

**Леся Рогач,**  
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,  
доцент кафедри англійської філології  
ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7709-017X>  
м. Ужгород, Україна

## **Contrastive semantics of profession nominations**

### **Контрастивна семантика назв професій**

**Summary.** *Linguocultural approach to the study of agentive professionalisms is aimed at investigation of the correlation of these nominations as signs of English and Ukrainian culture. In this regard, the importance of the system of standards, symbols and stereotypes is actualized to describe the cultural and national specificity of the system of agentive professional nominations. In our research the identification of national and cultural content of agentive professionalisms is performed from the standpoint of linguistic, contrastive, linguistic-cultural and cognitive approaches. The present study focuses on the contrastive typology of meanings of profession nominations in English and Ukrainian in economic discourse. The following aspects or types of meaning while contrasting English and Ukrainian lexemes under consideration are addressed: referential or denotative aspect; conceptual, or significative aspect; pragmatic, or connotative aspect; and systemic, or differential aspect. The referential semantics in our research deals with the meaning of a word denoting a profession as its capacity to represent the sphere of economic discourse in English and Ukrainian. The conceptual aspect of lexical meaning in our material is determined by the reference of the investigated lexemes to a mental entity. Pragmatic aspect of lexical meaning in lexemes denoting professions in both languages is defined by the communicative situation the word is used in. The systemic aspect of word meaning in the lexemes under study is established on the basis of the word's relations to other words within a group of lexical units denoting professions in economic discourse. The investigation of profession nominations in the economic discourse analyzes the SL lexemes in their correlation with the corresponding TL lexemes.*

**Key words:** *economic discourse, profession nominations, semantics, contrastive study, translation.*

**Анотація.** *Лінгвокультурний підхід до вивчення агентивних професіоналізмів спрямований на дослідження співвідношення цих номінацій як ознак англійської та української культури. У зв'язку з цим актуалізується значення системи стандартів, символів, стереотипів для опису культурно-національної специфіки системи агентивних професійних*

номінацій. У нашому дослідженні виявлення національно-культурного змісту агентних професіоналізмів здійснюється з позицій лінгвістичного, контрастивного, лінгвокультурологічного та когнітивного підходів. Стаття присвячена дослідженню контрастивної семантики назв професій в англійській та українській мовах. Увага зосереджується на контрастивній типології значень назв професій у двох мовах. У дослідженні аналізуємо аломорфні та ізоморфні семантичні особливості англійських і українських агентивних професіоналізмів, що функціонують в економічному дискурсі мови оригіналу та мови перекладу. У статті розглядаються такі аспекти у процесі протиставлення англійських та українських лексичних одиниць: референтний, або денотативний, аспект; концептуальний, або сигніфікативний, аспект; прагматичний, або конотативний, аспект і системний, або диференційний, аспект. Референтна семантика у нашому дослідженні стосується значення слова, що позначає професію, як її здатність репрезентувати сферу економічного дискурсу англійською та українською мовами. Концептуальний аспект лексичного значення в нашому матеріалі визначається віднесенням досліджуваних лексем до ментальної сутності. Прагматичний аспект лексичного значення в лексемах, що позначають професії, визначається комунікативною ситуацією, в якій слово вживається. Системний аспект значення слів у досліджуваних лексемах встановлюється на основі зв'язків слова з іншими словами у групі. Дослідження номінацій професій в економічному дискурсі націлене на аналіз лексем цільової мови у їх співвідношенні з відповідними лексемами мови перекладу.

**Ключові слова:** економічний дискурс, назви професій, семантика, контрастивне дослідження, переклад.

**Introduction.** The search for new ways to study language and culture has led to an awareness of the need for linguistic analysis of national mentality, when in the process of comparison there is a conceptual content of language units that reflect the specific type of perception of the world and traditions of national culture. The thesis of the unity of language and culture makes it possible to consider communication with native speakers not only as an exchange of information by means of language, but also as a dialogue of the respective cultures.

Within the framework of semantic-linguoculturologic paradigm the study of profession nominations is understood as a reflection of the national consciousness of the linguistic-cultural community, and the attitudes embedded in it, to a certain extent, impose cultural and national worldview on native speakers. Profession nominations act as peculiar semiotic codes allowing to penetrate into history, culture and mentality of the nation. Lexical units denoting professions arise to describe the world as well as to interpret, evaluate and express a subjective attitude towards it. This is what distinguishes lexical units denoting professions from other nominative units [10, c. 82].

Contrastive studies tracing the development trends in the paradigms of English and Ukrainian profession nominations and translation studies seem to be **relevant** in view of the fact that economic cooperation between Ukraine and English-speaking countries is becoming increasingly stronger, while the systems of historically conditioned professional nominations of both countries show a number of significant differences. The **aim** of the investigation is the contrastive study of meanings of profession nominations in English and Ukrainian economy discourse. In accordance with the intended aim the following **objectives** of the research have been formulated: to determine lexical and contextual semantics of agentive professionalisms in the source discourse and the target discourse and to study the contrastive semantics of profession nominations.

**Methodology of investigation.** According to N. Andreichuk, the national and cultural specificity of the profession nominations consists in: 1) the way of world segmentation, reflects the peculiarities of mentality (firstly, the phenomenon of profession nominations non-equivalence in contrastive aspect, does not deny the existence of similar verbalized meanings on lexical level or in the form of verbalized background national cultural information, secondly, the elaboration of certain conceptual spaces, that is, the existence of different number of units, which verbalize the concept in the languages under study); 2) the way of verbalization (using certain metaphorical principles, prototype representations); 3) replenishment, generally typical for comparable languages, of the metaphorical model at the verbal level by specific components; 4) display of prototype and stereotype representations of profession nominations in national precedent texts [8, p. 44].

The identification of the national and cultural content of agentive professionalisms is performed from the standpoint of linguistic, contrastive, linguistic-cultural and cognitive approaches, which can be presented as stages of contrastive analysis: 1) revealing of non-equivalent extra-linguistic factors reflected in agentive professionalisms; 2) revealing of structural and semantic peculiarities of interlingual agentive professional analogues; 3) revealing of national and cultural connotations and cultural concepts in the semantic structure of agentive professionalisms; 4) revealing the peculiarities of the national segmentation of the linguistic worldview and the peculiarities of the mentality.

Cumulative properties of agentive professionalisms in SL and TL economy discourse contribute to their ability to accumulate cultural information about the life and customs of representatives of English and Ukrainian linguoculture, which makes it possible to carefully study the mentality, traditions and stereotypes. The linguistic worldview is described by means of profession nominations, in which each agentive

professionalism is an element of system and performs the function of description of realities and phenomena of surrounding reality. The system of agentive professionalisms is specific for each concrete language since not every phenomenon or action of the world around gets the same expression in the language in the form an agentive professional nomination [6, p. 7].

In the process of contrasting the agentive professionalisms of different SL and TL economy discourses, it is important to characterize the common and distinctive aspects in the semantics of the studied units, which is based on national originality. The objective fact of existence of ethno-cultural nomination parallels, which can cover not only to some extent related and culturally related languages, which are constantly in contact, but also languages that are completely unrelated, very far from each other in the structural manifestation, which did not have close ethno-cultural contacts in the past, testifies to the common laws of mentality of different peoples. Such parallels clearly demonstrate the existence of a certain tendency and the close interconnection and interdependence of the development of the language and culture of each people, while the agentive professionalisms that are unique from the national point of view are a result of linguistic reflection of the specificity of a particular mentality and linguistic worldview [4, p. 34].

Contrastive study of agentive professionalisms expands and deepens the holistic view of contrasted systems in all their diversity. Typological analysis is based on contrastive analysis which is carried out according to the selected parameters and allows for a more detailed examination of inter-lingual differences [2, p. 14]. Contrastive study reveals common features and differences in the use of linguistic means of different languages; allows to determine the peculiarities of each of the contrasted languages; allows to anticipate and avoid undesirable interference; creates a solid linguistic base for the theory of translation; supplies material for typology, identification of universals.

**Results and discussion.** The translation direction of contrastive research is related to the onomasiological approach to organizing the material being compared, where the researcher comes from invariant meanings and analyses how these meanings are conveyed in parallel texts on different languages. The contrastive analysis of profession nominations in English and Ukrainian in our research reveals the characteristics of a lexical item's content within two types of semantics: referential and lexical [5, p. 29]. The referential semantics deals with the meaning of a word denoting a profession as its capacity to represent the sphere of economic discourse, for example, the lexeme "*worker*" defined as "someone who works in a particular job or in a particular way" and "someone who works

for a company or organization but does not have a powerful position” [13] refers the lexeme to the sphere of employment in English while the Ukrainian word “*робітник*” defined as “той, хто здійснює нескладну, допоміжну фізичну роботу”; “людина, зайнята в якій-небудь певній галузі діяльності”; “той, хто працює, трудиться; трудівник” [18] describes the employment field in the Ukrainian economic discourse, for example: *The Chester plant had exemplary employee relations, so much so that the workers had decertified their own union* [12, p. 177]. *На заводі в Честері були зразкові відносини з співробітниками, настільки, що **робітники** відмовилися від сертифікації власної профспілки* [16, с. 137].

Lexical semantics considers the meaning of a word denoting professions in the English and Ukrainian economic discourse as an entity that encodes information about economic discourse. Thus, the lexeme “*manager*” differentiates between two components in its meaning structure: “the person who is responsible for managing an organization” and “the person whose job is to organize and sometimes train a sports team” [13] and its Ukrainian correspondence “*менеджер*” defined as “у сучасному капіталістичному суспільстві – найманий професійний керуючий (директор підприємства, керівник окремого підрозділу) у концернах, трестах, синдикатах і т. ін.” [18] both describe not just a mere physical world, but a conceptualized one, i.e. the conceived and interpreted reality in the economic area, for example: *It lays out how leaders and managers alike can surmount the cognitive, resource, motivational, and political hurdles in spite of limited time and resources in executing blue ocean strategy* [12, p. 21]. *У ньому йдеться про те, як керівники і **менеджери** можуть долати когнітивні, ресурсні, мотиваційні та політичні бар’єри, незважаючи на обмеженість часу і ресурсів, необхідних для здійснення стратегії «блакитного океану»* [16, с. 11].

The analysis of the lexical-semantic group of nouns denoting professions in English and Ukrainian manifests that the formation of their lexical meaning is influenced by three interrelated elements of the epistemological situation – a cognizer (a designator), a cognized object (the external world, i.e. reality) and a linguistic sign (lexical item) [7, p. 223]. Thus, we single out the following aspects or types of meaning while contrasting English and Ukrainian lexemes under consideration: a) referential or denotative aspect; b) conceptual, or significative aspect; c) pragmatic, or connotative aspect; d) systemic, or differential aspect.

Referential, or denotative aspect of lexical meaning of lexemes denoting professions in English and Ukrainian is determined by the word’s reference to an object (denotatum, referent). It is usually referred to as the

ostensive or demonstrative meaning. According to this approach, there is a certain relationship between a word in the economic discourse and an object in the area of economy, embodied and nominated by the word. The relation of the profession nomination to the object in the sphere of economy is interpreted as the referential meaning. For example: *The Standard requires the **auditor** to be more proactive in considering the risk of fraud in an audit of financial statements [12, p. 178].* Відповідно до цього стандарту, **аудитор** повинен проявляти більшу далекоглядність при розгляді можливості шахрайства в ході аудиторської перевірки фінансових відомостей [16, p. 137].

The conceptual, or significative aspect of lexical meaning in lexemes denoting professions in English and Ukrainian is determined by the word's reference to a mental entity (concept, image, idea, conception, etc.) [1, p. 87]. This aspect is considered within the conceptual theory of meaning [9, p. 200]. The lexical meaning of the lexeme "*budget analyst*" and its Ukrainian correspondence "*бюджетний аналітик*" or the lexeme "*broker*" and the Ukrainian correspondence "*брокер*" are treated as concepts (an abstract or generalized idea of particular objects, processes and other phenomena) denoted by a word belonging to the conceptual domain of ECONOMY, for example: *Relationship businesses, such as insurance, banking, and investing, have relied heavily on the emotional bond between **broker** and client [12, p. 74].* Такі види діяльності в сфері бізнес відносин, як страхування, банківська справа та інвестування, в значній мірі спиралися на емоційний зв'язок між **брокером** і клієнтом [16, p. 61].

The concept within the conceptual domain ECONOMY encompasses the minimum of typical features that characterize the object of designation and distinguish it from other objects as well as from the objects belonging to other conceptual domains [3, p. 95]. The concept verbalized by the English word "*bookkeeper*", on the one hand, differentiates the designated object from the one denoted by the lexeme "*dealer*" belonging to the same sphere of human activity, and, on the other hand, it distinguishes the object from the one verbalized by the lexeme "*journalist*" which refers this designatum to the field of journalism. The same holds true for the Ukrainian lexemes "*бухгалтер*", "*дилер*", and "*журналіст*", for example: *After graduation she continued to study theatre history and theatre science at the Theatre Science Institute and at the Berlin University, while working part-time as a **bookkeeper** and office manager [12, p. 211].* Вона продовжила вивчати театральне мистецтво та історію театру в Театральному інституті та в Берлінському університеті, одночасно працюючи неповний робочий день **бухгалтером** і адміністратором [14, p. 180].

The research shows that the generalization process in the lexical meanings of profession nominations in the both languages may provide for the selection of various features to represent the typicality of an object.

Depending on a designator's (speaker's/writer's) intention in selecting those typical features, lexical meanings of profession nominations may reveal different grades of equivalence in the contrasted languages, for example, the English lexeme "*minister*" is characterized by several meaning components including: "a member of the government in Britain and many other countries who is in charge of a particular department or has an important position in it"; "a religious leader in certain Christian churches" and "a person below the rank of ambassador whose job is to represent his or her country in a foreign country" [13]. Therefore, this lexeme verbalizes the concepts POLITICIAN, CLERGYMAN and DIPLOMATIC AGENT referring the designated objects to different conceptual domains. Apparently, this lexeme has different correspondences denoting the same concepts in the Ukrainian language, for example: *Rather, the decision depends on the discretionary authority of a minister and thus, of the executive* [15, p. 20]. *Рішення залежить більшою мірою від дискреційних повноважень міністра і, отже, виконавчої влади* [17, p. 58].

In the following example, the lexeme "*minister*" has the Ukrainian correspondence "*священник*": *Retiring age for ministers is 70 years old, when a minister and his wife each receives a monthly pension of \$200 monthly until they pass away* [11, p. 78]. *Священники виходять на пенсію після досягнення 70-річного віку, причому після цього священник і його дружина починають щомісяця отримувати довічну пенсію в розмірі 200 доларів кожен* [19, p. 70].

The lexeme "*minister*" verbalizes the concept DIPLOMATIC AGENT in the following text fragment: *The Minister provided some historical background to the mandate from the regional perspective, and stressed that regular dialogue with regional groups would be helpful* [11, p. 54]. *Посланник охарактеризував під регіональним кутом зору деякі аспекти передісторії мандата і звернув увагу на корисність регулярного діалогу з регіональними групами* [19, p. 50].

Thus, the same lexeme may verbalize various concepts in English while these concepts are designated by different lexemes in the contrasted language.

Pragmatic, or connotative aspect of the lexical meaning in lexemes denoting professions in English and Ukrainian is defined by the communicative situation the word is used in, i.e. the situation of its application. The analysis of the given profession nominations shows that this aspect usually includes the speaker's attitude towards a denoted object

in economic discourse, the relations between an addresser and addressee, communication environment, the purpose an interlocutor aims to achieve, and other parameters. The information about these situations is included in lexical meaning in the form of various components (evaluative, emotive, expressive, associative, ideological, stylistic, etc.).

Those components, being supplementary to the cognitive meaning, constitute the basis of the pragmatic meaning of a word, cf.: the English “dealer” – “a trader or merchant, esp. a wholesaler”; “the player distributing the cards in a card game”; “a person who behaves or acts toward another or others in a specified manner” and “*slang*. a person who buys and sells drugs illegally” [13] versus the Ukrainian lexeme “дилер” – юридична або фізична особа, що займається купівлею-продажем цінних паперів, валют, товарів і що діє від свого імені і за свій рахунок” [18], for example: *Minimum resale price maintenance occurs when a manufacturer imposes a minimum resale price on a dealer, thereby limiting or even excluding a dealer’s ability to offer discounts* [15, p. 89]. Підтримка мінімальних перепродажних цін відбувається в тих випадках, коли виробник строго фіксує мінімальну перепродажну ціну **дилера**, тим самим обмежуючи або навіть зводячи нанівець можливості **дилера** з надання знижок [17, p. 156].

In the following illustration, the lexeme “dealer” is substituted by the Ukrainian correspondence “посередник”, for example: *The Royal Company obtained its diamond dealer licence in September 2007* [11, p. 89]. «Ройал компанії» придбала свою ліцензію **посередника** в угодах з діамантами у вересні 2007 року» [19, p. 78].

The analysis of the following context shows the usage of the Ukrainian correspondence “наркоторговець”, for example: *We have a witness that places a dealer named Easy Eddie Moe at the scene* [12, p. 123]. У нас є свідок, який стверджує, що бачив **наркоторговця** на ім’я Очманілій Едді Мо на місці злочину [16, p. 102].

In terms of their pragmatic meaning, in the process of research we have detected the English and Ukrainian profession nominations of two types:

a) profession nominations that coincide in connotations, e.g.: Eng. “businessman” – “a person, esp. a man, engaged in commercial or industrial business, esp. as an owner or executive” [13]; Ukr. “бізнесмен” – “людина, яка займається комерційною діяльністю, бізнесом; підприємець” [18]. For example: *OIOS also adduced evidence to show that the letter leasing the relevant fuel installations to the businessman had actually been drafted by one of the businessman’s employees* (11, p. 57). УСВН також представило докази, які показують, що лист про передачу **бізнесмену** паливних станцій в довгострокову

оренду було дійсно підготовлено одним зі співробітників цього підприємця [19, p. 50].

b) profession nominations that do not coincide in connotations, e.g. Eng. “*politician*” – “a person actively engaged in politics, esp. a full-time professional member of a deliberative assembly”; “a person who is experienced or skilled in the art or science of politics, government, or administration; statesman” and “*derogatory* a person who engages in politics out of a wish for personal gain, as realized by holding a public office” [13] and Ukr. “*політик*” – “той, хто займається питаннями політики; політичний діяч”; “особа, яка вмiє тонко влаштовувати складну справу” [18]. For example: *Politicians can also be criticized for becoming “career politicians”. A politician who makes politics the source of their income, yet has to face re-election every few years can be less likely to make bold decisions or side with an unpopular bill* [15, p. 129].

*Політиків можна також критикувати за те, що вони стали “кар’єрними політиканами”. Політикан, який робить політику джерелом свого доходу, але змушений проходити перевибори кожні кілька років, може бути менш схильний приймати сміливі рішення або вставати на бік непопулярного законопроєкту* [17, p. 240].

The analysis of the given context shows that the English lexeme “*politician*” is replaced by the negative lexeme “*політикан*” while the following context represents the neutral Ukrainian correspondence “*політик*”. For example: *In addition, a construction firm filed defamation charges against a politician who had supported the farmers* [11, p. 116].

*Крім того, одна з будівельних компаній висунула звинувачення проти одного з політиків, який підтримав цих фермерів* [19, p. 109].

The systemic, or differential aspect of word meaning in lexemes belonging to the system of profession nominations in English and Ukrainian is established on the basis of the word’s relations to other words within a group of lexical units denoting professions in economic discourse. The analysis manifests that the meaning is not self-sufficient and self-defining, but bears certain relations with other meanings that specify it. In this way, we may observe some inconsistency in relations of certain profession nominations in English and Ukrainian:

a) in paradigmatic relations, e.g.: the Eng. “*crane operator, hoist operator, crane man*” versus the Ukr. “*кранівник*”; the Eng. “*marketing expert, marketer, marketing specialist*” versus the Ukr. “*маркетолог*”; the Eng. “*desktop publisher*” versus the Ukr. “*макетник, верстальник*”; the Eng. “*oceanographer*” versus the Ukr. “*океанолог, океанограф*”, etc. For example: *This activity has benefited considerably from the loaned expertise of a marketing specialist from the UK Forestry Commission, as well as in-kind and financial contributions from other*

*Governments, institutes and organizations* [15, p. 54]. Велике значення для цієї діяльності мала участь **маркетолога**, який був відряджений лісогосподарського комісією Сполученого Королівства, а також допомога натурою і фінансова підтримка, надана іншими урядами, установами та організаціями [17, p. 90].

b) in syntagmatic relations the lexeme “*inspector*” combines with the lexemes “*revenue*” and “*tax*” to form the profession nominations “*tax inspector*” and “*revenue inspector*” denoting “a person who collects unpaid taxes from other people or corporations” [13] while the Ukrainian lexeme “*інспектор*” forms the nomination only combining with the lexeme “*податковий*” – “*податковий інспектор*”. For example: *With regard to the finding of the court that the **tax inspector** had not been involved in the criminal inquiry the author argues that nevertheless there was an appearance of partiality which in itself constitutes a violation of article 14* [11, p. 200]. *Стосовно висновку суду про те, що **податковий інспектор** не брав участі в кримінальному розслідуванні, автор стверджує, що тим не менш були ознаки упередженості, які самі по собі є порушенням статті* [19, p. 195].

In the following text fragment, the use of the Ukrainian correspondence “*податковий інспектор*” is used: *In its judgement, the Court of Appeal rejected the author’s request that the criminal proceedings for fiscal fraud be declared inadmissible or subsidiarily that the **revenue inspector’s** 1989 report be removed from the criminal file* [12, p. 189]. *У своєму рішенні Апеляційний суд відхилив клопотання учасника про оголошення неприйнятними кримінально-процесуальні дії у зв’язку з фінансовим шахрайством або субсидіарно, щоб вилучити з кримінальної справи звіт **податкового інспектора** від 1989 року* [16, p. 219].

**Conclusions.** The contrastive analysis of English and Ukrainian profession nominations has given an opportunity to observe similarities and differences in paradigmatic relations of the contrasted languages. Although the objective reality exists outside human beings and irrespective of the language they speak, every language classifies reality in its own way by means of vocabulary units. English and Ukrainian profession nominations differ in their referential (denotative aspect), conceptual (significative aspect), pragmatic (connotative aspect) and systemic (differential aspect). The existence of interlingual lexical correspondences is not accidental, but a natural fact of linguistic reality, which, like the possibility of translation itself, is explained by extra and interlingual factors. One of the main reasons for the natural character of interlingual correspondence is the common material essence of human thinking, which from a physiological, psychological and logical point of view is subject

to common laws and is the same for all people, but from a linguistic point of view is inseparable. The mentality of all nations is expressed in one hypostasis – language itself, materialising in the forms of specific national languages.

## REFERENCES

1. Gómez-González M. de los Á. and Doval-Suárez S. M. On contrastive linguistics: Trends, challenges and problems. *The Dynamics of Language Use: Functional and Contrastive Perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 2005.
2. Ke Ping. *Contrastive Linguistics*. Springer, 2018. 219 p.
3. Khrystiuk S.B. Specifics of English economic terminology translation. *Міжнародний філологічний часопис*. 2019. Vol. 10. № 1. P. 94-99.
4. Korunets I.V. *Contrastive Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages*. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2004.
5. Potiatynuk U. *All about Words: An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology 1*. Львів : ПАІС, 2014. 362 с
6. Thuresson S. *Middle English Occupational Terms*. Lund: CWK Gleerup; Copenhagen : Ejnar Munksgaard, 1950. 285 p.
7. Umanets A. Lexical Translation Transformations. *Філологічні науки*. 2015. Випуск 39. С. 262-265.
8. Андрейчук Н.І. *Contrastive Linguistics = Контрастивна лінгвістика : навчальний посібник*. Львів : ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2015. 343 с.
9. Гергиева З.Г. О статусе контрастивной лингвистики. *Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского*. 2009. № 6 (2). С. 203–206.
10. Маслова В. А. *Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студ. высш. учеб. завед*. Москва : Изд. центр “Академия”, 2001. 208 с.

## SOURCES

11. Friedman M. *Capitalism and Freedom*. University of Chicago Press; 40th edition, 2003. 230 p.
12. Kim Chan W., Mauborgne R. *Blue Ocean Strategy. How to Create Uncontested Market Space and Make Competition Irrelevant*. Boston : Harvard Business School Publishing, 2015. 288 p.
13. Oxford Learner's Dictionary. URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (дата звернення: 18.09.2021).
14. Thesaurus. URL: <https://www.thesaurus.com/> (дата звернення: 18.09.2021).
15. Wray R. *Modern Monetary Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015. 306 p.
16. Кім Чан В., Моборн Р. *Стратегія Блакитного Океану. Як створити безхмарний ринковий простір і позбутися конкуренції*. Харків : Клуб сімейного дозвілля, 2018. 326 с.
17. Рей Р. *Сучасна теорія грошей*. Київ : Наш формат, 2018. 480 с.
18. *Словник української мови : в 11 томах*. URL: <http://sum.in.ua/> (дата звернення: 18.09.2021).
19. Фрідман М. *Капіталізм і свобода*. Київ : Наш формат, 2017. 216 с.