Main types of values of full-numerication words

Principales tipos de valores de palabras de numeración completa

Sergey O. Malevinsky*
Kuban State University - RUSSIA
malevina9@mail.ru

Ahmadzai Sultan Aziz*
Kuban State University - RUSSIA

Irina S. Karabulatova**
RUDN University - RUSSIA
radogost2000@mail.ru

Yury V. Luchinskiy***
Kuban State University - RUSSIA

Nelly Yu. Fanyan****
Kuban State University - RUSSIA

Elena S. Grushevskaya****
Kuban State University - RUSSIA

Valentina V. Zelenskaya****
Kuban State University - RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The aim of the paper is to identify and describe the main structural types of the lexical meanings of the autonomous words. These types are distinguished according to the modes of their inner organization, but not in dependence upon the character of signified objects. It has been established that there exist as a minimum of six semantic types of autonomous words: descriptive, comparative, deictic, anaphoric, criterial-evaluative and relational.

Full-valued words differ, as is well known, in that they are intended to perform a nominative function and have at least one basic lexical meaning, forming a kind of the semantic core, a kind of the semantic core, around which many other components of their semantics meanings and meanings. Full-valued words differ, as is well known, in that they are intended to perform a nominative function and have at least one basic lexical meaning, forming a kind of the semantic core, a kind of the semantic core, around which many other components of their semantics meanings and meanings.

The content of the main lexical meaning (signification, intentional, vocabulary meaning) is a "bundle" of semantic features (semes) that are collectively necessary and sufficient for the identification of potential referents of a word in terms of their conformity / non-conformity with the expressed value and the associated possibility / inability to be indicated by the word.

The relevance of the topic of this study is due to the fact that, despite the growing interest in this problem, no description has yet been created of a new, unchanging vocabulary that would take into account modern language processes and would reveal the developmental trends in the development of the morphological system of the Russian language.

Keywords: autonomous word, main lexical meaning, descriptive meaning, comparative meaning.

*Department of General, Slavic and Russian linguistics, Philological faculty, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia
**Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages of the Philological Faculty Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN-university), Moscow, Russia.
***Chief of Department of History and Legal Regulation of Mass Communication, Journalistic Faculty, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia
****Doctor of Philology, Kuban State University

RESUMEN

El objetivo del artículo es identificar y describir los principales tipos estructurales de los significados léxicos de las palabras autónomas. Estos tipos se distinguen según los modos de su organización interna, pero no en dependencia del carácter de los objetos significados. Se ha establecido que existen como mínimo seis tipos semánticos de palabras autónomas: descriptivo, comparativo, deíctico, anafórico, criterio-evaluativo y relacional.

Las palabras de valor completo difieren, como es bien sabido, en que están destinadas a realizar una función nominativa y tienen al menos un significado léxico básico, formando una especie de núcleo semántico, una clase de núcleo semántico, alrededor del cual muchos otros componentes de sus significados semánticos y significados. Las palabras de valor completo difieren, como es bien sabido, en que están destinadas a realizar una función nominativa y tienen al menos un significado léxico básico, formando una especie de núcleo semántico, una clase de núcleo semántico, alrededor del cual muchos otros componentes de sus significados semánticos y significados.

El contenido del significado léxico principal (significado, significado intencional, vocabulario) es un "conjunto" de características semánticas (semes) que son colectivamente necesarias y suficientes para la identificación de posibles referentes de una palabra en términos de su conformidad/no conformidad con el valor expresado y la posibilidad/ incapacidades asociadas para ser indicado por la palabra. La relevancia del tema de este estudio se debe al hecho de que, a pesar del creciente interés en este problema, todavía no se ha creado una descripción de un vocabulario nuevo e inmutable que tenga en cuenta los procesos del lenguaje moderno y revele las tendencias de desarrollo en El desarrollo del sistema morfológico de la lengua rusa.

Palabras clave: palabra autónoma, significado léxico principal, significado descriptivo, significado comparativo

Introduction

Full-valued words differ, as is well known, in that they are intended to perform a nominative function and have at least one basic lexical meaning, forming a kind of semantic core, a kind of semantic core, around which many other components of their semantics meanings and meanings are combined (Grushevskaya, Sovetovna, Sergeevna, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov. 2017).

The content of the main lexical meaning (signification, intensional, vocabulary meaning) is a "bundle" of semantic features (semes) that are collectively necessary and sufficient for the identification of potential referents of a word in terms of their conformity / non-conformity with the expressed value and the associated possibility / inability to be indicated by the word. This process is typical for different language pictures (Vassilenko, Karabulatova, Vasilishina, Tukaeva & Barabash. 2018).

Polyfunctionality stands out as a property of units of different levels: some researchers talk about the polyfunctionality of morphemes, others about the polyfunctionality of words or word forms, others reveal the polyfunctionality of statements, the fourth expressive language means, the fifth pay attention to the polyfunctionality of the language as a whole (Shiganova, Karabulatova, Sviridova & Yuzdova). Sometimes polyfunctionality is understood narrowly, sometimes very widely.

Words of one or another part of speech, uniquely defined as belonging to "their" categorical class, constitute the core of this field, and "controversial" lexical units within which it is possible to combine the grammatical features of different classes form the so-called peripheral area.

Materials and methods

The theoretical basis for solving the tasks was the works on Russian grammar (A.M. Peshkovsky, L. V. Scherby, V. V. Vinogradov, A. A. Reformatsky, M. V. Panova, I. P. Muchnik, E. A. Zemsky, E. V. Klobukova and other scientists who made a significant contribution to the study and theoretical understanding of Russian unchangeable vocabulary).

The study of new Russian analytical lexemes was carried out by us on the material of neologisms dictionaries, modern periodicals and conversational records.

The total volume of the files we collected is about 3,500 units of storage, reflecting about 1,000 new unchangeable

words (adverbs, nouns, analytical adjectives, and also multifunctional analytical lexemes) and more than 2,500 combinations with analyte-determinants.

The main research methods of modern Russian full-valued immutable lexemes were: system-functional analysis of relevant language material, obtained by continuous sampling from written sources (neologism dictionaries, modern newspapers, magazines, fiction), as well as from conversational speech and online publications. To clarify the place of analytical lexemes in the system of parts of speech, questionnaires of Russian speakers were conducted. Elements of a statistical analysis of the material obtained were also used (an assessment of the proportional ratios of various grammatical classes of variable and unchangeable lexemes), a graphic explication of the established ratios in the form of tables and graphs.

Discussion

A priori, based on the possibility of meaningful diversity of semantics of full-symbolic vocabulary of various types, it can be assumed that the principles of selecting and combining identifiable significant semantic features into one semantic whole (lexical meaning) can be fundamentally different. At one time, V.V. Vinogradov, who as far back as 1953 in the article "The main types of lexical meanings" wrote: in the structure of different types of lexical meanings " (Vinogradov V.V. 1977), however, did not try to identify and describe any special, specific ways of the internal organization of the semantics of a word. In his article, he focused on differences related to the origin and contextual features of the implementation of different lexical meanings. Based on these two assumptions, the scientist proposed, first, to distinguish between basic and derivative values and, second, to single out phraseological, syntactically fixed and constructively determined values as special types. In fact, informative indicators V.V. Vinogradov proposed to distinguish such types of meanings as "nominative" and "expressive-synonymous", meaning the latter semantics of the so-called stylistic synonyms, which "express their basic meaning not directly, but through that semantically basic or supporting word, which is the basis of the corresponding synonymous row" (Vinogradov V.V. 1977).

The question of the possibility of some more fundamental differences in the organization of the meanings of certain categories of full-symbolic words became relevant after the introduction of the concept of deixis in linguistic use, as well as in connection with the increasing interest of linguists in various forms of assessment and methods of verbal expression of estimated values (Zelenskaya, Golubtsov, Karabulatova, Kanon & Kasyanova. 2018).

Conducted in these areas, studies have shown that the entire meaningful diversity of lexical semantics does not boil down to the mere representation through certain sets of semantic features (semes) of some "essential" features of objects and phenomena of reality. In addition to simply isolating and selecting those subject features that form the basis of direct and immediate lexical nomination, the human brain is able to perform other mental operations, resulting in the formation of lexical meanings that are fundamentally different in their structure and content from the usual reflective-conceptual type (Luchinskaya, Karabulatova, Tkhorik, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov. 2018).

The latter are currently characterized as nominative or descriptive. Their originality lies in the fact that they are "directly directed at reality" and "are the immediate mental correlates, mental models of objects, phenomena, their properties, relationships, actions and states." (Vasiliev L.M. 1990).

Words with such meanings, being used as part of any speech messages, not only call certain components of the situations described in these messages, but also attribute to them those signs that ideally contain in their lexical meanings. Strictly speaking, this is the essence of the description, which determines the content specificity of the values of this type (Luchinskaya, Karabulatova, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov). So, for example, calling something a word a chair, we thereby offer to the addressees of our speech some at least an approximate, but quite definite description of this thing, which would suggest a set of such semantic signs as "a piece of furniture", "intended for sitting one person "," having a seat, back and legs "and" not having armrests ". All these signs are conventionally associated with the word chair as identification-significant semes, forming a socially accepted, mutually fixed and normatively obligatory lexical meaning of the word.

The typology of lexical meanings offered by modern semasiology is entirely predetermined by the ontological character of the objects and phenomena reflected by them and is essentially a typology of values of the descriptive type. Here, first of all, the values of subject and attribute (sometimes interpreted as denotative and significative) are distinguished, and then both are divided into smaller varieties in accordance with the specifics of the subject classes - their denotates (Khachmafova, Karabulatova Luchinskaya & Osipov. 2015).

Classification is purely nomenclature in nature, and it does not affect the general principles of constructing lexical meanings: it seems to be taken for granted that the meaning (conceptual content) of a full-valued word in any case involves a simple reflection of certain features inherent in these things.

Results

Meanwhile, the verbal characterization of various objects can be carried out not only by direct indication of their inherent properties and relationships, but also by comparing these objects with some other, somewhat similar objects and phenomena. (Bigaysha, Akhmetova, Kaliev, Karabulatova, Bazalina & Skachkova. 2018). Similarly, the transfer of information about a particular referent to a voice message can be made not only by attributing to it signs reflected in the meaning of any suitable descriptive word, but also through a verbal indication of a subject having some similarity with the above referent. And for the expression of information organized in such a way and transmitted in this way, there is a certain arsenal of specialized lexical tools.

Among them, first of all, it is necessary to refer those words in which the semantics of comparison (it could be called comparative) is expressed in their direct and unique lexical meanings. These are adjectives with the formant type:

- vidnyy, -obraznyy i -podobnyy, -

They are the direct derivational means of expressing comparative meanings:

Drevovidnyy - treelike,
Strelovidnyy - swept,,
Serpovidnyy - crescent,
Shishkovidnyy - pineal,
Zvezdoobraznyy - star-shaped,,
Podkovoobraznyy - horseshoe,,
Zheleobraznyy - jelly-like,
Chelovekoobraznyy - anthropoid,,
Gromopodobnyy - thundering,,
Zveropodobnyy - bestial,,
Zhenopodobnyy – effeminate.

In addition, for a number of adjectives, the value of comparativity may act as a secondary, portable, derived from the primary value of the ownership of an object or a sign to its owner, compare:

aristocratic background (from a nobleman) and aristocratic attitudes (from a plebeian),
lamb skin and lamb stubbornness (in humans),
Guards regiment and Guards growth,
horse neighing and horse face,
elephant trunk and elephant grace.

In modern dictionaries, values of this kind are interpreted according to the "such as in…" scheme, which clearly indicates their comparative nature.

A very special way of organizing semantic information is implemented in the meanings of deictic words (from the Greek: Deiksis - indication). Their semantic content also represents a kind of specific description of the objects they designate. However, the description is not in the representation of certain subject features, but in the correlation of designated objects with those specific situations of communication in which they appear as referents of speech statements.

At the very beginning of the linguistic development of the theory of deixis, some authors tried to deny the existence of any informative content in the deictic words, recognizing behind them only the referential correlation within the framework of a statement. However, from the point of view of modern scientific ideas, the values that contain certain information about the relevant referents, such words still exist. True, these meanings, taken by themselves, are extremely abstract in nature and acquire full semantic content only in relation to a specific communicative situation.

Thus, the pronoun I, expressing in general "an indication of one speaking to oneself", as part of a specific speech work inscribed in a certain communicative situation, acquires a meaning corresponding either to our immediate perception of the speaking person or to our ideas about a certain person known us as the author of this text. Similarly, not only pronominal, but also some adverbial words acquire a certain meaning, concretizing their vocabulary meanings only due to reliance on the communication situation. We are talking about the so-called chronotopic deixis, according to the laws of which, for example, adverbs "here and now" acquire the function of indicating a specific place and time only depending on where and when the speech act is performed in which these adverbs are used.

As a special kind of deixis, the functioning of so-called anaphoric words is traditionally interpreted, the speech semantization of which is carried out with the support of some elements of the preceding context. We are talking about pronouns and adverbs such as he, this, that, such, there, then, etc., speech (or contextual) meanings of which practically coincide with the meanings of those words contained in previous contexts with which they are anaphorically correlated. It seems that the peculiarity of semantics of this kind can serve as a sufficient basis for the selection of anaphoric lexemes as a separate, completely independent semantic type.

Recently, as one of the main types of lexical semantics in semasiological literature, much has been said about estimated values. The latter are often identified with the values of the emotive character, and are sometimes interpreted as special axiological meanings, reflecting the value approach, the value attitude of people to reality. A single, universally accepted classification of estimated values does not yet exist. The contradiction in interpretations of the uniqueness of such values is largely due to the insufficient theoretical elaboration of the very concept of assessment in modern science, not only in linguistics, but primarily in philosophy and logic, where the theory of assessment is traditionally regarded as just one aspect of the general theory of values.

The root of most of the difficulties in understanding the phenomenon of assessment and the specifics of the estimated values lies primarily in ignoring the semantic ambiguity of the word "assessment" that is common to most commonly used words (Khachmafova & Others. 2017).

Judging by our observations, it is used in modern scientific discourse in two completely different values that cannot be reduced to a common denominator, which can be defined as: 1) the experience and expression of one or another positive or negative attitude of the subject of evaluation to the object being evaluated and 2) mental correlation of the estimated object with one or another evaluation criterion. Based on the fundamental difference between these two understandings of the word assessment, it seems, and the semantics of lexical units with estimated values should be analyzed.

Those lexical meanings, the content of which is intended to reflect the results of the comparison of any subject with some evaluation criterion, may well be characterized as criterion-evaluative. The specificity of the content organization of these meanings certainly deserves to distinguish words expressing such meanings into a special semantic type (Polekhina & Others. 2018).

If we talk about the typology of criterion-evaluative semantics, then everything will be determined by the nature of those stereotypical mental formations that can act as evaluation criteria. In accordance with this, it is quite clearly possible to distinguish those types of criterion assessments, the results of which are directly reflected in the meanings of the corresponding criterion-assessment words:

1. Existential assessments (or assessments of typicality), in which the criteria are mental stereotypes containing ideas about the characteristics most typical of various subject classes. They are expressed by **typical - non-typical, ordinary - unusual, ordinary - extraordinary, ordinary - uncommon, distinguished, great, etc. adjectives.**

2. Quantitative assessments, where the human concept of a certain normal, average statistical level of manifestation of a characteristic of a particular subject class is used as a criterion. Estimated values indicate here either to exceed this level, or to undertake to it. The linguistic means of expressing parametric assessments are adjectives of the type **large - small, high - low, wide - narrow, thick - thin, heavy - light, expensive - cheap, poor - rich,** etc.

3. Gnostic assessments reflecting the correlation of any statements with our ideas about truth. They find their expression in the meanings of adjectives **true - false, truthful - deceitful, correct - wrong, true - incorrect, absurd, foolish, anti-scientific, exact - inaccurate, exhaustive - incomplete,** etc.

4. Standard estimates, where the criteria are different standards - a set of specific requirements for the quality of certain things. This kind of assessment is expressed most often with the help of such adjectives **as the standard — non-standard, qualitative — low-quality, good-quality — low-quality, defective, rough, clumsy, good, first-class, first-class,** etc.

5. Regulatory assessments, which consist in fixing the conformity or non-conformity of some human actions to certain behavioral norms, rules, laws and regulations. They are usually expressed in such words as it **is right - wrong, lawful - illegally, ethically - unethical, immoral, immoral, fashionable - unfashionable,** etc.

6. Teleological assessments, where the goals of human actions act as evaluation criteria. Expressed with the help of adjectives **expedient - inexpedient, effective - ineffective, successful - unsuccessful, useful - useless** and under.

7. Aesthetic evaluation, in which the evaluation criteria are aesthetic stereotypes, formed on the basis of hedonistic feelings of aesthetic pleasure. They are expressed by adjectives such as **graceful, harmonious, disharmonious,**

tasteless, arrogant, coarse, anti-artistic, highly artistic, etc.

8. Ideal assessments fixing the conformity or discrepancy of certain things to our ideal ideas about them - ideals. The means of expression of such evaluations are the adjectives **perfect, perfect, immaculate.**

Inclusion in the list of criterion-estimated values of utilitarian values sometimes noted in the axiological literature (**useful - useless - harmful)** seems superfluous to us, since, in our opinion, an indication of the usefulness or harmfulness of something for a person is an ordinary description.

Almost all of the above types of criterion assessments can be expressed by the so-called general-valued adjectives. It is this fact that determines and justifies the very existence of the definition of general-valued. These adjectives express such assessments as: 1) quantitative (good erudition, bad harvest), 2) teleological (good opportunity, bad advice), 3) normative (good behavior, bad father), 4) aesthetic (good singing, bad performance), 5) gnostic (good hypothesis, poor response), 6) various standard assessments, among which are medical (good health, bad heart), consumer (good strawberry, bad brandy), instrumental (good car, bad tool) , qualification assessment (good your teacher, a bad specialist). The specificity of criterion assessments expressed by general-valued words is that they all have a direct bearing on human life and activity, determine whether or not objects contribute to people's well-being, which makes them interpret these objects as good or bad (Malevinskiy & Akhmadzai. 2016).

As one more and, apparently, the last type of lexical meanings peculiar to full-significant words, we propose to single out those meanings that do not contain descriptions, criterial evaluations, or definitions of deictic or anaphoric character, but only express some relation - most often the attitude of the author of a voice message to a particular object. And as such an object can act not only the message designated by the word referent, but also the addressee of speech, and even the entire content of the message as a whole. In accordance with such a semantic specification, the values of this kind could well be defined as relational (from Lat. Relatio - relation).

On the pages of scientific papers on semasiology, consideration of relational lexical meanings is most often limited to various emotive phenomena, although in fact only the manifestations of emotivism are not limited to such values. Words that have non-emotional relational meanings can include, for example, lexemes and stable phraseological combinations expressing a certain rational attitude of the author of a speech message to its content — say, confidence / uncertainty in the reliability of the message (certainly - apparently, perhaps, how to drink) or an indication of greater or lesser significance for the speaker of one or another part of the message (first of all, the most important thing is, after all, first, second, and so on).

The relational meanings of an unemotional character may also be inherent in certain pronouns. Thus, the use of the indefinite pronoun "someone" or "something" means the author's admission that he does not care what kind of person or object is meant, as, for example, in the sentences:

Let someone go to the store or bring me something to read.

The use of pronouns by someone and something means, as a rule, that the referent of a message is simply unknown to the speaker, as in phrases like:

 Someone came or something fell.

And the pronouns "someone" and "something" usually express an unwillingness to call the referent to the addressee of a speech, although he is known to someone who says:

Today, someone will come to us; I have something in store for you.

However, the main mass of words with relational type semantics are, of course, lexical means of expressing emotional and evaluative meanings. Such values are most clearly manifested in statements that represent the emotional evaluations of certain objects, coming directly from the author of the statement, such as:

The weather is a miracle; It's just great that you come; How well done you are; What a beauty these tales; Ugh, what an abomination; How disgusting is your fish.

The emotional and evaluative content of these and similar statements is expressed through such relational and evaluative words as: miracle, charm, healthy, well done, abomination, disgusting, etc. The descriptive semantics of these lexemes is either completely absent or reduced (like the word well done) to the utmost minimum. And this is natural: after all, their semantic function is not to convey some objective information about the referent, but to express the speaker's emotional attitude towards him.

A vivid example of the speech realization of emotive relational semantics can be the use of lexical vocatives - those words that, being specialized in the use of the address function, express at the same time the most different types of the speaker's emotional attitude towards the addressee of speech. The range of emotive values expressed by them can be very wide - from love-caressing (gold, donut, svetik, cat) to dismissive and frankly hostile (man, shkat, goat, goat, scourer, mop, etc.).

Difficulties in interpreting the semantics of emotive words are that some kind of descriptive element can be present in their meanings (for example, indicating the gender or age of the referent), and also (and this is apparently the main thing) the relational meaning emotional evaluation is manifested in them by no means in all contexts. When they are used not to express the author's emotional attitude towards his referent or addressee, these words are turned into lexical units of a purely descriptive character, simply indicating that their referents have a certain emotional attitude on their part from some other person or all people in general, for example:

The rats feed on any filth (i.e., that which usually causes people to feel disgust); Gorky the realist sternly denounced the "lead abominations" of pre-revolutionary life (that is, the life-giving sides of disgust); There was some special charm in her game (i.e., what the audience liked); The grandmother didn't doze with her little gold (i.e., with her beloved grandson); Men, take care of your little ones (i.e. those women you love).

Such ease of transition of relational-emotive values to contextually determined values of the descriptive type seems to be the main reason that words with emotive lexical meanings do not find their worthy reflection as some special category of full-valued words in modern literature on lexicology and semasiology.

Conclusion

So, it can be obviously proven that the semantics of full-valued words from the point of view of the internal organization of its content does not boil down to any single, universal pattern: along with the most common descriptive type, there are also such types of lexical values as comparative, deictic, anaphoric criteria evaluation and various types of relational.

But that's not all. Of particular note is the possibility of the existence of words with values of a hybrid nature, where diversity semantic features can be combined that are in accordance with the semantic types we have selected. In most cases, the meanings of such words are combinations of various descriptive semes with comparative, relational, and criterion-valued semes. So, for example, the word "hominid" descriptive meaning "living creature of the primate genus" is combined with the comparative seme "human-like, similar to man." The meaning of the noun "git" can be represented as a combination of the descriptive semantic component "man" with the relational component "causing disgust". In the meaning of the noun "giant", the descriptive seme "man" is combined with a quantitative criterion-estimated semantic sign of "tremendous growth." And in the semantics of the adjective "deceitful", the general meaning of the gnostic assessment "not corresponding to reality" is accompanied by a descriptive sign of deliberate distortion of truth in the message or work described as a false message.

The combination of different descriptive meanings with meanings of the relational type is observed in the semantic structure of words that have different emotional expressive colors as semantic connotations that are not part of the main lexical meaning (conceptual content) of the word. However, this is a completely different topic, not directly related to the issues addressed in this article.

Acknowledgment

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Bigaysha, Akhmetova, Kaliev, Karabulatova, Bazalina & Skachkova. (2018). The Cognitive Analysis of Turkic Ethnonyms "Kazakh" and "Tatar" in the Linguistic Space of the Russian frontier in the context of ethno-confessional dialogue. In the: Opción, Año 34, No. 85 (2018): 1509-1526; Irina S. Karabulatova, Viktor V. Barabash, Elena A. Kotelenets. The influence of technology on the formation of values, ideological and political values of youth: a cognitive dimension of the impact of antiterrorist orientation sites. In the: Opción, Año 34, No. 85 (2018): 810-824.

Grushevskaya, Sovetovna, Sergeevna, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov. (2017) The game as a modern discursive practice in the culture of post-postmodernity. In the: Revista de Filosofía, N°85, 2017-1, pp 192-203.

Khachmafova & Others. (2017). The Specifics of an Estimate discourse of gender stereotypes in small forms of Folklore in a Network Discourse of Electronic and Information society at the Beginning of 21ct Century. In the: Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities, p.137-150.

Khachmafova, Karabulatova Luchinskaya & Osipov. (2015) Gender Features of Discourse of Woman's Literature as a Reflection of Changes in the Modern Society. In the: Mediterranean Journal of Social Science. 2015. Vol 6, No3, S.2, May 2015. – pp.: 476-481; Karabulatova I., Vildanov Kh., Zinchenko A., Vasilishina E., Vassilenko A. Problems of transformation matrices modern multicultural identity of the person in the variability of the discourse of identity Electronic Information Society. In the: Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities, 2017, Jul., p.1-16.

Luchinskaya, Karabulatova, Tkhorik, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov. (2018) New aspects of intercultural communication discourse modeling in the context of globalization and migration. In the: Opción, Año 34.

Luchinskaya, Karabulatova, Zelenskaya & Golubtsov. S.A. Characteristics of image of the russian family in modern advertising discourse. In the: Astra Salvensis. 2018. 699-713.

Malevinskiy & Akhmadzai. (2016). Kriterial'naya otsenochnost' v russkoy rechi. Krasnodar: Kubanskiy gos. un-t., 2016. 394 s. 322 -355 pp.

Polekhina & Others. (2018). The Evolution of the Concept of "Terror" / "Terrorism" in Modern Scientific Knowledge as a Factor in Ensuring the Security of Modern Society. In the: Astra Salvensis, 2018, Vol.6, #12, p.695-704

Shiganova, Karabulatova, Sviridova & Yuzdova. The concept of "knowledge" / "cognition" in russian paremia: the experience of structural semantic representation. In the: Astra Salvensis, Vol.6, #12, p.385-393

Vasiliev L.M. (1990) Modern linguistic semantics. Higher School. 175 p. p.111.

Vassilenko, Karabulatova, Vasilishina, Tukaeva & Barabash. (2018). The conceptual sphere of fiction in the Russian and English world picture. In the: Opción, Año 34, 825-839

Vinogradov V.V. (1977) Lexicology and lexicography: selected works. Science, 1977. 312 p. 171.

Vinogradov V.V. (1977) Lexicology and lexicography: selected works. Science, 1977. 312 p. 173.

Zelenskaya, Golubtsov, Karabulatova, Kanon & Kasyanova. (2018). Innovative Discourse in the Formation of a Modern Ethno-Cultural Environment. In the: Astra Salvensis, 2018, Vol.6, #12, p.753-766.