



XXI
MONOGRAPH

**SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
OF THE XXI CENTURY**

Volume 1

**Sherman Oaks, Los Angeles (USA)
2021**

COLLECTIVE MONOGRAPH

SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH
OF THE
XXI CENTURY

VOLUME 1

COMPILED BY
VIKTOR SHPAK

CHAIRMAN OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD
STANISLAV TABACHNIKOV

GS PUBLISHING SERVICE
SHERMAN OAKS
2021

The collective monograph is a scientific and practical publication that contains scientific articles by doctors and candidates of sciences, doctors of philosophy and art, graduate students, students, researchers and practitioners from European and other countries. The articles contain research that reflects current processes and trends in world science.

Text Copyright © 2021 by the Publisher “GS publishing service” and authors.

Illustrations © 2021 by the Publisher “GS publishing service” and authors.

Cover design: Publisher “GS publishing service” ©

Authors: Abuvatfa S., Ahisheva A., Andriichuk S., Azarova A., Azarova L., Bachynska H., Berest G., Bernatska I., Bezrukavyye., Bida V., Biliachenko M., Binert O., Bocheliuk V., Bondar Yu., Bondarchuk M., Borkhovych A., Boyeva S., Brazhko O., Broiako N., Brukh O., Bukhhalo S., Chahaida A., Chaika H., Chepil M., Cherep A., Cherep O., Cherkashyna V., Chervinska O., Chueshov V., Diumin E., Donii V., Dorofeieva V., Dubyna S., Gencheva V., Hanus O., Harkusha T., Havryliuk I., Hladukh Ie., Hovorova K., Hovorov P., Hryshchenko I., Huryn P., Ivanashko O., Fatkhutdinov V., Kaliuzhnaia O., Karpenko O., Karpova S., Kavertsev V., Khomenko L., Kindinova A., Kovalchuk O., Kovalenko S., Kravchenko O., Kruhla S., Kukhtenko O., Kurdupa V., Labenska I., Lakish L., Lazorko O., Lichkonenko N., Lunhol O., Markevych B., Martselyak O., Martyniuk V., Martynov V., Matvienko L., Mironova Yu., Moiseienko I., Moiseienko V., Mostenska T. H., Mostenska T. L., Mozhovyi V., Mushkevych M., Mykhaliuk N., Naumenko O., Nikitina N., Nosulenko I., Ohrebchuk V., Oleksandrovykh Yu., Olkhovska O., Olkhovska V., Omelyanchik L., Onishenko N., Palchak L., Panov N., Paranchuk S., Petrusha Yu., Pistunova T., Polishchuk O., Potanina T., Povch O., Rak N., Raksha-Sliusareva O., Riabinina I., Roman V., Romanova T., Ruden V., Sheretiuk R., Shepetko Ye., Shevchenko N., Shpak V., Shypko M., Sierykh N., Slabouz V., Sliusarev O., Solomko O., Stokolos N., Strelnikov L., Strilets O., Stryzhak N., Sukhanova O., Sukhovirska L., Taran O., Tarasenko H., Tarasiuk H., Ternovyi Yu., Tiamusheva V., Tiutiunyk L., Torop K., Virna M., Virna Zh., Voskoboynik O., Vyshnytskyi N., Yefimov O., Yesypenko T., Zakrasniana Zh., Zarembo Ye., Zarembo-Fedchysyn O., Zarembo O., Zolotarova N.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or search engine without the prior written permission of the publisher. The authors are responsible for the content and reliability of their articles. Citation or other use of the monograph is possible only with reference to the publication.

Publisher “GS publishing service”

15137 Magnolia Blvd, # D,
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403, USA.

ISBN 978-1-7364133-0-2

DOI : 10.51587/9781-7364-13302-2021-001

Scientific editors-reviewers: Bobrovnyk S., Bondar Yu.,
Cherep A., Glukhovskiy P., Hovorov P., Lazurenko V.,
Moiseienko V., Omelianchuk L., Protsiuk R., Virna Zh.

Scientific research of the XXI century. Volume 1 : collective monograph / Compiled by V. Shpak; Chairman of the Editorial Board S. Tabachnikov. Sherman Oaks, Los Angeles : GS publishing service, 2021. 430 p.

Available at: DOI : 10.51587/9781-7364-13302-2021-001

ТАРАСЮК Галина Миколаївна, КОВАЛЬЧУК Ольга Антонівна РОЗРОБКА СТРАТЕГІЇ ПОЗИЦІОНУВАННЯ НА ОСНОВІ БРЕНД-МОЛЕКУЛЯРНОГО ПІДХОДУ	99
МИХАЛЮК Наталія Іванівна, БІНЕРТ Олеся Василівна, ЛАКІШ Ліліана Миколаївна ПРИНЦИПИ ТА СКЛАДОВІ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНОГО МЕХАНІЗМУ ПІДПРИЄМСТВ	103
БОНДАРЧУК Марія Костянтинівна, ПАРАНЧУК Степан Васильович, ЧЕРВІНСЬКА Оксана Степанівна, ВИШНИЦЬКИЙ Назарій ПОТРЕБА СИСТЕМИ РАННЬОГО ПОПЕРЕДЖЕННЯ І РЕАГУВАННЯ В АНТИКРИЗОВОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ БІЗНЕС-СТРУКТУР	108
Energy	
HOVOROV Pylyp, HANUS Oleksiy, KINDINOVA Anastasiia MODE CONTROL OF LIGHTING SYSTEM BASED ON THE SMART-LIGHT CONCEPT	113
CHERKASHYNA Veronika STRUCTURING OVERHEAD LINES 35 - 750 KV IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONCEPT SMART GRID	120
HOVOROV Pylyp, ROMANOVA Tetiana, HOVOROVA Kateryna, DIUMIN Eduard LIGHT DYNAMIC SYSTEM OF LIGHTING OF DISPATCH POINTS	126
BUKHKALO Svitlana, OLKHOVSKA Oksana, OLKHOVSKA Victoria, KRAVCHENKO Oleksandr, BORKHOVYCH Anatolii SELECTION OF EVIDENCE-BASED METHODS FOR EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF SOLID WASTE POLYMERS	137
Linguistics	
SLABOUZ Viktoriia PECULIARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND LINGUOCULTUROLOGY	144
RIABININA Iryna, BACHYNSKA Halyna, ROMAN Viktoriia RESEARCH METHODS OF STUDYING THE SOURCES OF THE LANGUAGE HISTORY IN EAST SLAVONIC LINGUISTICS OF THE 19TH – THE 30S OF THE 20TH CENTURY	147
Literary Studies	
ДОНІЙ Вікторія Сергіївна ВІДСВІТ О. ДОВЖЕНКА У «ЗАЧАРОВАНІЙ ДЕСНІ»	151
Medicine	
АБУВАТФА Самі І. Х., ДУБИНА Сергій Олександрович МЕДИКО-СОЦІАЛЬНЕ ОБҐРУНТУВАННЯ ДОЦІЛЬНОСТІ СКРИНІНГУ СТАНУ ЗДОРОВ'Я НАСЕЛЕННЯ ЯК ПРАКТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ УДОСКОНАЛЕННЯ ЯКОСТІ ПРОФІЛАКТИКИ ЗАХВОРЮВАНЬ	155
РАКША-СЛЮСАРЕВА Олена Анатоліївна, СЛЮСАРЕВ Олексій Аркадійович, БОЄВА Світлана Станіславівна, СЕРИХ Наталя Олександрівна, СТРИЖАК Ніна Володимирівна ПРЕДИКТОРИ СИСТЕМИ КРОВІ ТА ІМУНІТЕТУ В УМОВНО ЗДОРОВОГО НАСЕЛЕННЯ ДОНЕЦЬКОГО РЕГІОНУ ПІД ЧАС ПРОВЕДЕННЯ ООС	162
ЗАРЕМБА Євгенія Хомівна, ЗАРЕМБА-ФЕДЧИШИН Олена Віталіївна, РАК Ната лія Олегівна, ЗАРЕМБА Ольга Віталіївна, ВІРНА Маріанна Михайлівна ПРОБЛЕМА ПЕРВИННОЇ ПРОФІЛАКТИКИ ДИСПЛАЗІЇ СПОЛУЧНОЇ ТКАНИНИ В ПРАКТИЦІ СІМЕЙНОГО ЛІКАРЯ	167
БІДА Віталій Іванович, ГУРИН Петро Олексійович ГАЛЬВАНІЗМ У ПАЦІЄНТІВ З МЕТАЛЕВИМИ НЕЗНІМНИМИ КОНСТРУКЦІЯМИ ЗУБНИХ ПРОТЕЗІВ	173



the issue will arise about the delineation of the conceptual picture of the world and the linguocultural conceptual picture of the world.

In cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology, the integrative approach to study language is used, because in most cases, to obtain objective research, it is necessary to synthesize the knowledge achieved in different sciences.

It should be noted that a huge number of directions are developing within the framework of cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics. For example, at the end of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century, mainly based on cognitive linguistics and political science, political linguistics emerges, the object of study of which is political discourse. At about the same time, a new trend in linguoculturology began to emerge with a philosophical title – axiological linguistics, values became the subject of study.

The presented theoretical review shows that cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology reveal similar features on the one hand: the integrative approach to language, maximum attention to the “language-human” dyad, the desire to explore concepts, and the picture of the world. On the other hand, the fact of differentiation of these concepts is obvious.

DOI: 10.51587/9781-7364-13302-2021-001-144-147

RIABININA Iryna,

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Donbas State Teachers' Training University

BACHYNSKA Halyna,

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk
National Pedagogical University

ROMAN Viktoriia,

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Donbas State Teachers' Training University
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3468-1062
Ukraine

RESEARCH METHODS OF STUDYING THE SOURCES OF THE LANGUAGE HISTORY IN EAST SLAVONIC LINGUISTICS OF THE 19TH – THE 30S OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Considering the problem of the range of sources for studying the history of the language and their significance in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics of the 19th century – the 30s of the 20th we will try to give the overview of all sources. In this way we take into consideration such sources as the material of ancient written manuscripts, modern dialect data, Ukrainiansms, Russianisms, Belarussianisms in other languages, i.e borrowed words from East Slavonic languages (these borrowings may reflect, in particular, the phonetic features of Ukrainian, Russian and Belorussian languages of the early period). On the other hand, East Slavonic Languages contain borrowed words from other languages and

the most ancient words may indicate some features of the East Slavonic languages of the early period. In addition, sources of studying the language history may include evidence given by foreigners concerning the East Slavonic Languages. Toponymy (place-name study) can be added to the sources mentioned above.

If one can take into account the most important sources, then, certainly, the most significant grounds are considered the material of ancient written manuscripts and modern dialect data. This fact was mentioned by the linguists of the 19th century – the 30s of the 20th century (particularly the linguists of the Moscow linguistic school, namely, A. Schakhmatov and M. Durnovo pointed out this information in their researches). When considering the material concerning the first direction, we must identify all the sources and indicate those which can be stated as the most significant in terms of representatives of various Ukrainian and Russian linguistics of the 19th century – the 30s of the 20th century.

The problem of priority is thought to be a very important question what in its turn it depends on the nature of the presentation of the material and its interpretation. If we suppose the material of ancient written manuscripts is recognized as a priority (as it was noted in the works of O. Sobolevskii and A. Krymskyi) then the research is conducted on the material of ancient written manuscripts and at the same time it acquires the appropriate character. The main thing is what feature is reflected in the manuscript and it is not so important whether this feature is preserved in modern dialects or not; however, there is a risk that certain graphic and spelling features in the researcher's interpretation may acquire the status of linguistic features. The risk mentioned above could not be avoided in the works of O. Sobolevskii and A. Krymskyi. The possible question may arise: what is the advantage of dialects? If manuscripts give separate, systematically uninterpreted linguistic features, (i.e. those features of monuments existing in 'living' languages are not just graphic and spelling norms but reflect the features of a language or a dialect), then a linguist has an ability to explore the systemic properties of a language. Firstly, . Shakhmatov emphasized this fact then V. Kolesov mentioned in his researches.

Thus, the problem of the priority of sources for studying the language history plays a crucial role. The key question is: what source is important – ancient written records or modern dialect data? If modern dialectal data are given priority, then ancient written works play a supporting role, being the most important means among the auxiliary ones; and, on the contrary, if ancient written works are recognized as the main priority source, then modern dialect data have only a stating function (such linguists as A. Sobolevskii, M. Karynskii and A. Krymskyi only noted if it was preserved a certain ancient feature in modern speech), less constructive than in the first case. Other mentioned sources play a supporting role, they can certainly be important but they only provide additional facts regarding the languages and dialects.

The second direction of the research is the development and improvement of methods for processing ancient written works. You can work with the material of ancient written works in different ways; you can 'literally' read ancient written papers and interpret certain features; another approach is an attempt to systematize the so-called 'faults',



an attempt to point out which of them are accidental, and which reflect the linguistic features of the rewriter. Taking into account the above-mentioned information, we can conclude that the linguist in his study must work with the papers very carefully working both at a simple level – ‘literally’ reading the manuscript and at a higher level involving the manuscript in close comparison with the data of speeches. We can see it in much later works by V. Kolesov and Yu. Sheveliov.

The third direction is the appearance and improvement of methods for studying modern dialect data which can be studied in different ways. Thus, we can suppose that in Linguistics of the first half of the 19th century and in the works of the scientists of the Kharkiv Linguistic School such approach can be observed: a separate linguistic feature is taken and studied in different dialects but speech as a system is not considered. We can observe a quite different approach in the works of the scientists from the Moscow and Kazan Linguistic Schools. Here there is a systematic study of a particular dialect when a number of features of this dialect are taken into consideration in the system which allows to explore the essential features of a speech. As V. Glushchenko states that in the studies of the linguists of the analyzed period comparative-historical research can be carried out on the basis of entirely modern dialect data if the manuscripts of writing give little material or do not give it at all.

The fourth direction of our study is the formation of methods for processing other sources of language history. Thus, the linguists of a comparative study in the 20s – the 60s of the 19th century pointed out such sources of studying the language history as folklore materials and the language of definite scientists. However, during this period the linguists did not offer a distinct method of using these sources neither in theoretical aspect nor in practice of their research. In the works of the linguists of a comparative study there was a certain limitation of the historical approach to the dialect phenomena of the East Slavonic languages. From the end of the 19th century such sources of studying the history of East Slavonic languages as the borrowing of other languages from East Slavonic languages as well as the historical facts of foreigners about East Slavonic languages began to be used in the works of linguists. A. Shakhmatov was the first among the Russian and Ukrainian linguists to use these sources and later M. Durnovo and A. Krymskyi studied the information of the first written documents. A. Shakhmatov also turned to toponymic material to reconstruct the ancient history of the Eastern Slavs. Since the 20s of the 20th century the principle of a complex development of ethno- and glotogenetic problems by the linguists, historians, archeologists, anthropologists, ethnographers and other specialists is gradually being put forward.

The fifth direction is a combination of different sources on the language history. During the 19th –20th cc it was developed a method according to which the facts taken from the manuscripts were correlated with the data of modern dialects resulting in the interpretation of these facts for different historical epochs. Prior to the works by A. Shakhmatov in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics the territorial distribution of ancient written manuscripts had not been carried out (many of them remained non-localized). The dialects also have not been insufficiently studied. This fact greatly limited the ability to compare ancient

written material with modern dialect data. As Yu. Karskyi stated this mistake was peculiar to the works of such scholars as O. Potebnia, M. Kolosov, P. Zhytetskyi.

The involvement not only of the facts of literary languages but also the material of the dialects of modern East Slavonic Languages correlated with the evidence of the manuscripts made it possible to characterize the most important processes of language history. However, not all attempts to correlate the material of the two most important sources of the history of East Slavonic languages used by the comparativists of the 20s in the 20th c – the 60s of the 20th century showed convincing results. Formation of the comparative and historical method in the works of representatives of Ukrainian and Russian of comparative and historical Linguistics in the 20s – 60s of the 19th century became possible due to the use of various sources of studying the language history such as the material of ancient written manuscripts, data of modern East Slavonic languages or dialects, other Slavonic languages and the proofs of folklore texts. At the same time it was typical for the majority of historians of East Slavonic languages to use characteristic non-differential approach to studying sources without a distinct method of their usage and as a result of which the procedure is considered as a proof of a statement rather than a study on the basis of homogeneous facts.

At the same time in the 20s – 60s of the 19th century there appeared a tendency to realize the greater or lesser importance of a source while studying the language history and to critical assessment of the sources. In the works of I. Sreznevskii and F. Buslaiev the drawbacks of ancient written documents were revealed and it was put forward a theory about a significant value for the historian of the language of the phenomena of modern languages in the whole unity of their dialects.

Examples of the combination of modern dialect data and material of ancient written documents can be seen in the works of such scientists of the Kharkiv Linguistic School (O. Potebnia, P. Zhitetskyi, M. Kolosov). However, such integration was not always productive as the localization of ancient written documents and modern dialects was still incomplete. Complete survey was done in the works of A. Sobolevskii. Examples of combining two most important sources for studying the history of East Slavonic languages are available in the works by A. Krymskyi. There are examples of combining along with these two sources and other sources in the study of the history of certain linguistic phenomena. Thus, in presenting the history of the East Slavonic vowel system A. Shakhmatov took into consideration such sources of studying the history of languages as modern dialect data, material of ancient written documents, borrowings from other languages into the Slavonic ones of different chronology.