

Alena Rudenka

The Competition of Conceptual Models of Different Stages of the Development of Slavonic Languages

Studia Germanica Gedanensia 17, 25-34

2008

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Alena Rudenka

Department of Theoretical and Slavonic Linguistics
University of Minsk

The Competition of Conceptual Models of Different Stages of the Development of Slavonic Languages

At the last session of the international conference «Kontakty językowe i kulturowe w Europie» («Speech and Culture Contacts in Europe») in my report I dealt with a new area in linguistics – cognitive-diachronic onomasiology, the main aim of which is to determine the correlation between the stages of verbal thinking and consecutive facts of language history. In particular, the discussion concerned the fact that different ways of conceptualization and nomination may exist simultaneously and “compete” with each other (on the example of the naming of the notion “a twenty-four hour day”). Today I would like to continue pursuing the topic of the competition of conceptual models.

Let us view in detail this subject matter. The idea was formulated not only within the framework of cognitive diachronic onomasiology (in the form it was stated two years ago), but within the framework of conceptual (cognitive, basic) metaphor as well.

Conceptual metaphor is today a popular area of linguistics and cultural studies. Let us only recall that conceptual metaphor is understood as the establishment of a relation between two different frames on the basis of similarity of some of their features.

It is characteristic of conceptual metaphors that they work as long term models for the development of metaphorizing frame, i.e. they serve as a basis for establishment of new particular conceptual structures and relations based on the selected model of metaphorization. In language all aforesaid is revealed in: a) similarity of the syntagmatic environment of lexemes nominating concepts of the frames being compared; b) possibilities of generating an infinite quantity of utterances about the metaphorized area of knowledge built on the basis of a given model of metaphorization.

There is no need to explain of this notion in detail – we may only refer to numerous summarizing works in this area, for example [Lakoff 1999; Jäkel 1997 and many others].

G. Lakoff, a recognized authority in the area of conceptual metaphor, the actual founder of this research programme, says that one and the same conceptual target domain may be serviced by different not connected with each other and sometimes even contradictory metaphors [Lakoff 1999]. Following him O. Jäkel asserts that metaphors offer only partial description and explanation of the conceptual target domain, moreover some aspects are revealed and some are shaded. It is in focusing that lies the difference between alternative metaphors servicing one and the same target domain [Jäkel 1997,2–3], i.e. the competition of different basic metaphors takes place when one and the same conceptual target domain is being serviced (= explained, represented).

The comparison of the two mentioned earlier ideas obviously shows that in this case the way of generation, organization and interrelation of conceptual spheres (= frames = conceptual domains) within the framework of a conceptual system transposes into the sphere of onomasiology which highlights to earlier stages of the naming process.

Comparison – transfer – metaphor as the mechanism of generation of new concepts and their nominations is relevant both for the individual and collective consciousness. The competition of different conceptual metaphors as well as the competition of naming units based on different ways of conceptualization is the consequence of the fact that the universal cognitive operation of comparison may be carried out on different grounds.

How does this competition in the processes of naming become apparent?

- 1) in the synchrony of one language – due to the presence of names of one and the same concept based on different ways of conceptualization;
- 2) in the diachrony of one language – due to the presence of different names of one and the same concept in the consecutive stages of language development;
- 3) in the synchrony of different languages – due to the presence of names of one and the same concept based on different ways of conceptualization in kindred languages.

The above mentioned possibilities of manifestation of competing ways of naming may be demonstrated on the material of Slavic languages.

Let us take as an example causative verbs of understanding and knowledge that belong to different stages of development of the Belarusian language, and in the first turn the lexemes with the meaning ‘to explain’ and ‘to teach’.

The lexical-semantic group of understanding both of the Modern and Old Belarusian (XIV–XVIII cc.) languages is rich in causatives. The meaning ‘to explain’ in the modern language is represented by the lexemes *агаварыць/ца(-ь)*, *асвятліць*, *асвяціць*, *арыентаваць*, *выкладаць*, *дэталізаваць*, *каменціраваць*, *канкрэтызаваць*, *матываваць*, *папулярызаваць*, *паясніць*, *прапагандаваць*, *праясніць*, *разжаваць*, *талкаваць*, *тлумачыць*, *трактаваць*, *убіць* (colloq.),

удзяўбіці (colloq.). The majority of the lexemes given here and subsequently are polysemantic, and ,to explain' is only one of their meanings.

In the Old Belarusian language there are fewer such designations: *выказати, выкладати, аб'ясніти, тлумачити, толковати, толмачити, трактовати* – mainly due to the existence of the newest borrowings in the language of the XX century (*арыентаваць, дэталізаваць, каменціраваць, канкрэтызаваць, матываваць, папулярызаваць, прапагандаваць*), and the development of the semantic transfer ,to make light, well seen' → 'to explain' (*асвятліць, асвятціць, праясніць*, etc. when the lexeme *аб'ясніти* disappeared from the language), and the realization of a new way of motivation ,to hammer in, to drum into (smb.'s head)' → 'to explain' (*убіць, удзяўбіці*). In Old Belarusian *выкладати, тлумачити, трактовати* were borrowings. The other verbs *выказати, толковати, толмачити*, except the dominant of the set *аб'ясніти*, are inseparably linked with the semantics of speaking: either by motivating lexical-semantic variant (*выказати*) or according to the meaning of their other lexical-semantic variants and the semantics at earlier stages of development, or due to the fusion of the process being named with speaking (*толмачити* ,to explain' ← 'to interpret' < *толмачь* ,an interpreter' < com. Slav. **тълмаць* < Turkic **тълмаць* [Фасмер 1997, IV, 72]; *толковати* < *толкъ* < com. Slav. **тълкъ*, kin. Ir. *ad-thuch* ,to thank', ,to ask for smth', Lat. *loquor; locūtus sum, loquī* ,to speak, to name, to say', etc.) [Фасмер 1997, IV, 71].

It is interesting that the verb *расширити* is used not only in the meaning ,to make known to everybody' that is analogical to Mod. Blr. *пашырыць*, but also in the meaning ,to expound, to explain': *Златоустъ написаъ и расшириъ в рѣчюх истинною правду* (Чэця, 157)¹.

Thus, three semantic transfers participate in the process of naming the notion ,to explain' in the Modern and Old Belarusian languages. They present three conceptual schemes ,to speak' → 'to explain', 'to make light, well seen' → 'to explain', 'to make a physical action changing spatial parametres of smth.' → 'to explain'.

Much has been written about the common tendency of the naive language consciousness to describe the processes of acquiring information in terms of moving in space. It should be noted though that spatial notions do not participate too actively in the formation of the concept ,to explain' at different stages of the existence of the Belarusian language (see O. Blr. *расширити*, Mod. Blr. *убіць, удзяўбіці*). Out of the above mentioned competing ways of conceptualization transfer on the basis of speaking prevails in Old Belarusian, while in Modern Belarusian the dominant forms are those based on the semantics of lighth.

In general the semantics of light plays a rather noticeable role in the formation of causatives of explanation and teaching. If the meaning ,make light, well seen' motivates ,to explain', ,to make dark, badly seen' motivates ,to

¹ The principles of writing Old Belarusian texts and abbreviations of written records correspond to those accepted in *Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* (Historical dictionary of the Belarusian language). Issue 1. Minsk, 1982. The letters underlined in the examples are super-linear.

entangle, to make unintelligible' (see O. Blr. *баламутити, мутити*; Mod. Blr. *марочыць, муціць, туманіць, цямніць*). However, also in this case (albeit to a lesser degree) a competing conceptualization by means of spatial notions is present (e.g., Mod. Blr. *блытаць*).

In Modern Belarusian the lexical-semantic group with the generalized meaning 'to teach' besides prefixal derivatives *вучыць* includes the verbs *выкладаць, убіць* (colloq.), *удзяўбіці* (colloq.), *наставіць* 'to teach' + 'to pass experience', *адукаваць* 'to teach' + 'to introduce to a culture'; *выхаваць, развіць, цывілізаваць* 'to develop the spiritual world, to introduce to a culture'; *арыентаваць, інструктаваць, практыкаваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць* which denote the transmission of special knowledge and skills and form the periphery of the designations of teaching.

The verb *учыти* bears the generalizing meaning in the lexical-semantic group of Old Belarusian causatives of teaching; the group also comprises its prefixal formations, as well as the verbs *выдавати, выкладати*; the same semantics with the element of passing experience is contained in *вразумити, напамніти, наставити, напамнянути*. The meaning 'to bring up, to educate, to enlighten' was denoted by the words *будовати, воспитати, выховати, осветити, цвичити*, i.e. the meaning under consideration transferred more actively in Old Belarusian, but the lexemes with the semantics 'to pass special knowledge' were absent.

Borrowings and calques (Mod. Blr. *адукаваць, развіць* (Fr. calque *developper*), *цывілізаваць, арыентаваць, інструктаваць, практыкаваць, спецыялізаваць, трэніраваць, выхаваць* (< O. Blr. *выховати*), *выкладаць* (< O. Blr. *выкладати*); O. Blr. *цвичити*; the meaning 'to teach, to bring up', 'to motivate' of O. Blr. *будовати* developed as a vernacular, Belarusian form though in its direct meaning 'to build' the verb was borrowed from Polish) as well as words with a direct intellectual meaning (Mod. Blr. *вучыць* < O. Blr. *учыти*, O. Blr. *напамніти, напамнянути*) should be eliminated from the analysis of the motivation for the designations of teaching. Among the other designations of teaching there are both those conceptualized on the basis of spatial notions (Mod. Blr. *наставіць* < O. Blr. *наставити* and already mentioned *убіць, удзяўбіці*) and on the basis of designations of light (O. Blr. *осветити*).

Other conceptual metaphors, which may figure in the mechanism of transfer, and other conceptual spheres which can serve as the source of transfer, can also participate in the process of naming concepts of explanation and teaching. The source concept O. Blr. *выдавати* is handing over some property; O. Blr. *будовати* – building (the transfer 'to form, to improve a building' → 'to form, to improve a person'), O. Blr. *воспитати* 'to provide with material food' → 'to provide with spiritual food', *вразумити* < *разумь* < *умь* < O. Rus. *умь* < Proslav. **ить* < I.E. **ou-tos* > Hitt. *ai-, auš-*, 'to see' [Трубачев 1959, 154–157], i.e. is motivated by the semantics of perception.

The relations between the conceptual spheres of perception and thinking should be dealt with separately. W. Neisser said that perception is a process of looking for a prototype of the incoming inner stimulus in long-term memory,

the meeting of the outer and inner worlds. „To perceive“ is a frequent and natural source concept for denoting thinking processes, acts of imagination, etc.; very often from a semantic viewpoints, words which stand for perception and thinking are treated as syncretic, indivisible, see, for example, Proslav. **videti* connected by the vowel alternation with **vedati* [Фасмер 1986, I, 137], besides the lexemes with the semantics ‘to see’ are used in the meaning ‘to understand’ in many languages of the world. The indicated relations may be seen on the material of the lexical-semantic groups under consideration, in particular, Mod. Blr. *раз’яваць* (colloq.) ,to explain in detail‘ ← ‘to make more simple for the intellectual perception, learning‘ ← ‘to make more simple for physiological perception‘.

The considered here semantics of light is systematically used as the source conceptual sphere for intellectual designations due to deep cognitive reasons: light presupposes better perception and, consequently, intellectual activity. In Indo-European languages the mentioned semantic transfer is realized mainly under the influence of Greek and Latin texts: the possibility to be enriched by the designations of light was brought to the intellectual lexicon with a religious world view. The use of such Old Belarusian verbs as *осветити, просветити* in the meaning ,to teach, to educate‘ pertains to the earlier periods. „The verb *просвѣтити (просвѣщати)* (O. Rus. – A.R.), which had the initial meaning ‘to begin to produce light, to burn’, acquired new meanings ‘to pass knowledge’, ‘to christen’, ‘to glorify’, ‘to improve’, ‘to adorn’. This was so because it started to be used not only with the names of the sources of light (*свѣча, лүчина*) but with the designations of people... , and such nouns as *лице, очи, дүша, манастырь, мирь*. Such compatibility, that was not originally typical for the verb, is borrowed from the Greek verbs *φωτίζειν, φωταγωγεῖν* which as well as O. Rus. *просвѣтити* derived from the root with the meaning ‘light’” [Копыленко 1969, 96–103]. Thus, the metaphoric use of these verbs that was introduced via translations of religious literature (in Old Belarusian from Greek through Old Slavic, as well as through Polish or directly from Latin) originally had a religious coloring that later transferred to science, art, education and culture in general. The ideas of Enlightenment spread in Belarus earlier than in Russia; the designation of the notions „to enlighten“, „Enlightenment“, „education“ was realized with the help of the Latin root *адук-* (*едук-*) that is why the element of enlightenment is weakened in Modern Belarusian verbs.

In Old Slavic language *просвѣтити* besides its direct meaning ‘to lighten, to illuminate’ is actively used in the figurative meaning: *да ты ми просвѣтиши оүмь* Евх 79а 21–2². By the way, one of the meanings of O. Slav. *просвѣтити* is ‘to return eye sight’ [Старославянский словарь 1994, 525–526], i.e. ,to improve the possibility to perceive‘.

² The principles of writing Old Slavic texts and abbreviations of written records correspond to those accepted in *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)* (Old Slavic dictionary (on the written records of X–XI centuries)) / Э. Благова, Р.М. Цейтлин, С. Геродес and others. Moscow, 1994.

The Old Slavic verbs that have the meaning under consideration ,to explain‘ are motivated either by the semantics of speaking – сѣказати (сѣказаше има отъ вѣсѣхъ кънигъ ѡже вѣахъ о немъ Мар. Лк. 24, 27)) or inseparably connected with it – протѣковати < тѣкъ 'an interpreter' (а не зѣло възништѣ въходоу образа • повѣдаѣ таньнѣ • не протѣкоуѣ не протѣкованааго Супр. 501, 24 [Старославянский словарь 1994, 530, 696]).

There are explanations motivated by the semantics of light among Old Slavic verbs – оушнати (показанне оудное на много приваждемо потрѣбнѣ намъ оушнати прѣдѣлежаштее Зогр-лл 16 6 [Старославянский словарь 1994, 781]).

The meaning ,to teach‘ in the Old Slavic language is denoted by the verb оучити and its derivatives наоучати, пооучати, прооучати; въразоумити, казати 'to point out' → 'to teach, to instruct, to induce' (егда никогоже вѣ кажшѣта • тѣгда... прѣмѣни сѣ — Супр 415, 4 [Старославянский словарь 1994, 280]) and its derivatives, see наказати; огласити 'to instruct (before christening or professing)', пооустити, правити 'to spread a true teaching', ставлати (наставлати кого въ чѣто (3) однѣи, to show (the way), to bring in, to bring to; fig. to teach': ограждена тѣ оврѣтаѣ • крѣпкоѣ ржкоѣ и вѣроѣ • къ наставлѣнцюмоу тѣ Евх 916 9–10. – Евх 266 4–5 [Старославянский словарь 1994, 354]), оувѣштати, оутѣшати.

Of the mentioned lexemes наказати, огласити, оувѣштати, оутѣшати are connected with the semantics of speaking; казати, въразумити — with the perception; правити, ставлати (наставлати) – with spatial notions.

The group under consideration as well as many other lexical-semantic groups of the Old Slavic text, shows a rather strict relation to the idea of propagation of divine teaching: въиде и(соу)с(ъ) въ цркъве і оучаше Мар. Ин. 7, 14; г(оспод)и • наоучи ны молити сѣ Мар. Лк. 11, 1; томѣ ли тѣ наказ оучитель Супр. 411, 3. It also takes place even if the teacher is not God himself: кодратъ... пооучаше кажшѣта Супр. 109, 10; онъ же како отьць доуховнѣ • став(ъ)шаше та Супр. 203, 14–15 [Старославянский словарь 1994].

As it is clear from the given contexts, persuasion is the main means of teaching in this case. In some contexts it is highlighted: на мнозѣ кажа • мола припадаѣ • кланѣ сѣ • оувѣштати кго не възможе Супр. 527, 14–15. Thus, the ideas of teaching and persuasion in Old Slavic texts are in correspondence with each other, see пооустити 'to encourage, to induce'; 'to teach, to instruct'.

The initial direct meaning 'to point' of the verb казати is fixed in Old Slavic texts while the meaning 'to speak' is fixed only for some prefixal derivatives such as сказати. In the dictionary of the Old Russian language for казати the meaning ,to show‘ (отъкрытиє ларѣ и покажѣте та члѣкоу ономоу чѣто ѡмоу хранѣть свѣтъ... Изб 1076, 272 об.–273³), as well as ,to speak‘ (и нача казати

³ The principles of writing Old Russian texts and abbreviations of written records correspond to those accepted in *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.) (Dictionary of the Old Russian Language (XI–XIV cc.))*. V. 1. Moscow, 1988.

[Пр XIV (2), 1256 – *сказати*] *моукоу мѣжа своѣго* Пр 1383, 1316), and ,to instruct‘ (*не подобаѣт ни неч(с)тѣва. ни грѣшника ненавиждѣти. нѣ молити за нѣ. и съ кротостию казати* ПНЧ 1296, 93 [Словарь древнерусского языка 1991, I, 186]) are fixed.

O. Blr. *казати* has the meanings 1) ,to speak‘, 2) ,to order‘, 3) ,to witness‘ [Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы 1996, 14, 224], i.e. in Old Belarusian the meanings ,to show‘, ,to point out‘ are denoted only by prefixal derivatives of the root.

Both the semantics ,to show‘ and ,to speak‘ is recorded for Proslav. *kazati (se). According to the *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* (Etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages) „the initial is ,to show, to give a sign‘ (hence the derived meaning – ,to speak‘)“ [1983, 9, 169]. Thus, the seme of causation of perception ,to make bright, better perceived‘ is relevant for both meanings that are syncretically bound in the semantics of the Proslavic verb while the competition of ,to show, to make better seen‘ and ,to speak‘ of the derivatives of this root and of the derivatives of different roots appeared later.

In the Russian language the same conceptual models are realized to denote the meaning ,to explain‘: on the basis of ,to speak‘ (*растолковать* and other prefixal formations), ,to make clear, light‘ (*объяснить* and other prefixal formations), ,to hammer in‘ \approx ,to move, put inside with an effort‘ (*вдолбить* (colloq.)), ,to chew up‘ \approx ,to make better perceived‘ (*разжевать* (colloq.)).

In the Bulgarian language the verbs *обясня, поясня, разтълкувам* are used. Their semantic development is analogical to that considered above for the lexemes with the same meaning in other languages.

The semantics ,to teach‘ in Russian is denoted by the borrowings *муштровать, дрессировать* in their secondary meaning ,to teach (excessively strict)‘, the verb *учить* with the intitial meaning of teaching and its affixal derivatives as well as by the verbs, the meanings of which are based on the semantic transfers considered above: *вразумлять* (the initial semantics is ,perception by organs of sense‘, see above); *наставлять, направлять* (obs.), *напутствовать* (before starting smth. to do, before a trip) with the common initial meaning ,to show the way, to orientate in space‘, *преподавать* with the initial meaning of property transfer (comp. O. Blr. *выдавати* ,to teach‘, Fr. *apprendre* ,to study‘, ,to teach‘ < *prendre* ,to take‘, ,to be spread‘ and analogical names formed on the basis of this model). Thus, among figurative names both in Modern Russian and Modern Belarusian prevail those motivated by spatial semantics, while in Old Belarusian source conceptual spheres are more varied („space“, „light“, „physical activity“). In the Old Slavic language the verbs denoting speech acitivity dominate in the designation of the process of teaching, in Modern Bulgarian the lexemes *уча* (and prefixal derivatives), *преподавам, утътвам* are used; in both Modern Russian and Modern Bulgarian the verbs Rus. *просветить*, Bulg. *просветя* are used.

A number of lexemes (the affixal derivatives were not taken into consideration) the naming of which was realized through one of the three considered

above conceptual models on the basis of the meanings ‚to make better perceived‘ including ‚to make better seen‘ and ‚to make better spotted‘ within the framework of the latter; ‚to speak‘; ‚to make a physical action changing spatial parameters of smth.‘ are presented below in the form of tables. Such a presentation allows us to ascertain the hypothesis offered above and conclusions drawn on the basis of concrete language material by visual demonstration.

Table 1.

The ways of motivation of lexemes with the semantics ‚to explain‘.

| Source conceptual sphere | | Language | Mod. Blr. | O. Blr. | Mod. Rus. | O. Slav. | Mod. Bulg. |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|
| to make better perceived | to make better seen | to make lighter | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| to speak | | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| to change space | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |

Table 2.

The ways of motivation of lexemes with the semantics ‚to teach‘.

| Source conceptual sphere | | Language | Mod. Blr. | O. Blr. | Mod. Rus. | O. Slav. | Mod. Bulg. |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|
| to make better perceived | to make better seen | to make lighter | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| to speak | | | | | | 4 | |
| to change space | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

The above tables demonstrate once again the competition of different ways of conceptualization in the naming of the concepts ‚to explain‘, ‚to teach‘ in the synchrony and diachrony of Eastern and Southern Slavic languages.

Thus, cognitive-diachronic onomasiology determines the correlation between mental processes of the individual and stages of language change. This research agenda is quite adequate for the main purpose of cognitive linguistics – to conduct research on verbal thinking.

Sources

Изб. 1076 – Изборник 1076 г. Изд. подгот. В.С.Гольщенко, В.Ф.Дубровина, В.Г.Демьянков, Г.Ф.Нефедов. Под ред. С.И. Коткова. М., 1965.

Ипат. – Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Ипатьевская летопись (воспроизведение текста издания 1908 г.). М., 1962.

Štít. – Tomáš ze Štítného. Sborník Vyšehradský, I. Vydal F. Ryšánek. Praha, 1960.

Dictionaries

Александрова З.Е. Словарь синонимов русского языка. М., 1986.

БРС – Белорусско-русский словарь / Под ред. К. Крапівы. М., 1962.

Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы. Вып. 1–. Мн., 1982–.

Даль В. Словарь живого великорусского языка. Т. 1–4. СПб., М., 1880–1882.

Желеховский Е., Недільский С. Малорусско-німецкий словарь. Т. I–II. Львів, 1882–1886.

3 нар. слоўн. – 3 народнага слоўніка. Мн., 1975.

РБЕ – Речник на съвременния български книжовен език. Т. 1–3. София, 1954–1959.

Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.). Т. 1–. М., 1988–.

Словарь языка Пушкина. Т. 1–4. М., 1956–1961.

Срезневский И.И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка. Т. 1–3. СПб., 1893–1903.

Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков) / Э.Благова, Р.М.Цейтлин, С. Геродес и др. Под ред. Р.М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерки и Э.Благовой. М., 1994.

Сцяшкoviч Т.Ф. Матэрыялы для слоўніка Гродзенскай вобласці. Мн., 1972.

Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка. Т. I–IV. М., 1986–1987.

Этимологический словарь славянских языков / Под ред. О.Н. Трубачева. Вып. 6, 8, 9, 15. М., 1979, 1981, 1983, 1988.

Gebauer J. Slovník staročeský. D. I–II. Praha, 1970.

Pokorny J. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern, 1949–1959.

SJS – Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Praha, 1958–1990.

References

Биркгоф Г. Теория структур. М., 1952.

Буслаев Ф.И. Историческая грамматика русского языка. М., 1959.

Копержинський К. До системи поняттів часу у слов'ян. Київ, 1928.

Копыленко М.М. О греческом влиянии на язык древнерусской письменности // Рус. речь. 1969. № 5. 93–103.

Кочерган М.П. Лексика часових понять в українській мові // Лексикологія та лексикографія. Київ, 1966.

Кубрякова Е.С. Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. М., 1997.

Мартынов В.В. Анализ по семантическим микросистемам и реконструкция праславянской лексики // Этимология 1968. М., 1971. 11–23.

Мартынов В.В. Из славянских этимологий // Этимологические исследования по русскому языку. Вып. 2. М., 1962. 44–57.

Степанов Н.В. Единицы счета времени (до XIII века) по Лаврентьевской и 1-ой Новгородской летописям // Чтения общества любителей истории и древностей российских. 1909. Кн. 4.

- Степанов Н.В. Календарно-хронологические факторы Ипатьевской летописи до XIII в. // Известия ОРЯС. 1915. Т. XX. Кн. 2.
- Трубачев О.Н. История славянских терминов родства и некоторых древнейших терминов общественного строя. М., 1959.
- Трубачев О.Н. Славянские этимологии // Вопросы славянского языкознания. 1957. Вып. 2. 29–42.
- Цейтлин Р.М. Материалы для изучения значений приименной приставки *sQ-* // Уч. зап. Института славяноведения АН СССР. 1959. Т. XVII. 229–241.
- Blank A. Words and Concepts in Time: towards Diachronic Cognitive Onomasiology // Das Online-Journal zu Metapher und Metonymie. 2001. № 1. 6–25 (www.metaphoric.de).
- Blank A. Historical semantics and cognition. Berlin, 1999.
- Geeraets D. Diachronic Prototype Semantics. A Contribution to Historical Lexicology. Oxford, 1997.
- Hoops J. Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde. Bd. I–IV. Strassburg, 1911–1913, 1913–1915, 1915–1916, 1918–1919.
- Jäkel O. How can mortal man understand the road he travels? Prospects and Problems of the Cognitive Approach to Religious Metaphor. Duisburg, 1997.
- Janko J. O pravěku slovanském. Praha, 1912.
- Lakoff G. The invariance hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image-schemas? // Cognitive linguistics. 1990. V.1. № 1. 42–81.
- Lakoff G. The System of Metaphors for Mind and the Conceptual System of Analytic Philosophy: A Study of the Metaphorical Constrains on Philosophical Discourse // Cognition and Function in Language. Stanford, 1999. 51–71.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, 1980.
- Moszyński K. Kultura ludowa Słowian. T. II. Warszawa, 1967.
- Nilsson M.P. Primitive Time-Reckoning. Lund, 1920.
- Schrader O. Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde. Bd. I–II. Berlin, 1917–1923, 1929.
- Theorie und Praxis des Lexikons. München, 1993.

Konkurencja konceptualnych modeli na różnych etapach rozwoju języków słowiańskich Streszczenie

W artykule rozpatruje się współistnienie metafor w procesie generacji nowych konceptów, czego skutkiem są nominacje tego samego pojęcia, oparte na różnych sposobach konceptualizacji. Istnienie kilku modeli nominacji jednego konceptu możliwe jest dzięki temu, że uniwersalna kognitywna operacja porównania może być przeprowadzona według różnych podstaw. Konkurencja modeli nominatywnych występuje: 1) w synchronii jednego języka – w obecności nominacji jednego konceptu, opartych na różnych sposobach konceptualizacji; 2) w diachronii jednego języka – w obecności nominacji jednego konceptu na kolejnych etapach rozwoju języka; 3) w synchronii różnych języków – w obecności nominacji jednego konceptu, opartych na różnych sposobach konceptualizacji w językach pokrewnych. W artykule te idee prezentowane są na materiale języków słowiańskich.