

УДК 811.111'37'42

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.32.1.8>

МОВА СУМНІВУ: ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИХ ФРЕЙМІВ

THE LANGUAGE OF DOUBT: EXPLORING LINGUISTIC FRAMES

Bialyk V.D.,

orcid.org/0000-0001-7428-7145

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,

Professor at the Department of Communicative Linguistics and Translation

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

Nizhnik L.I.,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1411-0561

Doctor of Philosophy,

Assistant at the Department of Communicative Linguistics and Translation

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

Nuzban O.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2726-2460

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Assistant at the Department of Communicative Linguistics and Translation

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

The article examines the frame structure of the DOUBT concept. A frame is considered as a structure of organization of knowledge in the mind, which can be formally presented through a fixed set of content components (slots) determined

by it. The frame aims to convey the entire palette of knowledge about a stereotypical situation with the help of language, emphasizes one or another element, profiles this knowledge and gives it a specific configuration, achieving the transfer of a certain content.

The slots of the researched concept were singled out using the component analysis of its nominative units, and the cognitive classification features – using the contextual analysis, the analysis of word combinations. The basic components of the DOUBT concept frame include REASON / SOURCE OF DOUBT, EMOTION / STATE OF DOUBT, ACTANT (can play the semantic roles of AGENT, PATIENT and EXPERIENCER), REACTION (EXTERNAL SENSATION, EXTERNAL IMPRESSION, EVALUATION, NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR, LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR). The slots of the frame of the DOUBT emotional concept are filled with cognitive classification features that reflect one or another aspect of the DOUBT concept categorization and generalize homogeneous differential cognitive features in the structure of the concept. In the article, 17 cognitive classification features of the studied concept were singled out: “causality”, “direction”, “duration”, “temporal localization”, “place”, “cyclicality”, “phasicity”, “intensity”, “quantity”, “connection of emotion with intellectual / mental sphere”, “connection of emotion with the perceptive sphere”, “evaluability”, “inconspicuousness”, “uncontrollability”, “combinativity”, “reactivity”, “dominance”.

As a result of the study, it was proved that DOUBT is a modus emotional concept that arises as a human reaction to the surrounding world, is dependent on primary knowledge and is inferential.

Key words: concept, doubt, frame, slots, cognitive classification features.

У статті досліджена фреймова структура концепту СУМНІВ. Фрейм розглядається як структура організації знань у свідомості, яку формально можна представити через фіксований набір зумовлених нею змістових компонентів (слотів). Фрейм має на меті передати всю палітру знань про стереотипову ситуацію за допомогою мови, наголошує на тому чи іншому елементі, профілює ці знання та надає їм конкретну конфігурацію, досягаючи передачі певного змісту.

Слоти досліджуваного концепту були виокремлені за допомогою компонентного аналізу його номінативних одиниць, а когнітивні класифікаційні ознаки – за допомогою контекстного аналізу, аналізу словосполучень. До базових компонентів фрейму концепту сумнів входять причина / джерело сумніву, емоція / стан сумніву, актант (може відігравати семантичні ролі агенса, пацієнта та експерієнцера), реакція (зовнішні відчуття, зовнішній вияв, оцінка, немовна поведінка, мовна поведінка). Слоти фрейму емоційного концепту СУМНІВ заповнюють когнітивні класифікаційні ознаки, що відображають той чи інший аспект категоризації концепту СУМНІВ та узагальнюють однорідні диференційні когнітивні ознаки у структурі концепту. В статті було виокремлено 17 когнітивних класифікаційних ознак досліджуваного концепту: «причинність», «скерованість / спрямованість», «тривалість», «часова локалізованість», «місце», «циклічність», «фазовість», «інтенсивність», «кількість», «зв'язок емоції з інтелектуальною / ментальною сферою», «зв'язок емоції з перцептивною сферою», «оцінність», «непомітність», «неконтрольованість», «комбінаторність», «реактивність», «домінантність».

В результаті дослідження було доведено, що СУМНІВ є модусним емоційним концептом, що виникає як реакція людини на навколишній світ, залежить від первинного знання та є інферентним.

Ключові слова: концепт, сумнів, фрейм, слоти, когнітивні класифікаційні ознаки.

Problem statement. The DOUBT concept can be named a modus concepts, the basic characteristics of which are intra-linguistic nature (emerges as a human reaction to the surrounding world of objects and events), secondary status (a certain dependence on primary knowledge) and inferentiality (the need for inferential knowledge to form the necessary content), which are based on the conceptualization of the functions of language objects, in contrast to the system characteristics that are the basis of other concepts. The DOUBT concept does not have its own information about the real world, but acquires a certain meaning in relation to other concepts or a conceptual structure. The DOUBT concept acts as a certain means of linguistic representation of reality, as it is related to the reflection of knowledge about the ideal world, which is reflected in the human mind, and not knowledge about the real world.

In this study, we use the frame as a means of interpreting the concept, which aims to convey the entire palette of knowledge about a stereotypical situation with the help of language, emphasizing one or another element or aspect and, thus, profiling this knowledge,

giving it a specific configuration and, accordingly, achieving the transfer of a certain content. Thus, with the help of doubt, the absence of a certain element of the event or one of the stereotypical characteristics (certainty) is profiled. Through the use of linguistic devices, a special cognitive context or mental space is created to show this absence or discrepancy.

A frame, in our opinion, can act as such a context, because it can be considered as a package of knowledge about a stereotypical situation, in which there are not only events, but also their interpretation and evaluation.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Interpretation of the concept, as is known, can occur within the limits and terms of cognitive semantics, namely: frame, mental space, cognitive context, profiling, etc. [12; 13; 15; 16; 24].

The DOUBT concept contains an emotional component, so the research is related to the study of the emotional reaction to doubt. Z. Kovecses differentiates between expert and people's understanding of emotions. “Expert understanding of emotions” looks at emotions in relation to the following aspects – the

emotion has a reason, the reason causes the emotion, the emotion prompts us to respond, we usually try to control the emotion, but we can't, so the response follows and is represented by the schematic model "cause → existence of emotion → expression". "People's understanding of emotion" includes typical features such as awareness of something as desirable or undesirable in a certain way, feelings and bodily sensations of a certain kind, involuntary bodily processes and overt expressions of emotion, a tendency to act in a certain way, and an excited state of mind or body [22, c. 130]. The frame structure of concepts, especially emotional concepts, is a popular topic of research [2; 3; 5].

Purpose statement. The purpose of the study is to build a frame of the DOUBT concept, including its profiling slots and to identify cognitive features for key slots in order to reconstruct the cognitive structure of the concept. Definitional and component analysis of the DOUBT concept and its verbalizers, contextual analysis and analysis of word combinations with doubt nominees make it possible to single out slots and extensions – stereotypical elements of the situation of doubt and build a frame model of the concept. The research methods include the description and categorization of the investigated word combinations according to cognitive classification features. Conventional phrases denoting the DOUBT concept appear due to the realization by nominees of doubt of the ability to enter into syntactic relations with units of other nominative spaces of the English-language picture of the world. Being updated in the context, the studied units are enriched with new senses that specify and detail their main content. A cognitive classification feature is defined as a component of the content of a concept that reflects one or another aspect, parameter of categorization of the corresponding object or phenomenon and generalizes homogeneous differential cognitive features in the structure of the concept. Classification cognitive features are always common to a number, group or many concepts. The conceptual feature summarizes causal, physiological, intellectual, perceptual knowledge about the DOUBT concept at the level of abstraction in a schematized form.

Research results. Frames have a sufficiently clear internal organization, which consists of the configuration of slots and terminals. The frame structure consists "not just of a formal set of fixed elements, as we are used to seeing any other structure, but of a combination of certain relations and features that have been carefully selected by using the practical experience of the speakers of the language and the cultural values inherent in this society" [4, c. 138].

Considering the DOUBT concept as an emotional concept allows us to distinguish its following slots: THE EVENT / SITUATION OF DOUBT is the CAUSE / SOURCE OF DOUBT, which motivates the appearance of the EMOTION / STATE OF DOUBT. THE EVENT / SITUATION OF DOUBT and EMOTION / STATE OF DOUBT have an INFLUENCE "+" and "-" on the subject of doubt – ACTAN, who can play the semantic roles of AGENT (one who acts), PATIENT (one who is acted upon) and EXPERIENCER (one who experiences). The subject's REACTION consists of his EXTERNAL IMAGE, INTERNAL FEELINGS, EVALUATION and BEHAVIORAL REACTION, which is divided into NON-SPEAKING and SPEAKING.

The EXPERIENCER of doubt can be both the AGENT – "*She trailed away, doubtful whether she should confide her recent revelation*" [26, c. 11], and the PATIENT – "*He felt that people mistrusted him*". The OBJECT of doubt can be a certain person, object, information, or the ACTANT himself – "... *with Briony's certainty rising whenever her cousin appeared to doubt herself*" [26, c. 42].

The conceptual feature "direction" on the subject determines the vector of a person's attention to his own psycho-emotional state or to the emotions of other persons [3]. Introversion identification reflects the focus of cognitive activity on recognizing one's own internal experiences of doubt, and extraversion identification is aimed at recognizing the doubt of other people. In the first case, the subject of the experience names, describes or expresses his own emotions in the type of "I"-sentence according to the classification of sentences by the character of the subject. In addition, the EXPERIENCER of doubt asks himself a question, thinking about what worries him: "*Am I deluded about having sponsors? Or has Peetas behavior made them all hang back? No, I don't believe it*" [9, c. 55]. Extraversion identification of doubt occurs with the help of such types of sentences as "he [she]-sentence" and "it-sentence": "*They've been treating me funny, as if they want to ask if I saw it. But they can't ask because they're not sure*" [18, c. 106]. In addition, doubt can be directed at an object of material nature, as a person can doubt its properties or existence, or an ideal object of knowledge (thought).

The conceptual feature "causality" fills the CAUSE / SOURCE OF DOUBT slot with suggestions. A CAUSE FOR DOUBT, according to the component analysis of the definitions of doubt from MWD [27], can be "uncertainty about the truth, fact, reality, truthfulness, nature or existence of something", "uncertainty about the probability",

“uncertainty about an opinion or belief”, “uncertainty about the value and suitability”, “uncertainty about honesty, reliability, legality”, “uncertainty about reputation, morality, decency”, “uncertainty about the result”, “uncertainty about oneself”. The reason for doubt in the given example is a lack of trust in the truthfulness of information, which is caused by certain prejudices – the belief that lies can be used to achieve a goal: “*Is that supposed to be a compliment, or you playing the dozens?*” [31, c. 23].

The slot EMOTION / STATE OF DOUBT structures masses of knowledge about the duration of emotion and the complexity of its influence on the subject of experiences, the relationship of the emotional sphere with the sphere of intelligence, thinking, cognition and sensual, bodily perception of the world. Temporal, quantitative, locative and qualitative characteristics of doubt are embedded in the slot.

Temporal characteristics. The conceptual feature “duration” covers different time periods – e.g. *lingering doubt, years of indecision, moment of hesitation*. The phrase *lingering doubt* describes a doubt that has existed for a long time, longer than expected: “*Ferguson can address some lingering doubts against the FBI*” [31, c. 145]. Doubt can exist for years and be a restraining force: “*After all those years of indecision, I simply acted on a whim*” [29, c. 22]. Doubt can last for a few seconds, which indicates the “momentary” nature of this state. In the following example, before answering the question, the character pauses for a moment, he doubts the expediency of telling the truth and disappointing the interlocutor. The period of hesitation before the answer gives him time to formulate his opinion in a softened form: “*He hesitated for a second before he told me*” [29, c. 28].

Doubt has a “temporal localization” and can relate to the past, present or future. It has a certain “cyclicity”. In the following example, we are talking about the daily recurrence of doubt that gnaws at the main character: “*The daily doubt was nagging him*” [21, c. 56].

Doubt is characterized by “phaseness”, which reveals the procedural nature of the concept. The first phase is the “emergence of doubt”, which is explained by the phrases *cause / create / give rise to / lead to uncertainty*: “*Too many whispers and rumors are causing uncertainty*” [10, c. 301]. The second phase is the “process of experiencing doubt” or the “accumulation” of doubt, which is explained by the phrases *add to / fuel / increase uncertainty*. The third phase is “overcoming or resolving the doubt” with the phrases *bring / put an end to / eliminate / remove / resolve*

uncertainty: “*From there, if the uncertainty resolved itself, accept the resolution. If the uncertainty did not resolve, return for further instructions*” [11, c. 4].

Locative characteristics. Doubts occupy a certain “place”, they are experienced by a person and are usually located in the stomach, head, eyes or voice: “*He felt it (uncertainty) simmering in his own stomach, too*” [10, c. 141]; “*Unless... but I was afraid to put my suspicions into words, even in my own head*” [29, c. 205]; “*Her doubtful eyes remained on his face a moment or two longer, then she turned and began to walk rapidly*” [20, c. 349]; “*That conclusion might save him a lot of trouble – if it flew, that was – but Ralph could hear the disbelief in his own voice*” [20, c. 222].

Quantitative characteristics. According to the quantity category, we single out the conceptual feature “intensity” of the DOUBT concept. Intensifiers in the attributive collocations of the verbalizers of the concept are divided into those with:

– “**high degree of feature manifestation**” is realized through such cognitive classification features as **STRENGTH** (*doubt seriously, doubt very much, considerable doubt, grave doubt, serious doubt, severe doubt, extremely doubtful, livid disbelief*) – e.g. “*She stared back at him with livid disbelief*” [29, c. 209]; **HEIGHT** (*highly doubtful*) – e.g. “*As for the Witiko, California propaganda claimed that Chancellor D’Trayne took to the skies in a Stingray to fight to the bitter end, something Trevor highly doubted*” [10, c. 78]; **DEPTH** (*deep mistrust*);

– “average degree of feature manifestation” can be traced in word combinations *rather doubtful, somewhat doubtful* – e.g. “*A somewhat doubtful proposal, but I say it with as much surety as I can muster*” [28, c. 98];

– “low degree of feature manifestation” is verbalized in the context with the following phrases *slight doubt, a bit doubtful, a little doubtful, vague suspicions, infinitesimal doubt* – e.g. “*A little hesitation hovered over the ordering of drinks – all but one of her students, a grad, were under the legal limit*” [32, c. 209].

The “amount” of doubt is indicated by quantifiers (*little, not much, no*) – “*The way she looked at Mike left little doubt that she would be up for anything he suggested*” [28, c. 22]. Characteristic of the doubt is its percentage designation, which gives it an accurate quantitative representation: “*To tell her exactly what that 1 percent of doubt represented. To just . . . say it*” [30, c. 80].

Qualitative characteristics. Contextually, we identify the qualitative characteristics of doubt,

which clarify the nature of the concept. The lexical verbalizer *reasonable doubt* demonstrates the conceptual feature “connection with the intellectual / mental sphere”: “*The attorney said that we would act basing upon the reasonable doubt*” [18, c. 301].

The conceptual feature “connection with the perceptual sphere” indicates the physical perception of doubt by the senses. Over time, a person will operate with knowledge that reflects the results of his sensory cognitive activity. Doubt may be seen: “*I watched his eyes as the doubt was suddenly replaced with a blazing determination*” [29, c. 178]; it is heard: “*Straining to hear any wavering doubt in their voices, Briony listened to Marshall, then Lola, repeating the words after the vicar*” [26, c. 78]; it is felt: “*...doubt was an almost palpable current in the air between them*” [14, c. 256]; “*Otherwise I will carry that waft of uncertainty forever*” [17, c. 386].

The REACTION slot contains four expansions describing the knowledge / procedure about the attribute in the slot, namely: ASSESSMENT, INNER FEELINGS, APPEARANCE, LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR and NON-LINGUAL BEHAVIOR.

The conceptual feature “value” reflects the parameter “polarity of emotions”, where the subject evaluates his emotional state and the event / situation according to the sign “+” / “-”. The connotative meaning of lexemes-representatives has an evaluative character, conveys the desirability or undesirability of an emotion / event, positive or negative impact on a person. The EVALUATION extension of the DOUBT concept is filled with a personal attitude towards doubt with the sign “-”, namely as a state of terrible (*horrible suspicion, horrified disbelief*), frightening (*fearful uncertainty*), furious (*furious disbelief*), shocking (*shocked, stunned disbelief*), amazing (*amazed disbelief*), silly (*stupid suspicion*), dark (*grim suspicions*), mocking (*mock expression of disbelief*), annoying (*fucking doubt*), painful (*pangs of doubt*), haunting (*haunting doubt*), torturing (*tormenting/troubling/niggling doubt*). In the following example, the character expresses his negative evaluation of doubt: “*Indecision is a terrible thing*” [31, c. 36].

However, on the other hand, doubt is associated with a positive rating of “+” in phrases such as *reasonable doubt*, when it comes to rational doubt when making a decision in court; *the benefit of doubt*, when insufficient evidence prevents a judge or jury from convicting the defendant of a crime; *half-hopeful disbelief*, when doubt is associated with hopes for the future. In the example “*He looked at me with half-hopeful disbelief*” [28, c. 154], the main character wishes that something he doubts will come

true. THE EVALUATION OF DOUBT depends on the degree of involvement of the EXPERIENCER in the situation of doubt and the “importance of the OBJECT of doubt”.

Paremiias do not have an author, they reflect folk wisdom and are built according to the canons of folk poetry. Units of paremiology are texts that can be used independently and act as typical models of various typical situations. A typical attitude towards doubt is reflected in English paremiias taken from dictionaries: “*when in doubt, leave it out*” and “*when in doubt, throw it out*”, which call for leaving doubts; “*when in doubt, do nothing*”, which urges a person not to take action when in doubt; “*when in doubt, play trumps*”, which calls for using a reliable method (playing trump cards) when in doubt. Paremia “*often wrong, never in doubt*” describes a person who would rather make mistakes than doubt. The paremia “*If you doubt everything, you will achieve nothing*” indicates a negative attitude towards doubt and condemns excessive doubt, which generates insecurity.

The INNER FEELING expansion is filled with conceptual signs describing the EXPERIENCER as a bearer of sensations. The conceptual feature “inconspicuousness” of DOUBT is verbalized through the phrases *to hide disbelief, secret doubt, disguised suspicions*. In the following example, the heroine feels secret doubts and does not want others to find out about them: “*I knew all along it wasn't Ziggy!*” she'd cried, but so exuberantly it was obvious she must have harbored some secret doubts [30, c. 300].

We observe the sign of “uncontrollability”, which indicates that emotional state is a psychophysiological phenomenon that is not controlled by a person. In the following example, the heroine feels nauseous because of hesitation: “*I hesitated, my stomach still spinning in uncomfortable loops*” [28, c. 149]. The reaction to doubt is the freezing of the heart: “*Can you take Mags?*” he asks me. “*Yes,*” I say stoutly, although my heart sinks [9, c. 45].

Doubt can exist in its pure form and mixed with other feelings: *His eyes glowered with a purity of suspicion which, in Ralph's experience, could be found only here in the Old Cape* [20, c. 431]. *Atropos gave him a narrow look in which doubt and suspicion were mingled* [20, c. 520]. Due to the fact that various sensations are associated with it, it realizes the cognitive feature of “combinativity” with other emotions. Behind doubt are such non-intense feelings as dissatisfaction, irritation, restlessness, discomfort, anxiety, confusion: *Moods swirled throughout the night, the joy of his parents in Althor's visit and the excitement of his family. Other moods*

stirred below the surface like eel-streamers in a lake. Tension, uncertainty, sadness [7, c. 4]. Doubt is associated with curiosity, because doubt contributes to human cognitive activity: *"He hunkered down next to his notebook, and started wondering why he'd said all that"* [18, c. 12] and surprise: *"Ralph saw Nat, looking at Lois with uncertainty and surprise"* [20, c. 624]. Negative intense states of experiencing doubt are in combination with sadness, fright, anger, fear, fury, disgust: *"Then what is going on? I bury my face in my hands. What is Haymitch doing? Despite my anger, hatred, and suspicions, a small voice in the back of my head whispers an answer"* [9, c. 55]. Positive feelings associated with doubt are hopes and expectations that focus on the future but are uncertain: *"He looked at me with half-hopeful disbelief"* [29, c. 154].

Another conceptual feature of the DOUBT concept is "reactivity", which consists in involuntarily transferring one's mood and experience to other people: *"When he lifted the clinging, silky dress again he thought her look of uncertainty mirrored his own"* [26, c. 33]. The conceptual feature of "dominance" implies that strong emotions suppress weaker ones: *"The blankness was replaced by a look of doubt"* [20, c. 74].

The EXTERNAL APPEARANCE expansion is filled with information about the EXPERIENCER's external appearance and reproduces the atmosphere of emotional experiences. The external expression of doubt is conveyed through conceptual metonymy and manifests itself in shaking one's head, tilting one's body and changing the distance (*lean forward, falter back*), shrugging one's shoulders, clutching things in hands, through face expressions (*stare / glare / gaze in disbelief, bulge eyes, narrow eyes, raise a brow, pucker a brow, blink eyes, twist lips, purse lips, open a mouth, mock smb. in disbelief*).

The extension NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR OF THE EXPERIENCER focuses information on behavioral and mental changes as a result of intense emotional loads on a person in a state of doubt, the results of the subject's voluntary actions in order to relieve or get out of the state, as well as adaptability to new life circumstances. Behavioral reactions include increased self-criticism, pessimism, paranoia, aggressiveness, and the desire to isolate. In the following example, the EXPERIENCER of doubt leaves the room as her doubts dissipate, she finds it difficult to face such truth and seeks solitude: *"She stared in disbelief: Mellie had done it. She had pushed herself from the table and managed to walk all the way to the open door"* [25, c. 262]. Doubts are objects of thought; therefore, they are operated

on as thoughts. Often, doubtful thoughts cause pain, so people try to forget such uncertainty. When the EXPERIENCER of doubt cannot find a rational explanation for his doubts, he rejects these thoughts: *"I wonder what Gale made of the incident for a moment and then I push the whole thing out of my mind because for some reason Gale and Peeta do not coexist well together in my thoughts"* [9, c. 65]. In order to dismiss doubts, the EXPERIENCER can resort to certain actions, such as, for example, taking a breath: *"Trevor closed his eyes for a moment, took a deep breath, then exhaled slowly, letting all the reluctance and doubt and questions dissipate"* [10, c. 53].

THE LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR OF THE EXPERIENCER of doubt is manifested in his unintelligible speech (*grunt of disbelief, mutter, murmur, mumble*), whisper, stuttering (*falter, stammer*), pauses in speech (*pause, delay*). A pause in speech is often filled with "verbal fillers" – sounds, words, or phrases that can appear anywhere in a sentence and that can be removed from the sentence without changing the meaning [8, c. 25]. Pause fillers include non-lexicalized phatic units – *ah, oh, eh, er, erm, mm, huh, uhu*. Verbal fillers fill a pause, mark hesitation, empathize, interrupt, soften what is said, and make corrections. When speaking, speakers use placeholders to find the next word, phrase, or idea. Verbal fillers are used when there is a pause in speech, silence. Among the graphic signs of silence, the main ones are dashes and three dots for the graphic indication of the silent effect [1]. Verbal fillers are used to express uncertainty and hesitation in what is said. So, in the following example, the main character does not know the answer to the question and answers with uncertainty using a verbal placeholder *uh*: *"Can you tell me what your wife's blood type is?" she asked. "Uh, no, I don't know"* [17, c. 49]. In the following example, the statement is so implausible that it causes a surprised *huh* that conveys disbelief: *"What do you mean? Who picked them up then?" "The ship did." "Huh?" "The ship did. All by itself" "Huh?"* [6, c. 111].

In statements expressing doubt, the conjunction *or* is used, which indicates the probability that one of the alternatives is not true. When using the conjunction *or*, homogeneous members of a certain sentence or the whole sentence are correlated, indicating the need to choose between them. The conjunction *or* can act in J. Lakoff's terms as a marker of approximation – a hedge used to reduce the accuracy of the statement [23]. In the following example, the speaker lists the possibilities of someone who could have committed the murder. The speaker does not have

sufficient grounds to claim that a certain organization committed the crime, so he lists all the alternatives. The list of alternatives shows both that the speaker allows different options and his ignorance of the situation: *The Nazis or Aryans or Kluxers or Mafia or some other group killed them because Rosenberg was Rosenberg, and because Jensen was the easiest target and somewhat of an embarrassment* [18, с. 54].

Conclusions. So, the frame model of DOUBT contains the following elements – CAUSE / SOURCE OF DOUBT, EMOTION / STATE OF DOUBT,

ACTANT and REACTION, manifested through INTERNAL FEELINGS, EXTERNAL APPEARANCE, EVALUATION, NON-SPEAKING BEHAVIOR, SPEAKING BEHAVIOR. The frame model reflects the most typical situation of doubt. Classification cognitive features, which are common to a number, group or many concepts, summarize causal, physiological, intellectual, perceptual knowledge about the concept at the level of abstraction in a schematized form. For the DOUBT concept, 17 cognitive features describing it have been identified.

REFERENCES:

1. Анохіна, Т.О. (2008). *Семантизація категорії мовчання в англomовному художньому дискурсі : монографія*. Вінниця : Нова книга. 160 с.
2. Борисов О. О. Мовні засоби вираження емоційного концепту страх : лінгвокогнітивний аспект (на матеріалі сучасної англomовної художньої прози) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Донецький національний ун-т. Донецьк. 2005. 20 с.
3. Вербицька, А. Е. Концепт DISTRESS / ДИСТРЕС в англomовному медіа-дискурсі : когнітивно-комунікативний аспект : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Луцьк, 2018. 277 с.
4. Дячук Н. В., Криворучко Т. В. Важливість теорії фреймів у лінгвістичній парадигмі. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського*. Серія : Філологія. Журналістика. 2021. Том 32 (71). № 4. Ч. 1. С. 135–139.
5. Попович Т. І. Гендерна специфіка актуалізації емоційного концепту страх у сучасному асериканському художньому дискурсі : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Чернівці, 2014. 221 с.
6. Adams D. *The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy*. Del Rey, 2005. 224 p.
7. Asaro C. *Schism*. New York : Tor, Edition, 2005. 419 p.
8. Blakemore D. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning : The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2002. 200 p.
9. Collins S. *The Hunger Games*. New York : Scholastic Press, 2008. 384 p.
10. DeCosmo A. *Beyond Armageddon*. Book IV : Schism. Kindle Edition, 2011. 548 p.
11. Farkas A. *Noir Girl : An Essay in Two Takes*. The North American Review. Vol. 303. No. 1. P. 3–8.
12. Fauconniere G., Turner M. Principles of Conceptual Integration. *Discourse and Cognition*. Stanford : Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1998. P. 269–283.
13. Fauconniere G., Turner M. *The Way We Think : Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002. 464 p.
14. Feather J. *A husband's wicked ways*. New York : Pocket Star Books, 2009. 512 p.
15. Fillmore Ch. Frame semantics. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul : Hanshin Publishing Co., 1982. P. 111–137.
16. Fillmore Ch. Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6. 1985. P. 222–254.
17. Flynn G. *Gone Girl*. London : Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2012. 416 p.
18. Grisham J. *The Pelican Brief*. N. Y. : Island, 1999. 436 p.
19. Hornby N. *High Fidelity*. London : Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1995. 256 p.
20. King S. *Insomnia*. Maine : Viking, 1994. 787 p.
21. King S. *The Running Man*. N. Y. : Signet, 1999. 336 p.
22. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor and Emotion : Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge University Press, 2003. 223 p.
23. Lakoff G. Hedges : A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Journal of philosophical logic*, 8. 1972. P. 183–228.
24. Langacker R. *Concept, Image and Symbol : The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991. 395 p.
25. Macomber D. *Cottage by the Sea*. Ballantine Books, 2018. 352 p.
26. McEvan I. *Atonement*. London : Jonathan Cape, 2001. 371 p.
27. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary – (MWD). URL : <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> (дата звернення : 14.02.2024).
28. Meyer S. *New Moon*. N. Y. : Little, Brown Books for Young Readers; 21 st edition, 2006. 608 p.
29. Meyer S. *The Twilight*. N. Y. : Little, Brown Books for Young Readers, 2005. 544 p.
30. Moriarty L. *Big Little Lies*. New York : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 2014. 460 p.
31. Selby H. *Requiem for a dream*. N. Y. : Da Capo Press, 2000. 288 p.
32. Smith Z. *On Beauty*. Penguin Books, 2006. 445 p.