

Onomacoecept as a language unit of nomadic conceptsphere

Raisa G. Zhamsaranova¹
Transbaikal State University.
E-mail: rebecca_zab@mail.ru

Abstract: The article represents the methods relevant for onomaseology and gives the results of the etimological analysis of the ethnonyms of the medieval nomadic tribes. It offers a new term onomacoecept, whose structure modeling enables to reveal the conceptual semantics of ethnonym. Onomacoecept as a type of linguacultural concept can “unfold” pre-ethnonym and ethnonym meaning of the onim under study. The methods of studying the structure of onomacoecept involve the following particular techniques: the method of conceptual analysis; the method of component analysis enabling to study the dictionary definitions of onomacoecept; the method of sememic analysis enabling to revel the archisemes that contextually become conceptual signs developing the notional basis of concept; the method of conceptual analysis of metaphor elaborating an image component of onomacoecept; the onomaseological method describing the ethnocultural and ethnohistorical background of a concept, and the semasiological method. The study of the congeneric names of nomadic tribes has revealed the system of onomacoecepts verbalized by ethnonyms. The reconstruction of the conceptual field of a congeneric name using onomaseological and conceptual analysis has enabled, first, to establish the ethimological meaning of onim and, second, to model the conceptsphere of nomadic consciousness. The complex methods of the analysis of onimic lexics have enabled to restore the system of archaic mental mindsets, reflections, and worldview system of medieval nomadism as completely as possible. The studies of such ethnonyms as Mongol, Tungus, Churchzhen’, and others in the context of their linguistic origin and etymology remain arguable in many respects. The linguaconceptual description of the nomadic linguistic worldview has enabled to reconstruct mental mindsets and the worldview of the nomadic consciousness at the period of establishing the Altai languages, for instance, and at the early stages of its existence. Thus, the onomaseological method of studying onims as verbalized onomacoecepts has enabled to consider an onim as the ethnocultural and ethnohistorical text deciphered by reconstructing the semantic archetype and conceptual archiseme and thereby to justify the author’s hypothesis for nomadic conceptsphere. The conceptual approach to the analysis of ethnonyms based on the corpse of appellative lexica of typologically non-related languages has enabled to reveal the diachronic Ural-Altai areal linguistic union within the territory under study, which allowed us to make a conclusion about some typologically similar phenomena in the languages related to different linguistic families – the Mongol and the Samoyed. **Keywords:** Ethnonyms, medieval nomadic tribes, onomacoecept, onomaseological method, conceptual semantics, nomadic linguistic worldview.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is known that the language reflects the evolution of human cultural consciousness, his internal self-consciousness and self-identification in the world around. The study of the onomastic lexica as congeneric proper names is associated with the objective challenge of their perception as linguistic texts “created” by the language and consciousness of Central Asian tribes, peoples and generic alliances that fell into oblivion long time ago. The learning of the sense and meaning of ethnonyms is quite a complicated task in onomastics. This article represents a principally new approach to the analysis of ethnonymics – a conceptual approach.

The analysis of the national and cultural conceptsphere of nomadic world on the material of historical ethnonymics and genonymics enables to describe the concepts of diachronic consciousness. For this purpose, we have offered a new term of onomacoecept as a language unit of nomadic conceptsphere [Zhamsaranova, 2011, P.12].

The study of the language in the XXI century defines the perception of the language as a sign quintessence of national culture in its integrity where the logical lies as if “on the surface” and seems obvious and visible, while the pralogical forms the essence being a conceived and coded symbol sign. Lingvaconceptology (cognitive linguistics), an interdisciplinary linguistic science based on the relation between language and culture, is actively developing. Its central

issue is to establish dependences and relations in the cognitive chain of “mind (consciousness) – language – representation – conceptualization – categorization – perception” [Kravchenko, 1996, P. 34].

A concept is a “verbalized cultural sense”, which is also a “semantic unit of the language of culture whose plan of expression is a two-sided linguistic sign whose linear length is, in fact, absolutely unlimited” [Vorkachev, 2007, P.10]. M.V. Pimenova defines a concept as a national image (idea, symbol) complicated by the signs of individual representation [Pimenova, 2007, P.14]. S.G. Vorkachev defines semiotic essence of linguacultural concept and writes that the evolutionary development of the “concept” term “is provided by its attributive expansion: the concept-synonym of the notion first became a ‘cultural concept’ and then a ‘linguacultural concept’. During this evolution, its semantic structure became quantitatively and qualitatively more complicated: the notional content reflecting definitionally essential signs of an object was complemented by the image component including culturally significant symbolic and value senses and the linguistic, “significant” component itself reflecting the involvement of the concept name in the lexical system of a particular natural language” [Vorkachev, 2014, P.16], which agrees with our general understanding of a concept.

Onomaconcept as type of linguacultural concept is also a “synthetizing mental formation which replaced the representation, notion and meaning and involved them in the form of corresponding components – notional, image, value and significant, each of which relates the ‘sign body’ of the concept in its own way” [Vorkachev, 2014, P.10]. The perception of onomaconcept as a sign phenomenon has enabled to define the role of conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy, which play an essential role in the nominative practice of the medieval consciousness. An onomaconcept is a complex of structural and system properties, signs and qualities as a linguacultural concept and linguaconcept, where the latter one is determined by the sign nature of a linguistic unit - ethnonym.

T.V. Toporova assumes that the linguistic analysis of the onomastic material is one of the autonomous and equal approaches to the reconstruction of the Old Germanic model of the world [Toporova, 1994, P.3]. T.V. Toporova defines the principles of the nomination of the basic notions of the Old Germanic world models and their semantic motivation and focuses on linguistic meaning of the word itself, namely – signification, and not denotation, as lying “on the surface” or referent meaning of the appellative. This approach agrees with our methods of searching for the conceptual meaning of the ethnonym of nomadic tribes associated exactly with the significative meaning of appellative as a concept name.

T.V. Toporova writes, “the penetration into the sources of a notion’s development finally implies the reference to the subject of the language, its archaic logics and linguistic consciousness imprinted in the semantic motivations relevant for a particular epoch” [Toporova, 1994, P. 6], which is also objective for the ancient consciousness of a nomad.

Like A. Vezhbítskaya and L.G. Babenko, we understand the application of the method of conceptual analysis as the identification and description of senses in the verbal artefacts of the language [Vezhbítskaya, 2001, P.37; Babenko, 2000, P.83]. A. Vezhbítskaya assumes that the concept analysis is the identification of the paradigm of culturally significant concepts and the description of their conceptosphere. L.G. Babenko includes some research procedures - the identification of a set of key words in the text; the description of the conceptual space denoted by them; and definition of basic concept [Babenko, 2000, P.83]. These methods are also essential for the study of onomaconcept.

The method of component analysis is significant. O.A. Ipanova offers several stages of studying linguacultural concept:

- to study the etymology of the word-name of the concept;

- to describe the dictionary definitions of the word-name of the concept using the method of component analysis, where a sememe is represented as a number of semantic signs, semes, which actualize in many contexts and become conceptual signs developing the notional basis of the concept;
- to reveal additional conceptual signs using the method of the analysis of the collocability of the word-name of the concept;
- to reveal the conceptual metaphor developing the image component using the analysis of metaphorical collocability of the words-representants of the concept;
- to describe the significant component of the concept including the comparison of the concept under analysis with other concepts related with it by the paradigmatic links in the language conceptsphere;
- to reveal the value component of the concept;
- to describe the national and cultural understanding of the concept in the national linguistic worldview [Ipanova, 2005, P. 13].

The analysis of onomastic material involves the complex of above-mentioned methods and particular techniques.

2. METHODS

It is well known that the national specifics of thinking and national culture are reflected in the ethnic language by elaborating a linguistic worldview, which opens the access to learning the peculiarities of national worldview and accumulates its cultural heritage. The specifics of the nomadic conceptsphere is revealed by ethnonyms, which, undoubtedly, represent an invaluable linguistic material for reconstructing the aspects of language, culture, and mentality of the nomadic ethnoses.

At the same time, ethnonyms are specific linguistic signs, whose semantic essence informs about the disappeared linguistic worldviews. It has turned out that we can reconstruct the linguistic worldview of the Medieval nomadism using the methods of cognitive linguistics. We know that a concept as a logically structured phenomenon of mentality is a unit of cognitology as a linguistic science. Therefore, we assume that it is possible to reconstruct and cognize the linguistic worldview of the Medieval nomads by studying its logico-structural units (epystems/logoepestems) – concepts. The content of a concept as a unit of the linguistic worldview is always national-specific. A new term – onomaconcept can represent the semantic potential of such medieval ethnonyms as Mongol, Tungus, Churchzhen' and other congeneric names representing the most informative class of proper names in the onomastics.

The structure of onomaconcept consists of several layers or segments, which relate to language, ethnographic knowledge, and historical events of the ethnic past. The last two compulsory segments from various ethnographic and historical sources prove the ethnolinguistic origin of ethnonym in the context of ethnogenetic succession of the Medieval ethnonyms (and the nations known under these names) with modern ethnic groups of Siberia and Russia in general.

We know that an ethnonym has two plans of meaning as a proper name – pre-ethnonym and ethnonym itself, which may actually belong to different ethnic communities by their language. The proper ethnonym meaning of both ethnonym and onomaconcept is tightly related to the ethnocultural peculiarities of modern nations as the successors of the medieval tribal alliances of the Central Asia. The pre-ethnonym meaning of both ethnonym and onomaconcept is related to the conceptual meaning of the proper name and therefore can receive adequate

semantic explanation only from the lexica of the substrate languages (the language of the nations that had disappeared long time ago). V.V. Bykonya identifies the stages of establishing congeneric names in the Selkup ethnonyms – proper ethnonyms (self-appellation), pre-ethnonyms, which sometimes are of exonym origin (i.e. they are given to ethnos from outside) [Bykonya, 2011, P.50], which is relevant for nomadic ethnonyms too.

Pre-ethnonym meaning of the onim (or pre-ethnonym) is a verbalized conceptual semantics of ethnonym situated in the core of onomaconcept. The previous existence of onomaconcept in the diachronic collective consciousness certainly enables to perceive this type of concept as a concept limited by consciousness, since this concept had a local extension, significance of the name and a set of particular motivational signs only in the consciousness of the people of remote epochs.

The place of metaphor in the content-notional field of semantics has been extremely important during the analysis of the medieval ethnonyms. Apart from the denotative meaning of onomaconcept, there are image-perceptive / image-metaphoric and notional (factual) components. The factual component is verbalized through the appellative row representing value, i.e. central core of the semantic-sense field of onomaconcepts: forest earth – sea (lake); bird – wolf/dog – ox bear; khan/tsar – person/man – ancestor/shaman [Zhamsaranova, 2013].

Image components of onomaconcepts are represented in the form of cultural-sense constants, whose nature is similar to archetypes and determined by the mythologism of the animalist-totemist views of a nomad. They are rendered through the description of accompanying connotation factors of historical-ethnographic character and confirmed by the factors of extra-linguistic interpretation.

An onomaconcept structurally consists of the core consisting in some cases of three or two tops covered by the “bundle” of associative representations, notions and images determined by the cultural background of the linguistic consciousness of a nomad. We imagine the tops of onomaconcept as sense constants in the consciousness produced, on the one hand, by the linguistic meaning of a lexical unit itself and, on the other hand, the conceptual meaning of appellative as a linguistic sign.

The linguistic meaning of an onomaconcept (in our case) is a product of linguistic consciousness, while conceptual meaning is a phenomenon of human cognitive consciousness [see: Sternin, 2004, Pp. 65-70]. The linguistic meaning, being a part of onomaconcept, renders certain cognitive signs and components included in the sense content of a concept by means of semes and sememes. Besides, “the conceptual signs in the conditions of concept’s verbalization act like semes, while conceptual layers can coincide with sememes” [Sternin, 2006, electronic resource, P. 236].

The conceptual meaning of onomaconcept to a word seems larger by comparing conceptual meaning with the linguistic meaning of an onim and concept to a word. The conceptual meaning renders the semantic content by means of conceptual metaphors and metonymically determined meanings together with a set of conceptual signs. The representation of a conceptual meaning of onomaconcept as a linguistic sign enables to use the terms of semiotics, according to which a signification is the signified, a denotation is the signifying, and a name is a “thing”. Therefore, we think that the conceptual meaning of onomaconcept lies in the significative predication of onomaconcept.

It is the signification that contains ethnocultural representations - mythologems and archetypes - rendered by the archiseme extracted from the structural field of meaning. The signification is a higher level in the semantic notional field of onomaconcept as a linguistic sign, like the archiseme – in the linguistic meaning of a language unit. Schematically, the onomaconcept has several tops, some of them can be perceived as not singled out; in other

cases, they may have obvious explication. This property of onomaconcept determines the existence of three or two tops in the concepts.

These tops can be schematically represented in the following projections:

As a linguistic sign	As a linguistic unit	As a representant of culture
ethnonym/sign-symbol	Lexeme	cultureme
interpretant/reference	seme/sememe	mythologeme
signification	Archiseme	archetype

The perception of ethnonym as a sign-symbol is associated, first, with the fact that the sign approach to the interpretation of onim enables to identify the plan of content directed and relevant to the “future”. This means that ethnonym was perceived in the tribal consciousness in the aspect of gramaticalization as an optative and imperative / desiderative, i.e. as “desirable” name (May the X be like this!). Second, such representation of ethnonym for the purposes of study will enable to identify the referential signs of onim as a linguistic sign and its significative meaning.

An onomaconcept is “covered” by a peripheral field, there, in Yu.S. Stepanov’s definition, there is the structure of concept in general, active (relevant) layer of signs and passive – additional informative fund learned only by some social groups [Stepanov, 2004] The active/relevant layer of signs is recognized by all the native speakers and obvious for all those who use language.

The passive sign layer of onomaconcept is available only in case of adequate interpretation of signification rendered by the identification of archiseme, whose semantic meaning is supplemented by the archetype of the archaic cultural consciousness of a nomad. It is from the passive layer of onomaconcept that we can extract ethnocultural informational potential including ethnohistorical information especially valuable for ethnocultural, ethnogenetic, linguistic and historical studies.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Further, we represent the results of studying the ethnonym of Mongol. This ethnonym has no commonly acknowledged explanation in the onomatology. The author’s approach to the linguistic interpretation of ethnonym has enabled to identify the onomaconcept of wolf relevant in the context of studying the conceptual sphere of nomadic consciousness. First, our technique of studying the onomaconcept has enabled to establish the etimological meaning (etymology of the word-name of a concept) of the Mongol onim as deappellative meäng dog/wolf from the lexica of the Koibal language. The Koibal language is a disappeared Northern Samoyed language. The Koibals as a tribe was partially turkified and then russified by the XIX century. I. Georgi found the Koibals “upward of the Yenisei, over Abakan, to both sides of the Yenisei, near the Sayan mountains in the Krasnoyarsk district” [Georgi, 2007, P.295]. The Koibals’ appearance is “more like Semoyad than Tatar. Their language is also a Semoyad dialect mixed with many Tatar words”, they are mostly engaged in cattle breeding, roam in the “portable” yurts, keep horses, sheep and camels. They are engaged in hunting because it is very profitable. “The Koibal women wear braids and caps in the Mongol manner” [Georgi, 2007, P. 294]. I. Georgi refer smaller tribes of Kamasintsy, Tubintsy, Karagasy and other groups of the “Otyak generations” to the “Semoyad nations” apart from Samoyed themselves and Koibals, Mators and Soyots.

V.V. Radlov mentions Koibals as a part of the Abakan Tatars – “a patchwork of various nomadic tribes, which went down the liberated Abakan value in the XVII-XVIII centuries [Radlov, 1989, P. 225-226]. V.V. Radlov notices that the Koibals have a very developed epic

poetry poetic tales and heroic epos, which create an ideal world occupying a very important place in the spiritual life of a nomad and represent a truly “poetic perception of the world”, which has little to do with the religious views of shamanism [Radlov, 1989, Pp.245-246]. Kaksin A.D. describes the Koibal subdialect in the Khakas language as disappearing [Kaksin, 2014. P.58-61].

Second, the linguistic interpretation of the ethnonym Mongol has enabled to compare the ethnonym with the name of a mysterious state of dog-head people Gou-Go (translated as a “dog-state”, i.e. the state of people-dogs), where we, like T.D. Skrynnikova, interpret the morpheme -go(l) as the Chinese appellative of go state [KRS]. Probably, the exonym nikan or the Nikan kingdom of dog-head people, Mongol and Gou-go are socionyms or politonyms of the same state alliance of the nomadic tribes of Central Asia [Zhamsaranova, 2014, P. 41-49].

The historical and ethnographic literature, which contains the facts and information quite valuable for a researcher, is crucial for studying the medieval ethnonyms. For these purposes, let us consider in brief some facts about the history of tribe and tribal name.

E.D. Philips assumes that the Chinese had been aware of the Mongols centuries before they became a threat. The historical chronicles of the VI century Tang dynasty mentions the Meng-u, “the Mongols are mentioned under the name of Meng-u among other Northern ethnic groups, which together were called Shiwei. Meng-u inhabited the Southern coast of the river Shizian, which flew to the East from the lake Kuilun; probably, it was the river Argun flown from the Ulyungur lake” [Philips, 2003, P. 18]. The hydronym Argun and limnonym Ulyungur are Western Transbaikal toponyms, which enables to suggest that the Eastern Transbaikal is a territory of Meng-u and Shiwei inhabitation.

The way of life of Shiwei resembled the way of life of Turks - a lot of pigs and cows, a few horses and no sheep, which enabled Philips to consider these tribes “that had just began to pass from the life in the forest to the nomadic life in the steppe” the Tungus.

Meng-u or Meng-ku mentioned in the chronicles of the Liao dynasty together with Ta-ta or Tatars were a little different; their way of life was closer to the steppe nomads who consumed meat and sour milk. The Jin chronicles report that these Meng-u become more and more dangerous and their raid on China become more successful. In the epoch of Jin in 1143, the government troops defended their influence on their territories with much effort; however, they lost the Mongol fortifications to the north of Kerulen. In brief, this was the political situation by the moment of birth of Temujin the Borjigin who later united different tribes under the common name of Mongols.

We will briefly notice the important for the study fact of the identity of different variants Meng-u or Meng-wu/Meng-uu, Meng-ren, Men-da (according to the Chinese sources) as the forms of the same ethnonym. The analysis of all the above mentioned ethnonyms in various forms – as Meng-u Shiwei (The Shiwei Mongols), Meng-wa Bu (the tribe of Meng-wa), Mangguzi or Mongus (Meng-gu-si, Monyus) has enabled T.D. Skrynnikova to consider them the same tribe though written under different names by the Chinese during the dominance of different tribes [see: Skrynnikova, 2006. Pp. 137-138]. Probably, this row also includes such ethnonym as Manchurian(s) / Manchzhurs, whose territory of inhabitation coincides with the areal of dominance of all the Mongol-speaking groups and tribes of the Circumbaikal and the Amur River Region.

We should mention the possibility of “transferring” the ethnonym to various areas of Central Asia. We assume that the shift, or rather the transfer of the ethnonym to other territories became the cause-and-effect relationship of the existence of the Mongol tribes at various territories written in the Chinese chronicles under the ethnonyms Meng-gu and Meng-da. Possibly, the second element of ethnonyms is a self-appellation of the tribe, which entered the confederation of Meng-U and Meng-da. In the Meng-u/Meng-gu or meng-yu ethnonym, the

second element can be compared to the Chinese appellative *go state*, i.e. literally the state of the Meng people. In another Meng-da ethnonym, the morpheme Meng-da represents the exonym of Tatar or Turkic-speaking tribes of the Northern Asia tatarin/tatar, i.e. mongol-tatarin / tatar.

With the increased military power due to the flow of new ethnic complements, the tribal name of Mongol acquires not only ethnocultural but already ethnopolitical actualization and receives double identity: this name was used to denote both Mongols and Tatars as well as other Siberian tribes, which later became subdued to the Mongols. We should also note that the Mongols became known in the Western Eurasia under the name of Mongol-Tatars or Tatar-Mongols. Therefore, the existence of two territories named by the word with various affixes but the same root *meng-* in the Chinese documents allows us to consider the functioning of the same ethnonym at various territories as a socionym and later a politonym.

The linguistic explanation of the transition of the Koibal appellative *meäng dog / wolf* in the ethnonymic Mongol in various forms *Meng-u shiwei* (Shiwei Mongols, *meng-gyy*), *meng-wa bu* (the *meng-wa*, *meng-wu* tribe), *Mangguzi* or *Mongus* (*meng-gu-si*, *monyus*) seems challenging. We assume that in the structure of the late form of the Mongol ethnonym the second syllable *-gol* could “transfer” from the original morpheme *-wu* of the name *Meng-wu* into *-gyy* originally, according to the historical processes of the development of phonology, including the Buryat language. The Mongologists note the phenomenon of the transliteration of the uvular consonant γ in the positions of beginning, middle and end of the hard row words in all the modern Mongol languages in written form (orphografically) as *-g-*. It is arguable that historically established modifications of consonants in the phonology of the Buryat language defined the dropping of the initial *-w-* and emergence of the sound *-g-[γ]* instead. The reconstruction of this state has found the presence of the consonant *-w-* in the position between vowels in the middle of the word, like *itawun ~ itayun* partridge; *šibawun~šibayun* bird [Rassadin, 1982, Pp. 48-49]. V.I. Rassadin assumes that some time ago, as seen from the examples, “...at the place of complex <> “vowel+consonant+vowel” (VCV), there are two syllables either with hiatus (V’V), or with bilabial fricative *w* (VwV) between vowels. It is commonly acknowledged in Mongol Studies after V.I. Rassadin works that the longitudinal complexes with intervocalic consonants represent the ancient state of the Mongol languages [Rassadin, 1982, P. 48].

The Buryat language and its dialects are characterized by the monophthongization of diphthongs caused by the emergence of long vowels [Rassadin, 1982, Pp. 59-65]. Possibly, this historical phenomenon can explain the emergence of *-o-* in the CVC position instead of the initial Koibal diphthong *-ä-* of the appellative *meäng* < *meng-wu* < *meng-gyy* < Mongol.

Third, the description of onomaconcept *dog/wolf* allows us to reveal lexico-semantic similarity of the designation of wolf in various languages using the method of component analysis of the dictionary definitions of the concept word-name. In the Mongol languages, the lexeme *chono(n) wolf /Mong./*; *shono wolf /Bur./* is highly frequent towards the derived groups of words with attributive *chonyn wolfish /Mong./* and *shono-wolfish /Bur./*: *azargan chono* male wolf; *elegchin chono* she-wolf; *chono khon khoyor shig* like a wolf and a ship (about hostile relations); *kheh chono* grey wolf (literally blue wolf); *chonon dah* wolf fur-coat; *chono yar* red tetter; *chonyn geleg* (= *beltreg*) wolf cub; 2 (as a part of botanic names): *chonyn erges* thistle; *chonyn suul* bears onion; *chonyn tems* yellow lily (literally wolf martagon); *chonyn khyalgana* fescue; *chonyn eleg* buckthorn; *chonyn khervee* (med.) chicken pox; *chonyn khervesh* (med.) hives [MRS].

In the Buryat language, the quantity of derived lexemes and combinations from the lexeme *shono/shonyn* is represented by much greater number of lexical units and reaches more than 68 units, including, apart from set phrases, the words representing various tabooed names

of a wolf by dialects: arzagan shuden (literally) bared teeth /Ung./; garyukhan (from gayargan huge and thin, sturdy (about wolf) /Bur./; (tabooed name of a wolf) /East and West/; gonzogoi khuulte (literally) with stretched tail /Barg./; burkhanai nokhoi (literally) god's dog /Al./; noohon tolgoito (literally) with furry (covered by fur) head /Tunk./; tengeriin nohoi (literally) heaven's dog /Al./; urta suulte with long tail /Sel./; uta hyylte with long tail /west/; khamuuta mangy, itchy /Sel./; khuiten shenzhete (from Bur. shenzhelhe to consider; to study); to investigate, to examine with cold mind /Al./; khuiten sheruun aloof and severe, unfriendly, cruel /Bokh./; kheeryn nokhoi wild dog /Tunk./; kheerib khukhe wild grey /Barg./; hanshagga (literally) with hair in the temples (colloq. woman) /Al./; sheruun severe, unfriendly, cruel, rude /Bokh./; haakhaltai bearded (common epithet of a wolf in folk stories); and also a number of words denoting the subspecies of wolf in general: azarga shono male wolf; goloi shara shono yellow steppe wolf; suuben shono jackal; khukhe shono grey wolf; gulgen shono wolf cub /Khorin./; khubuun shono wolf cub /Okin./ [BRS].

There is an obvious functional frequency of word-groups used to describe the “brutal” essence of a wolf: sharp teeth and tail that distinguish a wolf from a dog and also his wild and severe nature. These groups of lexemes reflect the perception of an animal-wolf and thus actualize the synchronous image of a wolf in human consciousness.

The lexical-semantic group verbalizing the conceptual semantics of the notion of wolf is more interesting. In the Buryat language, the lexeme shono is a part of the metaphorical expression shono bodol (literally) a thoughtful intention, longsighted, which has an additional meaning immovable, firm in the Western dialect; shono hanaan immovable urge, firm will reflected in the proverb shono zuuhanaa aldahadaa gurinha bolodog, ere zorihonoo tabihadaa neren khukhardag if a wolf loses his prey he will starve, if a man abandons what he strives for he will lose his honor [ibid.]

In the Mongol language, the lexeme chin as a derivative from the Old Mongol chinu=a wolf enters a frequency row of words and word-phrases translated as: firm, unmovable; chin bat immovable, immovability; chin zurh unmovable bravery; chin zurhnees deep from the soul, with all the heart; chin nut firmness, immovability; chin suseg deep faith; chin unen simple truth; sincerity; honesty; chin unench just; altruistic; honest; sincere; devoted; chin hemeen with diligence [MRS]. Possibly, the first meaning of Chin is the name of Jin dynasty long dominated in China. The “Iron” dynasty is considered an image epithet of the name of this dynasty. If we connect the written Mongol chinu=a with the dictionary row of the derivatives from the chin lexeme, we can assume that the diffusion of the ancient words determined the conceptual polysemy represented in the article.

Thus, the component analysis of the word definitions of a concept word-name has enabled to reveal 1) lexico-semantic similarity of the name of wolf in the Mongol languages; 2) the basic significative sign of the wolf image in the perception of the Mongols - the possession of such qualities as immovable firmness together with the devotion to family, i.e. wolf's monogamy. Such wolf's traits as long-sight, cruelty, severity, suspiciousness, and physical abilities typical of an image of a predator – sharp teeth, long tail, shape of skull (compare shontogor sharp-headed /Bur./) etc. are relevant. The separate groups of Buryats including the Barguzin and Selengin groups call the wolf a mythological primal forefather of their families: “those who belonged to the shono family called the wolf aba father/, akhai elder brother, uncle”, which indicates the mythological perception of the wolf image [BRS]. Among the Mongol congeneric names of the Middle ages, there are families of Abaganaad and Akhanaad, which were genonym names of the Mongol tribe.

It is curious that in the Northern Samoyed (Nenets) language, the notion of the wolf image based on the word meaning coincides with the image of wolf in the Mongol languages. In the Nenets language, apart from some names of a wolf, there is such name of wolf as sarnik

wolf unfolded semantically in the lexemes sarmana(s) to roam, to wander; sarty fang; sarke''le(s) to be sharp, to stick out [NRS]. The verbs of sarvabta(s) to catch tightly, to pull out quickly; sarvara(s) (figurative) to rely to another's without having one's own type are derived from the sarty lexeme. During the comparison of these derived lexemes from the original sarkta: sarkta titya the fang of a predator [NRS], there manifests the main principle of designation a wolf by the appellative sarmik reflecting his brutal essence. Sharp fangs together with the ability to catch the potential victim tightly and quickly and a wandering predatory lifestyle developed in the national worldview the image of wolf similar to the Mongol worldview.

Besides, the analysis of the words and word-groups describing the animal enables to add such properties as, for example, the length of a wolf tail into the conceptual semantics of the wolf onomacoept. A wolf has a long tail unlike a dog, i.e. in the Nenets language, the allegorical name of the wolf is tevta tailed, with a tail; wolf; tevta khadako she-wolf; teva yamb with a long tail (i.e. wolf) from the original word teva tail (of an animal) [NRD]. It is interesting that the Nenets tevary has the meaning the spirit assisting a shaman (he who reaches a shaman), where the stem tev is lexically identical to the stem of the euphemism tevta. There reveals an ancient perception of the image of a wolf as a "tailed" creature, therefore able to assist a shaman during his communication with spirits in the Nenets linguistic picture of the world.

All the listed qualities of a wolf including guile, cunning, ability to trace, to lie in the ambush in wait for a prey characterize and form the image of a wolf as strong and ferocious animal with almost human intelligence, which determined the choice of the image of a wolf as the totem ancestor of people in the mythological conscious of a nomad. We remind that a wolf is the only predator who can hunt in a horde chasing a prey into a circle, similar to the principle of the nomadic raid hunt. However, in our opinion, it is possible that the marked conceptual signs of the image of wolf are not basic.

In our opinion, the sign of the similarity of residence place or dwelling is the main significative sign that determined the choice of a wolf as a totem. This, in turn, determined the similarity of the image of a wolf and a human. This conclusion is determined by the morpheme analysis of the appellative tumpne~tumbne~chumana wolf in the Selkup language (one of the Southern Samoyed languages). During the analysis, we can reveal the morpheme chu-/chou-/tu-/tou- earth; clay; country, the second element -an(ä) is äñ egg [SRDS], which has enabled to interpret the meaning of the appellative chumänä wolf as earth+egg, which agrees with the notion of the image of a living being (including wolf) who was born and grew in the earth hole.

According to the Selkup worldview, all the living things are born from the earth substance. The Samoyedologists have a commonly accepted interpretation of the Selkup ethnonyms sysse-gom, schösch-kom, tschûmel-gop, tjûje-gom as a man of the land from tschu, tju, sye clay, earth, country; M.A. Kastren wrote about it as early as in 1845 [Tuchkova, 2005, P. 279; Bykonya, 2011, P.50]. It is curious that the lexeme an(g) in the Mongol languages is animal, which illustrates the example of the typology sem of the Selkup äñ egg and the Buryat an(g) animal.

The ethnographic fact of the history of the Mukri tribes in the Amur River Region and Shiwei in the Transbaikal clarifies the hypothesis for the identity of the image of wolf and nomad in the Medieval consciousness. The archeologists note that the Black River Mukri in the V-VIII centuries lead a half-nomadic life and lived in the dugouts, which "were the holes dug in the ground; above these holes, they mounted blocks in the trestle and covered them with a thick layer of earth and, possibly, turf" [Shavkunov, 1990, P. 73]. The Transbaikal archeologists notice numerous dwellings of half dugout type in the culture of the Shiwei tribal alliances, which occupied a large territory in the Upper Amur area and in the basins of the Onon, Ingoda, Shilka and Argun rivers. The basin of the river Shilka where the archeologists have found the largest barrows (up to 100 graves in each) and fortified settlements is considered the center of

the Shiwei expansion at the Transbaikal territory. These settlements and dwelling-dugouts resemble in their form similar constructions of the Amur tribes Mokhe, with which the Shiwei closely contacted [History...,2001, P.19]. Similar half-dugout type of dwelling had been known among the Siberian peoples since the time of the Xiongnu [Istoriya Sibiri, 1968, P. 244].

Possibly, the fact of the ethnographical past of the Ostyaks-Samoyeds “earlier the Ostyaks lived in the earth karamo” became a possible motivational sign of the ethymon of the late ethnonyms tyumelkop / chyulakum / chyumelgup Ostyak [SRDS]. Besides, our own material on the ethymology of the Selkup ethnonyms also suggests the existence of earth people. P. Haidu notes that the meaning of the South Selkup t’ūje-gum or t’ūjgum is earthman. P. Haidu assumes that the Vasyugan-Tymsk form of č’ūmilgup also relates to the appellative earth [Haidu, 1985, Pp.133-134]. Thus, a wolf was acknowledged an essence identical to a human by the medieval consciousness, since they had common origin (from the earth substance) and habits. The denotative signs of a wolf determining his typification with the specific features of a human-hunter also became a basis for choosing the image of this predator as a totem of new steppe culture, which represent Mongols at the period of their historical establishment.

Therefore, the theoretical reconstruction of the core of the onomaconcept wolf can be represented as a two-top mental formation. One of the tops is represented as a lexico-semantic field of appellative lexica revealing the above mentioned significant signs that elaborate the positively colored background of the conceptual metaphor wolf, which can indicate that the image of wolf was rather relevant and “popular” among both Mongols and other tribes in the Medieval epoch. The change of paradigms of consciousness due to various, first of all, historical-political reasons caused the change of priorities and moral foundations typical for vague times.

Besides, the Buryat language has enabled to reveal the signs giving the image of wolf almost human properties and thus showing the identification of a human and a wolf.

The second top of the onomaconcept wolf reveals the nominative ability of a concept. Onomastically, the concept is represented by the ancient ethnonyms Buryat and Mongol. The ethnonyms with the etymon wolf represent the ancient Turkic (Buryat) and Samoyed (Mongol) languages.

Let us briefly describe the semantic signs and semes, which actualize in many contexts and become conceptual signs elaborating the notional basis of the concept; It has turned out that the etymon of the ethnonym Mongol is a Samoyed appellative meäng wolf, which transferred to the proprial lexica and became the name of a new ethnic unit in the Medieval Asia - Mongol. Originally, the totem ancestor was the image of dog as an archetypal image; further it was replaced by the image of wolf marking, thus, the ambitious goals and urges of the Mongols and their origin implying the mythologeme of “wolf” ancestor of the Mongols embodied in the eponym Börtö-chino.

The old Turkic appellative bur’e wolf, a basis for the ethnonym Buryat, was primary by the time of its origin and the scales of the functional relevance. A Medieval nomad had to defend his right to live participating in many tribal conflicts and wars like the wolf horde. To achieve goals, the tribal chiefs created mobile, short-term military alliances, inside which there always was a danger to be destroyed due to one’s uncompetitiveness, incapability in the context of aggression, courage, cohesion and cautiousness relevant for the time.

In the context of conceptual metaphor, the image of wolf, like the image of dog, has a substitutional functional role in the mythological consciousness of a nomad. Still, one of the main role functions of the image of wolf is a function of world establishment. Performing the higher will, the will of heavens or Tengri God, the tribe of wolfs had to take obligations to prevent tribal conflicts, to establish peaceful co-existence by establishing strictly structured, hierarchic power of one tribal alliances over the others, disappearing and emerging in

qualitatively new transformed form based on previous alliances, which had not withstood the test of time and reality.

The fact that the ethnonym Mongol represents a Medieval politonym can be proved by the existence and functioning of such names as Chakhar-Mongols, Buryat-Mongols, Khalkha-Mongols, Olyot-Mongols, Dyurbyut-Mongols etc. as ethnonyms. The Mongol state of the IX-XI occupied a large territory from the eastern Amur River Region to the extreme borderlines of the Three Rivers Region to the north-west (Onon-Kerulen-Tola). At that time, the group of Mongols led by Temujin raised after wars with neighboring tribes could consist of some Turkic-Samoyed ethnolinguistic complements under the tribal name Mongol. Another, "marginal" Mongolia situated to the northeast of China and coincided with the Amur region left under the name Nikan "kingdom" or Gou-Go. We can assume that earlier the ancestors of the Amur Region tribes Manegrs or Manchurians could be known under the belligerent tribal name "dog vs wolf tribe" nikan (from the Samoyed kanan dog), which later, as it often happens in history, lost their olden might and gave power to other tribal alliances [see: Zhamsaranova, 2014, Pp. 41-49].

Ts.B. Tsydendambaev noticed the similarity of the genonym of the Ekherites (Western Buryats) Toanatskiy (calqued Chenorutskiy /Chinorukskiy) from the Nenets th'ona wolf [Tsydendambaev, 1972, Pp. 276-277].

We assume that Ts.B. Tsydendambaev defined the semantic meaning and linguistic origin of the Ekherite generic names – ekhe shonood and бага shonood (big wolfs and small wolfs) admitting thus possible proximity of the written Mongol chinu=a wolf and the Nenets th'ona wolf. The semantic and lexical proximity of the Nenets appellative th'ona wolf and the written Mongol chinu=a wolf seems obvious. It gives opportunity to define the archiseme in the context of describing the image component in the structure of onomaconcept, which is similar to the archetype in culture.

First, during this comparison, with account for the fact that the Nenets th'ona could develop up to the Mongol chono and the Buryat shono, there reveals the typology of the consonant Samoyed languages with that of the Mongol languages t~ch/sh. Therefore, the Ekherit name shono urug < Chenorut or Chinoruk is the same name as the Samoyed Toanat.

Second, the support from the comparative analysis of the lexemes of the Nenets and Buryat languages with the root stems ten- and shen- correspondingly will define the additional signs of the conceptual semantics of the image of wolf in the national linguistic worldviews. In the Nenets language, the appellative tenz means genus, tribe, ethnic group, family, breed, sort; way; technoque [NRS] and enters the derivational row: tenolyang stringy, with many strings; tenombă(s) to string; tenondă(s) to twist, to twist strings for sewing, to ask deer strings from someone; tenonz to string; tenota" nuda" strong arms; tenots to be stringy; (figurative) to be stout, strong, powerful [NRS]. It has become possible to select a number of words from the Buryat language enlarging the signs of the conceptual semantics: shen gabyaa valor; shen (gabyyaa) azhal, shen baatarlig valorous labour; shen zorig courage, valor; daring, foolhardiness; spirit; shen zorigto valorous; shen khatuu persistant, obstinate; shen khatu zorig persistence, obstinance; shen khatuuzhakha to become firm, to firm [BRS]. The morphemic shen- is a part of derivatives: shenzhegdehe from shenzhehe to be studied, to be investigated; shenzhegshe investigator; observer; shenzhelge investigation; study; observation; shenzhelhe to consider; to study; to investigate; shenzhelegshe investigator; khele (besheg) shenzhelegshe philologist, linguist; shenzhelel examination, study; observation etc. up to the lexemes shenzhelhe to consider (something); to dig; to pick (in something); shenzhehe to sniffle (for example, about dog); shenee(n) power; sheneetey strong; sheneetei bolokho to receive (or acquire) power [BRS].

This comparison enables to reveal the notion of something/someone stout, strong, mighty, partly due to stout strings and tendons as archetypically relevant for the image of wolf. The archiseme of the onomaconcept dog / wolf in the typological comparison of the Nenets *tenz* genus, tribe, ethnic group; family, breed with the Buryat *shenee(n)* power; *sen* (corresponding to the Buryat dialect *ton* actually so; over with the enhancing-expressive shade) is the meaning very, extremely; over; representing the fact of the pra-linguistic state of the ancient Ural-Altai community. The Buryat *shen* (denoting the limiting degree of what is expressed by the next noun, adj., verb): *shen gabyaa* valor; *shen zorig* courage, valor, daring, foolhardiness, spirit etc has the form *ton* in the Aginsk subdialect of the Khorin dialect of the Buryat language.

The sign of power, physical strength and endurance of a wolf or a dog, which these animals have not due to rather stout, trained tendons of the legs than big teeth, fangs and a long tail can be considered a value sign of onomaconcept. The saying “Wolves live by their legs” is the best to define this sign revealed in the structure of the onomaconcept of wolf.

The image sign of onomaconcept was reflected in the comparison of appellatives *th'ona* wolf/Nenet./ and *tinua/chinu*=a wolf/w.-Mo./ < *chono* wolf/Mong./, / *shono* wolf/Bur./, when the ideosemantics of this notion developed up to the lexeme *tenz* genus, tribe, ethnic group, family, breed, genus, sort; way; technique in the Nenets language, which should naturally manifest itself in the Mongol languages. The words *shinzh* sign /Mong./; *shenzhe* form; type, sign, mark; data; property (of an object) /Bur./ in the Mongol languages coincide with the additional meaning of the Nenets *tenz* genus, sort; way, technique, revealing the fact of consonant alteration *t~ch/sh* typical for both the Mongol and the Samoyed languages.

Thus, the image and value signs of the onomaconcept of wolf in the Buryat language manifest positive connotation revealing the typological similarity of the ideosemantic meaning of the lexemes of the Nenets and Buryat languages and denoting the potential strength, power, and stringiness by the Nenets lexemes; valor, courage, persistence, obstinacy, observation, investigative qualities by the lexical means of the Buryat language.

Interestingly, an image sign of the wolf naming in the Turkic languages. K. Novikova writes that the names of some mustelides in the Turkic languages are formed according to the model: *borsug~bursug* /old Turc/ (< *bor~bur~pur* - to smell, to stink + the archaic affix of the verbal name *-sug~sīg*), *purāsh* (< *pur*+affix *-āsh*) badger /Chuvash/; lit. stinky, stincard [Novikova, 1979, P.65]. In the Tungus-Manjur languages, *boro* I grey [SSTMYa] coincides with the Mongol and Buryat *boro* gray and is the most close lexically and semantically to the onim of the mythical ancestor of the Mongols *Börtö-chino* Grey Wolf.

These relations of the linguistic facts form the significant sign of the onomaconcept wolf /dog, which confirms the version of the ethnolinguistic community of tribes on once common territory, whose system of onims reflected the notion of an animal with a strong smell typical for the canids. For the linguistic worldview of the Turkic- and Tungus-speaking tribes, various value, image and significant signs prevailed in choosing a totem primal forefather. The nomadic consciousness in the Medieval epoch had to answer the challenges of this severe time, when only the strongest person, who demonstrates cruelty justified by the set goal, cautious and brave, whose might and power was able to subdue various tribes to his will to establish a kind of peace in the Steppe could be considered the “wolf” - leader, which became basic for defining the totem primal forefather under the name *Börtö-chino* in the nomad consciousness of the Mongols.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The article enlarges the results of the studies on historical ethnonymics and adds new methods and techniques as well as new knowledge of the ethnogenetic and ethnolinguistic processes of the historical past of the Asian peoples. It represents the methods of studying an ethnonym from the position of the cognitive linguistics. The onomaconcept wolf is represented by the ethnonyms Mongol and Buryat, the conceptual semantics reveals pre-ethnonym meaning of the Mongol tribal name. The reliance on the appellative lexica of the Mongol and Samoyed languages in constructing the structure of the onomaconcept confirms the thesis of the natural mutual influence of non-related languages – the Ural and the Altai determined by the areal contactology of the languages. This conclusion is of some value for creating the ethymological dictionary of the Mongol languages.

REFERENCES

1. Babenko L.G. *Lingvisticheskiy Analiz Khudozhestvennogo Teksta* [The Linguistic Analysis of the Fiction Text]. Yekaterinburg. The Publishing House of the Ural University, 2000. 533 p.
2. Bykonya V.V. *Selkupy: Yazyl i Kultura* [The Selkups: Language and Culture]. Tomsk. The Publishing House of the Tomsk State Teachers' Training University, 2011. 236 p.
3. Vezhbitskaya, A. *Ponimanie Kultur Cherez Posredstvo Klyuchevyh Sloz* [Understanding of Cultures by Means of Key Words]. Moscow. Yazyki Slavyanskoy Kultury, 2001. 288 p.
4. Vorkachev S.G. *Voploschenie Smysla: Conceptualia Selecta* [The Embodiment of Sense: Conceptualia Selecta]. Volgograd. Paradigma, 2014. 331 p.
5. Vorkachev S.G. *Postulaty Lingvakontseptologii* [The Postulates of Linguaconceptology]. Edited by V.I. Karasik and I.A. Sternin. Moscow. Gnosism 2007. Pp. 10-11
6. Georgi I.G. *Opisanie Vsekh Obutayuschih v Rossiyskom Gosudarstve Narodov: Ikh Zhiteiskih Obryadov, Obyknobenyi, Odezhd, Zhilisch, Uprazhneniy, Zabav, Veroyisповedaniy i Drugikh Dostoprimechatelnostey* [The Description of all the Peoples living in the Russian State: Their Everyday Rites, Habits, Clothes, Dwellings, Exercises, Entertainments, Confessions and Other Points of Interest]. Preface and notes by V.A. Dmitriev. Reprinted from the edition of 1799, revised and supplemented. The second edition. Saint Petersburg. Russkaya Simfoniya, 2007. 818 p., 100 p. with illustrations.
7. Zhamsaranova R.G. *Tipologicheskiy Analiz Buryatsko-Selkupskoy Terminologii Rodstva* [The Typological Analysis of the Buryat-Selkup Terminology of Kinship]. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosugerstvennogo Universiteta*. Tomsk. TSU, 2009. No 324. – P. 22-25.
8. Zhamsaranova R.G. *Kontseptosfera Srednevekovoi Mongolskoi Etonimii* [The Conceptosphere of the Medieval Mongol Ethnonymics]. The abstract of a PhD thesis (Philology). Tomsk, 2011. 50 p.
9. Zhamsaranova R.G. *Kontseptosfera Srednevekovoi Mongolskoi Etonimii* [The Conceptosphere of the Medieval Mongol Ethnonymics]. Chita. Ekspres-Izdatelstvo. 2013. 288 p.
10. Zhamsaranova R.G. *Onimy Nelyudskiy Ostrog (Nirchinskiy Ostrog), Nikanskoe Tsarstvo i Gosudarstvo Gou-Go v Aspekte Tsivizatsionnyh Protsessov Severnoy Azii* [The Onims of

Nelyudskiy Gaol (Nerchinskiy Gaol), Nikansk Tzardom and the State of Gou-Go in the Aspect of civilization processes in the Northern Asia]. *Tomskiy Zhurnal Lingvisticheskikh i Antropologicheskikh Issledovaniy*. Issue 2 (4). Tomsk, 2014. P. 41-49.

11. Ipanova O.A. Kontsept “Zhizn” v Russkoy Yazykovoi Kartine Mira: Lingvokulturologicheskii i leksicograficheskii Aspekty [The Concept of Life in the Russian Linguistic Worldview: Linguacultural and Lexicographic Aspects]. A PhD thesis (Philology). Saint Peterburg. 2005. 24 p.

12. Istoriya Vostochnogo Zabaikalya. Chitinskaya Oblast [The History of the Eastern Transbaikalia. The Chita Region]. A tutorial. Edited by I.I. Kirillov. Irkutsk. The Publishing House of the Irkutsk State Economic Academy. 2001. 283 p.

13. Istoriya Sibiri [The History of Siberia]. V.1. Drevnyaya Sibir [The Ancient Siberia] Leningrad. Nauka, 1968. 454 p. <http://www.pseudology.org/goroda/IstoriaSibiri1a.pdf>

14. Kaksin A.D. Koibalskiy Govor Khakasskogo Yazyka: Traditionnye i Novye Podkhody v Voprosah Dokumentatsii [The Koibal Subdialect of the Khakas Language: Traditional and New Approaches in the Issues of Documentation]. Proceedings of the XIV All-Russia Scientific Conference “Current Issues of the Dialectology of the Languages of Russia’s Peoples” (Ufa, November 10-22, 2014). Ufa. IYAL UNTs RAN, 2014. Pp.58-61

15. Kravchenko A.V. Yazyk i Vospriyatie. Kognitivnye Aspekty Yazykovoy Kategorizatsii [Language and Perception. Cognitive Aspects of Linguistic Categorization]. Irkutsk, 1996. P. 34-41.

16. Molchanova O.T. Sravnitelno-Istoricheskoe i Tipologicheskoe Izuchenie Yazykov i Kultur [The Comparative-Historical and Typological Study of Languages and Cultures]. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference XXV DULZON READINGS. Tomsk. Tomsk State Teachers’ Training University, 2008. Pp.83-84.

17. Novikova K.A. Naznaniya Domashnih Zhivotnyh v Tunguso-Manchzhurskikh Yazykakh [The Names of Domestic Animals in the Tungus-Manchurian languages]. Leningrad, 1979. Pp. 53-134.

18. Pimenova M.V. Metodologiya Kontseptualnyh Issledovaniy [The Methodology of Conceptual Studies]. Edited by V.I. Karasik and I.A. Sternin. Moscow. Gnosis, 2007. Pp. 14-16

19. Radlov V.V. Iz Sibiri: Stanitsi Dnevnik [From Siberia: Pages of a Diary]. Translated from German by K.E. Tsivina and B.E. Chistova. Notes and afterword by S.I. Weinstein/ V.V. Radlov. Moscow. Nauka, 1989. 749 p. With illustrations and maps.

20. Rassadin V.I. Ocherki Po Istoricheskoi Fonetike Buryatskogo Yazyka [The Sketches on the Historical Phonetics of the Buryat Language]. Moscow. Nauka, 1982. 199 p.

21. Skrynnikova T.D. Ierarkhiya Identichnostei u Srednevekovykh Mongolov [The Hierarchy of the Identities in the Medieval Mongols]. Moscow. Vostochnaya Literatura, 2006. Pp.129-214.

22. Stepanov Yu.S. Konstanty: Slovar Russkoy Kultury [The Dictionary of the Russian Culture]. The 3rd edition amended and supplemented. Moscow, 2014. 992 p.

23. Sternin I.A. Kognitivnaya interpretatsiya v Lingvokognitivnyh Issledovaniyah [The Cognitive Interpretation in the Linguacognitive Studies]. *Voprosy Kognitivnoi Lingvistiki*. 2004. No 1. Pp. 65-70.

24. Sternin I.A. Semantiko-Kognitivnoe Napravlenie v Rossiyskoy Lingvistike [The Semantic-Cognitive trend in the Russian Linguistics] [electronic resource]. *Respectus Philologicus*, issue: 10 (15), 2006. Pp. 43-51. Access mode: www.ceeol.com. Accessed date 20.02.2011
25. Toporova T.B. Semanticheskaya Struktura Drevnegermanskoj Modeli Mira [The Semantic Structure of the Old German Worldview]. Moscow, 1994. 190 p.
26. Tuchkova N.A. Yuzhnoselkupsкая Etnonimika [The Southern Selkup Ethnonymics]. Proceedings of the XII Western Siberian Archeologist-Ethnographical Conference “The Issues of Historical and Cultural Development of the Ancient and Traditional Communities of the Western Siberia and Cross-Border Regions”. Tomsk. Tomsk State University, 2005. Pp. 279-282.
27. Uspenskiy F.B. Granitsa, Doroga, Napravlenie v Predstavlenii Drevnikh Skandinavov [The Border, Road, and Direction in the Representation of the Ancient Scandinaves]. *Antropologiya Kultury*. Moscow. 2002. Issue 1. P. 226.
28. Philips E.D. Mongoly. Osnovateli Imperii Velikih Khanov. Zagadki Drevnikh Tsivilizatsiy [The Mongols. The Founders of the Empire of Great Khans. The Mysteries of Ancient Civilizations]. Translated from English by O.I. Perfilyeva. Moscow. Tsentrpoligraf; Vneshtorgpress, 2003. 174 p.
29. Haidu Peter. Uralskie Yazyki i Narody [The Ural Languages and Nations]. Translated from the Hungarian By E.A. Khelimskiy. Moscow. Progress, 1985. 430 p.
30. Choang M. Chingizkhan [Genghis Khan]. Rostov-on-Don. Feniks. 1997. 352 p. (Series “Sled v Istorii”).
31. Tsydendambaev Ts.B. Buryatskie Istoricheskie Khroniki i Rodoslovnnye (Istoriko-Lingvisticheskoe Issledovanie) [The Buryat Historical Chronicles and Geneological Trees (Historical-Linguistic Study)]. Ulan-Ude, 1972. 662 p.
32. Cherkasov A.A. Zapiski Okotnika Vostochnoy Sibiri [The Notes of an Eastern Siberian Hunter]. Chita. Ekspress-Izdatelstvo. 2006. 560 p.
33. Shavkunov E.V. Kultura Chzhurchzheney-Udige XII-XIII vv. i Problema Proiskhozhdeniya Tungusskih Narodov Dalnego Vostoka [The Culture of the Jurchens-Udige of the XII-XIII centuries and the Issue of the Origin of the Tungus Peoples of the Far East]. Moscow. Nauka, 1990. 282 p. Illustrated.
34. Shilov A.L. Razmyshleniya Nad Statyey Y. Koivulekhto o Pribaltiysko-Finskih etnonimah. Finno-Ugorskoe Nasledie v Russkom Yazyke. [Thoughts about Y. Koivulekhto’s Article About Baltic-Finnish Ethnonyms. Finno-Ugrian Heritage in the Russian Language]. Yekaterinburg, 2002. Pp.211-227.

Dictionaries

1. BRS - Buryad-Orod Slovar [The Buryat-Russian Dictionary]. Compiled by K.M. Cheremisov. Moscow. The Soviet Entsiklopediya, 1973. 804 p.
2. MRS - Mongol-Oros Tol [The Mongol-Russian Dictionary]. Under the general editorship of Luvsandendev. Moscow. The State publishing House of the Foreign and National Dictionaries, 1957. 175 p.

3. NRS - Nenetsko-Ruskiy Slovar [The Nenets-Russian dictionary]. compiled by N.M. Tereschenko. Moscow. The Soviet Encyclopedia, 1965. 942 p.
4. KRS - Kitaisko-Ruskiy Slovar [The Chinese-Russian Dictionary]. Edited by Xia Chong I. Beijing The Publishing House of the Shanghai University of Foreign Languages, 1922. 1250 p.
5. SRS Selkupsko-Ruskiy Dialektnyi Slovar [The Selkup- Russian Dialect Dictionary]. Edited by B.B. Bykonya. Tomsk. The publishing House of the Tyumen State Teachers' training University, 2005. 348 p.
6. SSTMYa - Sravnitelnyi Slovar Tunguso-Manchzhurskih Yazykov: Materialy k Etimologicheskomu Slovaryu: v 2 t. [The Comparative dictionary of the Tungus-Manchurian languages: materials for the etymological dictionary: in 2 V.] edited by V.I. Tsintsius. Leningrad. Nauka, 1975. V.1. 672 p.; V.2. Leningrad, 1977. 992 p.

List of abbreviations of languages, dialects and subdialects

- Alar. – alar dialect of the Buryat language
- Barg. – the Barguzin subdialect of the Buryat language
- Bokh. – the Bokhan subdialect of the Buryat language
- Bur. – the Buryat language
- East. – the Eastern dialect of the Buryat language
- Old-Turk. – the Old Turkic language
- West. – the Western dialect of the Buryat language
- Mong. – the Mongol language
- Nenets – the Nenets language
- Okin – the Okin subdialect of the Buryat language
- w. Mo. – the Old Written Mongol Language
- Sel. – the Selegin subdialect of the Buryat language
- Tunk. – the Tunkin subdialect of the Buryat language
- Khorin – the Khorin dialect of the Buryat language
- Chuvash – The Chuvash language