


Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology
Linguistics and Translation Department

Цим підписом засвідчую,
що подані на захист
рукопис та електронний
документ є ідентичні
01.06.2026 р. 

**LANGUAGE MEANS OF REPRESENTING
THE TRANSPORT CONCEPT
IN MODERN ENGLISH ROCK LYRICS**

MA Paper
Anastasiia Bibro
Group MLAm-1-24-2.0d

Research supervisor
Professor O.S. Kolesnyk

Approved for defense at
the Linguistics and
Translation Department
26, May, 2026, Minutes 5
_____ Andrii KOZACHUK

Kyiv 2026

CONTENTS

Abstract	4
Introduction	5
 Theoretical Background	
1. The TRANSPORT concept from the point of view of cognitive linguistics: the direct and metaphorical meaning of the concept	8
1.1. History of the development of cognitive linguistics, the TRANSPORT concept as one of the subjects of its research	8
1.2. Definition of the TRANSPORT concept: its direct and indirect (metaphorical) meaning	10
1.3. The functional significance of metaphorical meanings in concept formation	11
1.3.1. The role of metaphor in human communication and expression of one's thoughts (with an example of using the TRANSPORT concept)	11
1.3.2. The TRANSPORT concept from a typological perspective	12
1.3.3. The TRANSPORT concept in the dimension of world modelling	13
1.3.4. The axiological colouring of the TRANSPORT concept	14
 Research Methods	
2. The TRANSPORT concept: belonging to classifications and options for its verbalisation	17
2.1. The TRANSPORT concept according to the classification of concepts..	17
2.2. Mechanism of nomination	20
2.3. Basic types of nomination	20
2.4. Verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept in the aspect of semiosis...	22
2.5. Sign-typological characteristics of nominative units	26
2.6. Functional-semantic typology of linguistic signs	30
2.7. Linguocognitive basis of nominative units	31
2.7.1. Conceptualisation models	33
2.7.2. Frame-based representation of conceptualised information	37
3. Linguosemiotic analysis of the means of verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in English-language rock song lyrics of the 20th and the 21st century	38
3.1. Sign-typological characteristics of the verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept	38
3.2. The structural characteristics of linguistic units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept	42

3.3. The pragmatic functions of nominative representations of the TRANSPORT concept in the textual space of artistic (song) discourse	43
3.4. Verbalisers of the Transport Concept from the Perspective of Force Dynamics Theory	45
3.5. The semantic characteristics of the nominative units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in the English rock lyrics of the 20th century (1960s-2000s)	47
3.6. The semantic characteristics of the nominative units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in the Modern English rock lyrics (2000s-nowadays)	48
Results	50
Conclusions and Discussion	58
References	60

ABSTRACT

To begin with, in my opinion, choosing linguoconceptology – and specifically the TRANSPORT concept – as a research topic is justified and might be called intellectually productive because it operates at the intersection of language, cognition, and culture, allowing for a multidimensional analysis of meaning.

To begin with, the importance of this topic stems from the fundamental role of linguoconceptology in modern linguistic studies. Unlike approaches that treat words as isolated units, linguoconceptology views language as a system that encodes structured knowledge about the world. As defined by scholars, such as Professor O. Selivanova (a famous Ukrainian linguist, PhD in Philology), concepts are not simple meanings but complex “mental-psychonetic structures” that integrate verbal and non-verbal knowledge, shaped by perception, memory, and cognition. This means that studying any concept – including TRANSPORT – provides access to how humans mentally organise reality.

Moreover, the relevance of this research topic is reinforced by the diversity of theoretical approaches to the concept itself. For example, N. Sluhai (a Ukrainian Professor of Philology) emphasises the idea of the concept as a culturally conditioned mental prototype, while some other researchers define it as an “energy clot of culture,” highlighting its experiential and value-laden nature. These perspectives demonstrate that concepts are not purely logical constructs – they are deeply embedded in cultural and emotional experience.

In conclusion, choosing linguoconceptology – and specifically the TRANSPORT concept – as a research topic is important because it enables a comprehensive analysis of how language encodes knowledge, reflects cultural values, and structures human experience. The TRANSPORT concept, due to its universality, systematic organisation, dynamic development, and metaphorical richness, serves as an exemplary model for demonstrating the theoretical principles of linguoconceptology and for exploring the deep connections between language, thought, and culture.

Key words: *linguoconceptology, concept, transport, mental-psychonetic structures, human experience, organisation.*

INTRODUCTION

At the start, I would like to mention the reason why studying a concept, and especially the TRANSPORT concept, may be considered important. The importance lies in the internal structure of concepts. From a diachronic perspective, any concept consists of interconnected components: sensory (sensitemes), rational (mentalites), and cultural (culturemes). This triadic structure makes the concept a rich object of study, as it unites perception, thought, and cultural knowledge into a single semantic whole. Investigating such a structure enables a deeper understanding of how meaning is formed, stored, and transmitted in human consciousness.

In addition, the concept is dynamic and open-ended. It evolves through communication, constantly expanding its informational field. This dynamic nature creates a productive tension between stability (fixed meanings, definitions) and change (new interpretations, metaphorical extensions). As a result, research in this area can capture both the static and evolving aspects of language, making it especially relevant in the context of rapid social and technological change.

Within this theoretical framework, the TRANSPORT concept emerges as an especially valuable research object. Its importance lies in several factors.

First, transport is a universal and fundamental phenomenon. It exists in all cultures and is essential to everyday life, which ensures the relevance and applicability of the research. At the same time, the ways in which TRANSPORT is conceptualised may vary across languages and cultures, providing opportunities for comparative analysis.

Second, the TRANSPORT concept has a high degree of systematicity. It includes a wide network of nominative units (vehicles, infrastructure, processes, and participants) which clearly demonstrate how language organises knowledge into semantic fields. This makes it an ideal example for illustrating theoretical principles such as nomination, accuracy, unambiguity, and definability.

Third, the TRANSPORT concept reflects technological and historical development. Changes in transportation systems (from traditional to modern, from physical to digital mobility) are directly mirrored in language. Studying this concept therefore allows us to trace how linguistic systems adapt to innovation and societal change.

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, TRANSPORT has a strong metaphorical and symbolic dimension. It is widely used to conceptualise abstract domains such as life, time, and personal development (e.g., “life is a journey”, “moving forward”, “crossroads”). This demonstrates how some specific, concrete experience is transformed into abstract thinking, making the concept particularly valuable for cognitive and cultural analysis.

Finally, the TRANSPORT concept clearly demonstrates all the key properties of nominative units: it fulfills the naming function, forms part of a

structured system, maintains relative accuracy, and allows for precise definition. At the same time, it participates in grammatical structures and adapts to different communicative contexts, further confirming its relevance as a linguistic object of study.

In contemporary humanities, lyrics are regarded not only as a form of artistic self-expression but also as an important cultural phenomenon that accumulates the collective experience, values, and worldview of a particular society. Song texts function as specific models of cultural memory in which historical processes, social transformations, emotional attitudes, and features of national or group identity are reflected. Particularly significant in this context are rock lyrics, which act as manifestants of a subculture formed around the ideas of freedom, protest, individualism, inner search, and the reconsideration of social norms. Rock culture creates its own symbolic space in which music and lyrics become instruments for representing an alternative vision of the world and a means of interpreting reality.

One of the important elements of this symbolic space is the TRANSPORT concept, which goes far beyond its direct meaning. Transport, as a component of the civilisational matrix, reflects technological progress, mobility, the dynamism of the modern world, and the humanity's ability to overcome spatial and psychological boundaries. In the cultural dimension, the TRANSPORT concept becomes a universal image of movement, transition, escape, freedom, or, conversely, loss of control and alienation. For this reason, the verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept in the English rock lyrics (ROAD, CAR, TRAIN, MOTORCYCLE etc.) possess symbolic significance. Such images become markers of freedom, rebellion, escape from everyday routine, the search for identity, or movement toward a new stage of life. Thus, transport in rock lyrics functions not only as an element of material culture but also as a multilayered cultural symbol representing the peculiarities of the subcultural worldview and reflecting the interrelation between language, culture, and collective consciousness.

The present study therefore aims to explore the verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept in English-language rock lyrics and to determine the ways in which TRANSPORT imagery contributes to the construction of the artistic worldview characteristic of rock culture. Particular attention is paid to the symbolic, cultural, and conceptual meanings embedded in transport-related lexical units (verbalisers of the concept) and the metaphorical meanings that these verbalisers represent, such as MOVEMENT, TRANSITION, FREEDOM, REBELLION etc.

In my Master's paper I will study what the TRANSPORT concept is like from the point of view of cognitive linguistics, what verbalisers are used to represent it in the modern English-language rock lyrics, and also consider the main approaches to determining the typology of the TRANSPORT concept. I will analyse the typology of the TRANSPORT concept from the following

perspectives: 1) the cognitive-semantic aspect, from the point of view of which we will know what semantic features form the TRANSPORT concept (MOVEMENT, SPEED, CONVENIENCE, SAFETY, PROGRESS, etc.) and how they are verbalised in the English language; 2) the cultural-typological aspect, which compares how different cultures (especially English-speaking ones) perceive TRANSPORT (a symbol of technical development, a means of social mobility, an ecological threat, etc.); 3) metaphorical modelling – an aspect that studies how the TRANSPORT concept is used in metaphors, that is, how it is projected onto different spheres of human experience; 4) discursive aspect – an analysis of how the TRANSPORT concept is implemented in media, technical, political, environmental discourse (TRANSPORT as a factor of progress, danger, globalisation).

I will also pay attention to linguistic nomination, that is, fixing the result of knowing the world's aspect in one word (a concept). In terms of this research, I will take the types of linguistic nomination (primary, secondary) and its mechanisms (metaphor, synecdoche, semantic expansion/narrowing of the meaning of the concept) into consideration.

The topic of my Master's paper is reflected in my articles "THE "TRANSPORT" CONCEPT IN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE SONG DISCOURSE: THE LINGUOCOGNITIVE ASPECT", published in in Periodical scientific journal "GRAIL OF SCIENCE" № 64 ("Science in Motion: Classic and Modern Tools and Methods in Scientific Investigations" conference held on March 20th, 2026 by NGO European Scientific Platform (Vinnytsia, Ukraine) LLC International Centre Corporative Management (Vienna, Austria)), and "THE TRANSPORT CONCEPT IN LINGUOCONCEPTOLOGY: THE CONCEPT-MINIMUM AND THE CONCEPT-MAXIMUM", published in Periodical scientific journal "GRAIL OF SCIENCE" № 67 ("Open Science Nowadays: Main Mission, Trends and Instruments, Path and its Development" conference held on May 1st, 2026 by NGO European Scientific Platform (Vinnytsia, Ukraine) LLC International Centre Corporative Management (Vienna, Austria)). Some results of my study are also reflected in my thesis "THE TRANSPORT CONCEPT: ITS TYPOLOGY, FEATURES AND REPRESENTATION IN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LYRICS" presented at the All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference of Young Researchers and Students: "Philosophy, Philology, Culture, Education: The Voice of Youth".

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. The TRANSPORT concept from the point of view of cognitive linguistics: the direct and metaphorical meaning of the concept.

1.1. History of the development of cognitive linguistics, the TRANSPORT concept as one of the subjects of its research.

First of all, I should note what cognitive linguistics is. Cognitive linguistics (from “knowledge, cognition”, “cognitive ability”) is a linguistic direction that considers the functioning of language as a type of cognitive activity, and explores the cognitive mechanisms and structures of human consciousness through linguistic phenomena.

Cognitive linguistics arose in the 70s of the 20th century. In 1975, American linguists G. Lakoff and H. Thompson proposed the term “cognitive grammar” in one of their articles. Some scientists also consider the symposium organised in 1989 by René Dirven (a famous, prominent Belgian linguist) at the University of Louisbourg (Germany) and founding the journal called “Cognitive Linguistics” during that symposium to be the beginning of cognitive linguistics as a science.

Cognitive linguistics is a component of cognitology – the science concentrating on cognitive processes in the human mind, which provide one’s operational thinking and the ability to learn many things about the world. Cognitology studies models of consciousness related to the processes of cognition, along with the acquisition, production, storage, use, transfer of knowledge by a person, and also the representation of knowledge and processing the information that comes to a person through various channels. Cognitologists also study knowledge processing, decision-making, understanding human languages, logical deduction, argumentation and other types of cognitive activity. As a result of studying the mind and mental systems, cognitive science considers intelligent behavior as a certain calculation. There is an opinion that the cognitive paradigm can develop into a creative one, that is, a creative paradigm that will use cognitive structures to produce new knowledge.

Therefore, cognitive linguistics is a part of cognitology, and the general principles of cognitive linguistics are expansionism (exits into other sciences), anthropocentrism (study of language with the aim of knowing its speaker), functionalism (study of the whole variety of language functions), and explanatory nature (explanation of language phenomena). Linguistics of the 20th century may be presented as “how-linguistics” (a science that studies how language is constructed), but cognitive linguistics should be presented as “why-linguistics”, which will be mainly based on explanations of the functioning of language.

Representatives of the cognitive approach in semantics are mainly American scientists, such as G. Lakoff, R. Langaker, R. Jackendoff, C. Fillmore, L. Talmy, A. Goldberg, J. Taylor, J. Fauconnier, B. Rudzka-Austin, A. Chenki, etc.

In his famous work “Semantics and Cognitive Activity” (1983) R. Jackendoff substantiated the connection between semantics and psychology. In particular, this piece of work proved that when perceiving speech, a person uses the same mechanisms as when perceiving the world with the help of his other abilities (visual perception, auditory perception of music, etc.).

According to A. Prykhodko, the problem of the connection between language and thought has always occupied a central place in linguistics. At the current stage of scientific development, due to its increasing integration with related sciences, it has become possible to take a new look at this fundamental problem. Until the mid-19th century, the problem of the relationship between language and thought was considered primarily from a philosophical perspective. In linguistics, W. von Humboldt was the first scientist to prioritise this problem. He spoke about the fundamental influence of mental activity on speech. According to W. von Humboldt, language is not simply a tool for expressing thought, but also a means of its formation, influencing the thought process itself.

In the 1930s–1950s there was a series of experiments that confirmed the hypothesis of the dialectical unity of language and thought and demonstrated their mutual influence: inner speech influences mental processes, and mental and cognitive activity, in turn, shapes the linguo-cognitive structures that form the basis of speech activity.

However, it is not only the experience of cognitive linguistics that testifies to the deep roots of linguo-conceptology. Concepts have been studied indirectly in both philosophy and linguistics. The semasiological and onomasiological approaches in lexicology, the study of conceptual categories, the exploration of lexical and functional-semantic fields, and the search for “semantic primitives” as the cognitive foundation of natural languages have enabled the development of a corresponding methodological toolkit and the accumulation of a vast and diverse linguistic resource for understanding the ways and means of human mental exploration of the world.

Linguistic philosophy, with its eternal question of the relationship between language and thought, linguacognitology with its reflections on knowledge and consciousness, linguosemantics with its exploration of meaning and sense, linguaculturalism (or linguoculturology) with its search for the universal and the ethnospecific – all of these became, essentially, the launching pad for the concept's entry into scientific life. Beginning around the 1990s, its active, wide-ranging exploitation began, so CONCEPT, as the former analogue of NOTION, narrowed its scope and expanded its content. Having acquired additional properties, it became first a “cultural concept,” then a “linguocultural

concept,” and, ultimately, a “linguoconcept” as a generic term for concepts, meanings, senses, representations, and images.

Given this, it seems relevant to clarify questions regarding the ontological essence of the concept as a constitutive unit of linguoconceptology, the taxonomy of concepts, techniques of “externalisation” etc.

The next step is to define the concept of TRANSPORT. As long as a CONCEPT is one of the subjects of study of cognitive linguistics, there are many definitions of such a concept as TRANSPORT.

1.2. Definition of the TRANSPORT concept: its direct and indirect (metaphorical) meaning.

Representatives of different cultures interpret the TRANSPORT concept differently, depending on their worldview. A.M. Prykhodko states the following point: if language reflects a particular view of the world, then the reflection of the observer's position in it corresponds to the general subjectivity of the meanings reflected and enshrined in it: the same phenomenon can be interpreted and described in different ways, using different linguistic means, which, in turn, presupposes the presence of different details, nuances, and features that contribute to the accumulation of knowledge.

In terms of my research and in order to demonstrate the variety of meaning one concept may have, I have chosen the following definitions of the TRANSPORT concept: the movement of people or goods from one place to another; a system of vehicles, such as buses, trains, aircraft, etc. for getting from one place to another; something that takes things, esp. soldiers or military supplies, from one place to another; the movement of a chemical substance in and out of living cells; the activity of moving goods or gas, oil, etc. from one place to another; a vehicle for a person or group of people to use for a particular journey (Cambridge Dictionary, Meaning of TRANSPORT in English).

Thus, the analysis of dictionary definitions demonstrates that the TRANSPORT concept is multidimensional and extends far beyond the simple notion of physical movement. At its core, the concept stands for transfer, mobility, and connection between different points in space. However, its semantic structure also includes social and psychological dimensions. Transport is represented both as a process of movement and as the means that enable such movement, including vehicles, systems, and mechanisms of transportation.

It is interesting that taking into account the last of the above definitions of the TRANSPORT concept (“a vehicle for a person or group of people to use for a particular journey”), the following opinion of mine should be noted: in this case, the concept of JOURNEY may have a literal meaning (moving from point A to point B) or a figurative meaning (changes in life, in which TRANSPORT is a means of implementing such changes). This opinion can be evidenced by

numerous cases of the use of the image of TRANSPORT in literature: poems, short stories, songs, etc.

1.3. The functional significance of metaphorical meanings in concept formation.

1.3.1. The role of metaphor in the human life, communication and expression of one's thoughts (with an example of using the TRANSPORT concept).

According to George Lakoff (*Metaphors We Live By*, 1980), metaphor is usually viewed as characteristic of language alone and as a matter of words rather than thoughts or one's actions. That is why many people believe that they communicate pretty well without using metaphors, which is not actually right. On the contrary, linguists have come to a conclusion that metaphor is pervasive in a human's everyday life, in the person's thought and action, not just in language. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. According to this piece of theory, the concepts that we create do structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. So, our conceptual system plays a central role in defining the realities of our everyday life. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor.

But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do every day we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language. Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like.

Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. And we have found a way to begin to identify in detail just what the metaphors are that structure how we perceive, how we think, and what we do.

With the help of all the information above, I want to note that the TRANSPORT concept has also been used quite often by creative people in their works as a means of depicting the idea of escaping from one life situation to another, transitioning from one stage of life to another, the escape from reality, the desire to express protest, to let go of control over the situation etc. And a very big number of examples of such conscious or subconscious use of the TRANSPORT concept are found in English-language songs. Especially, in the songs of the rock genre, because the representatives of rock music culture often have quite expressive personality, views or behavior, which forms gives them

love for speed, adrenaline, and therefore transport, where TRANSPORT gives them the speed and emotions, and also serves as the embodiment of their associations with escape, fun, rebellion, changes, intrigue, etc.

Therefore, in my Master Paper, exploring the TRANSPORT concept, I am going to focus on English-language rock songs lyrics of the 20th and 21st centuries.

1.3.2. The TRANSPORT concept from a typological perspective.

In this subsection, I will be discussing the meaning of the concept itself and studying the TRANSPORT concept from a typological perspective. This subsection will also indicate how the concept TRANSPORT relates to each type of concept.

As noted above, the main semantic aspect of studies in cognitive linguistics is a CONCEPT, which is what makes cognitive linguistics most different from other areas of semantics research (logical, structural, etc.).

Currently, a CONCEPT does not have a single definition which could be called the clearest one by meaning. It is understood as a mental prototype (an undivided representation of an object) or the idea of a thing. The CONCEPT has a dual essence: the mental one and the linguistic one. On the one hand, a CONCEPT is an ideal image (more precisely – a prototype), which personifies the speaker's culturally conditioned ideas about the world. On the other hand, it has a specific name in the language.

Anna Wierzbicka, a Polish linguistics scholar, distinguishes between a concept-minimum, a concept-maximum, and an encyclopedic supplement (supplement). A concept-minimum is the incomplete knowledge of the meaning of a word (the speaker knows the reality, but not everything that concerns it; in everyday life it is not important for the speaker or they have never encountered it). A concept-maximum encompasses the speaker's comprehensive (complete) knowledge of the meaning of a word (the reality is known to the speaker in all aspects), including encyclopedic information, professional knowledge of reality.

For example, for a Ukrainian the concept of an APPLE is a concept-maximum, while the concept of a KIWI is a concept-minimum (speakers do not know whether KIWIs grow on a bush or a tree, how these plants are cared for, how they bloom, when the fruits ripen, etc.).

In 1987, the American linguist professor George Lakoff noted that each concept has an idealised cognitive model, which is understood as all our ideas about the object at once, as a whole, some kind of “undivided image”, which determines a certain behavior of the linguistic sign (role structure). For example, the English verb JOGGING and RUNNING have different “idealised cognitive models”. Jogging is associated with a healthy lifestyle, the physical form of middle-class people who have achieved success in the societies of developed countries. The concept of this word excludes competitions, target situations, and

is also incompatible with young children, the elderly, animals, and other options usually associated with RUNNING.

Considering what has been mentioned in this section, and especially taking into account the conclusions made by Professor Anna Wierzbicka regarding the existence of the concept-minimum and the concept-maximum, I can draw my own conclusion that the TRANSPORT concept also has a concept-minimum and a concept-maximum. Therefore, I suggest taking a closer look at the following suggestion of mine:

Concept-minimum: for the average person, TRANSPORT is a means of moving (car, bus, subway). So the basic idea is that TRANSPORT is “something that moves and transports people”. Concept-maximum: for a specialist (an engineer, a logistician, an economist, an urban planner) TRANSPORT is a system that includes technical, social, economic, environmental and even cultural aspects.

For example, a specialist distinguishes between types of transport (land transport, air transport, water transport), principles of operation, logistics, energy consumption, environmental impact, urban structure, economy.

Based on George Lakoff's conclusions that each concept has its own idealized cognitive model, I may note the following: the concept of TRANSPORT also has an idealised cognitive model, which includes many meanings, namely:

The concept of TRANSPORT in our consciousness is not only a technical concept, but a whole image of the system of movement and mobility, which includes the spatial aspect (moving from point A to point B), the temporal aspect (speed, delays, schedules), the social aspect (comfort, accessibility, prestige (e.g., car vs bicycle), the emotional aspect (some people associate it with travel and freedom, others with stress and traffic jams).

So, TRANSPORT is both a physical and mental category that unites the material world (means of transportation) and the internal one – our emotions, assessments, experiences and cultural associations. Also, the concept of TRANSPORT is a cognitive unit that reflects human understanding of movement, space, technological progress and social mobility.

It has different levels of depth (minimum – everyday perception, maximum – professional, scientific, poetic), and its cognitive model combines material, functional, and emotional-cultural components, including the consideration of the concept of TRANSPORT as a symbol of travel and change, and in English-language (including modern) songs by the rock-genre artists – as a symbol of rebellion, resistance, and a journey to a better life.

1.3.3. The TRANSPORT concept in the dimension of world modelling.

Different variants of the world are generated and modeled within particular types of discourse and forms of nominative activity, since language

does not merely reflect reality but also structures and interprets it according to the values, experiences, and communicative purposes of a specific community. Each discourse constructs its own worldview by selecting, categorising, and verbalising certain aspects of reality while foregrounding particular meanings and symbolic associations.

Scientific discourse, for instance, produces a rational and systematised model of the world based on objectivity, classification, and logical explanation. In this type of discourse, nominative activity is aimed at defining phenomena precisely and establishing conceptual relations between them. Political discourse, in turn, constructs an ideological worldview shaped by power relations, persuasion, and collective identity formation. Media discourse models reality through evaluation, interpretation, and selective representation of events, thereby influencing public perception and social consciousness.

At the same time, artistic discourse creates an imaginative and symbolically charged version of the world in which reality is transformed through metaphor, imagery, and emotional experience. Within literary and musical texts, nominative activity acquires not only a denotative but also a deeply connotative character, as linguistic units become carriers of cultural meanings, emotions, and value systems. Such discourse does not simply reproduce the external world, rather, it constructs an alternative artistic worldview that reflects the author's perception of reality and the collective consciousness of a particular cultural or subcultural community.

Rock lyrics, as a form of artistic and subcultural discourse, model a specific variant of the world grounded in the ideas of freedom, rebellion, self-expression, and existential search. In this context, nominative activity manifests itself through the selection of lexical units, metaphors, symbols, and conceptual images that verbalise the experiences and values characteristic of rock culture. Consequently, the artistic world created in rock lyrics may be viewed as a symbolic model of reality in which cultural concepts, including TRANSPORT, acquire special semantic and metaphorical significance.

Consequently, the TRANSPORT concept becomes an important element in the modelling of alternative worldviews characteristic of rock culture. Through transport imagery, authors construct a symbolic space in which movement represents not only physical relocation but also psychological transformation. In this sense, transport serves as a conceptual bridge between objective reality and its artistic reinterpretation, reflecting how language and discourse shape human perception of the world.

1.3.4. The axiological colouring of the TRANSPORT concept.

In this subsection, I am going to discuss the axiological coloring of the TRANSPORT concept, in other words, I will investigate what values (with a

positive or a negative coloring) may be expressed by the speaker through the use of the TRANSPORT concept.

The TRANSPORT concept in the dimension of world modelling should be considered as a cognitive-semantic structure that reflects a whole layer of knowledge, ideas and values related to movement, space, progress, technology, as well as social and cultural changes, in the human mind. In world modelling, the TRANSPORT concept is not just the name of a means of transportation, but a model in a fragment of reality that organises ideas about: 1) movement and overcoming distance, 2) connections between people, cities, countries, 3) technological development and civilisational progress, 4) time, speed, changes. Thus, the TRANSPORT concept, like many other diverse concepts, takes part in the formation of a conceptual picture of the world, that is, the way in which a person comprehends the world through language.

The TRANSPORT concept has an idealised cognitive model that includes typical scenarios: 1) movement (person – transport – path – destination), 2) path / road (metaphor of life: life path, getting off the rails, standing still), 3) speed / progress (time flies, the world moves forward). That is, TRANSPORT is not only a technical, but also a cultural-metaphorical concept.

In different cultures, the TRANSPORT concept acquires specific connotations: 1) in the West – a symbol of modernisation, mobility, freedom (freedom of movement, driving your own destiny), 2) in the East – it may be associated with the harmony of movement or the rhythm of life, 3) in the Ukrainian culture – it often reflects social and everyday experience (riding a minibus, standing in traffic jams, being late for the train).

Speaking about the linguistic embodiment of the concept, I may say that the TRANSPORT concept is represented with the help of the lexical-semantic field, which includes: 1) means of transportation: car, bus, tram, train, airplane, boat; 2) processes: to drive, move, transport, fly; 3) abstract concepts: movement, path, speed, journey, progress.

Speaking more precisely about the TRANSPORT concept in world modelling, it should be noted that with the TRANSPORT concept, a person models the world as dynamic, mobile and interconnected. This concept performs a cognitive function (structures knowledge) and an axiological one (expresses values, such as freedom, development, and mobility).

Summarising all the information given above, I would like to state that in world modelling the TRANSPORT concept acts as a symbol of movement, development, connection and progress. It also forms the idea of the world being very dynamic and shows the active role of a human in it. Thus, I have come to a conclusion that the axiological colouring of the TRANSPORT concept is rather positive, because in the literal sense of TRANSPORT contributes to the development of human life (the emergence of transport connections, travel, consolidation of international connections, and acquaintance with the culture of other places). In a figurative, metaphorical sense, in English-language rock

songs (older and modern ones), TRANSPORT is not just a means of transportation, but also a symbol of movement, freedom, protest and self-searching. It expresses the inner state of a person, their wish for changes, escape or discovering the world, which is important for the basic ideas of the modern picture of the world.

RESEARCH METHODS

2. The TRANSPORT concept: belonging to classifications and options for its verbalisation.

2.1. The TRANSPORT concept according to the classification of concepts.

Speaking about a concept in general, I would like to start this subsection with the following statement: being the fundamental unit of conceptology and linguacultural studies, a concept is distinguished by its contradictory interpretation (ambiguity). It is reflected in the fact that the term “concept” itself is not established or the only possible one for denoting mental formations. It is often used synonymously with “stereotype,” “archetype,” “prototype,” “mentefact,” “symbol,” “gestalt,” “cultureme,” “logoepisteme” and others. This terminological diversity testifies not so much to the lack of unity of viewpoints regarding the nature and functions of the concept, but rather to the richness of its attributes and properties, continually discovered by the researcher.

According to A.M. Prykhodko, a Ukrainian linguist and researcher specialising in cognitive linguistics, concepts are classified according to such criteria: within the framework of such binary oppositions as “parametric” – “non-parametric”, “universal” – “specific”, “regulatory” – “non-regulatory”, “positivity” – “negativity”. Thus, there is the general typology of concepts, according to which concepts are divided into “universal” and “specific”. Among both universal and specific concepts there are regulatory and non-regulatory concepts, which in turn have additional parameters.

Parametric concepts include concepts that (in terms of the linguocultural consciousness) are associated with certain quantitative and/or qualitative indicators, e.g. metric values: size (a GIANT), quality (a GENIOUS), volume (WEALTH/POVERTY), function (a STARTER), status (a CHIEF, a LEADER) etc. Non-parametric concepts are profiled at the level of sensations, ideas and associations phenomena (just like SOUL, LOVE, GLORY, FEAR etc), which it is very difficult to apply any measurement criteria to. Therefore, TRANSPORT is a parametric concept (because it has, to say the least, size and function), bearing features of a non-parametric concept (as long as it carries associations with some abstract notions such as LOVE, ALIENATION, REBELLION, LONELINESS, HAPPINESS etc. in the English-language rock lyrics)

In addition, according to A.M. Prykhodko, concepts may be classified according to several criteria, since a concept is understood as a multidimensional mental and cultural formation that combines linguistic, cognitive, figurative, and axiological components. A. Prykhodko emphasises that concepts differ in their structure, origin, degree of universality, discourse variability, and the format of their representation.

One of the most detailed typologies proposed by A. Prykhodko is based on the degree of discourse variability and systemic stability. Within this classification, three major types of concepts are distinguished:

Metachthons – universal and highly stable concepts that exist in almost all cultures and discourses. These concepts possess a high degree of abstraction and form the conceptual foundation of human cognition. Examples include LIFE, DEATH, TIME, LOVE, FREEDOM, and MOVEMENT. Such concepts are relatively independent of a specific discourse because they reflect universal human experience. The concept TRANSPORT may partially belong to this category because movement and spatial transition are universal cognitive phenomena.

Autochthons – nationally and culturally specific concepts rooted in a particular linguoculture. They reflect the historical, social, and cultural experience of a given community and often contain ethnospecific meanings and associations. These concepts are deeply connected with national mentality, traditions, and collective memory. In the context of transport imagery, examples may include culturally marked symbols such as the American highway, the British underground, or the Ukrainian train as a marker of migration and displacement.

Allochthons – borrowed or externally introduced concepts that enter a linguoculture through intercultural communication, globalisation, technological development, or media influence. Such concepts often preserve traces of foreign cultural models and gradually adapt to a new conceptual system. Modern transport-related concepts connected with globalisation, digital mobility, or international travel may function as allochthons in certain linguistic cultures.

Another important classification proposed by A.M. Prykhodko concerns the format of concept representation. According to this typology, concepts may appear in different structural forms:

- Single concepts – isolated conceptual units such as ROAD, TRAIN, CAR, or JOURNEY;
- Double gestalts – paired concepts that exist in binary opposition or correlation, for example LIFE/DEATH, FREEDOM/CAPTIVITY, ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE. In transport discourse, such oppositions often structure the symbolic meaning of movement;
- Cluster concepts – groups of interconnected conceptual elements united around one semantic center;
- Accumulative concepts – concepts formed through the accumulation of cultural, historical, and associative meanings;
- Image-bearing concepts – concepts strongly connected with metaphorical and symbolic imagery;
- Parabolic and essay-type concepts – concepts represented through extended narratives, reflections, or interpretative structures.

Professor A.M. Prykhodko also classifies concepts according to the sphere of their functioning and representation. In this regard, concepts may be:

- Textual concepts – generated within a literary or artistic text;
- Discursive concepts – formed within a particular discourse type;
- Linguocultural concepts – reflecting cultural values and national mentality;
- Artistic concepts – shaped within artistic discourse and characterized by metaphorical and symbolic reinterpretation.

From this perspective, **the TRANSPORT concept in rock lyrics may simultaneously function as:**

- a **discursive concept**, because it is shaped by rock discourse;
- an **artistic concept**, because it acquires metaphorical meanings;
- an **accumulative concept**, because it accumulates technological, social, emotional, and cultural associations.

I could also state that according to the criterion of universality and cultural markedness, the concept TRANSPORT demonstrates features of a **metachthon**. At its core, transport is connected with the universal human experience of movement, spatial transition, travel, and communication between places. The need to move people, goods, and information is common to all civilisations and historical periods; therefore, the semantic nucleus of the concept possesses universal cognitive significance. In this sense, TRANSPORT is related to broader universal concepts such as MOVEMENT, ROAD, SPACE, FREEDOM, and TRANSITION.

As an artistic concept, TRANSPORT acquires symbolic reinterpretation within literary and musical discourse. In rock lyrics especially, transport imagery becomes an important element of subcultural worldview modelling. Rock discourse transforms transport from a material object into a symbolic representation of freedom, rebellion, emotional escape, and existential movement. Motorcycles, trains, and endless journeys reflect the values of rock culture, including nonconformity, protest against social restrictions, and the search for identity.

Let us take this as an example: the modern song called “Chasing Cars” by the Snow Patrol band contains the phrase: “Let's waste time chasing cars around our heads”, where “chasing CARS” is an action without a reason, without a result, driven by emotions only. In the context of the song, such an action is a symbol of sincere, pure, but a naive feeling that defies logic and the concept of a CAR stands for the character's way to escape from the world or to outdrive the problems.

The other example may be “Magic Bus” by The Who. The line “I want it, I want it, I want my magic bus”, shows us the concept of a BUS, which is the representative of freedom, youth culture, and travelling without rules or limits.

Different metaphorical features of the TRANSPORT concept may as well be found in such English-language songs of the 20th century as “Fast Car” by

Tracy Chapman, “Ticket to Ride” by The Beatles, “Crazy Train” by Ozzy Osborne, “Cars” by Gary Numan, “Downtown Train” by Tom Waits etc.

These examples prove that the TRANSPORT concept has both a substantive embodiment and a metaphorical meaning, making it a parametric concept (having size and function), bearing features of a non-parametric concept (carrying associations with some abstract notions such as LOVE, ALIENATION, REBELLION, LONELINESS, HAPPINESS etc. in the English-language rock lyrics).

2.2. Mechanism of nomination.

Nomination (from Lat. *nominatio* – naming) – is the whole creation of units with a nominative function, which serves for: 1) naming and seeing fragments of activity; 2) the formation of subordinates to understand about them in the form of words, words, phraseological units, speech.

The subject of studies of the theory of nomination as a special linguistic discipline is: 1) study and description of the hidden patterns of creation of word units; 2) the role of the pragmatic factor in the choice of sign, which lies at the basis of the nomination; 3) research into linguistic technology of nomination – its assets, features and methods; 4) creating a typology of nominations, a description of communicative-functional mechanisms.

Now speaking more in detail about the mechanism of nomination, I would like to start this thesis by mentioning the significance of the fact that the CONCEPT and the WORD do not exist solely, apart from one another. CONCEPT is a category of thought, while WORD is a category of language. A THOUGHT and a WORD have an inseparable connection, so a CONCEPT is naturally connected to the WORD. One may say that a word is a material image of a concept. But the thing is that a concept cannot be understood any other way except for having infused itself with a sign (in our case – a word). So there is a very important role for a mechanism of nomination in our life.

The mechanism of universal nomination (giving a concept a word that represents it) operates in the following manner: the choice of a word to express a new concept is not casual. If the word, selected/found for designation, does not accurately express the concept or it does not correspond to the designated object, and the term is imprecise or ambiguous, it should be replaced with another, more precise word.

2.3. Basic types of nomination

There are emerging types of nomination: internal and intercultural, figurative and non-figurative, primary and secondary. The internal nomination is valid independently of the external contact. Inter-movement nomination, however, must be kept in contact between this language and another language,

or with several other languages. The figurative nomination is characterised by the presence of an opposition between the internal form and the actual meanings of the name. The non-figurative nomination is characterised by the presence of such a position. The understanding of the types, listed previously, gives us all types of global nominations.

The internal figurative primary nomination is based on additional affixation, word formation, as well as formation of stems, word stems and abbreviations with the creation of an acronym. The internal figurative primary nomination is of a semantic nature and operates on the basis of the establishment in the knowledge of relations between the fragment of action already recorded in the nominative arsenal and the fact that only is fixed. On the surface of the language, such a process is expressed as a transfer (outside or part) of the name of an already known object to the name of a newly recognised or newly assessed one.

The primary nomination – both mono- and non-singular – is obtained mainly through the stage of predicative attribution of the sign to the signing nose. Moreover, the predicate trace of understanding is not so much of a grammatical meaning, but a psychological predicate.

The secondary nomination, as a transformation of the already explicit name of the object, is not tied to one syntactic position. Internal figurative secondary nomination can be implemented either by transferred naming or by phraseological nomination. By means of transference, the name is equal, metaphor, metonymy, epithet, irony, synecdoche, allegory, hyperbole, lithota, oxymoron, extension and specialization of meaning. Internally, the second nomination is presented in abbreviations.

The internally unimagative secondary nomination is due to the simplified naming. Thus, it can be noted that the most productive type of internal nomination is the internally figurative secondary nomination, and the least productive type is the internally unimagative secondary nomination.

The cross-national primary nomination is characterised by the combination in one word of two different similar elements: the position and the power of the movement. A positional element becomes the basis of a word, one of the bases, or an affix.

The formation of a new meaning of lexemes, with the scientists' caution, may occur within the boundaries of a word and create the so-called autonomous nomination, or within the boundaries of the word, depending on the context, they can create the so-called non-autonomous nomination. Current linguistic research has revealed the active processes of creation of both types of names of secondary nominations (L. Shutak, Functional semantics of lexical units. Theory of nomination).

Autonomous nomination is the second meaning of words that connote an independent nominative function and name the next fragment of objective activity. In addition to the autonomous nomination, the new names are a direct

reflection of the characteristics of the object of activity. This is the creation of a secondary meaning of a word that has an independent nominative function and names any fragment of objective activity, which means it operates autonomously, on the basis of one name (L. Shutak, Functional semantics of lexical units. Theory of nomination).

The basis of non-autonomous (indirect) nomination is low lexical-semantic processes – metaphorisation, paraphrase, metonymy, phraseological semiology, oxymoron, euphemism, figurative equalisation, etc. The main mechanism of such a cognitive technique operates through the associative combination of hidden signs of two different objects. Substitute components, which, after their re-interpretation, extract secondary meanings, shape the internal form of these meanings, and therefore, save the internal meanings that are wasted, scientists differentiate between motivated and unmotivated meanings of words and phrases. The more necessary information is contained in the word, the more likely it is that it will be selected for the second nomination. (L. Shutak, Functional semantics of lexical units. Theory of nomination).

Moreover, our nomination is one of the most productive processes in language, in addition to which realities generate sound and semantic meanings. Looking at the fact that the nomination process is carried out at different levels of language, using different types of language, it is possible to develop a concept that this process is the most productive and interesting for the language. Continuously, throughout the entire period of humankind's birth. This explains the importance of the nomination for the normal functioning of the language.

2.4. Verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept in the aspect of semiosis.

In this subsection I am going to concentrate on semiotics. Semiosis is the process of interpreting something as signifying something else. The process resembles a logical deduction that is missing its universal premise, which must therefore be supplied, whether or not tacitly (W.C. Watt, 2006, Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition)).

Verbalisation in semiosis is the process of translating conceptual, perceptual, or non-verbal experiences into linguistic signs (words, speech, text) to construct meaning. It acts as a cognitive and communicative tool, shaping thought and mediating interaction, often working in tandem with non-verbal semiotic resources like gestures and images to create polysemiotic meaning. Within this approach, researchers use tools both to shape and make sense of the world.

The concept of TRANSPORT occupies a central position in human cognition, culture, and language, reflecting both material practices and symbolic meanings associated with movement, transition, and connection. From a semiotic perspective, TRANSPORT is not about merely a physical act of moving people or goods from one place to another, but it is a complex system of

signs that encode cultural values, social structures, and cognitive metaphors. The verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept thus represents a rich field of study within linguistics, particularly in the domains of cognitive linguistics, semiotics, and discourse analysis.

According to classical semiotic theory, a sign consists of two inseparable parts, typically identified through the dyadic (two-part) model developed by Ferdinand de Saussure, a Swiss linguist and philosopher widely recognised as the father of 20th-century modern linguistics. These two parts are a signifier (in French – “signifiant”) – the form which the sign takes, such as a sound, image, written word, or gesture (it is the perceivable, material part of the sign) and a signified (in French – “signifié”) – the concept or meaning that the signifier represents. This is the mental idea associated with the form, not the physical object itself. In the case of TRANSPORT, the signified encompasses a wide range of meanings: physical movement, vehicles, infrastructure, and also abstract notions such as progress, transition, and life journeys.

From a cognitive linguistic perspective, concepts are mental constructs shaped by embodied experience. Transport, as a fundamental human activity, is deeply embedded in bodily experience (travelling, navigating space) which makes it a rich source of metaphorical extensions. The verbalisation of TRANSPORT thus reflects both direct experiential knowledge and culturally mediated interpretations.

At the most basic level, the TRANSPORT concept is verbalised through a wide array of lexical items that denote vehicles, modes of transport, and related actions. These include nouns such as CAR, TRAIN, BUS, BICYCLE, and AIRPLANE, verbs such as DRIVE, RIDE, TRAVEL, COMMUTE, and adjectives like FAST, SLOW, EFFICIENT or DELAYED. Each of these lexical units functions as a sign that encodes specific aspects of the transport experience.

The lexical field of transport is highly structured and hierarchical. Hypernyms such as VEHICLE encompass more specific hyponyms like SEDAN, TRUCK, SCOOTER, while verbs of motion can be classified according to manner (RUN, CRAWL, GLIDE) or direction (ENTER, EXIT, ASCEND). This lexical organisation reflects the cognitive categorisation of transport-related phenomena.

Moreover, transport vocabulary often includes technical terminology (ENGINE, FUEL, TRANSMISSION, INFRASTRUCTURE) as well as colloquial expressions (RIDE, WHEELS, HITCHHIKE), demonstrating the interplay between formal and informal registers. The richness of this lexical field indicates the centrality of transport in human communication.

TRANSPORT may be viewed as a semiotic system in its own right, where vehicles, routes, and signals function as signs within a broader communicative framework. For instance, traffic lights, road signs, and signals are explicitly designed to convey meaning and regulate behaviour. These non-verbal signs are

often verbalised in language through expressions such as stop sign, green light, or yield, which encapsulate both the physical object and its communicative function.

The verbalisation of such signs involves a process of semiotic translation, where visual or physical signals are encoded in linguistic form. This process highlights the intersemiotic nature of transport, where meaning is constructed across different modes of representation.

Furthermore, transport systems themselves can be interpreted symbolically. A railway network, for example, may represent connectivity and industrial progress, while a broken-down vehicle may symbolise failure or stagnation. Language captures these associations through idiomatic expressions and metaphorical usage.

One of the most significant aspects of the verbalisation of TRANSPORT is its role in metaphorical thinking. Transport-related vocabulary is extensively used to conceptualise abstract domains such as time, life, emotions, and social processes. These metaphorical extensions are grounded in the embodied experience of movement and navigation.

For example, the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY is pervasive in many languages. Expressions such as “at a crossroads”, “moving forward”, “on the right path”, “going nowhere” all derive from the domain of transport and spatial movement. These expressions allow speakers to structure their understanding of life events in terms of movement through space.

Similarly, time is often conceptualised in terms of transport. Phrases like “time flies”, “we are moving into a new era” reflect the metaphor TIME IS MOTION. In this case, the language of transport provides a framework for understanding temporal progression.

Emotional states can also be described using transport metaphors. For instance, “carried away by emotions”, “driven by passion”, “stuck in a rut” all draw on the imagery of movement and vehicles to convey psychological experiences. These metaphorical uses demonstrate the cognitive salience of the TRANSPORT concept.

The verbalisation of TRANSPORT is not culturally neutral. It reflects the specific social and historical context in which it is used. Different cultures prioritise different modes of transport, which is reflected in their linguistic repertoires. For example, societies with a developed railway systems may have a richer vocabulary related to trains, while others may emphasise maritime or road transport.

In addition, transport vocabulary often carries social connotations. Words like COMMUTER, PASSENGER, and DRIVER can imply specific roles and identities, while terms such as “first class” or “economy class” encode social hierarchies. The language of the transport field thus participates in the construction of social meaning.

Technological developments also influence the verbalisation of TRANSPORT. The emergence of new modes of transport, such as electric vehicles or autonomous cars, introduces new lexical items and shifts existing meanings. For instance, the term “ride-sharing” reflects changes in both technology and social practice.

In discourse, transport-related language often serves as a structuring device for narratives. Journeys, voyages, and travels provide a natural framework for storytelling, with a clear beginning, middle, and end. The verbalisation of TRANSPORT in narratives can symbolise transformation, discovery, or escape.

In literary and everyday narratives alike, transport is frequently used to mark transitions between different stages or states. For example, a character boarding a train may signify a new chapter in their life, while a journey home may represent closure or return to origins. These narrative functions are deeply rooted in the semiotic potential of transport.

Moreover, transport discourse can reflect broader ideological perspectives. Discussions about public transport, sustainability, and mobility often involve evaluative language that encodes attitudes and values. Terms like “efficient”, “sustainable”, “congested” and “accessible” carry implicit judgments about transport systems and their impact on society.

The TRANSPORT concept is often represented across multiple semiotic modes, including visual, auditory, and textual forms. For instance, a map, a timetable, and an announcement all convey transport-related information through different sign systems. The verbalisation of TRANSPORT involves the integration of these modes into coherent linguistic expressions.

Multimodal communication is particularly evident in digital contexts, where transport apps combine text, icons, and real-time data. The language used in these contexts is often concise and functional, reflecting the need for efficient communication.

In conclusion, the verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept in the aspect of semiosis reveals the intricate relationship between language, cognition, and culture. Transport is not only a practical activity but also a powerful source of meaning that permeates various domains of human experience. Through lexical representation, metaphorical extension, and discourse functions, the concept of TRANSPORT is deeply embedded in language as a system of signs.

From a semiotic perspective, the study of transport highlights the dynamic nature of meaning-making, where linguistic expressions interact with embodied experience and cultural context. The richness of transport-related language demonstrates how fundamental human activities shape and how they are shaped by the semiotic resources available to us.

So, the verbalisation of TRANSPORT exemplifies the broader processes of semiosis, illustrating how language encodes both concrete realities and abstract conceptualisations. As transport systems continue to evolve, so too will

the linguistic and semiotic frameworks through which we understand and communicate them.

2.5. Sign-typological characteristics of nominative units.

Starting this subsection, I would like to mention that here my aim is to explore the sign-typological characteristics of nominative units that verbalise the TRANSPORT concept. By examining their structural, semantic, and functional properties, my study seeks to reveal how different types of linguistic signs – ranging from direct nominations to figurative expressions – contribute to the conceptualisation of movement, space, and human experience. Such an approach allows for a deeper understanding of how language encodes complex conceptual domains and reflects both universal cognitive patterns and culturally specific interpretations.

Nominative units, as a result of words and terms, have the following main characteristics: naming function (nomination), systematicity, accuracy, unambiguousness (within their system) and the obviousness of definition. They are also characterised by grammatical signs such as row, marking and number.

The current symbolic-typological characteristics of nominative units are emerging:

- Naming function (nomination): the main function of nominative units is to name objects, processes, components, signs, etc.;
- Systematicity: a skin nominative unit, such as a term, belongs to a signing terminosystem, which has its own meaning;
- Accuracy: nominative units should be accurate to their meaning;
- Unambiguousness: the boundaries of their own terminosystems have a unit that is not unambiguous;
- Definition: the skin nominative unit can be clearly defined (definition).

The TRANSPORT concept can be effectively analysed through the lens of nominative units, since it is presented in language through a system of words, terms, and expressions that reflect both its practical and symbolic dimensions.

First of all, the naming function (nomination) is central to the TRANSPORT concept. Language contains a wide range of nominative units that directly name means, processes, and elements of transport: CAR, TRAIN, AIRPLANE, BICYCLE, JOURNEY, COMMUTE, ROUTE, TRAFFIC. Each of these units serves to identify a specific object or phenomenon within the broader domain of movement. Beyond literal naming, transport-related words can also extend metaphorically, naming abstract processes such as LIFE JOURNEY, CAREER PATH, EMOTIONAL TRANSITION, thus demonstrating that nomination operates not only on the physical but also on the conceptual level.

Secondly, the transport concept clearly demonstrates systematicity. All nominative units related to transport belong to a structured semantic field or terminological system. This system includes subcategories such as:

- types of vehicles (bus, tram, subway, ship);
- infrastructure (road, highway, station, airport);
- processes (travel, transportation, migration);
- roles (driver, passenger, pilot).

Each unit gains its meaning not in isolation but through its relationship to other elements in the system. For example, the meaning of TRAIN is related to RAILWAY, STATION, CARRIAGE, forming a coherent network. This systematic nature reflects how humans cognitively organise knowledge about transport.

The characteristic of accuracy is also evident in transport terminology. In technical or professional contexts, nominative units tend to have precise meanings. For instance, terms like freight transport, public transit, high-speed rail, and electric vehicle are used to denote clearly defined categories. This precision is especially important in fields such as logistics, urban planning, and engineering, where ambiguity could lead to misunderstanding or inefficiency.

Closely related is unambiguousness, which is typically maintained within a specific terminological system. For example, in transportation studies, the term “modal split” has a specific meaning referring to the distribution of different transport modes. However, outside this system, some words may become polysemous (e.g., “train” as a vehicle vs. “to train” as a verb). Thus, for the TRANSPORT concept unambiguity is context-dependent and strongest within specialised discourse.

Another important feature is the definability of nominative units. Each transport-related term can be clearly defined. For example:

- BUS: a large motor vehicle designed to carry passengers along a fixed route;
- The ability to provide clear definitions ensures that the concept remains structured and communicable across different contexts and disciplines;

In addition to lexical-semantic properties, the transport concept also reflects grammatical characteristics of nominative units. As nouns, most transport-related words exhibit:

- Number: car/cars, train/trains, indicating singular and plural distinctions;
- Case or marking (in inflected languages): in Ukrainian or other languages, transport nouns change form depending on grammatical function;

- Gender (where applicable): in languages with grammatical gender, transport nouns are assigned masculine, feminine, or neuter categories, which influence agreement patterns.

In linguocultural and semiotic studies, the analysis of a concept often involves the examination of its sign-typological characteristics, since concepts are verbalised and represented through different types of signs. Such an approach makes it possible to determine how language reflects cultural knowledge, collective experience, and stereotypical models of reality. Within this framework, particular importance is attached to Charles Sanders Peirce's semiotic classification of signs, which distinguishes icons, indexes, and symbols, as well as qualisigns, sinsigns, and legisigns. These categories help reveal how concepts function in discourse and how they generate cultural meanings.

The first level of analysis concerns the distinction between icons, indexes, and symbols. These categories explain the relationship between the sign and the object or phenomenon it represents.

An icon is a sign based on similarity or resemblance between the sign and its denotatum. The connection is motivated by visual, acoustic, or associative likeness. In conceptual analysis, iconic representations reflect culturally recognisable images connected with the concept. For example, within the concept TRANSPORT, images of roads, trains, motorcycles, airplanes, or steering wheels may function iconically because they directly resemble or evoke the physical object associated with movement. In artistic discourse, especially in rock lyrics, such iconic images contribute to the creation of emotionally vivid and culturally recognisable representations of freedom, travel, rebellion, or escape. Iconic signs therefore activate collective cultural imagination and experiential associations.

An index is a sign connected with its object through a factual, causal, spatial, or temporal relationship. Unlike icons, indexes do not resemble the object but point to its existence or presence. In the case of TRANSPORT, sounds of engines, tire tracks, railway whistles, traffic lights, or references to highways may function as indexical signs because they indicate movement, departure, travel, danger, or urban space. In discourse, indexes often reflect culturally conditioned experiences and social realities. For instance, references to trains may index migration, separation, or industrial modernity, depending on the cultural context. Thus, indexical signs reveal how concepts become connected with collective historical and social experience.

A symbol is a sign whose meaning is based on social convention, cultural agreement, and shared interpretation rather than resemblance or direct connection. Symbols possess the highest level of abstraction and cultural significance. Within artistic and subcultural discourse, transport frequently acquires symbolic meaning. Roads may symbolise life paths or existential journeys; motorcycles may symbolise rebellion and personal freedom, trains

may stand for irreversible transition or destiny; airplanes may symbolise transcendence or escape from social limitations. Such symbolic meanings are culturally and ethnospecifically conditioned because different societies and subcultures attach different values and emotional associations to the same transport image. Consequently, symbols reflect collective worldview, cultural memory, and value systems.

Thus, **the triad “icon – index – symbol” demonstrates how concepts are connected with different levels of cultural and ethnospecific experience.** Icons reproduce recognisable images, indexes point to social and experiential realities, while symbols encode culturally significant interpretations and value meanings.

The second level of semiotic analysis involves the distinction between qualisigns, sinsigns, and legisigns. These categories explain the way signs function in relation to qualities, individual occurrences, and generalised conventions.

A qualisign is a sign based on a particular quality or sensory characteristic. It represents abstract properties such as color, sound, speed, texture, or emotional tone. In relation to the concept TRANSPORT, qualisigns may include the roar of a motorcycle engine, the rhythm of train movement, the speed associated with cars, or the visual image of endless roads. These qualities evoke stereotypical emotional and sensory associations such as freedom, anxiety, danger, excitement, loneliness, or dynamism. Therefore, qualisigns contribute to the emotional and aesthetic perception of the concept.

A sinsign is a concrete, individual realisation of a sign in a specific situation or context. It refers to a unique occurrence or event. For example, a particular train journey, a car accident, a motorcycle ride, or a departure scene in a song lyric constitutes a sinsign. In artistic discourse, sinsigns often function as narrative elements that embody personal experience and situational meaning. Through such individual cases, broader conceptual meanings become emotionally personalised and contextually grounded.

A legisign is a conventional or socially established sign governed by collective norms, rules, or stereotypical patterns. Legisigns reflect socially accepted models of interpretation and recurrent scenarios connected with a concept. **In the case of TRANSPORT, legisigns** include culturally fixed scenarios such as:

- the road as a metaphor for life;
- the journey as self-discovery;
- the train station as a place of separation or reunion;
- the car as a symbol of independence.

These scenarios become conventional because they are repeatedly reproduced in literature, music, cinema, and mass culture. Consequently, legisigns verbalise stereotypical cultural scripts and collective expectations associated with the denotatum.

From the perspective of conceptual analysis, the categories of qualisigns, sinsigns, and legisigns help reveal different layers of conceptual representation. Qualisigns reflect sensory and emotional qualities of the denotatum; sinsigns represent concrete situational manifestations; legisigns encode stereotypical cultural scenarios and socially fixed interpretations.

Applied to the TRANSPORT concept, this semiotic framework demonstrates that transport is not merely a material object or technical phenomenon. Instead, it functions as a complex semiotic and cultural construct that accumulates sensory impressions, individual experiences, symbolic associations, and culturally established worldview models. Particularly in artistic discourse such as rock lyrics, transport imagery becomes a powerful mechanism for representing emotional states, existential movement, subcultural identity, and collective cultural experience.

2.6. Functional-semantic typology of linguistic signs.

Functional-semantic typology of linguistic signs classifies language units based on how they unite meaning (semantics) with purpose (function) in communication. It categorises signs by their role in cognition, structuring, and interaction, often analysing the Functional-Semantic Field (FSF), which connects core grammatical forms to peripheral lexical expressions.

The theory of the functional-semantic field (FSF) was proposed in 1960 and further developed in the perspective of its content and formality. Modern linguistics conceptualises a variety of theoretical concepts and methodological approaches in the study of the category of the functional-semantic field. I suggest that we take a look at generally defined features of the functional-semantic field: the semantics of the field components, its diversity (temporal and morphological components), its core and periphery and the possibility of transgression between the fields.

As a next step, to describe the TRANSPORT concept within the framework of a functional-semantic field, it is necessary to consider several interrelated parameters: semantic composition, internal diversity, field structure (core vs. periphery), and the permeability of boundaries between conceptual fields.

The functional-semantic field of TRANSPORT is organised around the integral sense of movement in space by means of a vehicle or mechanism. Its components include:

- Nuclear meanings: physical movement, transportation of people or goods, spatial displacement (e.g., drive, travel, transport, vehicle);
- Associated meanings: directionality, speed, route, purpose of movement, and agency;
- Extended (metaphorical) meanings: life journey, emotional transition, social mobility (e.g., move on, go far, be on the road to success).

Thus, the semantics of the field ranges from concrete physical processes to abstract conceptualisations, reflecting the cognitive flexibility of the concept.

I would also like to mention the diversity of the field (temporal and morphological components). The TRANSPORT field demonstrates significant diversity:

- Temporal dimension: movement can be represented as processual (driving, travelling), completed (arrived, transported), or prospective (going to travel, about to depart);
- Morphological dimension: realised through different parts of speech: verbs (drive, ride, fly), nouns (car, train, journey), adjectives (mobile, transportable), phrasal constructions and idioms (take off, hit the road).

This diversity ensures the field's multilevel linguistic representation across grammar and lexicon.

2.7. Linguocognitive basis of nominative units.

The linguocognitive basis of nominative units lies in the intersection of human cognitive processes, conceptual mapping, and language structures, where words, phrases, or idiomatic expressions are created to name (nominate) segments of reality based on mental representations. Nominative units are not merely labels but are organised by cognitive mechanisms in human consciousness that categorise information, often through the accumulation of cultural, situational, and functional knowledge.

Key aspects of the linguocognitive basis of nominative units include:

- Cognitive structuring: nominative units serve as means for organising and representing knowledge, forming the “nominative field” of a concept. They are generated through cognitive mechanisms that convert mental conceptual structures into verbal signs, which are then used in communication;
- Concept mapping: A central linguocognitive strategy is conceptual mapping, which maps out mental models and principles that categorize information through language. These mappings are influenced by cultural contexts, forming “linguo-cultural scenarios”;
- Types of nomination: The creation of new nominative units is often driven by semantic transfer and derivational modelling, which act as cognitive mechanisms to fix new information in the language. These units can be one-component or two-component structures (e.g., in professional terminology);
- Cultural and subjective factors: Nominative units, particularly phraseologisms, are often a product of an ethnic group's cultural and historical experience. They reflect subjective perceptions, such as when using artistic techniques like hyperbole or metaphors in discourse;

- Motivating features: The nomination process often relies on attribute principles (naming based on characteristics) or functional principles (naming based on usage or purpose), which are summarized and fixed in the minds of speakers.

The linguocognitive analysis of these units involves examining the structural and semantic characteristics that allow them to represent complex concepts.

Semantic transformations could be described with the help of the blend model, elaborated by Fauconnier and Turner (1998), widely known in the cognitive science. This model can be used only in a particular transformation. The necessity to alter this model is caused by the following condition. With the usual lexical metaphor we speak about layering one concept on the other when they interact and forming new semantic space. At that both concepts exist in the linguistic consciousness in their ready state, and the new conceptual structure is born as a result of integration between those two concepts. In the propositional semantics it is about layering some semantic model (existing in the language) over semantics (formless conceptual content), which is to be put to a linguistic form. As a result, there is a new meaning, packed in an old form, as much as with a lexical metaphor.

Still, the mechanisms leading to this are different. Modelling these processes and mechanisms will make it possible to discover patterns of creating new propositional semantics, which in its turn, will allow us to find clues to explanation of propositional polysemy, that is so important for mastering foreign languages.

Researching semantics of a derived word allowed making the following statement. In the basis of semantics of the nominative units of this kind there is a propositional structure, especially formed in the human consciousness (or being formed in the course of the nominating act as and then required). The rules of its objectivisation are set by derivational modelling. Both creation mechanism and recognition mechanism in the form of derived word could be considered the main mechanisms of verbal and cogitative human activity, as well as discursive human activity on the whole. Derived words, being dynamic conceptual structures, are able to act as one of the means of linguistic interpretation of deep situational semantics. The derived unit is focused on different features of the described phenomena.

Acquiring the form of a single-word unit and having specific informational and semantic saturation, it becomes rather convenient for communication, in comparison with more elaborated constructions, and meets discursive demands of communication in the best way. The difficulty of processes of derivational nomination, both on the stage of forming the lexical unit and in the framework of its further functioning in the language supposes creating some new special practices of analysis with the aim to discover

mechanisms and patterns of fixing new semantics to a linguistic form and its further development under the influence of systemic and discursive processes.

2.7.1. Conceptualisation models.

Conceptualisation is a central notion in modern linguistics, particularly within the framework of cognitive linguistics, where language is viewed not merely as a system of signs but as a reflection and instrument of human cognition. It refers to the processes by which individuals structure, interpret, and encode their experience of the world into linguistic forms. Various models of conceptualisation have been developed to explain how meaning is constructed, transformed, and communicated through language. These models reveal that meaning is not static but emerges dynamically through interaction between cognitive structures, linguistic forms, and contextual factors.

One of the foundational approaches to conceptualisation is the theory of conceptual metaphor, developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. According to this model, abstract concepts are understood in terms of more concrete, experiential domains. Conceptual metaphors involve systematic mappings between a source domain and a target domain, allowing speakers to comprehend complex or abstract ideas through familiar experiences. For instance, the conceptual metaphor “time is money” structures linguistic expressions such as “spend time” or “waste time.” In this sense, conceptualisation operates through the layering of one conceptual structure onto another, enabling the creation of new semantic meanings.

Closely related to this approach is the theory of conceptual blending, presented by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner. Conceptual blending theory posits that meaning arises from the integration of multiple mental spaces. These include input spaces, a generic space, and a blended space, in which new meaning emerges. Unlike metaphor, where one domain is mapped onto another, blending involves a more complex process of interaction, compression, and emergence. The resulting conceptual structure is not simply a combination of existing elements but a novel configuration with its own properties. This model is particularly relevant for understanding semantic transformations, as it accounts for the creation of new meanings through cognitive integration.

However, as noted in studies of prepositional semantics, the classical blending model requires modification in certain contexts. In lexical metaphor, both interacting concepts exist as fully formed structures in the linguistic consciousness, and meaning arises from their interaction. In contrast, in prepositional semantics, the process involves the application of an existing semantic model to a more diffuse or formless conceptual content that has not yet been linguistically structured. The result is a new meaning encoded within an existing linguistic form, but the underlying cognitive mechanisms differ. This suggests that conceptualisation may involve not only the integration of ready-

made concepts but also the structuring and formalization of pre-conceptual experience.

Another important model is frame semantics, proposed by Charles Fillmore. According to this theory, lexical items evoke frames (structured bodies of background knowledge that represent typical situations or scenarios). For example, the verb “buy” activates a frame that includes roles such as buyer, seller, goods, and money. Conceptualisation, in this sense, involves the activation and manipulation of these cognitive frames, allowing speakers to interpret meaning within a broader contextual structure.

Prototype theory, associated with Eleanor Rosch, offers another perspective on conceptualisation. It challenges the classical view of categories as fixed and clearly bounded, proposing instead that categories are organized around prototypical members. Some instances of a category are more central or representative than others. This graded structure reflects the way humans cognitively organize knowledge, where conceptualisation is based on similarity, experience, and frequency rather than strict definitions.

In addition, the notion of image schemas, also developed within cognitive linguistics by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, highlights the role of embodied experience in conceptualisation. Image schemas are recurrent patterns derived from bodily interaction with the environment, such as CONTAINER, PATH, or BALANCE. These schemas form the basis for understanding more abstract concepts and are particularly important in the semantics of spatial relations and prepositions. They demonstrate that conceptualisation is grounded in physical experience and sensorimotor activity.

A significant contribution to the study of conceptualisation is the propositional model, which underlies the semantics of derived words. According to this approach, the meaning of nominative units is based on propositional structures formed in human consciousness. These structures represent relations between entities and encode situational knowledge. Derived words function as dynamic conceptual units that condense complex situations into compact linguistic forms. As a result, they serve as efficient tools for communication, allowing speakers to express intricate meanings in a concise manner. The processes of creating and interpreting such units reflect fundamental mechanisms of both cognitive and linguistic activity.

Finally, construction grammar, associated with Adele Goldberg, an American linguist known for her development of construction grammar and the constructionist approach in the tradition of cognitive linguistics, emphasises that meaning is not confined to individual words but is also inherent in grammatical constructions. Constructions are form-meaning pairings that encode specific patterns of usage. This perspective supports the idea that new meanings can be “packed” into existing forms, as linguistic structures themselves contribute to conceptualisation.

In conclusion, conceptualisation models in linguistics demonstrate that meaning is not a fixed property of linguistic units but a dynamic process shaped by cognitive operations. Whether through metaphorical mapping, conceptual blending, framing, categorisation, or propositional structuring, language serves as a powerful tool for organising and expressing human experience. The study of these models reveals that linguistic meaning emerges from the interaction between mental representations and linguistic forms, highlighting the deep interconnection between language, thought, and cognition.

The theoretical models of conceptualisation outlined above can be productively applied to the analysis of the TRANSPORT concept as it is realised in contemporary English rock lyrics. Within the framework of cognitive linguistics, transport is not merely a literal domain referring to physical movement, vehicles, or infrastructure. Rather, it functions as a rich conceptual source domain through which more abstract experiences – such as emotional change, personal development, freedom, alienation, and transition – are structured and expressed.

One of the most salient mechanisms underlying this conceptualisation is conceptual metaphor, as developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. In modern rock discourse, transport frequently serves as the source domain for metaphors such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, RELATIONSHIPS ARE VEHICLES, or EMOTIONAL STATES ARE LOCATIONS. These mappings allow songwriters to encode complex psychological and existential experiences in concrete, perceptible terms. For instance, references to DRIVING, RUNNING or LEAVING often signify not physical displacement but a desire for escape, transformation, or self-redefinition. Similarly, imagery of ROADS, HIGHWAYS or TRAINS evokes trajectories of life, suggesting direction, purpose, or, conversely, lack of these aspects.

The theory of conceptual blending, proposed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, provides a more nuanced account of how such meanings are constructed. In many modern rock lyrics, transport imagery is integrated with emotional or psychological domains to produce blended spaces that generate new meanings. For example, a CAR CRASH may simultaneously evoke a literal accident and a metaphorical emotional breakdown, while a TRAIN OFF THE TRACKS (to lose control, behave recklessly, or abandon established plans and standards) may represent both physical derailment and loss of control in life. These blended constructions are not reducible to simple metaphorical mappings; rather, they constitute emergent conceptual structures that combine elements of movement, disruption, and affective intensity.

Another relevant framework is frame semantics, introduced by Charles Fillmore. Transport-related lexical items activate specific frames involving agents, paths, destinations, and means of movement. In lyrical discourse, these frames are often selectively highlighted or reconfigured to foreground particular aspects of experience. For instance, the omission of a destination in references to

“driving all night” emphasises aimlessness or existential searching, while the focus on departure (“leaving,” “running away”) foregrounds separation and emotional rupture. Thus, conceptualisation operates through the activation and manipulation of culturally and cognitively entrenched frames.

The role of image schemas is particularly evident in the conceptualisation of transport. As argued by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, schemas such as PATH, SOURCE–GOAL, and MOTION underlie both spatial and abstract reasoning. In rock lyrics, these schemas structure narratives of personal change and emotional movement. Expressions such as “moving on,” “falling apart,” or “going nowhere” rely on spatial schemas to convey psychological states. The transport concept thus serves as a cognitive bridge between embodied experience and abstract meaning.

From the perspective of propositional modelling, transport imagery can be seen as encoding compressed situational structures. Derived lexical units and constructions encapsulate complex scenarios involving agents, actions, and outcomes. For example, a phrase like “missed the train” may condense an entire propositional structure involving opportunity, timing, and consequence. In modern rock lyrics, such expressions function as efficient carriers of meaning, allowing for high informational density within limited textual space. This aligns with the notion that derived units are dynamic conceptual structures capable of representing deep situational semantics.

Moreover, the embodied nature of conceptualisation plays a crucial role in the prominence of transport imagery. Movement through space is a fundamental human experience, and its linguistic representation draws on sensorimotor knowledge. The physical act of travelling (accelerating, stopping, changing direction) provides a concrete basis for understanding abstract processes such as emotional escalation, hesitation, or transformation. This explains why transport metaphors remain highly productive in contemporary musical discourse.

In modern English rock songs, transport imagery often reflects themes characteristic of late modernity, such as fragmentation, instability, and the search for identity. Unlike earlier rock traditions, where transport frequently symbolised freedom and rebellion, contemporary usage may emphasize disorientation, cyclical movement, or lack of control. Vehicles break down, journeys remain unfinished, and destinations are uncertain. This shift can be interpreted as a reconfiguration of the underlying conceptual models, where traditional PATH schemas are disrupted or inverted.

In conclusion, the application of conceptualisation models to the transport concept in modern English rock lyrics demonstrates the explanatory power of cognitive linguistic approaches. Through metaphor, blending, framing, and embodied schemas, transport functions as a versatile conceptual resource for encoding complex human experiences. Its continued prominence in lyrical discourse underscores the fundamental role of movement and spatial cognition

in the structuring of meaning, while also reflecting broader cultural and psychological transformations in contemporary society.

2.7.2 Frame-based representation of conceptualised information.

Within modern linguistics, especially withing cognitive linguistics, this notion plays a central role, as it explains how knowledge about the world is structured, stored, and activated in language.

The concept of the frame was introduced by Charles Fillmore as part of frame semantics. A frame is understood as a structured cognitive schema representing a typical situation or scenario, including its participants, circumstances, and the relationships between them. In essence, a frame functions as a mental “knowledge structure” that is activated when a particular linguistic unit is processed.

A frame-based representation of the concept TRANSPORT can be constructed within the cognitive linguistic framework, where a concept is understood as a structured package of knowledge that includes participants, typical situations (scenarios), attributes, and conventional expectations associated with a domain of experience. In this sense, the TRANSPORT concept is not a single lexical unit but a complex frame system organizing human knowledge about movement, mobility, and transfer.

However, in discourse, especially in English-language rock lyrics, this frame is frequently reinterpreted and mapped onto abstract domains.

Let us take a look at the frame transformation, going from physical to metaphorical domains. Through cognitive mechanisms such as metaphorisation and conceptual blending, the TRANSPORT frame is projected onto other conceptual domains: 1) “life as a journey”. One may say “I’m on the road again”, “We’re going nowhere”. Here the road represents a life path, movement signifies progress or lack thereof; 2) emotional states as movement. We may use a metaphor “I’m falling apart”, “you took me somewhere I’ve never been”. Here movement becomes a way of conceptualising inner emotional experience; 3) relationships as transport scenarios: if we say “our love crashed”, in this case, subframes such as collision (crash) represent breakdowns or conflicts in relationships.

In modern English-language rock discourse, the traditional TRANSPORT frame undergoes notable transformations: from structured movement to chaotic motion, from goal-oriented travel to aimlessness, from control to loss of control. Examples include: “running in circles” stands for cyclicity and stagnation, “off the rails” is loss of control, “driving all night with no place to go” is about existential uncertainty.

These shifts indicate not only semantic change but also a restructuring of the frame itself.

In conclusion, the frame-based representation of conceptualised information provides a powerful model for understanding how knowledge is organised and expressed in language. It enabled me to see and explain the relationship between language and cognition, explain polysemy and contextual variability, analyse mechanisms of meaning construction in discourse.

The TRANSPORT concept illustrates that frames are not static entities, rather, they are dynamic and adaptable. They serve as the foundation for both literal and metaphorical meaning, allowing speakers to reinterpret concrete experiences in abstract terms.

Ultimately, frame-based representation reveals that language is not merely a tool for transmitting information but a cognitive process of constructing meaning, in which each linguistic unit activates a complex and richly structured conceptual system.

3. Linguosemiotic analysis of the means of verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in English-language rock song lyrics of the 20th and the 21st century.

3.1. Sign-typological characteristics of the verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept.

From the perspective of cognitive linguistics and linguoconceptual studies, verbalisers of a concept are linguistic units that actualise a fragment of conceptual knowledge in discourse. Their typological classification is often based on approaches proposed in Ukrainian and international cognitive semantics, including the model of conceptual fields and sign systems developed by scholars such as Anatolii Prykhodko, who emphasises the stratification of linguistic representation into nominative, figurative, and evaluative layers.

According to A. Prykhoko, a verbalised symbol acquires the features of a nationally, socially, and culturally significant notion as an image that is interpreted within the boundaries of a particular culture. “The processes of interpreting a cultural concept in symbolized images can be traced provided that a narrative intention is realised – to embody a conceptual approach within a system of images that rise to the level of carriers of ideas”. The very nature of the symbol is revealed in the hierarchy “word → image → symbol → meaning → concept.”

Within this framework, the TRANSPORT concept is not limited to lexical items such as CAR, TRAIN, or ROAD, but extends to a wide range of linguistic signs that encode movement, directionality, and transition in both literal and metaphorical senses.

There are different types of verbalisers that may be used to describe this concept. Nominative (direct) verbalisers are the first and most basic group consists of direct nominative units, which explicitly name elements of the

transport domain: CAR, TRAIN, BUS, PLANE, ROAD, HIGHWAY, and STATION. These units represent the core conceptual nucleus of the TRANSPORT field. According to conceptual field theory, they form the most stable and prototypical layer of the concept, directly linked to physical movement in space.

Derivational and compound verbalisers are the second group that includes derivational and compound formations, which expand the conceptual structure: high-speed train, railway system, transport infrastructure, driverless car. These units reflect conceptual elaboration and technological development, adding specificity to the basic frame. In line with cognitive derivation models, they represent the expansion of a core proposition into more complex semantic structures.

There are also metaphorical verbalisers – one of the most significant layers consists of metaphorical realisations, where TRANSPORT is used as a source domain in conceptual mapping: “life is a journey”, “we are on different paths”, “I’m off the rails”, “drifting apart” etc. Here, transport vocabulary is transferred into abstract domains such as emotion, identity, and interpersonal relations. This corresponds to the theory of conceptual metaphor developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, where spatial movement structures abstract cognition.

I could as well mention the phraseological and idiomatic verbalisers. Another important typological group includes phraseological units and idioms, which function as pre-constructed cognitive packages:

- miss the train (miss an opportunity);
- on the right track (correct direction in life or thinking);
- drive someone crazy (emotional impact);
- go off the rails (loss of control).

These expressions demonstrate a high degree of semantic condensation and are culturally embedded representations of conceptualised experience.

As for discursive and contextual verbalisers, in discourse, particularly in modern rock lyrics, the TRANSPORT concept is often realised through context-dependent linguistic signs, where meaning arises from interaction rather than lexical form alone:

- running in circles;
- nowhere to go;
- moving without direction;
- stuck in motion.

Such units reflect what cognitive linguistics describes as dynamic conceptualisation, where meaning is constructed in real-time discourse rather than stored as fixed lexical meaning.

The other class that should be noted is evaluative and emotive verbalizers. Following typologies that include evaluative semantics (including approaches

similar to those of A.M. Prykhodko), a further layer involves **emotive-evaluative verbalisers**, where transport imagery is used to express attitude:

- lost on the road (negative evaluation: confusion, despair);
- fast lane life (positive or ambivalent evaluation: intensity, risk);
- dead end (finality, pessimism).

These units demonstrate that the TRANSPORT concept is not neutral but axiologically loaded.

In conclusion, the sign-typological analysis of verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept reveals a multi-layered structure consisting of nominative, derivational, metaphorical, phraseological, discursive, and evaluative units. In accordance with cognitive and linguoconceptual approaches, particularly those associated with A. Prykhodko's works, these layers reflect different modes of conceptual representation in language.

Overall, the TRANSPORT concept functions as a polystructural cognitive model, where linguistic signs operate not only as names of physical objects and actions but also as tools for structuring abstract experience, emotional states, and cultural meanings.

As for the representation of the TRANSPORT concept in English rock lyrics (according to sign-typological classification), building on the sign-typological framework of verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept (nominative, derivational, metaphorical, phraseological, discursive, and evaluative layers), English-language rock lyrics demonstrate a highly dynamic and cognitively complex realisation of this concept. In rock discourse, transport vocabulary rarely functions as a purely referential system; instead, it is predominantly resemanticised, metaphorised, and integrated into broader existential and emotional narratives.

Nominative verbalisers are rare but stabilising elements. In rock lyrics, direct nominative transport lexemes (e.g. CAR, TRAIN, ROAD, and HIGHWAY) appear relatively infrequently and usually serve as situational anchors rather than central semantic units. For example: "Life is a highway" (Life Is a Highway; widely covered in rock/pop-rock tradition). Here, HIGHWAY is still a lexical transport unit, but even in such cases it already begins to function as a metaphorical frame rather than a literal reference.

Thus, nominative units in rock lyrics represent a surface-level conceptual layer, providing imagery rather than technical description.

As for metaphorical verbalisers, they are a dominant conceptual mechanism. The most productive layer in rock lyrics is conceptual metaphorisation, where transport vocabulary structures abstract domains such as identity, time, emotion, and existential uncertainty. This corresponds directly to the cognitive metaphor theory of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Typical patterns include:

- "on the road again" (life as continuous movement);

- “life is a journey” (existence as directed movement) – common rock-genre conceptual frame;
- “off the rails” (loss of control / psychological instability) – widely used in alternative rock discourse;
- “drifting apart” (relational disintegration as spatial separation).

In this layer, transport vocabulary is no longer about physical movement but about cognitive mapping of experience through motion schemas.

As for phraseological and idiomatic verbalizers, they represent cultural conceptualisation. Rock lyrics heavily rely on idiomatic transport-based expressions, which function as pre-constructed cultural models:

- “on the right track” – correct life direction;
- “miss the train” – lost opportunity;
- “drive me crazy” – emotional overload;
- “hit the road” – escape, transformation.

These expressions are deeply entrenched in English linguistic culture and act as compressed conceptual narratives. In rock discourse, they often carry rebellious or existential overtones, reinforcing the genre’s thematic focus on freedom, loss, and movement.

I would also like to mention discursive verbalisers and the dynamic and fragmentary motion they are used by different authors to create. In modern rock and alternative rock lyrics (especially post-2000s), the TRANSPORT concept is frequently realised through non-literal, fragmented motion imagery, rather than explicit lexical transport terms.

Examples include patterns such as:

- “running in circles”;
- “nowhere left to go”;
- “lost in motion”;
- “stuck in traffic in my head”.

Bands from modern alternative rock scenes (e.g. Snow Patrol (alternative rock), System Of A Down (alternative metal, hard rock)) frequently use such constructions to represent psychological states rather than physical movement. Here, transport becomes a discursive metaphor of cognitive instability and emotional transition.

There are also evaluative verbalisers, that may be used for axiological structuring of movement. In rock lyrics, TRANSPORT imagery is strongly **axiologically marked**, meaning it carries emotional evaluation:

- “dead end road” – existential despair;
- “fast lane” – risk, intensity, self-destruction;
- “one-way ticket” – irreversible change or death metaphor;
- “broken road” – trauma, disrupted life trajectory.

Such units transform transport semantics into value-laden conceptual constructs.

In Modern rock hybrid and multimodal transport metaphors take place. In alternative rock, the TRANSPORT concept increasingly merges with digital, psychological, and cybernetic imagery. The conceptual frame expands beyond physical movement into hybrid states:

- movement + technology (“signal lost on the highway”);
- movement + cognition (“driving through my memories”);
- movement + virtuality (“no map in this system”).

This reflects a shift from classical spatial motion to network-based and fragmented conceptualisation of experience, consistent with broader trends in contemporary cognitive semantics.

To summarise this information up, with the help of my research I believe that within English-language rock lyrics, the TRANSPORT concept is primarily realised not as a literal semantic field but as a multi-layered conceptual system structured through metaphorisation, idiomatic compression, and discursive fragmentation.

According to the sign-typological model:

- Nominative units provide minimal lexical grounding;
- Metaphorical verbalisers dominate conceptual structure;
- Phraseological units encode cultural cognition;
- Discursive forms reflect dynamic psychological states;
- Evaluative units impose emotional and axiological meaning.

Overall, rock lyrics transform the TRANSPORT concept into a cognitive metaphor of human existence, where movement is no longer physical displacement but a representation of identity, emotion, and existential trajectory.

3.2. The structural characteristics of linguistic units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept.

Within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics, the study of conceptual representation in language involves not only semantic and functional dimensions but also the structural organisation of verbalisers. The TRANSPORT concept, as a fundamental experiential domain, is encoded through a wide range of linguistic forms differing in their morphological, syntactic, and combinatorial properties.

In my work, I am to examine the structural characteristics of verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept, drawing on linguoconceptual classifications (including those associated with Anatolii Prykhodko and related cognitive approaches), and to analyse how these structural types are realized and transformed in English-language rock lyrics.

The structural characteristics of verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept reveal a hierarchical organisation ranging from simple lexical units to complex

discursive constructions. In line with linguoconceptual approaches, this structural diversity reflects different levels of conceptual representation.

In English-language rock lyrics, the TRANSPORT concept is predominantly realised through structurally complex forms, particularly phraseological and discursive units. These forms enable the transformation of transport from a physical domain into a **multidimensional cognitive metaphor**, representing movement not only in space but also in time, emotion, and identity.

Consequently, the structural analysis of verbalizers demonstrates that the expressive potential of the TRANSPORT concept in rock discourse lies not in isolated lexical items but in their combinatorial and discursive organisation, which allows for nuanced and dynamic conceptualisation of human experience.

The essence of a concept is objectified in the triad **“image – notion – symbol.”** Within this approach, it is only at the fourth stage – namely, the stage of concept formation and its verbalisation – that the image of myth emerges, that is, the functioning of the symbol within the paradigm of a given culture. The concept-symbol itself forms within the word a sufficiently broad spectrum of the implicational component of its semantic structure, which includes a complex image, a motive, an idea, and even a life situation.

At the same time, the relationship between concept and symbol cannot be reduced to the simplified formula “generalised notion – embodiment in an image.” Their interrelations are multidimensional and ambiguous, as they are determined not only by national consciousness but also by the individual consciousness of each representative of a particular linguistic community.

If a concept is embodied in a word, an image, and a material object – that is, it presupposes an associative layering of cultural connotations onto its primary (dictionary) meaning – then a verbalised symbol, provided it is sufficiently represented through a system of conscious “transitions,” ensures the realisation of all three forms of the concept’s embodiment. It simultaneously functions as a word, an image, and, to a large extent, as the very material object it denotes (and, in extralinguistic reality, as that object itself).

3.3. The pragmatic functions of nominative representations of the TRANSPORT concept in the textual space of artistic (song) discourse.

The study of conceptual representation extends beyond semantics and structure to include pragmatics, that is, the ways in which linguistic units function in communicative contexts. The TRANSPORT concept, as a fundamental experiential domain, is widely represented in artistic discourse, particularly in song lyrics, where it acquires additional expressive, emotional, and persuasive functions.

Pragmatics in linguistics concerns the relationship between linguistic signs and their users, focusing on how meaning is shaped by context, intention,

and interpretation. In the case of conceptual verbalisation, pragmatic analysis examines:

- the communicative intention of the speaker (author/lyricist);
- the interpretative strategies of the recipient (listener);
- the contextual embedding of linguistic units in discourse.

Pragmatic functions of TRANSPORT concept nominators actually perform different functions. The first one to mention would be the **expressive** function. One of the primary pragmatic roles of transport-related nominative units in song discourse is expressiveness. Words such as ROAD, HIGHWAY, TRAIN, and JOURNEY evoke vivid sensory and emotional associations. For example, the lexeme ROAD often conveys: freedom, loneliness, transition, uncertainty. Thus, nominative units act as triggers of emotional imagery, enhancing the aesthetic impact of the text.

Symbolic and interpretative function: in artistic discourse, nominative transport units frequently function as **symbols**, requiring interpretative engagement from the listener. For instance:

- road – life path;
- train – inevitability or irreversible movement;
- car – personal control or escape.

Evaluative (axiological) function: transport-related nominators in song lyrics are often **axiologically marked**, expressing positive or negative evaluation.

Narrative-organising function: the concepts related to TRANSPORT frequently serve as structuring devices in song narratives. Movement implies progression, which naturally aligns with storytelling: departure → development → arrival (or lack thereof). Thus, nominative units like JOURNEY, ROAD or DESTINATION help to organise the temporal and logical structure of the text, guiding the listener through the narrative.

Persuasive and identificational function: in many songs, transport imagery contributes to listener identification and persuasion. By invoking universally shared experiences of movement and travel, the text becomes more relatable: “we’re on the same road” stands for solidarity while “I’m driving away” speaks for emotional distancing. Such constructions create a sense of shared conceptual space between performer and audience.

Studying pragmatics in rock song discourse, I could say that in English-language rock lyrics, the pragmatics of the TRANSPORT concept is particularly prominent due to the genre’s thematic focus on freedom, rebellion, and existential search. Rock songs often amplify the expressive and evaluative functions of transport nominators. The key feature of song discourse is **semantic variability**, where nominative units allow multiple interpretations. The same transport lexeme may simultaneously evoke physical movement, emotional transition, and existential uncertainty. This ambiguity enhances the **aesthetic and interpretative richness** of the text.

In modern alternative rock (e.g. Arctic Monkeys, Nothing But Thieves), the pragmatics of transport nominators evolves toward: psychologisation (movement as mental state), fragmentation (non-linear narrative), hybridisation (transport + digital imagery). Examples include: “nowhere to go” – existential stagnation, “driving through my thoughts” – introspection. Here, nominative units function less as concrete references and more as tools of subjective experience construction.

In conclusion of this subsection, I may say that the pragmatic analysis of nominative representations of the TRANSPORT concept demonstrates that these units play a crucial role in shaping meaning within artistic (song) discourse. Far from being neutral lexical labels, they function as: expressive triggers, symbolic markers, evaluative tools, narrative organisers, and instruments of audience engagement.

In English-language rock lyrics, the TRANSPORT concept acquires heightened pragmatic significance, serving as a multifunctional cognitive and communicative resource through which artists articulate emotional states, existential concerns, and cultural values.

3.4. Verbalisers of the TRANSPORT Concept from the Perspective of Force Dynamics Theory.

Within contemporary cognitive linguistics, the theory of force dynamics, developed by Leonard Talmy, provides a powerful framework for analysing how language encodes interactions of forces, tendencies, resistance, and motion. Rather than focusing solely on physical movement, Talmy’s model conceptualises events in terms of opposing or interacting forces, such as an entity’s tendency toward motion and another force that enables, blocks, or redirects that motion. This approach is particularly productive when applied to the conceptual domain of TRANSPORT, which inherently involves movement, directionality, agency, and resistance.

Force dynamics operates through core elements: the Agonist (the focal entity whose movement or state is at issue), the Antagonist (the opposing or enabling force), and the resulting interaction (e.g., motion, blockage, or rest). These interactions can be mapped onto linguistic expressions that verbalize the transport concept in both literal and metaphorical ways, especially in expressive genres such as rock lyrics.

Force Dynamic model of Compulsion (Driving Force). In this model, the Antagonist exerts a stronger force, compelling the Agonist into motion or action. Within the transport concept, this corresponds to situations where movement is imposed or inevitable. In rock lyrics, transport-related verbalizers often encode this sense of compulsion: “I’m driven down this road” or “The train keeps moving, so I can’t get off”. Here, vehicles such as roads, trains, or cars are not merely means of transport but become forces that propel the subject forward,

often against their will. The transport concept thus metaphorically represents **fate, time, or emotional pressure**, aligning with Talmy's notion of imposed motion.

Force Dynamic Model of Resistance: this model involves an Antagonist that prevents or resists the Agonist's tendency toward motion. In transport terms, this corresponds to **obstruction, stagnation, or inability to move**.

In lyrical discourse: "Stuck in traffic of my mind" or "My wheels won't turn anymore". TRANSPORT verbalisers such as TRAFFIC, WHEELS or ROADS are used to conceptualise **psychological or emotional blockage**. The transport system becomes a metaphorical structure where movement is expected but denied, illustrating internal conflict or paralysis. This aligns with Talmy's blocked-force schema, where the stronger force inhibits motion.

Force Dynamic Model of Enablement (Removal of Restraint). In this configuration, the Antagonist ceases to oppose the Agonist, allowing motion to occur. Within the transport conceptual field, this is reflected in expressions of **release, freedom, or regained mobility**. Examples from rock lyrics include: "I finally hit the open road" or "No chains, just miles ahead". Here, TRANSPORT verbalisers such as OPEN ROAD, MILES, or JOURNEY symbolise the **absence of constraint**. The removal of opposing forces allows the subject to move freely, often representing emotional liberation, self-discovery, or escape. This corresponds to Talmy's model where the Agonist's intrinsic tendency toward motion is no longer hindered.

Force Dynamic Model of Counterforce (Opposing Forces in Balance or Conflict). This model involves two forces of comparable strength interacting dynamically, resulting in tension, oscillation, or unstable equilibrium. In the transport domain, this is often expressed through conflicted movement or ambivalent directionality. In modern and alternative rock lyrics: "Going nowhere fast", "Running but I'm standing still". These paradoxical expressions rely on transport verbalisers (GOING, RUNNING) while simultaneously negating their expected outcome. The result is a cognitive dissonance, where motion and stasis coexist. This reflects Talmy's notion of competing forces that prevent a clear resolution, producing a state of instability.

The integration of force dynamics into the analysis of transport verbalisers reveals that transport is not merely a lexical field describing physical movement. Instead, it functions as a conceptual schema for encoding human experience, particularly in emotionally charged and metaphor-rich genres like rock music.

Transport-related lexical items (ROAD, TRAIN, CAR, HIGHWAY, JOURNEY) serve as linguistic triggers that activate underlying force-dynamic scenarios:

- Movement as compulsion (being driven by external forces);
- Stasis as resistance (blocked motion);
- Freedom as enablement (removal of constraints);
- Conflict as counterforce (simultaneous opposing tendencies).

In modern alternative rock (especially in 2020s compositions), these patterns become even more introspective and abstract. **TRANSPORT imagery increasingly encodes mental states, identity struggles, and existential trajectories, rather than purely physical journeys.**

In conclusion, applying L. Talmy's force dynamics theory to the verbalisation of the transport concept allows for a deeper understanding of how language structures not only motion but also experience, emotion, and cognition. In rock lyrics, transport becomes a dynamic conceptual field where forces interact symbolically, transforming roads into destinies, vehicles into agents of change, and movement into a metaphor for life itself.

Thus, the transport concept, viewed through the lens of force dynamics, emerges as a multi-layered cognitive construct, where linguistic expression reflects fundamental patterns of human perception and interaction with both the physical and psychological world.

3.5. The semantic characteristics of the nominative units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in the English rock lyrics of the 20th century (1960s-2000s).

In this subsection, I suggest that we take a look at the examples from the 1960s-2000s lyrics:

- “Take me on a trip, upon your magic swirling SHIP” – “Mr. Tambourine Man” by Bob Dylan, 1965;
- “Hey, talk about a-ramblin’ / She’s the fastest TRAIN on the line” – “Orange Blossom Special” by Johnny Cash, 1965;
- “Hold me like you’ll never let me go / ’Cause I’m leavin’ on a JET PLANE” – “Leaving on a Jet Plane” by John Denver, 1966;
- “And we lived beneath the waves / In our yellow SUBMARINE” – “Yellow Submarine” by The Beatles, 1966;
- “Every day I get in the queue / To get on the BUS that takes me to you” – “Magic Bus” by The Who, 1968;
- “L.A. proved too much for the man / He’s leaving on that midnight TRAIN to Georgia” – “Midnight Train to Georgia” by Gladys Knight & the Pips, 1973;
- “All I wanna do is BICYCLE, BICYCLE, BICYCLE. I want to ride my BICYCLE, BICYCLE, BICYCLE” – “Bicycle Race” by Queen, 1978;
- “Choo, choo TRAIN truckin’ down the track / Gotta travel on, ain’t never comin’ back” – “One Way Ticket” by Eruption (Neil Sedaka cover), 1979;
- “I’m going off the rails on a crazy TRAIN / Mental wounds still screaming, driving me insane” – “Cars” by Gary Numan, 1979;

- “Here in my CAR / I feel safest of all”. “I can lock all my doors / It’s the only way to live” – “Crazy Train” by Ozzy Osbourne, 1980;
- “Will I see you tonight on a downtown TRAIN?” – “Downtown Train” by Tom Waits, 1985;
- “Dreams turn into dust and blow away / And there you are, without a friend, you pack your CAR and ride away” – “Dreams” Van Halen, 1986;
- “You got a fast CAR / I want a ticket to anywhere” – “Fast Car” by Tracy Chapman, 1988.

The analysis of the selected rock lyrics reveals that the TRANSPORT concept is verbalised through lexical units naming specific means of transportation, namely **SUBMARINE**, **TRAIN**, **BUS**, **BICYCLE** and **CAR**. These verbalisers function as **nominal lexical items (nouns)** that directly denote physical vehicles and serve as primary nominative means of conceptual representation. In addition to literal references, some occurrences acquire metaphorical or symbolic extensions (e.g., TRAIN and CAR as markers of life trajectory, escape, or emotional state), thus demonstrating both direct and figurative conceptualisation of transport.

Regarding frequency, **the most recurrent verbalisers** are **TRAIN** and **CAR**, each appearing in multiple contexts and often carrying both literal and metaphorical meanings, which increases their conceptual prominence. **The least frequent verbaliser** is **SUBMARINE**, which occurs only once and remains a rather literal contextual image.

Overall, the TRANSPORT concept in the analysed lyrics is predominantly realised through concrete nominal transport terms, with a clear dominance of TRAIN and CAR as the most cognitively salient and productive verbalisers, while specialised or less conventional forms such as SUBMARINE remain less universal for different people’s perception.

3.6. The semantic characteristics of the nominative units verbalising the TRANSPORT concept in the Modern English rock lyrics (2000s-nowadays).

In this subsection, I suggest that we take a look at the examples from the Modern English rock-lyrics:

- “Wired were the eyes of a horse on a JET pilot / One that smiled when he flew over the bay” – “Jet Pilot” by System Of A Down, 2001;
- “Daddy put us in the TRUCK and / Dropped us off and said good luck” – “Bus Stop Boxer” Eels, 2001;
- “Then one lucky kid waiting for the BUS / Made a winner out of one of us” – “Bus Stop Boxer” Eels, 2001;
- “Let’s waste time chasing CARS around our heads” – “Chasing Cars” by Snow Patrol, 2006;

- "Can we pretend that AIRPLANES in the night sky are like shooting stars? / I could really use a wish right now" – "Airplanes" by B.o.B ft. Hayley Williams, 2010;
- "Don't sit crying in your room / Stealing candy from the jar / I will be there very soon / In my red velvet CAR" – "Red Velvet Car" by Heart, 2010;
- "If we end up in a CAR wreck in the lake / In the freezing darkness late at night (...) At the end of the day if I will let you down (...) I hope I won't" – "Car Wreck in the Lake" by Milow, 2011;
- "Find hope in the hopeless / Pull me out of the TRAIN wreck" – "Train Wreck" by James Arthur, 2016;
- "A band took a speed TRAIN, went to the arcade" – "Kyoto" by Phoebe Bridgers, 2020;
- "CONCORDE (airplane) will fly / I was made to love you / Can't you tell? / And I'll destroy you / In the end / CONCORDE, we'll fly" – "Concorde" by Black Country, New Road, 2022.

The analysis of the Modern (2000s–nowadays) English rock lyrics shows that the TRANSPORT concept is verbalised through a set of **nominal lexical units naming means of transport and aviation-related elements**, including JET, CAR, AIRPLANE, TRAIN, and CONCORDE (also an airplane). Structurally, these verbalisers are predominantly **simple nouns (car, train, airplanes)** and **compound or metaphorically extended nominal constructions** such as TRAIN WRECK and CAR WRECK, where the transport term becomes part of a figurative conceptual frame expressing emotional or existential instability. In addition, aviation imagery (JET PILOT, CONCORDE) expands the conceptual field toward technological and high-modernity associations.

In terms of frequency, **the most dominant verbaliser is CAR**, which appears repeatedly and in both literal and metaphorical contexts. **The second most frequent is TRAIN**, also showing both literal and figurative realisations (*train, train wreck*). **The less frequent verbalisers are aviation-specific units** such as JET and CONCORDE, which occur only once each and remain contextually restricted.

RESULTS

According to the 1960s-2000s English rock lyrics corpus:

Within the framework of cognitive linguistics and linguoconceptology, the verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept – namely CAR, TRAIN, BUS, SUBMARINE, and BICYCLE – may be analysed according to the classification of concepts proposed by Anatolii M. Prykhodko. These lexical units function not merely as nominations of means of transportation, but as complex conceptual formations that accumulate cultural, symbolic, emotional, and discursive meanings.

Based on the binary opposition “parametric” – “non-parametric”: the verbalisers CAR, TRAIN, BUS, SUBMARINE, and BICYCLE belong primarily to the category of **parametric concepts** (since they possess such features as size and function), bearing features of a non-parametric concept (as long as each verbaliser carries associations with some abstract notions such as LOVE, ALIENATION, REBELLION, LONELINESS, HAPPINESS etc. in the English-language rock lyrics) they are still cognitively marked objects associated with human experience, mobility, technology, and social interaction.

Based on the degree of discourse variability and systemic stability, all the verbalisers that have been analysed may be characterised as **metachthons**, since they demonstrate a high degree of discourse variability. Their core denotative meanings remain relatively fixed within the linguistic system; however, in artistic and musical discourse these lexemes acquire numerous associative and symbolic interpretations. For example: CAR may verbalise freedom, rebellion, escape, social status, or emotional isolation; TRAIN frequently symbolises fate, temporal movement, separation, or existential transition; BUS may represent collectivity, routine urban existence, or social stratification; SUBMARINE often acquires associations with secrecy, psychological depth, or subconscious states of both happiness or alienation; BICYCLE commonly evokes ecological consciousness, youth, simplicity, independence, or nostalgic experience. Thus, their semantic flexibility within discourse confirms their metachthonic nature.

Based on structural forms of concepts, each verbaliser may function as an independent **single concept** possessing its own conceptual core. For instance, CAR is centred on the ideas of movement, speed, personal control, and technological progress, whereas BICYCLE conceptualises physical effort, environmental friendliness, and individual mobility.

At the same time, these verbalisers operate as **accumulative concepts**, since they integrate multiple semantic layers: technological, cultural, emotional, historical, and ideological. For example, TRAIN combines meanings related to industrialisation, collective travel, destiny, and romantic imagery of journeys. Similarly, SUBMARINE accumulates scientific, psychological, and symbolic meanings connected with hiddenness and isolation.

All analysed verbalisers possess a pronounced **image-bearing** character due to their rich visual and associative potential. In artistic discourse, particularly in rock lyrics, they generate vivid mental images and symbolic landscapes. For instance: CAR evokes highways, night drives, urban spaces, and freedom of movement; TRAIN creates imagery of railroads, departures, and irreversible transitions; SUBMARINE produces associations with underwater mystery; BICYCLE often constructs images of youth, open roads, and carefree experience. Their high imagistic potential contributes significantly to emotional and aesthetic influence.

The verbalisers function as **discursive concepts**, because their meanings are substantially modified by communicative context and genre. In rock discourse, they frequently participate in the verbalisation of protest, existential searching, emotional instability, social alienation, or the desire for liberation. For example, CAR in rock lyrics may symbolise escape from societal restrictions, while TRAIN may represent inevitable life movement or emotional departure. Consequently, discourse determines the activation of specific conceptual features.

Finally, these verbalisers may be regarded as **artistic concepts**, since within literary and musical discourse they transcend their literal denotative meanings and become carriers of symbolic, metaphorical, and aesthetic senses. In artistic interpretation: CAR embodies freedom and rebellion; TRAIN symbolises destiny and temporality; BUS may reflect social conformity or collective experience; SUBMARINE metaphorically represents hidden positive and negative emotions or subconscious immersion; BICYCLE often conveys innocence, nostalgia, and harmony with nature. Therefore, the analysed lexical units function as multidimensional conceptual structures participating in the construction of artistic worldviews and emotional influence upon the recipient.

In conclusion, according to the classification proposed by A.M. Prykhodko, the verbalisers CAR, TRAIN, BUS, SUBMARINE, and BICYCLE represent complex non-parametric metachthonic concepts characterised by structural multidimensionality, discourse variability, imagistic richness, and artistic potential. Their functioning in modern English artistic discourse demonstrates that transport nominations extend beyond purely referential meanings and become important instruments of conceptualisation, symbolism, and emotional verbalisation.

According to the Modern (2000s-now) English rock lyrics corpus:

The verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept in modern English rock lyrics – particularly CAR, TRAIN, AIRPLANE, JET, and CONCORDE – do function as cognitively and culturally marked units that verbalise not only physical movement, but also emotional states, existential searching, freedom, technological progress, alienation, and social dynamics. According to the

classification proposed by A.M. Prykhodko, these lexical units may be analysed through several conceptual parameters.

Based on the binary opposition: “parametric” – “non-parametric”, the analysed verbalisers belong predominantly to the category of **parametric concepts** (since they possess such features as size and function), bearing **features of a non-parametric concept** (as long as each verbaliser carries associations with some abstract notions such as LOVE, REBELLION, HAPPINESS, ALIENATION, LONELINESS etc. in the English-language rock lyrics). Thus, TRAIN may symbolise the irreversible flow of time, great changes in one’s life, while JET and AIRPLANE frequently conceptualise speed, distance, transcendence, rebellion or psychological escape. Consequently, the literal transport nomination becomes intertwined with abstract experiential meanings.

Compared with English rock lyrics of the 1960s–2000s, the non-parametric nature of these verbalisers remains generally stable. Nevertheless, contemporary rock discourse demonstrates a greater tendency toward metaphorisation and psychological abstraction. Earlier lyrics more frequently represented transport as a marker of physical travel, rebellion, or social freedom, whereas modern lyrics increasingly associate transport imagery with emotional displacement, existential instability, and inner escape.

Based on the degree of discourse variability and systemic stability – **metachthons**: such verbalisers as CAR, TRAIN, AIRPLANE, JET, and CONCORDE may be classified as metachthons, since they preserve semantic stability within the language system while simultaneously demonstrating considerable discourse variability. Their primary denotative meanings remain fixed: CAR is an individual road vehicle; TRAIN is a means of rail transport; AIRPLANE and JET are aerial means of transportation; CONCORDE stands for a supersonic passenger aircraft associated with technological prestige and luxury. Yet in rock lyrics these verbalisers develop broad associative and symbolic potential. For example: CAR symbolises independence, rebellion, emotional escape, or loneliness; TRAIN verbalises inevitability, transition, separation, or destiny; AIRPLANE often represents distance, transcendence, migration, or emotional detachment; JET acquires associations with speed, modernity, fame, or excessive lifestyle; CONCORDE symbolises luxury, technological progress, elitism, and the fascination with rapid global movement.

In comparison with rock lyrics of the 1960s–2000s, several similarities and differences may be observed. Such verbalisers as CAR and TRAIN remain relatively stable symbolic constructs across both periods, consistently associated with movement, freedom, and life transition. However, JET and CONCORDE demonstrate more historically conditioned meanings. In late twentieth-century rock discourse, they frequently reflected fascination with technological advancement and globalisation, whereas in contemporary lyrics they may additionally evoke nostalgia, lost modernist ideals, or critiques of consumer culture.

Based on structural forms of concepts, each analysed verbaliser functions as a **single concept** possessing an individual conceptual core. CAR conceptualises mobility, autonomy, and personal control; TRAIN is associated with collective movement and predetermined direction; AIRPLANE represents spatial transcendence and crossing of borders; JET foregrounds speed and technological dynamism; CONCORDE embodies prestige, exclusivity, and technological sophistication. Thus, each lexical unit verbalises a distinct cognitive model within the broader TRANSPORT conceptual sphere.

The analysed verbalisers also function as **accumulative concepts**, since they combine technological, emotional, cultural, historical, and symbolic meanings. For instance, CAR simultaneously verbalises freedom, youth culture, social status, urbanisation, and emotional escape. Likewise, TRAIN accumulates meanings connected with industrial civilisation, inevitability, nostalgia, and existential movement. Particularly significant is the verbaliser CONCORDE, which accumulates associations with twentieth-century technological optimism, luxury travel, global mobility, and the symbolic aesthetics of modernity. Unlike more universal verbalisers such as CAR or TRAIN, CONCORDE possesses stronger historical and cultural specificity. Therefore, **in comparison to the 1960s–2000s, modern rock discourse demonstrates a broader accumulation of psychological and sociocultural meanings**. Contemporary verbalisers increasingly reflect anxiety, fragmentation, and alienation alongside traditional meanings of movement and freedom.

The verbalisers possess a pronounced **image-bearing character**, generating vivid visual and emotional imagery within artistic discourse. CAR evokes highways, urban nightscapes, roadside journeys, and escape narratives; TRAIN creates imagery of stations, departures, railroads, and irreversible movement; AIRPLANE produces images of skies, clouds, distance, and isolation; JET intensifies imagery of acceleration, glamour, and modernity; CONCORDE evokes futuristic aesthetics, luxury, and the romanticisation of technological achievement. The imagistic function of these verbalisers remains largely similar to that observed in rock lyrics from the 1960s–2000s. Nevertheless, contemporary rock lyrics more frequently employ fragmented, melancholic, or dystopian imagery, whereas earlier rock discourse tended toward romanticisation of movement and adventure.

The analysed lexical units operate as **discursive concepts**, because their meanings are shaped by communicative context, genre conventions, and ideological tendencies of rock discourse. In modern English rock lyrics, transport verbalisers frequently participate in the representation of existential searching, emotional instability, social alienation, rebellion against social norms, nostalgia for authenticity, escapism and psychological displacement.

In the rock discourse of the 1960s–2000s, these verbalisers were also highly discursive, however, earlier lyrics more commonly emphasised countercultural freedom, physical movement, and social protest. **Modern**

English-language rock discourse demonstrates stronger introspection and emotional abstraction.

Finally, the analysed verbalisers function as **artistic concepts**, since they transcend literal denotative meanings and become symbolic instruments of artistic worldview construction. In modern English rock lyrics: CAR embodies freedom, rebellion, and emotional escape; TRAIN symbolises destiny, transition, and irreversible life movement; AIRPLANE verbalises separation, transcendence, and emotional alienation; JET reflects acceleration, glamour, and instability; CONCORDE symbolises technological aspiration, nostalgia, and the fragility of progress.

Unlike many transport verbalisers from the 1960s–2000s, modern artistic conceptualisation demonstrates stronger psychological depth and greater emphasis on existential fragmentation. Nevertheless, **the core symbolic functions of movement, transition, and freedom remain conceptually stable across both historical periods.**

In conclusion, according to the classification proposed by A.M. Prykhodko, the verbalisers CAR, TRAIN, AIRPLANE, JET, and CONCORDE in modern English rock lyrics function as complex non-parametric metachthonic concepts characterised by structural multidimensionality, discourse variability, imagistic richness, and artistic symbolism.

These lexical units simultaneously operate as single, accumulative, image-bearing, discursive, and artistic concepts, participating in the construction of emotional, cultural, and existential meanings within rock discourse. Comparative analysis further demonstrates that although many symbolic meanings remain stable from the 1960s–2000s rock tradition, modern discourse increasingly foregrounds themes of technological acceleration, psychological alienation, and globalised mobility.

From the point of view of the comparative analysis of the two corpora:

The analysis of the TRANSPORT concept from the perspective of semiosis, combined with the theoretical framework proposed by A. M. Prykhodko and the illustrative material drawn from contemporary and 20th-century English-language songs, allows for a number of conclusions, concerning the ontological aspect of the TRANSPORT concept, its semiotic nature, its verbal realisation in language, and its cognitive, cultural, and symbolic functions.

First and foremost, the TRANSPORT concept proves to be a productive and multifaceted unit of human cognition. Its relevance stems from its deep integration into everyday human experience. Transport is not merely a domain of physical movement, but it is a fundamental mechanism that structures human interaction with space, time, and society. The linguistic representation of transport reflects the richness and diversity of transport-related vocabulary

demonstrate that language systematically encodes various aspects of mobility, including modes, speed, direction, purpose, and social roles. Therefore, the verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept is not accidental, but constitutes an essential part of the linguistic worldview.

From a semiotic standpoint, TRANSPORT functions as a complex sign system that operates on multiple levels simultaneously. At the primary level, transport-related lexical units act as signs that denote concrete objects and actions: vehicles, infrastructure, and processes of movement. However, within the process of semiosis, these signs do not remain limited to their literal meanings. Instead, they generate a wide network of secondary meanings through metaphor, metonymy, and symbolic association. This demonstrates that the TRANSPORT concept is deeply embedded in the mechanisms of meaning-making and interpretation.

One of the key conclusions concerns the dual nature of the TRANSPORT concept, which combines both concrete and abstract dimensions. On the one hand, transport has a clear material embodiment: cars, trains, buses, planes, and other vehicles that can be perceived, measured, and categorised. On the other hand, transport also exists as an abstract conceptual structure that organises human understanding of more complex and intangible domains. This duality aligns with A. Prykhodko's classification of concepts and supports the argument that TRANSPORT belongs to the category of parametric concepts.

Indeed, the parametric nature of the TRANSPORT concept is evident in its association with measurable characteristics such as size, speed, capacity, efficiency, and function. These parameters are linguistically encoded in numerous lexical items and grammatical constructions. For example, adjectives like fast, slow, heavy, and light, as well as verbs like accelerate, depart, and arrive, reflect the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of transport. This confirms that TRANSPORT, as a concept, is structured around specific measurable attributes, which distinguishes it from purely abstract, non-parametric concepts.

At the same time, the analysis reveals an apparent paradox: while TRANSPORT is fundamentally a parametric concept, it also exhibits features typically associated with non-parametric concepts. This is due to its extensive metaphorical and symbolic usage, particularly in artistic discourse such as song lyrics. In such contexts, transport-related lexemes lose their direct connection to measurable physical properties and instead evoke emotions, experiences, and abstract ideas.

Compared to the 1960–2000s corpus, there is a noticeable shift from primarily literal, concrete transport nominations (e.g., BUS, BICYCLE, SUBMARINE, TRAIN) toward a more metaphorically complex and structurally expanded system of verbalisers in the 2000s–2020s. Earlier lyrics tend to foreground direct, referential naming of everyday transport means, whereas the later corpus increasingly integrates transport lexemes into

metaphorical constructions (e.g., X + wreck) and aviation symbolism, indicating a stronger conceptualisation of transport as an emotional and cognitive metaphor rather than only a physical object domain.

Although both corpora demonstrate active verbalisation of the TRANSPORT concept, **the 1960s–2000s corpus contains a somewhat larger number of transport nominations than the 2000s-noawadays corpus. Nevertheless, the modern corpus reveals greater metaphorical diversification and semantic complexity.**

Moreover, the analysis confirms that the verbalisation of TRANSPORT is deeply influenced by cultural and historical factors. Different societies and time periods prioritise different modes of transport, which in turn affects the linguistic representation of this concept. For example, the prominence of trains in 19th- and early 20th-century discourse reflects the importance of railway systems during the industrial era. Similarly, the increasing use of terms related to digital and automated transport technologies reflects contemporary technological developments. This demonstrates that the TRANSPORT concept is not static but evolves in response to changes in material culture and social practices.

In addition, **another significant conclusion of my study** concerns the pragmatic and discourse functions of transport-related language. In communication, transport expressions are frequently used to structure narratives and organise discourse. Journeys, departures, and arrivals serve as powerful narrative devices that mark transitions, developments, and resolutions. This is particularly evident in literary and musical texts, where transport often symbolises personal transformation or emotional change. The ability of transport language to convey both literal and figurative meanings makes it a highly effective tool for communication.

Finally, **the overall analysis leads to a broader theoretical conclusion** regarding the nature of concepts and their verbalisation. The TRANSPORT concept exemplifies how language serves as a bridge between the physical world and abstract thought. Through the process of semiosis, concrete experiences of movement and transportation are transformed into symbolic structures that shape human cognition and culture. This process is dynamic and ongoing, reflecting the continuous interaction between language, thought, and reality.

Particular attention has been devoted to the analysis of individual verbalisers. The CAR verbaliser has been identified as one of the dominant representations of freedom, rebellion, individuality, emotional escape, and self-identification in rock discourse. TRAIN frequently verbalises inevitability, destiny, emotional separation, temporal continuity, and existential movement. AIRPLANE and JET symbolise transcendence, aspiration, distance, technological dynamism, and rapid transformation, while CONCORDE verbalises prestige, futurism, elite mobility, and the cult of speed characteristic

of technological modernity. Additional verbalisers such as BUS, SUBMARINE, and BICYCLE reveal further semantic dimensions associated with collectivity, secrecy, subconscious immersion, nostalgia, environmental consciousness, and simplicity.

To summarise all the information up, **my study speaks in favour of the hypothesis that modern English rock lyrics function as a productive type of artistic and musical discourse** in which transport nominations acquire substantial conceptual and symbolic significance. **In this discourse, namely in both 20th century English rock lyrics and modern English rock lyrics, the TRANSPORT concept is verbalised through a wide range of lexical means,** among which the most productive verbalisers include CAR, TRAIN, AIRPLANE, JET, CONCORDE, BUS, SUBMARINE, and BICYCLE. These lexical units function not merely as direct nominations of vehicles, but as carriers of culturally conditioned meanings and emotionally charged symbolic associations.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In conclusion, the TRANSPORT concept can be characterised as a highly complex, dynamic, and multifunctional unit of linguocultural knowledge. It is rooted in concrete reality, which justifies its classification as a parametric concept. However, its extensive metaphorical and symbolic extensions reveal its capacity to function as a non-parametric concept in certain contexts. This dual nature underscores the flexibility and richness of human conceptual systems.

The verbalisation of TRANSPORT in the aspect of semiosis demonstrates that language is not merely a tool for describing reality but also a means of constructing and interpreting it. Transport-related language encodes not only factual information about movement but also cultural values, emotional experiences, and cognitive structures. As such, the study of the TRANSPORT concept provides valuable insights into the broader processes of meaning-making and conceptualisation in human language.

Thus, the initial hypothesis that TRANSPORT is an important and meaningful concept in both linguistic and cultural terms is fully confirmed. Its significance lies not only in its practical function but also in its symbolic power, which allows it to serve as a universal framework for understanding movement, change, and human experience as a whole.

The further perspective of this linguistic research lies in the possibility of expanding the analysis of the TRANSPORT concept from a limited corpus-based study of English rock lyrics into a broader, multidimensional cognitive-linguistic and discursive framework. Several promising directions can be identified.

First, the study can be extended diachronically, by incorporating a wider historical range of musical discourse (e.g. from early 20th-century popular music to contemporary genres such as hip-hop, indie, and electronic music). This would allow for a more systematic investigation of how the conceptualisation of TRANSPORT evolves over time, particularly in relation to socio-cultural transformations, technological development, and changes in human mobility practices. Such an approach could reveal shifts from predominantly literal representations of transport means toward increasingly metaphorical and abstract conceptualisations.

Second, the research perspective may be broadened cross-genre and cross-discursive, comparing rock lyrics with other types of discourse, such as pop music, folk songs, film discourse, advertising, or literary texts. This would help determine whether the observed patterns of verbalisers (e.g. car, train, airplane) are genre-specific or represent more general tendencies in English-language conceptualisation. It would also enable the identification of genre-dependent metaphorical models and evaluative meanings associated with transport imagery.

Third, the study may be deepened through cognitive-semantic analysis of metaphorical models, focusing on how transport lexemes function as source domains in conceptual metaphors (e.g. LIFE IS A JOURNEY, EMOTIONAL STATE IS MOVEMENT, RELATIONSHIPS ARE TRANSPORT PROCESSES). Special attention could be paid to the mapping mechanisms between physical movement and abstract domains such as emotions, identity, temporality, and existential experience.

Finally, a cross-linguistic comparative perspective could be introduced by analysing how the TRANSPORT concept is verbalised in different languages and cultural traditions of music. This would contribute to typological insights into universal versus culture-specific cognitive patterns in conceptualising movement and mobility.

An additional research perspective concerns the pragmatic role of transport verbalisers in achieving a specific perlocutionary effect upon the listener. Scholars may analyse how transport imagery influences emotional perception, identification with lyrical heroes, persuasion, emotional catharsis, or ideological positioning.

This direction would combine cognitive linguistics with pragmatics and discourse psychology.

Special attention may be devoted to technologically marked verbalisers such as JET or CONCORDE, which reflect ideas of acceleration, futurism, prestige, and global mobility. Future studies may investigate how technological transport imagery participates in the conceptualisation of postmodern identity, consumer culture, media influence, and technological consciousness.

Another research perspective involves the multimodal study of transport imagery in music videos, album covers, concerts, and visual aesthetics accompanying rock lyrics. Such analysis would allow researchers to explore the interaction between verbal, visual, and acoustic means of conceptualisation.

Future research may also apply corpus linguistics methods to identify the frequency, collocational patterns, and semantic tendencies of transport verbalisers in large corpora of song lyrics.

This would provide statistically grounded evidence concerning the productivity and evolution of transport imagery in musical discourse.

To summarise the ideas up, the conducted analysis demonstrates that the verbalisers of the TRANSPORT concept possess significant cognitive, symbolic, cultural, and artistic potential. Their multidimensional character creates broad opportunities for interdisciplinary research combining cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, semiotics, cultural studies, stylistics, pragmatics, and music discourse analysis.

Overall, the research has the potential for further development from a narrow lexical-semantic study into an integrated cognitive-discursive model that combines diachronic, cross-genre, corpus-based, metaphorical, multimodal, and cross-cultural approaches.

REFERENCES

Single-author books:

- Langacker, R.W. (1977). *Space grammar, analysability, and the English passive. Language.*
- Prykhodko, A.M. (2008). *Kontsepty i kontseptosystemy v kohnityvno-dyskursyvni paradyhmi linhvistyky [Concepts and conceptual systems in the cognitive-discursive paradigm of linguistics]. Premier.*
- Prykhodko, A.M. (2013). *Kontseptolohiia dyskursu: apeliuvannia kontseptu do dyskursiv [Conceptology of discourse: appealing of a concept to discourses].*
- Prykhodko, A.M. (2006). *Kontsept yak obiekt zistavnoho movoznavstva [The concept as an object of comparative linguistics].*
- Talmy, L. (2003). Foreword: Past, present, and future of motion research. In *Cognitive foundations of language structure and use.*

available online:

- Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition.* MIT Press.
https://openlibrary.org/books/OL22000682M/Semantics_and_cognition
- Shopen, T. (Ed.). (2007). *Language typology and syntactic description* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
https://assets.cambridge.org/97805215/88553/frontmatter/9780521588553_frontmatter.pdf
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics* (Vols. 1–2). MIT Press.
https://openlibrary.org/books/OL25546573M/Toward_a_cognitive_semantics
- Wierzbicka, A. (1972). *Semantic primitives.* Athenäum-Verlag.
<https://archive.org/details/semanticprimitiv0022wier/mode/2up>

Sources of illustrative material (lyric copprora):

- B.o.B feat. Hayley Williams. (2010). *Airplanes.*
- Black Country, New Road. (2022). *Concorde.*
- Bob Dylan. (1965). *Mr. Tambourine Man.*
- Eels. (2001). *Bus Stop Boxer.*
- Eruption. (1979). *One Way Ticket.*
- Gary Numan. (1979). *Cars.*
- Gladys Knight & the Pips. (1973). *Midnight Train to Georgia.*
- Heart. (2010). *Red Velvet Car.*
- James Arthur. (2016). *Train Wreck.*
- John Denver. (1966). *Leaving on a Jet Plane.*

Johnny Cash. (1965). *Orange Blossom Special*.
Milow. (2011). *Car Wreck in the Lake*.
Osbourne, O., Rhoads, R., & Daisley, B. (1980). *Crazy Train*.
Phoebe Bridgers. (2020). *Kyoto*.
Queen. (1978). *Bicycle Race*.
Snow Patrol. (2006). *Chasing Cars*.
System of a Down. (2001). *Jet Pilot*.
The Beatles. (1966). *Yellow Submarine*.
The Who. (1968). *Magic Bus*.
Tom Waits. (1985). *Downtown Train*.
Tracy Chapman. (1988). *Fast Car*.
Van Halen. (1986). *Dreams*.