

**ORIENTAL JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY**

journal homepage:

<http://www.supportscience.uz/index.php/ojp/about>**CONVERSENESS AND ITS LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION****Uktamjon Urozovich Kuldoshov***Associate professor of the department of Translation Theory and Practice**Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*kuldashovuktamjon@gmail.com*Samarkand, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: converseness, converse units, lexical semantics, syntactic semantics, conceptualization, frame theory, cognitive linguistics, translation theory, argument relations, semantic transformation.

Received: 03.10.26**Accepted:** 04.10.26**Published:** 05.10.26

Abstract: This article examines the phenomenon of converseness, its linguistic description, its semantic and cognitive characteristics. The manifestation of converse units at lexical, syntactic and grammatical levels is analyzed using examples from English and Uzbek. Special attention is paid to the role of converseness in translation as well as its relationship with conceptualization and frame theory. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the communicative and cognitive functions of converseness in language and discourse.

KONVERSIVLIK VA UNING LISONIY TAVSIFI**Uktamjon Urozovich Kuldoshov***Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti**Tarjima nazariyasi va amaliyoti kafedrasi dotsenti*kuldashovuktamjon@gmail.com*Samarqand, O'zbekiston***MAQOLA HAQIDA**

Kalit so'zlar: konversivlik, konversiv birliklar, leksik semantika, sintaktik semantika, konseptuallashtirish, freym nazariyasi, kognitiv lingvistika, tarjima nazariyasi, argument munosabatlari, semantik transformatsiya.

Annotatsiya: Maqolada konversivlik hodisasining mohiyati, uning lingvistik tavsifi hamda semantik va kognitiv xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Konversiv birliklarning leksik, sintaktik va grammatik sathlarda namoyon bo'lishi ingliz va o'zbek tillari materiallari asosida yoritiladi. Shuningdek, konversivlikning tarjima jarayonidagi o'rni, konseptuallashtirish va freym nazariyalari bilan bog'liqligi ko'rib chiqiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari konversivlikning til va nutqdagi

kommunikativ hamda kognitiv funksiyalarini
aniqlashga xizmat qiladi.

КОНВЕРСИВНОСТЬ И ЕЕ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ОПИСАНИЕ

Уктамжон Урозович Кулдошов

Доцент кафедры теории и практики перевода

Самаркандского государственного института иностранных языков

kuldashovuktamjon@gmail.com

Самарканд, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: конверсивность, конверсивы, лексическая семантика, синтаксическая семантика, концептуализация, теория фреймов, когнитивная лингвистика, теория перевода, аргументные отношения, семантическая трансформация.

Аннотация: В статье анализируются сущность конверсивности, её лингвистическое описание, а также семантические и когнитивные особенности. Рассматриваются проявления конверсивных единиц на лексическом, синтаксическом и грамматическом уровнях на материале английского и узбекского языков. Особое внимание уделяется роли конверсивности в процессе перевода и её связи с теориями концептуализации и фреймов. Результаты исследования способствуют более глубокому пониманию коммуникативных и когнитивных функций конверсивности в языке и речи.

Introduction. The concept of converseness derives from the Latin word *conversionis*, f. (*converto*), which denotes such meanings as: (1) “to turn” or “to move in a circular manner”; (2) “to be transformed,” “a turn,” or “a change of direction”; and (3) “the completion of speech” [KLRS, 1941/2001: 96]. These meanings, along with numerous other derivatives and semantic variants, are also recorded in the Latin-Russian Dictionary [LRS, 1976: 258].

In linguistics, the term *converse* is used to describe reverse or reciprocal relations between linguistic units. The phenomenon initially attracted the attention of syntacticians, whose primary focus was the interrelationship between the subject and the object. In O. Akhmanova’s linguistic dictionary, a *converse* is defined as a member of a converse pair. Here, we should not confuse the terms *converse* and *conversion*. *Conversion* in English refers to the formation of a new word by transferring an existing word into another grammatical paradigm. For example, *pen* (noun) → *to pen* (verb), as illustrated in the forms *He pens*, *He penned*, and *He is penning* [Akhmanova, 1966: 202]. In this dictionary, *conversion* is primarily treated as a type of word-formation process, as exemplified by *a man* → *to man* and *a book* → *to book*.

Literature review and research methodology. J. Lyons was among the first scholars to employ the term converseness in 1963 [Lyons, 1963/1977: 82]. F. Palmer, in turn, interpreted the concept as a form of relational opposition [Palmer, 1976: 82]. More specifically, he defined it as a mutually related contrast, a dependent opposition, or an opposition between arguments sharing a common semantic basis. Independently of J. Lyons, the Russian linguist Yu. Apresyan developed a detailed theory of converses (“конверсивы”) in his monograph “Lexical Semantics” (1974). It should be noted that both scholars had advanced these ideas in a number of influential articles prior to the publication of their monographs (Apresyan, 1975/1995; Lyons, 1977), and it is likely that they were familiar with one another’s research.

Another linguist who examined the notion of converseness was L. Novikov. Discussing the core meaning of the term and its linguistic implications, he emphasized that converseness may also be realized within the category of grammatical voice. For example:

The workers build the house → The house is built by the workers.

Research on grammatical voice and diathesis demonstrates the broad functional potential of the voice category [Novikov, 1982: 214].

Certain converse pairs express relations such as above/below, before/after, older/younger and similar oppositions. For instance:

A precedes B → B follows (succeeds) A [Novikov, 1982: 214].

A leads B → B follows A (author’s translation).

Sobir is older than Vali → Vali is younger than Sobir.

As can be observed, a shift in perspective does not affect the denotative structure of the proposition. Rather, the reversal of the subject-object configuration conceptualizes the same extralinguistic fact from a different viewpoint [Ivanova, 2016: 17].

Differences in perspective likewise give rise to different linguistic realizations. Consider the following example:

John: Where is Nick?

Tom: He went to your office.

John: When will he come?

Tom: In half an hour.

This discourse concerns a single event. John calls Tom to find out where Nick is. Tom informs him that Nick has gone to his office. John, however, is interested not in the time of Nick’s departure but in the time of his arrival. Depending on the position of the observer, speaker or participant, the same action may be described differently. It is precisely this circumstance that necessitates the use of converses in discourse. Verbs such as come, go, leave and depart inherently

encode information about the location of the speech participant. Such deictic information constitutes an important component in the formation of lexical meaning [Safarov, 2013: 31].

The components of converse pairs are referred to as arguments [Palmer, 1976: 82]. Some examples of converses found in English and Uzbek are presented in the following table (see Table 1.):

Table 1.
Examples of Converses in English and Uzbek

No.	Part of Speech	Converse Lexical Units in English	Converse Lexical Units in Uzbek
1	Verbs	<i>buy/sell, lend/borrow, give/take, rent/let, belong to/own, give/receive</i>	<i>sotmoq/sotib olmoq (sell/buy), bormoq/kelmoq (go/come), gapirmoq/tinglamoq (speak/listen), olmoq/bermoq (take/give), ijaraga qo'y moq/ijara olmoq (rent out/rent), tegishli bo'lmoq/egallik qilmoq (belong to/own), ergashmoq/ergashtirmoq (follow/lead)</i>
2	Nouns	<i>husband/wife, fiancé/fiancée, parent/child, debtor/creditor, teacher/pupil</i>	<i>er-xotin (husband/wife), ota-ona/farzand (parent/child), qarzdor/qarz beruvchi (debtor/creditor), o'qituvchi/o'quvchi (teacher/pupil), tog'a-jiyan (uncle/nephew)</i>
3	Prepositions	<i>above/below, in front of/behind, north of/south of</i>	<i>ustida/ostida (above/below), oldida/orqasida (in front of/behind)</i>

The renowned French linguist Charles Bally was among the scholars who devoted considerable attention to the phenomenon of converseness. In his work *French Stylistics*, published in 1921, he examined a number of cases related to this phenomenon [Bally, 1921/2001: 141]. Among the examples discussed by the scholar, the expressions *avoir le droit* ("to have the right") and *être légitime* ("to be legitimate" or "to be lawful") are regarded as one of the sources of lexical synonymy.

Lexical synonymy is of particular importance in translation practice because linguistic units and sentences, although selected according to different communicative situations, preserve an invariant meaning. Consequently, equivalent expressions may semantically be employed in different contexts without altering the core propositional content of the utterance (see Table 2):

Table 2.
Sources of Lexical Synonymy

English	Uzbek
He was given the right to protest.	Unga e'tiroz bildirish huquqi berilgan edi.
He had the right to protest.	U e'tiroz bildirish huquqiga ega edi.
His protest was legal.	Uning e'tirozi qonuniy edi.
His protest was lawful.	Uning e'tirozi qonun doirasida edi.
His protest was legally grounded.	Uning e'tirozi qonunan asosli edi.

As illustrated in Table 2. the lexical items employed in these sentences differ in their expressive semantic features; however, they convey the same denotative meaning. This demonstrates that lexical synonymy enables the representation of an identical proposition through different linguistic forms while preserving semantic equivalence. Strictly speaking, these sentences are not converses; they illustrate the broader class of synonymous transformations to which converse substitution belongs.

Among the linguists of the twentieth century, Otto Jespersen investigated the phenomenon of converseness in connection with concepts related to the passive voice. He interpreted the above-mentioned cases as changes in the functional roles of the subject and the object and introduced the term “conversion of the object” [Jespersen, 1924/1958: 193; 186–187].

Discussing the semantic relationship between the sentences “A precedes B” and “B follows A,” Jespersen emphasized that the first sentence presents the situation from A’s perspective, whereas the second presents it from B’s perspective [Jespersen, 1958: 186].

Through these observations, Jespersen broadened the scope of syntactic synonymy and pointed out that converse relations may exist between different parts of speech, including prepositions. For example, among prepositions: above – under and before – after; among adjectives: older – younger; among nouns: examiner – examinee; and among verbs: sell – buy and give – receive [Jespersen, 1958: 192–193].

Subsequently, a considerable number of articles and larger-scale studies devoted to various aspects of lexical converses were published by such scholars as A. Zholkovsky, I. Melchuk, Y. Apresyan, Ch. J. Fillmore and others.

V. Komissarov emphasizes that one of the principal challenges of translation is associated with the implicit meaning embedded in a text or utterance [Komissarov, 2002: 61]. The phenomenon of converseness likewise contains implicit meanings that must be recognized and interpreted by the translator. Only a translator who successfully identifies these implicit semantic components can preserve the overall meaning of the source text, even when making syntactic modifications in order to adapt the sentence to the norms and conventions of the target language.

The study employs descriptive, comparative and transformational methods. Converse pairs were identified by the converse substitution test: a pair is regarded as converse if replacing one member by the other, together with the permutation of its arguments, preserves the denotative content of the sentence. The material comprises English and Uzbek examples drawn from dictionaries and linguistic literature, as well as sentences constructed by the author and checked against native-speaker usage.

Results and discussion. Another noteworthy characteristic of converseness is that lexical units which do not inherently possess converse properties may form converse pairs under the

influence of context. This context-dependent emergence of converse relationships constitutes an important aspect of converseness and warrants special attention (see Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3.

English converse pairs formed under the influence of context

No.	Converse pair	Sentences with converse relation
1	to spend – to run out	We spent all our money. / Our money ran out.
2	to go – to take	He goes there in his friend's car. / His friend takes him there.
3	to make ready – to wait for	The future made ready some problems for them. / Some problems were waiting for them.
4	to hold up – to hang on	A single button held up his trousers. / His trousers hung on a single button.
5	to appear – to obtain	A new meaning appears in the word. / The word obtains a new meaning.

Table 4.

Uzbek converse pairs formed under the influence of context

No.	Converse pair	Sentences with converse relation
1	tugamoq – sarflamoq. to finish – to spend	Pulimiz tugab qoldi. Biz pulimizni sarflab bo'ldik. Our money ran out / We have spent all our money.
2	ketmoq – olib bormoq. to go – to take (lead)	U do'stining mashinasida ketadi. Uni do'sti mashinasida olib boradi. He goes there in his friend's car / His friend takes him there.
3	tayyorlamoq – kutmoq. to prepare – to wait	Kelajak unga sinovlar tayyorlab qo'ygan edi. Kelajakda uni sinovlar kutib turar edi. The future had prepared challenges for him / In the future, challenges were waiting for him.
4	ushlab turmoq – osilib turmoq. to hold – to hang	Shimni bitta tugma ushlab turardi. Shim bitta tugmaga osilib turardi. A button held the trousers / The trousers were hanging on a button.
5	o'z og'ushiga olmoq – qolib ketmoq. to embrace – to be left	Uni jala o'z og'ushiga oldi. U kuchli jalada qolib ketdi. The heavy rain embraced him / He was left in heavy rain.
6	ustun kelmoq – ortda qolmoq. to surpass – to lag behind	Odatda bu yoshda qizlarning bo'yi o'g'il bolalar bo'yidan ustun keladi. Odatda bu yoshda o'g'il bolalarning bo'yi qizlar bo'yidan ortda qoladi. At this age, girls usually surpass boys in height / At this age, boys usually lag behind girls in height.
7	paydo bo'lmoq – ega bo'lmoq. to appear – to acquire	So'zda yana bir yangi ma'no paydo bo'ldi. So'z yana bir yangi ma'noga ega bo'ldi. A new meaning appeared in the word / The word acquired a new meaning.
8	ta'zirini bermoq – nasibasini olmoq to punish – to get what one deserves	Kecha prorab Nosirning ta'zirini berdi. Kecha Nosir prorabdan nasibasini oldi. Yesterday the foreman punished Nosir / Yesterday Nosir got what he deserved from the foreman.

Other Uzbek converse pairs include: to give – to take (bermoq – olmoq); to send/hand over – to receive/take (uzatmoq – olmoq); to sell – to buy (sotmoq – sotib olmoq); to hold – to be caught (tutmoq – qo'lga tushmoq); to learn – to teach (o'rganmoq – o'rgatmoq). Pairs formed by causative

or passive affixes (e.g., o‘qimoq – o‘qitmoq, qoplamoq – qoplanmoq) belong to grammatical voice (diathesis) rather than to lexical converseness and are therefore excluded.

In Uzbek linguistics, converse words and the converse method are described as a form of transformational analysis. In transformations occurring within the converse approach, the underlying (base) sentence undergoes changes at both semantic and syntactic levels, which consequently leads to grammatical modifications as well.

For instance: “Sobirning bu gapi hammamizni xushnud qildi” → “Sobirning bu gapidan hammamiz xushnud bo‘ldik” (Sobir’s remark pleased all of us → We were all pleased by Sobir’s remark) [Kh. Khayrullayev, 2007: 24]. In the given example, the subject of the base structure is the word “gap(i)” (“remark/speech/statement”), and the predicate is “xushnud qildi” (“pleased”), whereas after transformation, “hammamiz” (“all of us”) functions as the subject, and “xushnud bo‘ldik” (“were pleased”) serves as the predicate. Thus, the subject in the first sentence performs the function of an object in the second sentence.

According to conceptualization theorists, the essence of conceptualization is manifested in the linguistic system and linguistic activity, particularly in the possibility of expressing a single fragment of reality in different ways. Such variability in expressing reality may also be realized through converse: “bulut ostidagi tog‘” – “tog‘ ustidagi bulut” (“a mountain under the cloud – a cloud over the mountain”). These units may be regarded as functional equivalents; however, they represent different models of conceptualization. The choice of a particular conceptualization strategy depends on various factors. For example, in English, the sentences “There was Sam sitting on the floor” and “Sam was sitting on the floor” have identical referential meaning, but their differences in form indicate variations in perceptual processing under different situational and pragmatic conditions. The fact that such conceptual operations are differently realized in the cognitive activity of translators belonging to different linguistic cultures is reflected in the translation process. Studying which types of cognitive orientations and mechanisms are activated in the selection of linguistic units has become one of the important tasks of translation theory [Sh. Safarov, 2019: 95].

Sh. Safarov and T. Bushuy, in their research, interpret converseness as a phenomenon arising from the interrelation of arguments within a sentence, and, based on H. Reichenbach’s theory, state the following: According to Hans Reichenbach (1947), the representation of a relation with more than one argument as a unary function results from the incorporation of the subsequent object into a more complex function. In this case, the second argument has an implicit form. The scholar represents such a unary function as follows:

$$q(x) = f(x, y_1)$$

Here, y_1 is the implicit argument of the function $q(x)$.

However, it is more appropriate to interpret Reichenbach's example sentence ("X is William's son") as a representation of a binary function.

Firstly, such an interpretation of sentence structure allows the relation between two arguments to be considered as converse (reversible, mutually interchangeable). Converse relations arise when there is a defined point of reference. For example, if the relation between x and y is expressed as " x is taller than y " or " x is y 's son" then the reverse converse forms are " y is shorter than x " or " y is x 's father". The notion of converse relations makes it possible to unify expressions such as "greater–smaller": " x is greater than y " and " y is smaller than x ". Similarly: "smarter–stupider" (" x is smarter than y " and " y is stupider than x "); "better–worse" (" X is better than Y " and " Y is worse than X ").

When any sentence is interpreted as a subject–predicate structure, the second participant can be conceived only as an extension of the predicate. However, in this case, the subject and object cannot be regarded as components of a single relational system.

Secondly, interpreting sentence structure as a system of relations makes it possible to distinguish between symmetric and asymmetric types of relations between two entities (arguments). If the relation between two arguments is symmetric, the expression of a binary function remains unchanged in both forward and reverse directions. For example, in the structures " x is y 's brother" and " y is x 's brother," x and y denote male individuals. In cases where the relation between two arguments is asymmetric, the form of expression of the direct relation changes. For instance, in the structure " x is y 's son" the linguistic representation of x 's relation to y is expressed as "son". Its converse counterpart is represented by the sentence " y is x 's father" where y 's relation to x is expressed as "father" [T. Bushuy, Sh. Safarov, 2007: 165].

As noted by linguist Wallace L. Chafe, the semantic inventory of language is incomparably richer and more diverse than its formal (phonetic-acoustic) inventory. This asymmetry accounts for many aspects of language development, including phenomena such as homonymy and synonymy, and also underlies the existence of transformational processes in language [W. Chafe, 1975: 72–73, 75–78].

Converse words can also serve as a tool for explaining Charles Fillmore's concept of frames. According to his interpretation, a frame is a cognitive structure that organizes experience in a schematic way; it is formed through linguistic units and constitutes the foundation of a concept. Consider the frame known as a "commercial event." The event represented within this frame is typically described through the use of the English verb buy ("to purchase"). Initially, Person A has money, while Person B possesses goods to be sold. After the price is agreed upon, A pays money

to B and acquires the goods. At the end of the event, A becomes the owner of the goods, while B becomes the owner of the money. Excluding certain marginal cases, the frame of buy is associated with at least four core categories: buyer, seller, goods and money. These categories collectively constitute the buy frame [Ch. J. Fillmore, 1977: 104]. The “nodes” (slots) of the “buying” frame appear to correspond to the valency structure of the verb buy: buyer (Abbos) as subject, goods (notebook) as object, seller (Rafik) as another participant and money (one hundred soums) as instrument. However, the frame should not be reduced merely to a description of syntactic valency of individual predicates. As a unit of the “language of thought” the selected schema must reflect stereotypical properties of an entire class of events and provide the basis for the linguistic realization of the concept [Sh. Safarov, 2006: 42].

Converses – i.e., pairs of words that express mutually related inverse relations – are characterized by logicians in terms of symmetry, transitivity and reflexivity. If the relation between arguments (interrelated linguistic units) is bidirectionally connected, it is considered symmetric. In symmetry, the order of comparison between two objects does not affect the outcome: whether A and B are compared or B and A, the result remains the same. For example: Tom resembles John = John resembles Tom.

However, symmetric relations in converse pairs are a complex phenomenon. When similarity between objects is based on their properties, it is determined relative to a specific point of reference or goal-oriented orientation. For instance, sentences such as “The son resembles his father,” “The painting resembles the original” and “The student resembles the teacher” follow the same structural pattern: “A resembles B.” If we preserve the formal structure but reverse the elements (B resembles A), the resulting statements, although grammatically correct, often appear unnatural or stylistically marked, producing effects similar to wordplay or paradox: “The father resembles his son,” “The original resembles the painting,” “The teacher resembles the student.”

To describe the goal-oriented nature of similarity relations, A.Tversky introduces the notion of a “comparison referent” which serves as a reference point in the act of comparison. The comparison consists of relating one object to a referent. However, the selection of the referent is not arbitrary: it must possess a distinguishing feature that allows it to function as a benchmark against the compared object. One of the reasons for such asymmetry lies in the structure of the world itself: for example, “the son resembles the father” because the child inherits properties from the parents; thus, ancestry represents a primary direction of similarity [Sh. Safarov, 2006: 55].

Reflexive relations, in contrast, refer to the property of any object being identical to itself, which is constant and requires no explanation. That is, the relation holds only within the same argument. For example: Four equals four. Spatial converse relations such as above/below are, in addition, transitive: if A is above B and B is above C, then A is above C. For example:

The clock is above the painting = The painting is below the clock.

Summarizing the above views, the following conclusions may be drawn:

Conclusion. Converses are linguistic units that arise from naming a single denotative event from different perspectives, reflecting elements of relationality in language and conceptualizing extralinguistic reality as a category of relative perspective.

Lexical converseness is the most common type of this phenomenon and serves to enhance the emotional and informational load of discourse.

In modern translation studies, as the linguistic-cultural nature of textual meaning is increasingly interpreted from a cognitive perspective, attention is shifting not only to translation itself but also to the development of translators' professional competence and cognitive operations such as converse interpretation.

Converseness is one of the most relevant, controversial, and multidimensional phenomena in lexical and syntactic semantics. It enables different ways of expressing a single fragment of reality and can be regarded as an aspect of conceptualization as well as a cognitive transformation in translation.

Although converseness is not a highly frequent phenomenon in language, it plays an important role in communication by fulfilling various communicative functions in discourse. Depending on the speaker's perspective, cognitive position, or observational standpoint, the same action may be linguistically encoded in different ways, which explains the frequent use of converses in spoken discourse.

References:

1. Lyons J. Semantics. Cambridge university press, 1977. – 386 p.
2. Palmer F.R. Semantics: A New Outline. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. – 164 p.
3. Бушуй Т.А., Сафаров Ш.С. Тил қурилиши: Таҳлил методлари ва методологияси. – Т.: Ўзбекистон Республикаси фанлар академияси. “Фан”, 2007. – 278 б.
4. Краткий латинский-русский словарь. Сост.: Малинин А.М. – М.: Государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей, 1941/2001. – 672 с.
5. Латинский-русский словарь. Сост.: Дворецкий И.Х. – М. Изд. Русский язык, 1976. – 1096 с.
6. Сафаров Ш.С. Таржимашуносликнинг когнитив асослари. Монография. – Тошкент: “Наврўз” нашриёти, 2019. – 300 б.
7. Хайруллаев Х. Умумий тилшунослик. Услубий тавсиялар. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ нашри, 2007. – 48 б.
8. Чейф У. Значение и структура языка. – М.: Прогресс, 1975. – 432 с.

9. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 1966. – 608 с.
10. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка. Избранные труды том I. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», «Восточная литература» РАН, 1995. – 472 с.
11. Новиков Л.А. Семантика русского языка. – М.: ВШ, 1982. – 272 с.
12. Иванова И.Е. Репрезентация конверсивной лексики в современном русском языке и проблемы её лексикографирования. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград, 2016. – 27 с.
13. Сафаров Ш. Семантика. – Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси” давлат илмий нашриёти, 2013. – 344 б.
14. Балли Ш. Французская стилистика (Bally Ch. Traite de stylistique française, 1921). 2-е изд., стереотипное. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2001. – 392 с.
15. Есперсен О. Философия грамматика. – М. Изд-во иностр лит-ры, 1958. – 380 с.
16. Lyons J. Structural Semantics: An Analysis of Part of the Vocabulary of Plato. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1963. – 237 p.
17. Комиссаров В.Н. Современное переводоведение. – М.: ЭТС, 2002. – 424 с.
18. Fillmore Ch.J. Scenes-and-frames semantics // Linguistic Structures Processing / ed. by A. Zampolli. – Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977. – P. 55–81.
19. Reichenbach H. Elements of Symbolic Logic. – New York: Macmillan, 1947. – 444 p.
20. Tversky A. Features of similarity // Psychological Review. – 1977. – Vol. 84, No. 4. – P. 327–352.
21. Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006. – 91 б.
22. Жолковский А.К., Мельчук И.А. О семантическом синтезе // Проблемы кибернетики. – 1967. – Вып. 19. – С. 177–238.