

6-20-2019

COGNITIVE ASPECT OF THE UZBEK IDIOMATIC WORDS AND THEIR EQUIVALENTS IN ENGLISH

Akmal Yuldashev Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm>

Recommended Citation

Yuldashev, Akmal Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) (2019) "COGNITIVE ASPECT OF THE UZBEK IDIOMATIC WORDS AND THEIR EQUIVALENTS IN ENGLISH," *Philology Matters*: Vol. 2019 : Iss. 2 , Article 2.

DOI: 10. 36078/987654348

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2019/iss2/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philology Matters* by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.



Akmal Yuldashev

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD),
UzSWLU

COGNITIVE ASPECT OF THE UZBEK IDIOMATIC WORDS AND THEIR EQUIVALENTS IN ENGLISH

ABSTRACT

The progressing of the Uzbek linguistics and learning approaches to language, especially, problems of cognitive linguistics have been analyzed in the article. The results show that cognitive approach and methods of cognitive language materials carried out legislation of lexical units of the Uzbek language, as the materials of the Uzbek language indicate the reasons of conceptual connection of linguistic units, including the semantic factor of cognitive linguistic connection were illuminated in the article. The main characteristics of idiomatic units were based on conceptual connection. Some idiomatic words of the Uzbek language were translated into English with their equivalents. A variety of Uzbek language materials is based on the perception of reality, knowledge, opportunities linguistic memory of people.

The article is dedicated to the research of ways of idiomaticity in the Uzbek word formation. It describes various causes of emergence of idiomaticity in compound words. The aim of the research work is the study of the cognitive aspect of idiomatic words of the Uzbek language.

The role of cognitive mechanisms in word formation and verbalization of language units is considered as one of the topical problems of linguistics. The author of the article analyzes the cognitive bases of the formation of the idiomatic words in the Uzbek language. Conceptual metonymy, conceptual metaphor and metaphonymy were demonstrated as basic cognitive mechanisms in the formation of idiomatic words. Moreover, the article covers the problems of engendering of idiomatic words as a result of human being's

Акмал Юлдашев

Филология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори,
ЎзДЖТУ

ИДИМАТИК СЎЗЛАРНИНГ КОГНИТИВ АСПЕКТИ ВА УЛАРНИНГ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТИ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Мақолада ўзбек тилшунослигининг тараққиёти, хусусан когнитив лингвистикани ўрганишдаги илмий ёндашувлар муҳокама қилинади. Натижалар шуни кўрсатадики, ўзбек тили лексик бирликларининг тадқиқи доираси когнитив метод ва ёндашувларга асосланган. Ўзбек тилининг идиоматик тил бирликларининг концептуал ва семантик боғлиқлиги асосий материал сифатида ёритиб берилган. Ўзбек тилидаги айрим идиоматик бирликлар инглиз тилига таржималари ёки муқобил вариантлари билан берилган. Тилшуносликда ўзбек тилининг тил материалига бой эканлиги, дунёни идрок этишда, тил хотираси имкониятларини очиб беришда асосий ўрин тутади.

Бундан ташқари, ўзбек тили сўз ясалишида идиоматик ибораларнинг шаклланиши ҳам ўрганилган. Қўшма сўзларда идиоматик ҳолат юзага келишининг турли сабабларини когнитив таҳлил қилиш мақоланинг асосий мақсадини ташкил қилади. Сўз ясалиши ва тил бирликлари вербализациясида когнитив механизмнинг аҳамиятини очиб бериш масаласи тилшунослик фанининг асосий масалаларидан биридир.

Мақола муаллифи ўзбек тилидаги идиоматик сўзлар ясалишининг когнитив асосларини таҳлил қилади. Идиоматик сўзлар ясалишида концептуал метонимия, концептуал метафора, метафтонимиялар асосий когнитив механизм эканлиги очиб берилди. Шу билан бирга, ушбу мақола идиоматик сўзларни гуруҳлаш инсоннинг дунёни идрок этиш ва тилда ког-

understanding of the world, their reflection in human being's cognition and the process of reflection of cognitive mechanisms in the formation of the concept.

Key words: idiomaticity, conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy, metaphonymy, equivalence, motivation, idiomatic words.

нитив акс этира олиш натижаси эканлигини ҳамда концепт мазмуни шаклланишида когнитив механизмларнинг акс этишини ёритиб беради.

Калит сўзлар: идиоматиклик, концептуал метафора, концептуал метонимия, метафтонимия, эквивалент, мотивация, идиоматик сўзлар.

INTRODUCTION

The end of the XX century is distinguished by its focus on anthropocentrism, a new scientific paradigm which studies the problems related to the factor of a human being in linguistics. Studying the language units in relation to extra-linguistic factors like communication, the spirituality of language users, their knowledge of the world, associative thinking, national and cultural worldview have become the basic concern. Since, the study of the cognitive basis of the formation of Uzbek idiomatic words in comparative aspect remains an important issue thanks to their potential to conceptualize the world of the language users.

As is known, idiomatic words serve as a means of preserving and transmitting human beings knowledge thanks to their cognition of the world.

Especially, compound words emerge in the point when cognition and communication coincide. There may be several language units in the structure of idiomatic compound words on the basis of economy of language principles. It is worth noting that compound words reflect a person's physical, cultural and historical experience. The cognitive basis of compound words, which is peculiar of various languages, enables to study the problems of relations between language and culture, language and ethnos and to define the significance of language units; the fact that leads to study idiomatic compound words from cognitive viewpoint in linguistics.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The term "idiomaticity" became a central notion in a number of researches in the third quarter of the XIX century, and the present term was used by Ch. Bally towards phraseological units in linguistics. According to him, idiomaticity is a phraseological unit which is a result of losing its denotative meaning from semantic point of view being inseparable from each other (Bally, Ch., 1961). A.A. Reformatzkiy gave the following definition to the term "idiomaticity": "they cannot be translated into another language word for word. Such linguistic unit is called idiom and their general state is called idiomaticity" [Reformatzkiy, A.A., 2006]. According to the scholars, the term "idiomaticity" means a set of idioms. "Oxford Dictionary of Idioms" includes simple words, derived words, compound words and phraseological units. We assume that idiomaticity should be studied towards each language not in general but separately. Charles F Hockett [Hockett, Ch.F., 1958] & Glaser R [Glaser, 1988]

in their work distinguished that not only phraseological units but single words and even morphemes can be idiomatic. Idiomatic units demonstrate the peculiarities of the language potential presenting information of the language speakers' imagination of the world and how they are perceived. As to A.I. Smirnitskiy general meaning of idiomaticity of a compound word is not dependent on the combination of components [Smirnitskiy, A.I., 1956]. As well as Ch. Carr and O. Jespersen note that the meaning of an idiomatic compound word as a language unit cannot be understood by its combination of components (Jespersen, O., 1954). According to I. Arnold, a compound word becomes idiomatic when it loses the degree of its motivation, since one of its elements is not used in its real meaning [Arnold, I.V., 1986].

As is known, the role of motivation is important in the word formation, when there is no necessity for additional knowledge to understand the meaning of a derived word. However, if the case of idiomaticity replaces motivation there is a necessity for additional knowledge from addressee which is clearly seen in the compound words.

Idiomatic compound words are connected with semantic peculiarity of a word. It is impossible to define its meaning on the basis of the pattern of a compound word structure and it should be stated that the meaning of idiomatic compound words have a unique meaning. Idiomatic compound words are not judged from a static state of a language but defined through a dynamic state and their meaning is considered as a result of metaphorical or metonymical transformation. In this sense, we interpret idiomaticity and motivation as a phenomenon peculiar to compound words.

Idiomaticity is peculiar to a majority of the Uzbek compound words. The semantic volume of compound words is larger than patterned compound words. Their formation is regarded as more complicated process than patterned compound words, hence they are related to as re-comprehension of the world.

The phenomenon of idiomaticity may be observed in the works of A.Hajiev [Hajiev, A., 2007], B.Madaliyev [Madaliyev, B., 1966] and M.Mirtajiev [Mirtajiev, M., 2010], however they do not mention "idiomaticity". A.Hajiev states that words may have metaphoric meaning and states that: "The meaning of compound words will not appear as a result of combination of components, for instance, itog`iz, (it – dog, og`iz – mouth) in English snapdragon, otquloq (ot – horse, quloq – ear) its English correspondences are sorrel; dock" [Hajiev, A., 2007].

One can notice that general meaning of analyzed words is connected neither with the first nor with the second component. Idiomatic nature of these words comes out of its expression of a plant name but not a body of the animal.

How do idiomaticity processes occur in compound words? A human being undergoes a number of cognitive processes in the formation of idiomatic compound words. The following cognitive mechanisms actively participate in the formation of idiomatic compound words:

1. Conceptual metaphor.
2. Conceptual metonymy.
3. Metaphonymy.

By the last quarter of the XX century "theory of metaphor" was introduced in the

book “Metaphors We Live by” published by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson. The essence of the present theory lies in the conception offered by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, i.e. the new nature of a metaphor not as a stylistic means but as a conceptual linguistic phenomenon. According to them, metaphors exist in human beings’ conceptual system as a means of expression through language. In other words, a metaphor is peculiar to thinking, and linguistic metaphors are outer expressions of the present phenomenon, “metaphors are not only in our everyday life, not only in our language but they are in our thinking and activities. Our every day, conceptual system, our ideas and actions to their essence are metaphoric” [Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., 2003].

So, the metaphor is not only a means of expression, but also a phenomenon, which is related to thinking and culture. Therefore, conceptual metaphors are not such simple derived meanings appeared only on the basis of a simple transformation of meaning but the result of a complex cognitive process which takes place in human beings cognition. Our observations, in this respect, show that a conceptual metaphor is the most productive way of a new name. A conceptual metaphor is considered an important mechanism in the formation of idiomatic compound words.

J. Lakoff and M. Johnson indicated two domains in the formation of a metaphoric derived meaning in cognitive linguistics, i.e. source domain and target domain [Lakoff, G., 2003]. According to them, there is inter effect of a frame and scenario behind metaphors. “Source domain” is a human being’s set of knowledge mainly on the basis of experience, whereas the “target domain” is comparatively less clarified and defined as an inevitable knowledge.

When a meaning transformation takes place through a metaphor, a human being uses the units existing in the structure of the vocabulary of a language which serves to be a “source domain”. As for the “target domain” a human being uses a new derived meaning formed of ready-made language units in his/her thinking.

According to Ayvor A. Richards, “thinking itself is metaphoric, it takes place on the basis of comparison and just on this point of the language metaphor appears” (Ayvor, A.R., 1990).

Jose Ortega-I-Rasset also advances the idea that “metaphor is not only a means of expression, but it is a basic tool of thinking” [Jose Ortega-I-Rasset., 1990].

Metonymy has been studied as a stylistic means to express imagery. As V.N.Teliya states, there is a common relation between a meaning through metonymy which appears on the basis of a meaning transfer smoothly (Yazikovaya nominasiya (vidi naimenovaniy) 1977).

The introduction of a new approach to metonymy by Z.Kovecses and G. Raden has changed and it is worth noting: “metonymy is a cognitive process, in which one concept is a vehicle and another concept is a target which is provided by mental achieving the target domain within one domain or idealized cognitive models” [Kovecses, Z., Radden, G., 1998].

It should be stressed that there is notion commonness in this definition. It is explained by the fact that concepts are the parts of idealized cognitive models, thus they will be in common relation.

The theory proposed on metaphor and metonymy by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson is of great significance. According to them, metonymic concepts are nourished on the basis of knowledge accumulated by human beings, they will be more clear than metaphoric concepts, usually metonymy concepts have exact physiological or associative distinction [Lakoff., Johnson 2003:38].

We support the idea advanced by the scholars on cognitive linguistics Ungerer, F., Schmid, H.-J. who differentiated the most active metonymic models of word formation [Ungerer, F., Schmid, H. J., 2006]: (Types of Stand for Relations in Metonymies)

PART FOR WHOLE (all hands on deck)

WHOLE FOR PART (to fill up the car).

The formation of idiomatic compound words urges the transference of the meaning of a conceptual type. V. Croft and D. Cruse state that a conceptual metonymy includes two domains: a vehicle domain and a target domain. According to them, the task of a vehicle domain is to define the structure of a target domain in metonymy [Croft, V., Cruse, D., 2004].

METHODOLOGY

The data are analyzed, applying a very scientific method, and using in a comparative and contrasting style in a way to elicit the idiomaticity in the semantic differences between the Uzbek and English languages. Compound words are analyzed according to the motivation and idiomacity.

DATA ANALYSIS

In the process of transfer of the meaning of a conceptual metonymy type the name of the part serves to express the whole. For instance, in Uzbek and English somatic lexemes express the features peculiar to an individual and events and phenomena related to it in the structure of the idiomatic compound words *kalla*, – head: *xomkalla* – a dull person (*xom* – raw, uncooked, *kalla* – head) . The equivalent of this lexeme in English is a blockhead.

One thing is obvious that idiomatic compound words can be formed not only through a conceptual metaphor or a conceptual metonymy but also as a consequence of the integration of both conceptual phenomena. Consequently, it would be reasonable to speak of another new term in linguistics – metaphonymy.

The term metaphonymy was first introduced in linguistics by L. Goossens. The scholar was the first to pay attention to the integration process of metonymy and metaphor and called it as a phenomenon of metaphonymy. According to him, there is a complex mechanism which combines both metonymy and metaphor in the language [Goossens, L., 1990].

At present, metaphonymy has become one of the basic models of conceptualization the reality. L. Goossens differentiates two primary types of metaphonymy: 1) metonymy within a metaphor; 2) metaphor from metonymy.

The essence of the group one is characterized by the transferring of the meaning within “vehicle domain”. Metonymy is metaphorically re-considered and turns

into the element of the whole domain. L. Goossens analyzes this theory through the following convention phrases: bite one's tongue off – “be sorry for what one has just said”. The general meaning of a given metonymy is a metonymy within a metaphor.

As the analysis of these examples shows that metaphoric, metonymic and metaphonymic derived meanings are the result of a complex cognitive process. Certain knowledge obtained as a result of understanding the world by a human being lies behind these derived meanings. The formation of a metonymic and metaphoric meaning is carried out in the point where human cognition and communication unite.

The Uzbek language is rich in idiomatic compound words with conceptual metaphoric meaning. The following three idiomatic compound words can reveal conceptual metaphoric meaning of idiomatic compound words in Uzbek:

The Uzbek word *qizilishton* means a bird with short legs, a strong and a long beak living in the woods. (*qizil* – red, *ishton* – pants). The first component of the word *qizil* means “the color of a blood or rubies”. In the formation of the idiomatic compound word as a principles emeruby-colored comes first. The component of the word *qizil* belongs to the cognitive domain COLOR. This concept fulfills the task of a “source domain” in the formation of a compound word and it is projected with the second component of the word. The component *ishton* (pants) according to the mentioned dictionary, means “underpants or knickers, *lozim* – “underpants of women in Central Asia”. For the word “*ishton*” the same long underwear is basic one, it is included in the structure of the cognitive domain CLOTHES. There appears blending between the first and second components COLOR and CLOTHES of the word. At the next stage the resemblance between COLOR and CLOTHES which is a “source domain” and BIRD “target domain” is defined. Resemblance is that the bird's feathers are red, the part of human body where s/he has underwear. It is clear that the user of the Uzbek language relying on the categorized and subcategorized conceptual systems and on the basis of the knowledge in comprehension of the world, i.e. based on the fact that the bird's back part has a red feather so called as “*qizilishton*”. In English, the very bird is called woodpecker; the fact that the bird eats worms in the tree and its action related to cleaning trees are taken into account in terms of naming. The Uzbek naming, probably, paid attention to its appearance as for English they paid attention to its activity. It is concluded that every culture has its own way of formation the linguistic view of the world.

In Uzbek, there is a word which means a disease “*otpaypoq*” “shin-hand joints stable hardened paws palms side (bottom) bent over and paw”. (*ot* – horse, *paypoq* – socks).

The “*ot*” component of the present compound word means “a solid-hoofed plant-eating domesticated mammal with a flowing mane and tail, used for riding, racing, and to carry and pull loads” and it takes place in the conceptual domain ANIMAL. The concept ANIMAL is considered to have a wide domain and it fulfills the function of “source domain”. The component of the compound word “*paypoq*” means “thigh, calf, or rounding off, mostly made of forged shoes”. In this compound word the component *son why this word* takes a place from the ARTEFACT conceptual do-

main is that the socks were created by human beings.

In the structure of the compound word the seme of the first component becomes active. In the formation of the idiomatic compound words the language user takes into consideration the fact that horse hoofs do not bend and socks are not deep when they are worn. On the basis of these signs a disease which is found in human beings' is called *otpaypoq* – horse socks. The units which were subcategorized from two conceptual domains integrated passed over the third new concept DISEASE. It is considered to be “a target domain”.

In comparison to English, idiomatic compound words formed with conceptual metonymic meaning are widely used in Uzbek.

The compound word "ayiqtovon" means “a type of less than a year grassy plant”. (*ayiq* – bear, *tovon* – heel).

The component "ayiq" of this idiomatic compound word means “towels, wooly, fat, big, mammals, wild animal”. This word has an associative meaning as well as including club footed, i.e. pence wrong, crooked.

The word "ayiq" belongs to the concept of ANIMAL of the cognitive domain. The associative meaning of the word "ayiq" and "oyoq" paw becomes active in the formation of the word "ayiqtovon". The second component of the compound word – compensation means “part of the back of the leg”. This lexeme semantically is included in the structure of the domain of the concept BODY. In the formation of the compound word the semesole of the foot becomes active.

In the process of the formation of the idiomatic compound word "ayiqtovon" concepts ANIMAL and BODY fulfill the function of a “vehicle domain”, where the metonymic meaning transfer, which reflects WHOLE for PART relation, comes to existence. As a result of a conceptual integration of the meaning of concepts ANIMAL and BODY a concept PLANT, which is the “target domain”, appears. In English, this plant's color resembles the color of the butter and its flower resembles a cup and on the basis of this resemble the word "buttercup" is formed.

In Uzbek an unhappy person is called "shorpehona" which means an “unhappy and unlucky man or woman” (Uzbek Explanatory Dictionary V, 2008). (*shor* – salt(y), *pehona* – forehead).

The first component of the compound word "shor" means “excessive salts, suffering, distress; misery”. The lexeme "shor" is semantically included in the cognitive domain TASTE. This lexeme is also used in figurative meaning “suffering, distress; misery”; the meanings become active in the formation of the compound word "shorpehona”.

The second component of the compound word ""pehana"" means “defects of eyebrow hair, forehead”. The lexeme ""pehana"" is included in several phraseological units. “He might discharge a capacity of the forehead, to see the forehead” means “as the fates decree, as fate (has) willed”.

The second component "pehana" of the idiomatic compound word "shorpehona" is in the cognitive domain of the concept BODY. In the formation of the present compound word the concepts TASTE and BODY fulfill the function of the “vehicle

domain". Metonymic transfer of meaning is carried out by means of a part of the body which means *pehona*. That is, in the pattern of PART for WHOLE. The process which took place in the formation of the idiomatic compound word "*shorpeshana*" means "cruel fate written on his forehead". The concept HUMAN BEING is "a target domain". This idiomatic compound word ("*shorpeshana*") in English will be "unlucky".

Using metaphonymic meaning the following words are analyzed taking into account the principle of "part for the whole": metaphor from metonymy.

The idiomatic compound word "*qiziloyoq*" means "a long-legged bird who lives along the water and fish". In the formation of the present compound word its first component a lexeme – "*qizil*" has a metaphoric transfer (here bird's red leg is taken into consideration). The lexeme "*qizil*" (red) is in the cognitive domain of the concept COLOR.

The second component of the compound word lexeme "*oyoq*" (leg and foot) is semantically in the cognitive domain of the concept BODY. In the process of the formation of the compound word a name was formed on the basis of PART for WHOLE, i.e. by the leg of the bird the whole bird was named. As a result of integration of the two concepts an idiomatic compound word "*qiziloyoq*" expressing a bird's name was formed on the basis of metaphonymy. This bird in English is called sandpiper.

As can be seen from the list of idiomatic compound words, all of them have English equivalents. But the expression of these meanings are different.

CONCLUSION

The issue of cognitive aspect of idiomatic compound words is rather a new field of investigation. Idiomatic compound words are formed of known components to language users and components that are not borrowed from other languages. Idiomatic compound words are language units formed through cognitive processes step by step based on the knowledge preserved in a human being's intellect, demonstrating the national-cultural features of the relevant society. Conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy and metaphonymy play very considerable role in the formation of idiomatic compound words. Verbalization of the world view through metaphor, metonymy and metaphonymy in languages are carried out by a conceptual analysis and defined with the help of cognitive models. Human being's knowledge and re-comprehension of the world is vividly seen in cognitive idiomatics. Fulfilling J. Lakoff's idea that "our thinking is metaphoric in the first place" we would state "it is just our thinking that is idiomatic".

REFERENCES

1. Arnold I.V. (1986). *The English Word*. Moskva: *Visshaya shkola*.
2. Ayvor A. Richards. (1990). *Metafora [Metaphor]. Teoriya metafora [Theory of Metaphor]: Sbornik: Per. s.ang.,fr., isp., pols., yaz. / Vstup. St. i sost. N.D.Artyunovoy; Obsh. red. N.D.Artyunovoy i M.A.Jurniskiy*. Moskva: Progress.
3. Bally Ch. (1961). *Fransuskaya stilistika [French stylistics]*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Inostranniy Literaturi.
4. Croft W., D.Alan Cruse. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. New York by Cambridge University Press.

5. Friedrich Ungerer, Hans-Jorg Schmid. (2006). An introduction to cognitive linguistics. Second edition. Great Britain: PEARSON LONGMAN.
6. Glaser, R. (1988). The grading of Idiomaticity as a Presupposition for a Taxonomy of Idioms, in Hullen, W. and Schulze, R. (Eds.). *Understanding the Lexicon: Meaning, Sense and World Knowledge in Lexical Semantics*. Tubinger: Niemeyer, 264-279.
7. Goossens L. (1990). Metaphonymy: The Interaction of metaphor and metonymy in figurative expressions for linguistic action. // *Cognitive Linguistics*. – Berlin; New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1 (3), 323-340.
8. Hajiyev S.K. (2007). Soʻz manosining koʻchishi bilan bogʻliq lingvistik hodisalar [Linguistic phenomena related to the transference of meaning of the word Abstract of PhD diss]. *Filol. fan. nomz. ... dissertasiya*. Tashkent.
9. Hajiyev A. (2007). Oʻzbek tili soʻz yasalishi tizimi [The word formation of Uzbek]. Toshkent: Oʻqituvchi.
10. Hockett, C. (1958). *A course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
11. Jan Svanlund. (2007). Metaphor and convention. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 18 (1), 47-89.
12. Jespersen. O. (1954). *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles Part I Morphology*. Copenhagen: K. Munbesgaerd.
13. Jose Ortega-I-Gasset. (1990). Dve velikiye metafori [Two great metaphors]. *Teoriya metafora [Theory of Metaphor]: Sbornik: Per. s.ang.,fr., isp.,pols., yaz. / Vstup. St. i sost. N.D.Artyunovoy; Obsh. red. N.D.Artyunovoy i M.A.Jurmiskiy*. Moskva: Progress.
14. Kovecses Z., Radden G. (1998). Metonymy: Developing a Cognitive Linguistic View. – *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9 (1), 37-77.
15. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
16. Madaliyev B. (1966). Xozirgi oʻzbek tilida qoʻshma soʻzlar [Compound words in Uzbek]. Tashkent: Fan.
17. Mirtojiev M. (2010). Oʻzbek tili semasiologiyasi [Semasiology of Uzbek]. Tashkent: Mumtoz soʻz.
18. Reformatskiy A.A. (2006). *Vvedeniye v yazikoznaniye [Introduction to Linguistics]*. Moskva: Aspekt press.
19. Smirnistkiy A.I. (1956). *Leksikologiya angliyskogo yazika [English Lexicology]*. Moskva: Litiratura inostrannix yazikax.
20. Yazikovaya nominasiya (vidi naimenovaniy) (1977). [Language nomination (species names)]. Moskva: Nauka.