

Representation of the linguistic world picture through a human factor

Representación de la imagen lingüística del mundo a través de un factor humano

Madzhidova Rano Urishevna*

Uzbekistan State University of World Languages - Uzbekistan

r.urishevna@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the analysis of the role of human factor in the representation of the linguistic world picture. In particular, it places a special emphasis on the way a human being perceives or interprets the world and through which a knowledge of the world is reflected and considers language a tool which help to represent the world in connection with a human factor. Language is the most important argument in human life. We receive language at birth as a given; in the social environment and society, a person forms his worldview only through language. Linguistic picture of the world, it directly has a special role in reflecting the national mentality. And in every language picture of the world, there are categories of culture, to which value concepts can be attributed. A linguistic world picture is represented by the way he perceives, interprets, understands, expresses his or her natural language. Therefore, it is claimed that the language picture of the world should be studied in close connection with a human factor.

Keywords: human being, human factor, linguistic world picture, world picture, anthropocentrism

RESUMEN

El artículo aborda el análisis del papel del factor humano en la representación de la imagen lingüística del mundo. En particular, pone un énfasis especial en la forma en que un ser humano percibe o interpreta el mundo y a través del cual se refleja el conocimiento del mundo, y considera al lenguaje una herramienta que ayuda a representar el mundo en relación con un factor humano. El lenguaje es el argumento más importante en la vida humana. Recibimos el lenguaje al nacer como un hecho; En el entorno social y en la sociedad, una persona forma su cosmovisión solo a través del lenguaje. Imagen lingüística del mundo, directamente tiene un papel especial en reflejar la mentalidad nacional. Y en cada imagen lingüística del mundo, hay categorías de cultura a las que se pueden atribuir conceptos de valor. Una imagen lingüística del mundo está representada por la forma en que percibe, interpreta, comprende y expresa su lenguaje natural. Por lo tanto, se afirma que la imagen lingüística del mundo debe estudiarse en estrecha relación con un factor humano.

Palabras clave: ser humano, factor humano, imagen lingüística del mundo, imagen del mundo, antropocentrismo.

* Corresponding author. PhD, Associate Professor, Department of General Linguistics, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Recibido: 11/03/2019 Aceptado: 22/05/2019

It is much cited in world linguistics that knowledge of the world can be represented through a language in which a human factor plays a role in it. It can be said that a language picture of the world can be defined as a world embodied through the eyes of a man. A linguistic world picture is represented by the way he perceives, interprets, understands, expresses his/her natural language. Therefore, it is claimed that the language picture of the world should be studied in close connection with a human factor.

Being one of the modern areas of the humanities, anthropocentrism today occupies a leading place in linguistics. This direction was the reason for the formation of new humanitarian disciplines, such as axiology, ergonomics, heuristics, as well as the emergence of new interdisciplinary sciences, such as linguoculturology, cultural semantics, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguistic studies.

This is due to new opportunities and provisions of linguistics among the humanities, since language is one of the most important sources of knowledge about the language.

Language is the most important argument in human life. We receive language at birth as a given; in the social environment and society, a person forms his worldview only through language. And only language can change our attitude to the environment. V.A. Maslova believes that “language is the only means that can help penetrate the hidden from us sphere of mentality, because it determines the way the world is divided into one or another culture” (Maslova, 2007).

On the basis of linguistic means, as a linguistic personality, a language can be reconstructed in its basic features. For example, V.A. Maslova emphasizes such a point that “any person who knows the natural human language can be modeled as a linguistic person. Three structural levels can be distinguished in a linguistic personality: structural-linguistic (reflecting the degree of proficiency in everyday language), cognitive (reflecting the linguistic model of the personality world, its thesaurus and culture) and motivational or pragmatic levels” (Maslova, 2007)

The linguistic picture of the world is directly related to the concept of “linguistic personality”. And at the same time, the linguistic picture of the world is a set of ideas about the world reflected in the language. Presumably, we can say that each natural language corresponds to a peculiar linguistic picture of the world.

Whatever the linguistic picture of the world, it directly has a special role in reflecting the national mentality. And in every language picture of the world, there are categories of culture, to which value concepts can be attributed. Such as friendship, love, homeland, time, freedom, work, parents, family, etc.

And each of this concept is directly related to the personality.

The problem of the expression or representation of the world knowledge in a language is due to a human factor. Anthropological linguistics deals with the property of a person in language use. In this connection, it is essential to cite the following statement made by the famous French linguist, E. Benveniste: “It is impossible to imagine a person without a language and inventing language... In the world there is only a person with a language, a person speaking language, and thus the language is germane to the very definition of man” (Benveniste, 1974).

In accordance with the ideas expressed by one of the representatives of the linguistic logic G.V. Leibniz: “Language is a constitutive characteristic of the person, “the mirror of the mind”, the mind interpreter”, “a carrier of a certain national character” (G.V. Leibniz). It can be noted that the idea expressed at different times by different authors, was firstly formulated as a theoretical, linguo-philosophical concept by W. Humboldt, in which the language (Gumboldt, 1984) is recognized as the force that makes a human being a human being. Man becomes a human being only through the language (Ibid, 349), in which he/she involves all his/her creative potential. Relying on the beliefs aforementioned, we can state that language can be a peculiarity of a person; it is essential in the very issue being investigated which is the main feature, functioning as a tool allowing one to consider a man as the subject matter of a language picture of the world, giving a person a chance to represent his/her attitude to the objective and nonobjective world, nature ... embody himself/herself in the names of natural objects, introducing the utilitarian and ethnic assessment (Arutyunova, 1999).

It can be noted that the language is characterized by a person who is central to its objective realization.

The language representation of such a property of a human being is reflected in anthropomorphism and it compares the subject, the phenomena of animate and inanimate nature of a man and express them with human qualities.

According to the analysis of the research materials, anthropocentrism is not only manifested in various pictures of the world but also in its various fragments.

We have revealed that anthropomorphic regular metaphorical translations such as *man – the animal world*, *man –*

the plant world can be widely represented in the Uzbek language picture of the world, now, let's deal with some examples: man – the animal world – *bo'tako'z* - (word by word: camel eyes), *bo'ri kalla* – *type of melon* (word by word: wolf head), *Lochin* - “falcon” (about a brave, purposeful person), *musicha beozor* – zool. a kind of bird (about a calm, harmless person), *qaldirg'och* - *swallow* (name of girls), *xongizi* - zool. ladybird (word by word: an insect of Mr. Khan, a man - flora – *busayni uzum* – a kind of grape «ladies' fingers» (word by word: grapes of Hussein; *Abdulla qovun* - *kind of melon* (word by word: melons of Abdullah); *Nilufar* - *female name* - a kind of flower (word by word: Nile - blue sky, *ufar* - aspiring, growing – word by word: a flower growing toward a blue sky; (cf.: irregular for the Russian language, the transfer of a man - a plant: *female fingers* to designate a kind of grape, *mother* - *and* - *stepmother* to designate a perennial plant, *pansies* to designate a flower).

It is peculiar feature for the compared languages that the anthropomorphic environment of the Uzbek and Russian linguistic pictures of the world is clearly represented in the spatial model of the world in the insight and linguistic expression of a person by the environment. In many languages, when nominating spatial representations, the names of human parts of the body (somatisms) are used to express the location and direction - Uzbek: *tog' ningtepasi* - top of the mountain, *tog' ningyelkasi* - mountain range, *o'ng qo'lda* - on the right hand, *chap qo'lda* - on the left hand, *tog' ningtagi* - *bottom of the mountain*, etc.

In addition, language manifestations of spatial realia words are the result of the position of a person. A person thinks space relative to himself/herself, tries to represent himself/herself in the names of spatial objects. In the construction of a spatial model of the world, a person applies the names of almost all parts of his/her body. This lexico - semantic group as a means of nominating spatial realities is most completely manifested in the Uzbek language. For instance, in the perception of the Uzbek people model “top - bottom” is related to the vertical, and the model “beginning - end” - with the horizontal posture of a man, according to his head and legs: “head” - the top, the upper part - in a vertical orientation (*tog' ningboshi* - «the top of the head»; word by word: the head of a mountain) and the beginning, the upper part - in horizontal orientation (*el-yurt boshi* - “the beginning (top) of the people; word by word: the head of the people); *oyoq* “Leg” - bottom, lower part (*sunning oyog'i* “lower part, last part of water” (word by word: water leg) and end (*so'zimningoyog'ida* (dialect)) - “At the end” (word by word: at the feet of my words). The middle part of the spatial orientation is symbolized by “bel” (waist) (*tog' ningbelida* is “in the middle of the mountain” (word by word: in the mountain belt). It seems that in such metaphorical nominations as “daryoning”, *sunning bo'yni, bo'yi* - “river bank” (word by word: the river's neck), *kunning beti* “the sunny side” (the lexeme *bet* “face” is used in the spatial meaning “side”), *ariqning og'zi* “mouth gorge” (*og'iz* “mouth” - in the meaning of “gorge”), *u betda, bubetda* - “on that slope” (word by word: on that cheek, on that face)

Sunning, ariqning, daryoning labi – Russian: губа воды, арыка, реки: bank of water, ditch, river. The manifestation of the ethnic consciousness is worth highlighting here, its “constructive”, “reasoning” ability in interpreting the results of cognitive activity.

The toponyms most completely reflect the characteristics of human partiality, the eternal aspiration of man to preserve, perpetuate himself/herself, his/her clan, tribe in the names of spatial objects.

In the chronological model of the world, a man represented the history of the development of ethnic communities and humanity as a whole, traditions, culture, behavioral norms, attitudes to life values, which are particularly pronounced in the phraseological model of the world, for example, in the Uzbek language: *ko'zi ochliqigida* (during the life), *alimsoqdan qolgan* - (outdated), *yeti avlodiga yetadi* - (enough for seven generation); *Bir umrga, hayoti davomida* (forever, forever, forever); *tuyaning dumi yerga tekkanda* (never, when pigs fly), *o'la o'lguncha* (for life, forever); *bo'rini yo'qlasang qulog'i ko'rinadi* (*speak of angels and you hear their wings*), etc. The Russian language: *вовременаоны* (obsolete, long ago), *времянеждет* (urgent need to immediately act), *воцветелет* (in the early years, in the heyday of physical and spiritual strength), *прицаре Горохе* (in very distant, time immemorial), *детскоевремя* (not very late, early time to go to bed), *в самойпоре* (in full blossom), *скольколет, сколькозим!* (How long ago! an exclamation at the meeting), *насклонелет* (in the extreme old age), *много (многие) лета* (obsolete: wish for a long life), *мафусаиловылета (года) прожить* (for a long time, longevity), *сгодами* (over time), *испоконвеков* (a long time, since time immemorial).

It is suggested in language data that in both the altitudinal and the chronological model of the world, a person used the same semantic motivations, the same naming principles in the nominations of the relevant categories as a whole, due to the unity of the main parameters and characteristics space and time (beginning, end, limit, length, range, proximity).

Anthropocentrism of temporal model of the world is found in the fact that the time is the universal, and the collective and an individual value, high-quality option, contributing to the organization of all other values (Ryabtsev, 1996). In this respect, it is worth pointing out that the most expensive, valuable notion to a person is

life which is defined through the concept of time. Since life is the time given to a man from birth to death, it is not astonishing that the individual and society are not unconcerned to what the life is filled with: with useful deeds or wasting money.

It can be said that time spent in useful work, by the sweat of the brow, is encouraged in numerous proverbs, sayings and idiomatic expressions: in Uzbek: *manglay teri bilan yashamoq* (live on one's own labor) *qo'li qimirlaganningog'zi ham qimirlaydi* (word by word: whose hands work, in fact, and his/her mouth works, i.e. he/she earns his/her living) *erta turganning otiqukun tug'ibdi* (word by word: who gets up early, he has stallion foal); in Russian language: *кторановстает, томубогдает* (*God awards helshel who gets up early*); *делу – время, потехе – час* (*business - time, fun - an hour*); *весенний день год кормит; не тот хорош, кто лицом пригож, атотхорош, ктодляделагож* (*a spring day feeds a year; he is not good, who has a good face, but he is good, who is good for the cause*); idle pastime is condemned: *bekorchidan hudo bezor* - (slacker), *ishlamagan tishlamas* (equal to: who does not work, does not eat); *o'roqdayo'q, mashoqdayo'q – hirmonda hozir* (in food - a wolf, in work - a dead man); human labor feeds, and laziness - spoils; to meet a loafer – to grief piling up.

According to the language data, the people whose life was completely dependent on active labor at a certain time of the year, could not take control over the time. Therefore, the implementation of business on time is mostly encouraged and the habit of putting off all the next day is mostly decried norm of behavior by the ethnic communities: *bugungi ishni ertaga qo'yma, ishni boshladimgi, obiriga yetkaz* (never put off until tomorrow what can be done today; *qolgan ishga qor yog'ar* (the wolf will eat the delayed case).

Also, it is noted that slowness, accomplishing things for a long time, as well as hastiness are not valuable for the ethnos. These notions related to the poles, extremes are very richly represented at various language levels: *oshiqqan qiz erga yolchimas* (a hasty girl once becomes a spinster), *ko'z ochib yumguncha* (quickly, hastily word by word: in a blink of an eye), *shoshgan ikki marta to'lar* (word by word: one who hastes pays twice) – haste makes waste, *olmapish, ozimga tush deb yotma*, (the more you lie the more you waste the time). “Золотая середина” (Golden mean), which plays a significant role in peoples' values practically is not reflected in the language: *sabr tagi sariq oltin* (patience is valued as a pure gold) – diligence is the mother of success.

As the examples show, events are judged by the subject, based on the criteria good – bad, acceptable – unacceptable, in terms of their concordance with the principles set by human beings.

So, the analysis of the linguistic units related to the space and time from the point of view a person as a subject introduces into the image of the world, allows making the following conclusion: a person captures himself/herself, his physical appearance in spatial nominations, whereas in the notation of time he reflects his/her active value oriented attitude to the world and life.

It is worthwhile to note that a man does not only represent and interpret the world, but does evaluate it. Consequently, a spatial - temporal model of the world turns out to be involved in the personal sphere of a human being. However, to assess the world according to N.D. Arutyunova, “человек должен пропустить его через себя” (a person is to experience it through himself/herself) (Arutyunova, 1999), therefore the model of the world created by the subject includes not only cognitive components associated with the thinking activity, but axiological that are based on the principle of the value of orientation.

In this connection, the approximation is due to the nature of a human being, so the definition of the concept of evaluation, as well as identifying the ways the articulating the assessed attitude of a person towards the world and himself/herself are essential in connection with the problem of interpreting the image of a person in the linguistic picture of the world.

Assessment is a subjective expression of the significance of the objects and phenomena of the world; evaluation is a mental act, the subject's attitude to the evaluated object, aimed to determine its value for the life and activity of the subject. Therefore, the assessment is an integral part of the cognitive process, closely related to human practice.

The material analysis shows that the spatial model of the world, in the suggestions of space and spatial realias are the most marked sensory and rationalistic assessments, which makes it possible to speak of the epistemological nature of the anthropocentrism of a particular picture of the world, whereas in the time model of the world the language units nominating the time have been clearly demonstrated, due to the anthropocentrism of the time model of the world which can be described as axiological.

Furthermore, it is revealed that a human being can be considered not only as a subject, but also as an object of linguistic research, since a person, as a fragment of the linguistic picture of the world acts as an object of nomination.

According to the “Big Encyclopedic Dictionary” the concept of *object* is interpreted as “a philosophical category expressing that is opposed to the subject in his/her subject - practical and cognitive activity. An objective reality, existing independently of a person and his/her consciousness, acts as an object for the cognizing individual in the forms of activity, language and knowledge developed in the course of the historical growth of society” (SES 1987, 914). In this preparation, the following pieces of this statement seem interesting: “*opposes the subject*”, “*exists independently of the person and his/her consciousness*”, “*acts as an object for the cognizing individual*”. The consideration of a person as an object of the linguistic picture of the world urges to be concerned with a special object that is not opposed to the subject, but constitutes an integrated unity with an object knowing itself.

It is acknowledged that the main characteristics of a person finds a detailed expression in the relevant parts of the ideographic dictionary, thematic classification, which in a certain sense “reflects the image of the world in language” (Karaulov, 1981, 19). Based on the above, it can be expected that ideographic (thematic) dictionaries most completely reproduce the properties of a person as an object. In this regard, we turned to the thematic dictionary, compiled by the famous German lexicographers R. Hallig and V. von Wartburg. A distinct section that is directly related to the person was followed in detail.

The dictionary is based on the classification scheme as it is recognized as the most universal, consistent, based on the principles of anthropocentrism (Hallig, Wartburg, 1963, 316). In the dictionary of R. Hallig and V. von Wartburg the part associated with a person has been classified as following:

- 1. Man as a living being:** gender, race, parts of the body, organs and their functioning, the five senses, movement and position, sleep, health and illness, human life in general, needs.
- 2. Soul and Mind:** general position, intelligence, wisdom, ability, perception, consciousness, representation, memory, imagination, thinking, feeling, will and morality.
- 3. Man as a social being:** social life in general societies, language, public relations, people at work, general provisions, agriculture, crafts and professions, industry, trade and finance, property, room, house, transport, post office, telegraph, telephone.

It can be said that all above mentioned thematic groups of this classification characterise a person as a natural object with a complex of individual, physical and physiological characteristics (sex, appearance, reality perception method, physical condition, needs, etc.), a person of spiritual character (mind, ability, memory, will, emotions, etc.), an object with socially determined characteristics (public relations, work, social professions, crafts, etc.).

So, it is essential to say that the entire conceptual sphere of a “person”, which is characteristic in general for a certain stage of knowledge, for a specific cultural, social and historical public, as a way of regulating knowledge about a person helps to establish a chain of categorized enslavements caused by diverse and many-sided relations of a person with the internal and external world. Moreover, it is represented as a form of reflection of the phenomena of reality in thought, as a system of views and ideas in which people’s attitudes towards reality are realized and evaluated. All this appears at the same time as a way of generalizing and concretizing the content of a person as an object.

The prism of values can be a root of the creation of human language models based on physical and mental characteristics. In this case, the following point should be mentioned: “The human psyche is a structural dynamic predictable model of external reality. The bulk of the units of this model (let’s call them conditionally conceptual) consists of the concrete images — reflections of individual denotations (phenomena and objects) with which a person practically deals. However, besides these individual structural models, the so called “generalizations” are formed in the consciousness (according to L.S. Vygotsky’s terminology), i.e, independent abstract conceptual units that are generalized images — structural models inherent in entire classes of concrete images” (Melnikov, 1974). All in all, a person, as an object with a variety of properties, qualities, connections and relationships with reality, but living and acting as a whole unity, is also a very complex system, since the representatives of different national, social groups and geographical territories may be associated with diverse associations due to the sex, age, intellectual and professional features.

It is noted that language units nominating the concept of “human being” can be outlined in the following way: 1) human being as an integral object of living nature, opposed to all inanimate notions; 2) human being as a biological creature with gender differences, as well as psychophysical and emotional properties; 3) creature with brain, whose life is connected with certain timing parameters of age and representative of a particular period; 4) a living being, whose life takes place in a certain space, with different family relative, national - racial, labor, moral - ethical, etc. features.

As it can be noted that different aspects of intellectual and practical activities, as well as many-sided networks of a person with other people, in general, differential symbols of a person as an object can be categorized as follows:

1. Family - kinship relations: *ota - father, ona - mother, o`g`il - son, yoshqiz - daughter, nevara - grandson, kuyov - son-in-law, qaynota (kuvov uchun) - father-in-law, qaynona (kuyov uchun) - mother-in-law, Amaki yoki tog`a - uncle, amma yoki xola - aunt, qaynota (kelin uchun) father-in-law, qaynona (kelin uchun) - mother-in-law, aka yoki uka - brother, opayokisingil - sister, bobo (dialect oppoq Dada, katta ota buva) - grandfather, buvi (katta ona, ena) - grandmother, er - husband, hotin - wife and others;*

2. Based on nationality:

O`zbek - Uzbek, rus- Russian, fransuz- French, ingliz- English, xitoy- Chinese, arman- Armenian, tojik - Tajik, ozarbojyon - Azerbaijani, avg`on - Afghan, eron - Iranian, etc.

3. Based on the employment, as well as a specialist in a specific field of knowledge:

Dehqon - farmer, cho`pon - shepherd, temirchi - smith, o`roqchi - mower, Alashulachi yoki qo`shiqchi - singer, o`qituvchi - teacher supply - cattleman, g`isht teruvchi - Kamen crate, tarjimon - translator, suvoqchi - plasterer, tabib- doctor, dorishunos- apothecary, etc.

4. Belonging to a particular group, political, social or religious organization:

O`quvchi - schoolboy; harbiy askar - military, demokrat - Democrat, tashvilotchi - Propagandist, musulmon yoki musurmon - Muslim - Muslim, buddachi yoki sanamga sig`inuvchi - Buddhist and others. The concept of "person" can be detailed, indicating the place of residence, belonging to social groups, gender, and so on.

Man as a biological being, characterized by sex, can be detailed by a systematic description of the concepts of "man" and "woman."

The concept of "man" can be described as follows:

1) **by age:** *o`g`il bola - a boy, o`smir - teenager, yigit - a boy, erkak - a man, qariya yoki chol - an old man;*

2) **on family - related relations:** *bobosi (katta ota, oppoq dada, buva) - grandfather, o`g`li - son, otasi - father, eri - the husband, akasi - elder brother, ukasi - younger brother, amakisi yoki tog`asi - uncle, qaynotasi - father-in-law, kuyovi - son-in-law etc.;*

3) **for public relations:** *hizmatchi - employee, qo`shni - neighbor, Mulla - representative of religion (pop), mahalla boshlig`i - makhalla leader and etc.*

Now, let's deal with the examples in Uzbek, there is no grammatical category of gender, lexical units are used to denote females, for example:

1) **by age:** *qizbola - girl, bo`yi yetganqiz - (female) teenager, ayol - (wife) woman, kampir - old woman;*

2) **the family - related relations:** *buvisi, katta onasi - grandmother, qizi - daughter, onasi - mother, xotini - wife, opasi yoki singlisi - sister, holasi yoki ammasi - aunt, qaynonasi - mother-in-law, kelin-daughter - in-law and others;*

3) **on public relations:** *o`quvchiqiz - a schoolgirl, ishchi ayol - an employee, honima - a princess, shoira - a poetess, muallima - a teacher, raisa - a woman chairman, mudira - a manager and others.*

A person as a living and rational being, whose life is associated with certain spatial parameters and different types of relationships can be represented as follows:

1) **resident of a particular area:** *qishloqlik - villager, shaharlik - citizen, tog`lik - hill people, etc.;*

2) **citizen of a particular country:** *rossiyalik - Russian, afrikalik - African, Qozoqistonlik - Kazakhstani, xitoylik - Chinese, finlandiyalik - finlandets etc.;*

3) **a representative of a nation, the team:** *yapon - Japanese, ukrain - Ukrainian, yo`lsozlovchi - road builder, yozuvchi - writer, konchi - miner, etc.*

It can be highlighted that if kinship terms in the Russian language are formed by various methods of affixation - (*дед-ушк(а), баб-ушк(а), ма-ч-ех(а), отч-им, внуч-к(а), свекровь*), in the Uzbek language the terms of this class are produced using complicated words, separable components, as well as paired words, such as: *o`gayota - stepfather,*

o`gayqiz - stepmother, qayinota-father-in-law, Ota - bobo - ancestors, ota- ona - parents, qari-qartanglar - old men, etc.

It should be summed up that the structure of the lexical meaning of the words “ona” and “мать” in the Uzbek and Russian languages allocated other semes: **“a parent, a direct relationship”, “kinship”, “first generation”**, revealed in opposition: *ona-xola (the mother -aunt), ona-o`gayona (the mother - stepmother), ona-kata ona, buvi (mother - grandmother)*, which make it possible to carry out a more detailed classification of these ideographic words.

In conclusion, based on the results of the research, the following inferences can be drawn:

- a) The concept a “human being” demonstrated the interaction of three kinds of fields: conceptual, semantic and associative fields, which express the systematic and non-systematic relation of lexical units nominating a person.
- b) The features of perception and language representation of different aspects of human life enable to assume that a human being as a subject and object of a language picture of the world carries an anthropocentric orientation; an ideographic description of the concept a “human being” allows setting different components of the concept itself.

Thus, the axiological characteristic of phraseological units cannot be imagined without national and traditional characteristics of native speakers. Science has proved that no other units of linguistic levels than phraseological units absorb the value orientation of the people. And a person, speaking as a member of this people, through his language reflects the national flavor of the whole nation. This social approach of a person can be understood from different angles. He can appear both as an object and as a subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Arutyunova N.D. (1999) Language and the world. Languages of Russian culture. 896 p.
- Grinev-Grinevich S.V. (2008). Fundamentals of anthropolinguistics: textbook. Allowance for students. Higher textbook. institutions. Academy, 2008. 128 p.
- HalligR., Wartburg B. (1963). Begriffssystem als Grundlage für die Lexikographie. Versuch eines Ordnungsschemas. Berlin, 1963. S/316/
- Leibniz G.W. (1903). Opusculi et fragmenta inedita de Leibniz. Ed. Louis Couturat. Paris.
- Maslova V.A. (2007). Homolinguals in culture. Gnosis.320 s.
- Melnikov G.I. (1974). Types of signified language mark and language determinants. The problems of semantics. M.
- Ryabtseva N.K. (1996). Axiological models of time. Logical analysis of the language. Language and time. M. Nauka, 94 p.