

**FRAME-MODELLING OF INTERTEXTUAL CONNECTIONS
MARKED BY PRECEDENT UNITS CONTAINING PROPER
NAMES AND THEIR DERIVATIVES
(A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE MEDIA TEXTS)**

Svetlana Rubtsova

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia
E-Mail: s.rubtcova@spbu.ru

Abstract. *The article is focused on to the study of intertextual frames in media discourse where precedent units containing proper names and their derivatives serve as markers of intertextuality. These cognitive structures are considered at semantic and pragmatic levels of discourse. Groups of precedent units marking intertextual connections are identified at each level. At a semantic level intertextual markers include lexicalised precedent names and their derivatives, precedent names as part of set expressions or figures of speech; at a pragmatic level they consist of citations, quasi-citations, specific metaphors, and speech patterns, typical of a certain author or type of text. Intertextual markers can be strong or weak. The operations of reference and inference are applied in order to interpret the information coded in the intertextual frame.*

Key words: *intertextual frame, precedent unit, proper name, discourse levels*

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of the paper is to study precedent units containing proper names which mark intertextual connections when actualised in English language media discourse and activate intertextual frames at semantic or pragmatic discourse levels in the mind of the recipient. The study is based on the hypothesis that the mind of a recipient, who interprets intertextual information marked by precedent units and actualized in a new context, activates a cognitive structure – intertextual frame - with the help of semantic or pragmatic associations. Information coded in the frame is interpreted through cognitive operations of reference and inference. The study is conducted in line with the cognitive discourse approach to the analysis of precedent phenomena. The significance and urgency of this subject stems from the fact that precedence is studied by several linguistic branches: cognitive linguistics, linguacultural studies, and discourse analysis. The interest in precedence can be explained by the fact that this phenomenon can be considered as a dialogue between the addresser and the addressee at a certain time and in the context of certain sociocultural conditions (Remchukova et al., 2017, p. 95). However, some aspects of precedence require clarification or more detailed examination, e.g. the possibility of frame modelling of intertextual connections marked by specific precedent units.

Submitted October 4th, 2019, accepted for publication November 1st, 2019

The paper provides original insight into the frame approach to studying intertextual connections marked by precedent units containing proper names and their derivatives. It differentiates between intertextual frames depending on the level of discourse (semantic or pragmatic) at which they are created and describes groups of precedent units which operate as intertextual markers and intertextual frame activators at semantic or pragmatic levels of discourse.

Works on the theory of precedence (D.B. Gudkov, 1999, V.V. Krasnykh, 1997), frame semantics (Ch. Fillmore, 1977), intertextuality (U. Eco, 1979, M. Panagiotidou, 2001, V.Ye. Chernyavskaya, 2009), discourse theory (V.I. Karasik, 2002, M.L. Makarov, 2003), and the theory of hidden meanings (A.A. Maslennikova, 1999) form the theoretical basis of the study.

2. METHODS AND STUDY MATERIALS

In this paper the following methods have been applied: deductive and inductive methods, interpretative analysis, analysis of dictionary definitions and pragma-semantic analysis. The deductive method consists in generalisation of scientific literature on the subject under study and justifies the possibility of identifying intertextual frames at two levels of discourse – semantic and pragmatic. Then, actual speech material from American, British and Australian media has been used to verify this assumption (inductive method). Interpretative analysis is used to identify hidden meanings formed by precedent units actualised in discourse. The interpretation is achieved through the cognitive operations of reference and inference, which make it possible to "distinguish personalised meanings in the social context" (Makarov, 2003, p. 161).

Reference, viewed in the theory of intentionality as intentional indication of the object by the speaker and use of an appropriate expression (Ibid., p. 121), is absolutely necessary for the interpretation of intertextual frames as precedent units activating them have double referential meaning and name both the "initial proprial referent and a new (non-proprial, contextual) referent" (Spiridonov, 2014, p. 103). Inference is a semantic conclusion made by the addressee based on implicata – signs that activate certain conceptual structures in the mind of the addressee and help them infer hidden meanings (Prokhorov, 2006). First of all, inference helps to draw a new axiological denotation for discourse actualised precedent units. Also, through inference it is possible to identify their pragmalinguistic characteristics. Analysis of dictionary definitions is necessary to determine systemic meaning of precedent names and their derivatives. Pragmasemantic analysis identifies the illocutionary force of precedent expressions actualised in media discourse.

As the study material there served English media texts from such periodicals as "The New York Times", "The Times", "The Boston Globe", "The Wall Street Journal" and others. The precedent units taken from them were analysed in the following way: firstly, with the help of dictionary definitions there were studied the systematic meanings of these units and their derivatives; secondly, we pointed out double referential meanings of precedent units; thirdly, all the precedent units were grouped according to their ability to serve as markers of intertextuality; then the discourse actualised units were interpreted (their new axiological denotation was identified) or underwent pragmalinguistic analysis.

3. RESULTS

The analysis demonstrated that in the English-speaking media discourse precedent units, containing proper names and their derivatives may act as weak or strong intertextual markers by referring to a certain pretext and activating in the mind of a recipient specific cognitive structures – intertextual frames, grouped around concepts of precedent units at a semantic or pragmatic levels of discourse. Interpretation of information represented in the intertextual frame is achieved through cognitive operations of reference and inference. The operation of reference is necessitated by the double referential meaning of a precedent unit, while inference makes it possible to infer hidden meanings, formed during the actualisation of precedent units in discourse.

In the course of study there were identified and described groups of precedent units acting as intertextual markers and activators which initiate intertextual frames at semantic and pragmatic discourse levels.

There are two groups of precedent units that activate intertextual frames at a semantic level of discourse: 1) lexicalised precedent names and their derivatives; 2) precedent names as parts of set expressions or figures of speech (similes or metaphors). The first group of units acts as lexical reference to certain concepts or slots of concepts (*eros, erotic, to bork, a brodie*); the second forms the semantic centre of speech and develops a certain topic (*Frankenstein food, Morton's fork, Bow street runners, like Peeping Tom of Coventry*).

Intertextual markers and intertextual frame activators at a pragmatic level of discourse include citations, quasi-citations, specific metaphors and figures of speech patterns typical of certain authors or types of texts (*Alas, poor Yorick!, Katy, bar the door*). These precedent units, constituting specific speech acts / genres, perform the same pragmatic function in a new context as in the pretext, or change their initial illocutionary force, forming additional hidden meanings.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Precedence in the context of intertextuality

Precedent units are characterised by structural and semantic complexity of different levels and include proper names and their derivatives, set expressions, statements and texts which are well-known to all or majority of a national community. They have substantial 'additional' cognitive (gnostic), lexicosemantic or communicative–pragmatic potential and the national community refers to them with sufficient regularity. These properties, some of which are described, albeit in different terms, by V.V. Krasnykh (1997), are considered to be dominant for the definition of precedent units.

Being a reflection of the social and cultural experience of a certain national community (Gudkov, 1999), precedent units form concepts stored in the 'cognitive space / cognitive domain' of this community in the form of frames (Krasnykh, 1997), provided frames are understood, following the definition of Ch. Fillmore (Fillmore, 1977, p. 79), as an idealised representation of an object, action or situation.

When the precedent unit is invoked in the discourse, a particular slot of its frame is being actualised and additional information, whose meaning is hidden in some source pretext, is being introduced into the text. New discourse meanings of a precedent unit or, in other words, its additional meanings, formed as a result of discourse actualisation, lead

to changes in the content of the original frame of the unit and form a so called intertextual frame, consolidating intertextual knowledge and new knowledge derived from a new text. In doing so, the addresser presupposes that the recipient is familiar with this unit and can 'correctly' interpret its hidden meanings, i.e. those that, in accordance with the definition by A.A. Maslennikova, are not verbally expressed in the text of the message, but perceived as intended (Maslennikova, 1999).

While agreeing with the researcher on the three subsystems of hidden meanings (non-intentional / linguistic, socially induced conventional and intentional meanings) identified using the criterion of intentionality, it seems possible to regard precedent units actualised in discourse as concepts around which intertextual frames are grouped as a consequence of interaction and integration of non-intentional (mostly linguistic) and intentional hidden meanings. Precedent units mark intertextual connections and, at the same time, activate intertextual frames in the mind of an addressee. The ability for marking manifests itself in deharmonisation of text structure and, thus, attracting the attention of the recipient (Chernyavskaya, 2009, p. 199).

The term 'intertextual frame' was introduced by U. Eco in relation to narrative texts and understood as actualised in the text narrative function, hypercoded in earlier texts (Eco, 1979, p. 37). M. Panagiotidou distinguishes semantic and thematic or stylistic intertextual frames based on the means involved in their activation: semantic frames are activated by lexical units (lexical concepts) responsible for identification of a certain literary work; thematic frames are introduced into a new text through specification of certain denotative aspects of work; while stylistic ones are represented by explicit expressions or genre specific features shared by at least two literary works (Panagiotidou, 2001).

Sharing the idea expressed by M. Panagiotidou on distinguishing different types of intertextual frames, this paper, however, focuses on the study of intertextual frames at two levels of discourse (semantic and pragmatic) rather than defining and describing the three types of frames. According to V.I. Karasik, it is at these two levels that intertextual orientation, one of the meaningful content categories of discourse, is manifested (with other denotative discourse categories including informativity, modality, interpretability, images of an author and a recipient) (Karasik, 2002, p. 288).

4.2. Marking intertextual connections and activation of intertextual frames at a semantic level

At a semantic level an intertextual frame is established through semantic associations between a new text and a pretext. Its activation is initiated by two basic groups of precedent units: 1) lexicalised precedent names and their derivatives functioning in a new text as lexical denomination of certain concepts or slots of concepts (examples 1-7); 2) precedents names as parts of set expressions (examples 8-11) or figures of speech (examples 12-13).

Depending on the level of denomination lexicalised precedent names and their derivatives can act as weak or strong markers of intertextuality. Let us consider some examples:

(1) *After all the hype, the movie did a **brodie** after the second week* (The Record, 28 December, 1997).

(2) *The yuppie market is where everybody wants to be because that's where the money is - or was, up until the Dow Jones did a **Brodie*** (The Boston Globe, 15 November, 1987).

The lexeme "brodie / Brodie" activates in the mind of a reader semantic associations with the name of Steve Brodie (1863–1901), American bookmaker from Brooklyn, who

claimed to have jumped off the Brooklyn bridge on July 23, 1886, and survived. The supposed jump, the veracity of which is under a doubt, brought Brodie a lot of publicity due to numerous publications in newspapers (Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias, www). Brodie's name has become a common name to denote a wide range of acts, activities and events, usually with a negative axiological denotation: a fraud, confusion, muddle, mistake, failure, flop; sudden reversal in a vehicle's direction; plunge; suicidal leap from a bridge or a roof of a building. The expression 'to do a brodie / Brodie' entered American slang to represent the concept of a flamboyant, but dangerous activity / act / event, where flamboyance has rather a negative connotation. For instance, example (1) refers to a failure of a film, while example (2) is about a sharp drop in Dow-Jones index.

(3) *"I love that little guy. I know it, it's the only thing I know" - he won't Hamletize. He won't, that is, not act* (The New York Times, 21 April, 1985).

In the above example it is quite easy to identify the pretext – the tragedy by W. Shakespeare 'Hamlet,' – because of the derivative verb 'Hamletize' (capitalisation suggests incomplete lexicalisation of a name). The verb refers to the concept 'Hesitation' and indicates the action of showing hesitancy (as follows from the character of the main hero of the tragedy). In example (3) the verb is used in the negative form, i.e. it implies the absence of doubts in a young man, who is thus opposed to the hesitant Hamlet.

(4) *Bioethics was founded by people who understood that the new biology touched and threatened the deepest matters of our humanity: bodily integrity, identity and individuality, lineage and kinship, freedom and self-command, eros and aspiration, and the relations and strivings of body and soul* (The New Republic, 2 June, 1997).

(5) *Though pure fantasy, the eroticism of the scenes and her glamorous co-stars make the video eminently watchable* (The New York Times, 12 November, 2006).

(6) *Creating movies and theater, he explains, is a profoundly erotic experience* (The New York Times, 6 December, 2006).

Lexeme 'eros' and its derivatives 'eroticism' and 'erotic' elicit semantic associations with ancient Greek mythology. Due to the fact that mythological discourse is a collection of various texts – myths, legends, folk tales, united by a common theme, it is necessary to introduce the concept of mythological macro-pretext. In mythological macro-pretext Eros is a god of love or, more exact, passion and sensual desires, as well as fertility. In the Archaic period he was portrayed as a beautiful winged youth with bow and arrows, but by the Hellenistic period he was represented as an infant bearing the same attributes (Encyclopaedia Britannica, www; Cartwright, www). After lexicalisation and metonymic transfer into the class of common nouns, the theonym Eros narrowed its meaning and now the differential sense of the systemic meaning of the lexeme 'eros' and its derivatives 'eroticism' and 'erotic' is 'sexuality'.

Eros - sexual love or desire.

Eroticism -1. The quality of a picture, book, film, etc. or character of being erotic.

1.1. Sexual desire or excitement.

Erotic - relating to sexual desire and pleasure; (American English) causing or related to sexual feelings (Oxford Dictionary of English, www; Cambridge Dictionary, www).

Lexemes 'eros', 'eroticism', and 'erotic' represent the concept 'Feelings', actualising its subframe 'Love' and evoking its subframe slot 'Sexual feelings'. Example (4) contrasts sexual feelings with high aspirations, in the same manner as body is opposed to soul (the means to evoke the meaning is the contraposition of 'eros' and 'aspiration', 'body and soul'). In example (5) word 'eminently' intensifies the lasting effect of sexual

feelings, while in example (6) the intensifier ‘profoundly’ elicits the strength of these feelings.

Derivatives of completely lexicalised lexeme (examples 5 and 6) are relatively weak markers of intertextuality. Verbs formed by conversion from precedent names are even weaker markers of intertextual connection:

(7) *The newly nonconfrontational Ashcroft was not **borked*** (The New York Times, 27 May, 2001).

The verb ‘to bork’ was formed in 1980s by conversion after the name of the American judge Robert Bork (1927–2012), whose nomination to the US Supreme Court was rejected because of harsh criticism in the mass media (Oxford Dictionary of English, www). Referring to the precedent name and the situation, the verb ‘to bork’ in example (7) represents the concept ‘Struggle for power’, actualising the frame slot ‘Unfair practices of struggle for power’: cf. *To bork – obstruct (someone, especially a candidate for public office) by systematically defaming or vilifying them* (Oxford Dictionary of English, www).

Intertextual frames marked by the precedent units of the second group form the semantic centre of speech and develop specific topics. Among the markers of such intertextual frames are idioms containing anthroponyms and toponyms. It should be noted that the potential of idioms to mark and ‘establish’ a certain discourse theme lies in their nominative function, i.e. nominating the situation as a whole or a specific fact of reality.

Let us consider the idioms build in accordance with the pattern N(’s)+N, where the first component is an anthroponym naming historical, Biblical or mythological characters, characters from literature, films and television series.

(8) *Officials also think that the country’s own food exports may suffer in the world market, where fears of so-called **Frankenstein food** are rampant, if China becomes a pioneer in genetically altered foods* (The New York Times, 22 October, 2002).

The idiom ‘Frankenstein food’ was introduced by environmental groups to describe genetically modified products and alludes to the name of the main character of the novel by M. Shelley ‘Frankenstein; or the Modern Prometheus’. The name of Frankenstein is metaphorically used to denote an invention that eventually turns against its inventor: A thing that becomes terrifying or destructive to its maker (Oxford Dictionary of English, www). In the above example two groups of lexemes elaborate on the topic of genetically modified products (food, genetically altered foods) and the harm they cause or fears of potential harm expressed by people (suffer, fears, rampant).

(9) *(Japan’s political elites) face a **Morton’s fork** between being ignored or being seen as a problem to which there is little solution* (The Wall Street Journal, 22 April, 2010).

The expression ‘Morton’s fork’ is used to denote a dilemma, a situation of a stark choice between two undesirable alternatives (Oxford Dictionary of English, www). John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, is a real historical person. He was a tax collector for the English king Henry VII. He is alleged to have used a clever trick, later called ‘Morton’s fork’, by holding that anyone who lives in luxury obviously has spare money, while those who live modestly must be saving their money and, therefore, can afford to pay (Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias www). The situation of a difficult and unpleasant choice referred to in the example is specified in the text with the help of construction ‘between ... or’.

Idioms in examples (8) and (9) are the most common types of idiomatic expressions in the analysed corpus of idioms of the English language. Idioms following the pattern N+N, where the first component is a toponym denoting real or fictional geographic

objects (example 10) are less common. A syntactic synonym of this type is prepositional possessive expressions following the pattern N of N, with the second component being a toponym (example 11):

(10) *Before the arrival of the Bow Street Runners, victims of robbery in the 1750s would pay a ransom to thieves for the return of their belongings* (The Times, 28 January, 2008).

The name 'Bow street runners' – first police force (a nickname of London police officers in the 18th century) – is derived from the name of the street in London, where the buildings of the police court and various judicial institutions were located. The name 'Bow street runners' embodies the tokenism of existing police methods (Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias, www). Knowledge of this intertextual information enables the reader to understand the ironic attitude of the author to such policemen and the humour of the situation. The theme of the police work is elicited with the help of such words and word combinations as 'victims', 'robbery', 'pay a ransom', 'thieves', 'for the return'.

(11) *The Most Wonderful Body of Water in the World Discovered in the State of Washington; A Modern Pool of Siloam -- It Is Known as Medical Lake, and Is the Only Known Medical Lake in the World -- It Has Been Known to the Indians for Many Years Past as the "Scookum Limechin Chuck," or Water of Wonderful Healing* (The New York Times, November 2, 1902).

The above example contains an article headline, where the expression 'the pool of Siloam' alludes to the Bible or, more exact, to the New Testament (John 9:7), where Siloam is a spring near Jerusalem. It is the pool to which Jesus send the man who was blind from his birth to wash and who returned with his sight restored (Oxford Dictionary of English, www). The expression 'the pool of Siloam' / 'Siloam pool' has acquired a transferred meaning 'place of miraculous healing', in which it is used in example (11). The theme of miraculous healing is manifest in the headline with the help of two groups of words: 1) The Most Wonderful, Medical, Wonderful Healing; 2) Body of Water, Pool, Lake, Water. Intertextual information is introduced with the help of analogy (A Modern Pool of Siloam) and suggests a positive evaluation of a new referent by the author.

The analysis of the factual material demonstrated that the most common figure of speech that contains precedent names is simile:

(12) *And from what I know of him I am sure that up there he has his head out of the window most of the time, like Peeping Tom of Coventry, meddling with other people's business* (The New York Times, July 9, 1913).

The precedent unit '(peeping) Tom (of Coventry)' is an allusion to the mythological macro-pretext. According to the legend, in 1040 in Coventry Lady Godiva, wife of a local lord, rode naked through the town at the request of her husband in a deal to persuade him remit the oppressive taxation; while townspeople confined themselves to their homes, Tom the Tailor was the only one to look and was immediately struck blind (Oxford Dictionary of English, www; The Collins English Dictionary www; The Phrase Finder, www). In the middle of 18th century this expression began to be used in a figurative meaning: a person who derives pleasure, especially sexual pleasure from furtively watching other people, especially undressing or engaging in sexual activity (Oxford Dictionary of English, www; The Collins English Dictionary www). The image of a curious person, in this case with a negative connotation, is revealed in the text with the help of a metaphor 'he has his head out of the window' and exaggeration 'most of the time', the topic of interference into the life of other people is elicited by the participle 'meddling with' and word combination 'other people's business'.

(13) *He is up against some of the **gnomes of Zurich**, which means big money and international connections* (The New York Times, 17 June, 1984).

Intertextual information in example (13) is introduced to create a metaphorical image of bankers. The word 'gnome' is a reference to the mythological macro-pretext to name a fictional dwarfish creature guarding treasures hidden in the earth (Oxford Dictionary of English, www). In the expression 'gnomes of Zurich' the word is used in the transferred meaning to refer to 'a person regarded as having secret or sinister influence in financial matters'. The expression describes major international bankers with headquarters in Zurich. Additional textual information is represented by the word combinations 'big money' and 'international connections', which do not have negative connotations. However, the senses of the figurative meaning of the word 'gnome' – 'secret (influence)' and 'sinister (influence)' – contribute to the formation of a negative connotation not only of the idiom 'the gnomes of Zurich', but also of these word combinations.

4.3. Marking intertextual connections and activation of intertextual frames at a pragmatic level

At the pragmatic level of discourse intertextual frames are activated by citations, quasi-citations, specific metaphors, and figures of speech typical of certain authors or types of texts. In the new context these devices perform the same pragmatic function as in the pretext, representing specific speech acts / genres or changing its initial illocutionary force:

(14) *And you can keep your "corrected look" going until you hit that "**Alas, poor Yorick!**" phase* (The New York Times, 3 March, 2005).

The popular quotation from the tragedy of W. Shakespeare 'Hamlet' '**Alas, poor Yorick!**' is used ironically to express lamenting the fragility of life with an illocution of expressive speech act. In example (14) the communicative status of the phrase is changed to refer to a particular psychological state, adding irony to the whole phrase and turning it into a transposed speech act, namely a warning in the form of approval.

(15) *Because if you ever corrupt yourself on lying or stealing, then **Katy bar the door**"* (The New York Times, 29 December, 1989).

The catch phrase **Katie/Katy, bar the door!**, which was first used in the end of the 19th century in the USA, is either a reference to the Scottish folk song 'Get Up and Bar the Door!', first published by the Scottish editor David Herd in 1776, or to the poem by the British poet Dante Gabriel Rossetti 'The King's Tragedy', (1881). The poem describes the story of the Scottish king James I who was attacked by his enemies in 1437. When he cried to his maid 'Katherine, keep the door!', she tried to bar the door with her arm, but her arm was broken and the king was murdered (The Phrase Finder, www). In both pretexts the phrase is an imperative speech act. However, it has changed its illocution and turned into a humorous warning. In the above example this phrase is used as a warning against negative consequences of the acts of the addressee, described in the first part of the utterance. It should be noted that a complex sentence with a conditional clause is one of the linguistic means to express the speech act of implicit warning.

5. CONCLUSION

This work is an attempt to model intertextual connections in the form of concept frames of precedent units containing proper names and their derivatives, actualised in the English language media discourse. Due to volume limitations, the article could not include all groups of precedent units that have been identified in the course of study. However, the examples analysed thus far demonstrated that in the English speaking media discourse the concepts of precedent units with proper names and their derivatives form intertextual frames at semantic and pragmatic levels. The precedent units can be weak or strong markers of intertextuality. The perspective of the study can be application of its results in teaching translation and interpreting subjects, for example, intercultural communication in the process of translation and interpreting.

REFERENCES

- Chernyavskaya, V.Ye. (2009). *Linguistics of the text: Multi-coding, intertextuality, interdiscursiveness*. Moscow: Publishing house "LIBROKOM". [Чернявская, В.Е. (2009). *Лингвистика текста: Поликодовость, интертекстуальность, интердискурсивность*. Москва: Издательский дом «ЛИБРОКОМ»]
- Eco, Umberto. (1979). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.
- Fillmore, C. (1977). Topics in lexical semantics. In *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by R.W. Cole, 76-138. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gudkov, D.B. (1999). *Precedent name and problems of precedence*. Moscow: Gnosis. [Гудков, Д.Б. (1999). *Прецедентное имя и проблемы прецедентности*. Москва: Гнозис]
- Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse*. Volgograd: Peremena. [Карасик, В.И. (2002). *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Волгоград: Перемена]
- Krasnykh, V.V. (1997). The system of precedent phenomena in the context of modern research. In *Language, consciousness, communication: Collection of articles*, 2, 5-12. [Красных, В.В. (1997). Система прецедентных феноменов в контексте современных исследований // *Язык, сознание, коммуникация: Сборник статей*, 2, 5-12]
- Макаров, М. Л. (2003). *Fundamentals of the Theory of Discourse*. Moscow: Gnosis [Макаров, М.Л. (2003). *Основы теории дискурса*. Москва: Гнозис].
- Maslennikova, A.A. (1999). "Hidden meanings and their linguistic interpretation" Dr. Phil. Diss., Saint Petersburg. [Масленникова, А.А. (1999). *Скрытые смыслы и их лингвистическая интерпретация: Дис. ... д. филол. наук. С.-Петербург*]
- Panagiotidou, M. (2001). "A Cognitive Approach to Intertextuality: The Case of Semantic Intertextual Frames". *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17, 173-188.
- Prokhorov, A.V. "Conditionality of inference processes by implications of the advertising text" Cand. Phil. Diss., Tambov, 2006.
- Remchukova, E.N., Sokolova, T.P., Zamaletdinova, L.R. (2017). Precedent names of culture in the onomastic space of a modern city. In *Values and meanings*, 6 (52), 94-108. [Ремчукова, Е.Н., Соколова, Т.П., Замалетдинова, Л.Р. (2017). *Прецедентные имена культуры в ономастическом пространстве города // Ценности и смыслы*, 6 (52), 94-108]

Spiridonov, D.V. (2014). A proper name on the way of lexicalization: fr. Mentor, Messaline, Égérie. In *The study of foreign languages and literature: theory, history, practice: a collection of scientific papers*, 3, 97-105. [Спиридонов, Д.В. (2014). Имя собственное на пути лексикализации: фр. Mentor, Messaline, Égérie // *Изучение иностранных языков и литератур: теория, история, практика: сборник научных трудов*, 3, 97-105].

ON-LINE RESOURCES:

Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias. Accessed 20 August, 2019.
<http://www.en.academic.com>
Ancient History Encyclopedia. Accessed 18 August, 2019.
<http://www.ancient.eu>. <https://www.ancient.eu>
Cambridge Dictionary. Accessed 10 August, 2019.
<http://www.dictionary.cambridge.org>
Collins English Dictionary. Accessed 19 August, 2019. <http://www.collinsdictionary.com>
Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc. Accessed 20 August, 2019. <http://www.britannica.com>
Oxford Dictionary of English. Accessed 10 August, 2019.
<http://www.en.oxforddictionaries.com>
Phrase Finder. Accessed 18 August, 2019. <http://www.phrases.org.uk>

PRIMARY SOURCES:

The Boston Globe. Boston, Massachusetts, U.S., 15 November, 1987.
The New Republic. New York, U.S., 2 June, 1997.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 12 November, 2006.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 17 June, 1984.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 21 April, 1985.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 22 October, 2002.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 27 May, 2001.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 29 December, 1989.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 3 March, 2005.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 6 December, 2006.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 9 July, 1913.
The New York Times. New York, U.S., 2 November, 1902.
The Record. Sydney, Australia, 28 December, 1997.
The Times. UK, 28 January, 2008.
The Wall Street Journal. New York, U.S., 22 April, 2010.