис. ... доктора філол. наук : 10.02.01 — українська мова / Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова. Одеса, 2021. 685 с.

- Громко Т. В. Методологія та досвід дескрипції говірки: монографія. Дніпро, 2021. 452 с.
- Загнітко А. Словник сучасної лінгвістики : поняття і терміни. Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2012. 402 с.
- Загнітко А. Сучасний лінгвістичний словник. Вінниця : ТВОРИ, 2020. 920 с.
- Зеленько А. С. Аспект, метод, прийом, процедура у діалектології. *Сучасні проблеми мовознавства та літературознавства*. 2008. Вип. 12. С. 134–137.
- Зеленько А. С. Загальне мовознавство : навч. посібник. К. : Знання, 2010. 380 с.
- Івашенко В. Матеріали до Словника-мінімуму основних термінопонять концептуальної семантики. *Лексикографічний бюлетень*. Київ : Ін-т української мови НАН України, 2006. Вип. 14. С. 148–162.
- Лінгводидактика професора Степана Пилиповича Бевзенка : словник-довідник з української мови / [упоряд. С. В. Соколова]. К. : Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 2010. 254 с.
- Літературознавча енциклопедія : У двох томах. К. : Академія, 2007. Т. 2. 624 с.
- Мала філологічна енциклопедія / [укл.: О. І. Скопненко, Т. В. Цимбалюк]. К. : Довіра, 2007. 478 с.
- Матвіяс І. Г. Деякі питання термінології в українській діалектології. *Українська діалектна лексика*. К. : Наукова думка, 1987. С. 3–9.
- Мельничук О. С. Методологічні проблеми аналізу співвідношень ідеального й матеріального в сфері мови. *Мовознавство*. 1987. №1. С. 3–14.
- Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2006. 716 с.
- Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. 712 с.
- Тищенко К. М. Метатеорія мовознавства у своєму часі й соціумі. *Мовознавство*. 2021. №3. С. 3–24.
- Ткачук М. Діалектологія у структурі лінгвістичних знань : про підсумки Міжнародної наукової конференції. *Українська мова*. 2018. №2. С. 155–159.
- Трифонов Р. А. Метамова: теоретичні аспекти дослідження. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна*. Серія: Філологія. 2014. № 1107, вип. 70. С. 27–36.
- Українська мова. Енциклопедія / [за ред. І. В. Муромцева]. К. : Майстер-клас, 2011. 400 с.
- Gerd A. S. Metalanguage of modern lexicography. *Bulletin of VGU: Humanitarian Sciences*. 2004. №2. P. 33–40.
- Gvishiani N. B. Metalanguage. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. М. , 1990. P. 297–298.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.05.2023

УДК 811.161.2
<https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2023-36-6>

ВОЛИНСЬКІ НАРОДНІ ГЕОГРАФІЧНІ ТЕРМІНИ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ БОЛОТА: СТРУКТУРНО- СЕМАНТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ

Оксана К. Данилюк

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри філології та методики початкової освіти, Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки, Луцьк, Україна
 e-mail: oxana.danyliuk@gmail.com
 ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8765-8475>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Стаття присвячена вивченню народних назв боліт на Волині. Зібрані автором та опубліковані у словнику народні назви боліт відображають специфіку сприйняття їх місцевим населенням і відношення до них, а також містять важливу інформацію про характеристики та особливості боліт. Дослідження таких назв може сприяти збереженню культурної спадщини, пов'язаної з природними об'єктами, збагаченню наукової термінології та розумінню лексико-семантичних особливостей мовної картини світу. Ці назви можуть містити цінну інформацію про місцеві умови, рослинний світ, географічні особливості та екологічний статус боліт, що сприяє глибшому розумінню зв'язку між людиною та природним середовищем. Крім того, народні назви боліт можуть слугувати додатковим джерелом інформації для класифікації та ідентифікації різних типів боліт на Волинському Поліссі, а також виявлення місцевих термінологічних варіацій та особливостей. Лінгвістичний підхід допомагає виявити місцеві термінологічні варіації та особливості, які відображаються в лексичному складі та семантиці. Проведене дослідження є актуальним для розуміння лексичного фонду, лінгвістичного розмаїття та культурного спадщини, пов'язаної з тельмографією Волині.

Галузь функціонування, семантичні зрушення та особливості значення народних тельмографічних термінів впливають на їхнє ареальне поширення. Основу зазначеного класу діалектизмів становлять загальновідомі терміни, переважно праслов'янського походження, які мають широкі семантичні можливості. У дослідженому ареалі народні географічні термі-