

Phonetic semantics of onomatopoeias in Mongolian and Russian languages: from acoustic denotation to occasional denomination

Mikhail S. Vlasov¹, Odonchimeg Tumee²

¹The Shukshin Altai State Academy of Education, Biysk, Russia, e-mail: vlasov@bigpi.biysk.ru

²Khovd State University, Khovd, Mongolia, e-mail: odnoo_t@mail.ru

Abstract

The purpose of our research is to identify regularities in verbalization of 25 acoustic non-speech signals (impacts, continuants, dissonances, etc.) without any exact denomination. The study consists in analyzing onomatopoeias of these signals received from Mongolian and Russian speakers in the psycholinguistic experiment. The reactions (onomatopoeias) are considered from the perspective of the phonological, morphological and lexical system of the language under study, in comparison with codified onomatopoeias. These reactions are considered from the standpoint of the language influence, on the one hand, and speech activity of the native speaker, on the other hand. Experimental research methodology developed and tested in previous studies (Trofimova, 2009; 2011).

The sample involved 100 Mongolian and 100 Russian native speakers, aged 18 to 20. Russian respondents were in possession of two foreign languages (English and German); Mongolian respondents – English and Russian. Most of the respondents (95 %) were girls. They were presented 25 different sounds taken from the audio database for sound control supervisors. The sounds differed from each other in acoustic parameters: low and high, unbroken and broken, sharp and unsharp. Besides, most of them did not have any clear denomination. After listening each sound stimulus in five times the respondents had to write their own denomination for the stimulus. They reflected such invented onomatopoeias in script and transcription. The derived reactions were analyzed in terms of their phonetic composition, correlation between phonemes distinctive features (differentiae) and acoustic features of presented stimuli, attributing the onomatopoeias to usual or occasional words, identifying their typological class. These classes based on the typology of onomatopoeias described in (Voronin 2006, p. 44–66). Particular attention was paid to phonological syntagmatics of Mongolian occasional onomatopoeias in connection with the regularities of vowel harmony.

The study revealed phonetic-semantic language universals and unique properties of onomatopoeia generation by Mongolian and Russian respondents.

Keywords: phonetics, iconicity, phonetic semantics, verbalization, sound symbolism, onomatopoeia, Mongolian language, Russian language.

Vlasov, M.S., Odonchimeg, T. (2014). Phonetic semantics of onomatopoeias in Mongolian and Russian languages: from acoustic denotation to occasional denomination. *Central Asian Journal of Basic and Applied Research* [Фоносемантика звукоподражаний в монгольском и русском языках: от акустического денотата к окказиональной номинации, *Центрально-Азиатский журнал фундаментальных и прикладных исследований*], (1), pp. 30-50.

Фоносемантика звукоподражаний в монгольском и русском языках: от акустического денотата к окказиональной номинации

Власов М.С.¹, Одончимэг Т.²

¹Алтайская государственная академия образования имени В. М. Шукшина,
г. Бийск, Россия, e-mail: vlasov@bigpi.biysk.ru

²Ховдский государственный университет, г. Ховд, Монголия, e-mail: odnoo_t@mail.ru

Аннотация

Цель исследования – выявить закономерности процесса вербализации 25 акустических неречевых сигналов (ударов, континуантов, диссонансов и т. д.), не имеющих точной языковой номинации, путем анализа звукоподражаний данных сигналов, полученных от носителей монгольского и русского языков в ходе психолингвистического эксперимента. Реакции испытуемых в форме звукоподражаний (ономатопов, имитативов) рассматриваются в ракурсе фонологической, морфологической и лексической системы того или иного языка, прежде всего кодифицированных звукоподражаний. Данные единицы рассматриваются с точки зрения влияния языковой системы с одной стороны, и воздействия носителя языка с другой. Методика экспериментального исследования разработана и апробирована в ходе предыдущих исследований (Трофимова, 2009; 2011).

В эксперименте принимали участие 100 носителей монгольского и 100 носителей русского языков. Возраст испытуемых 18–20 лет. Российские студенты владели 2 иностранными языками (английским и немецким); монгольские студенты – английским и русским. Большую часть испытуемых (95 %) составляли девушки. Испытуемым было предъявлено 25 различных звучаний, отобранных из аудио-базы для звукорежиссеров. Звуковые сигналы отличались по акустическим параметрам: низкие и высокие, прерванные и непрерывные, резкие и нерезкие. Кроме этого, большинство из них не имели четкой номинации в языке. После пятикратного прослушивания каждого звукового стимула испытуемые должны были записать его словом. Носители языка отражали придуманные ими ономатопы в орфографической и транскрипционной записи. Полученные реакции анализировались с точки зрения их фонетического состава, соотношенности дифференциальных признаков используемых фонем и акустической природы предъявляемого стимула, отнесения к классу узальных или окказиональных единиц, выявлению их типологического класса. Классы звучаний определялись на основе типологии звукоподражаний, описанных в работе С. В. Воронина (Воронин, 2006, с. 44–66). Особое внимание мы уделяли фонотактике монгольских окказиональных ономатопов в связи с действием законов сингармонизма.

По итогам исследования выявлены фоносемантические универсалии и уникалии в образовании ономатопов монголоязычными и русскоязычными испытуемыми.

Ключевые слова: фонетика, иконизм, фоносемантика, вербализация, звукоподражание, звукосимволизм, монгольский язык, русский язык.

Введение

(Fischer, 2004;
Taylor&Taylor, 1962;
, 1973;
, 1974;
, 2006; Graham, 1992;
, 1995;
, 1997).

(Sapir, 1929; Wertheimer,
1958; Miron, 1961; Weiss, 1964;
1974)

(, 1957),
(, 1967),
(, 1987, 1992, 1995),
(, 1953),
(, 1997),
(, 1998),
(, 2007), (, 2008),
(, 2011),
(, 2011)

Теоретические предпосылки исследования

(, 1992, 1995),
XVIII (, 2011),
, 2011).

(, 2011),
(, 2011),

08-04-92301 /G “

(2008–2010).

2011).

2001; , 2006) (, 2001; , 1989)

(, 2013).

(, 2004).

2.

3.

(, 1987).

// “ ”).

(, 2013).

“ ” ,

(

), (, 2009).

“ ” “ ” “ ” “ ” (, 2004, . 73).

. - , , , , ,
 - .), [m], ,
 , , , - , -
 , - , . - (,
 - 2011). , -
 ,
 [k], [p], [f] ,
 (, [l], [r] ((, 2006).
), [š], [β] -
 /b/ ([]),
 [n] [], [g*] [],
 [k], [], [],
 [],
 (, 2004). . ,
 / /, /i/-/ /, /u/-/ /, /ʌ/-/ /,
 /r/-/ /, / / . ,
 : , -
 , ; , -
 . (, 2013).
 :
 , -
 , , - (-
 [r], [m]) ,
 . ,
 , - ,
 , - ,
 ,
 ,
 [r], .
 , ,
 ,
 ,
 (, -

), (-
).

Методика экспериментального исследования

5 .
 10
 -
 - “ 25 -
 (, 2009; , .
 2011).
 1. ”.
 2. 1)
 3. 2)
 4. 3)
 () 4)
 4. 5)
 10 . 6)
 100 7)
 (100 8)
 (18-20 . 9)
 2 ; 10)
 () ; 11)
 - ; 12)
 (95 %) ; 13)
 . 14)
 25 - 15)
 , - 16)
 , - 17)
 : -
 , 18)
 , - 19)
 20)
 (, - 21)
 22)
 - 23)
 , 24)

25)

Результаты исследования

[vig], [h`šh-], [šh-ke].

25

[dž`i] (. .), [š`i] (. .).

(. . , 2006, . 44-66).

. 10 %

(. . , . .).

1.

. 92 %

2.

[šh`]

[s], [x`]

[dž`].

[i:].

[i] “

[šh` šh`].

[u:], [i:] –

[ui].

[xnx].

([šh], [šh`], [r], [g`]).

[d`i].

[]

[i:].

[d`] (32 %

[t`], [t], [d].

[].

[i],

: [tn],

... ; (, 2006, . 48–51).
 [], [], [],
 ['], - []. 53 %
 : [], [g], [], - [].
 , , - , , , ,
 . . .

4. . .
 “ ” - -
 (: [d`], [d], [t], [g]
 + + [g`], [b], [b`], [β`]
 ”). []
 (24 %), [g] [], [g].
 [], - [']. [i] (24 %), [u], [].
 . [ui], [ei].
 “ ’ ” , [du], [d`i].
 (, , ,).

3. .
 [], [], - [],
 [].
 [e] (25 %), - [] [].
 [g], [b], [dž`], [f], : - , - , - . . .
 - [], [g], [], [i].
 [ei:],
 [ua], [j]
 (:
 (, 2004, . 114)). ”
 (,). + - (-
); + -
 [], [], [], [i].
 [] [].
 [].
 - [].

5. . .
 [] / [f] (-
). [t] (44 %),
 [d], [t`].
 [x`]
 (40%), [r]
 , [:]. []

(, , , ,).

: [tx⁻], [px⁻]. (, 2006, . 52).

[] / [f],

[], [], [], [], [k].

[], [], [].

[], [], [].

[tš], [t], [s[`]], [g], [p].

[i], [].

(. . .),

:

7. , “ ”

, [a].

[dž[`]], [tš], [t[`]], [i], [u].

[g] (28 %

[x⁻], [] [], [k], [u].

6. [tx⁻], [px⁻]. [š^hiš^hu], [tiš^hu], [tšimog], [turai]). [i] (36 %

[s[`]], [k], [g], [p]. [tš], [t], [] [], [f]. [], [], [].

[i], [u], [].

([t], [š^h], [dž[`]])

[tšg]). ([mn], : [], [], [], [g] / [], [], [], [], [u] / [].

[] []. [], [], []. 10 % [i], [u]

: , [i] (36 %).

8. [], [], [], [].

[], [], [], [].

['], [], [].

(48 %).

[], [u].

[g], [d], [d`],

[b]

[k]; [g], [r], [p].

([g βa:g] (.

“ - ”, “ - ”), [gag], [kag], [wawa]).

10. [], [], [], [], [], [].

[d`], [d] (48 %

), [b`], [t`] [dž`].

27 % [].

[j] [iju:] [t`iuju:i), [d` nj :], [iu] (, ,), [i : :] ([pic]).

(,).

[] [].

[], [], [], ['], [], []. 10 %

9. CVV (+).

“ ” (+ ([d], [d`], [g]; - [ae],)+).

[oe], [ui], [:e] ([d`io], [t`roe], [due]). [dž`]

11. []

, [bš`ug], [v`i β*], [twi]).
 [d`], [d], “ ”
 [b], [b`], [β], [β`],
 [w] (: [widiju:], [vaj], [v`ixβ*]),
 (, 2006, . 62).
 (, 2004, . 19, 79)). []
 [p`], [] / [u]
 [], [], [],
 [`], [].
 [], [] – [i]
 []. **13.**
 []/
 [u]. [g], [g`], [d`],
 [dž], [dz`],
 [i:]. [], [r],
 [ju:], [u:].
 [d`], [d]
 [], [],
12. : , , . .
 [], [],
 [p`], [].
 [d`], [t], [t`], – [i].
 []
 ([ju], [u]). [] /
 [r].
 (, ,).
 [],
 [], [],
 [], (+ +
), ()
 [], [], [], []. . .).

14. [tʰ], [d], [dʰ], [pʰ], [k], [kʰ]. “ + ” [tr]. CVC [i] (35 %), [ʌ], [r] (41 %), [ʃʰ]. [], [], [], [], [ʰ], [ʰ]. : , , . [], [], [], [ʰ], [ʰ]. : , , 43 % , , , “ ” [k], [r] [g]. [i], [ʌ]. 16. (+) + (, ,). [a], [o], [u], [oe]. [g], [b], [k], [kʰ], [g], [k], [ʌ]. ().

15. [], [ʌ], [ʌ], [ʌ], [ʌ]. (CVC), [i], [ʌ], [ʌ], [ʌ].

: - , - , - , - , - [d`ir], [d`er], [dž`i]: -
 . 27 %
 . (- , - , -).
 [k], [d] [d`]. 32 %
 [u] / [], [r]. [dr].
 [r]. [i],
 [u].
 (-
 + +), [] []
 (+ [], - []
 [+]). [], []
17. [], [].
 []:
 .
 .
 (, , , ,
). [i], ()+ ()
 [o]. [d`], [d], [m`], [dž`], - +).
 [r`] (46 %),
 [g], [t]. [dž`or] (,).
 .
 [] [] [] []. **19.** [] [].
 [] [].
 - [].
 - [],
 : , - : ,
 - , . (, , , ,).
 .
 (- [u] [i],
 + +). ([u:], [t`ug],
 [t`ju]).
 . [t], [t`], [d`], [d];
 [r], [], [g].
 [o], (,
 - ,). (, , -
 (, ,).).
18. .
 . [], [], [],

[], - ['], [], . -
 [], []. -
 [], [], -
 [] []. (.29 % - , ,
 (- , -).): + -
 . () + (, 2006, . 57).
 “ ” [], -
 - (+ - , “ ”
 +). -
 - []/[r]. -
 . 10 % -
 , - [],
 [g], -
 [i], . **21.** .
 , - :
 [t] (47 %), [t`],
 [tš`], [tr]. -
 , [r], [], [p]. -
20. . [i], [i:], [a]. -
 . 18 % -
 [g], [], [d], [p`], [š^h]. :
 , [i], [a]. , , , , , .
 [kr], [tr]. [x], [r], [] [],
 [g], [p]. - [], ['], ['],
 [].
 (, , , , , , [] []. 30 % -
). : , , , , . .
 [], [] .
 []: - , . [],
 [] []. ,
 [] [], :
 , , .10 % -
 (). “ -

” - (+ [s], [s`],
+). [i], [a], [u], -
-
(+ - ([s`ir], [sar], [sur]).
+). -
-
: -
(18 %), [], [], [], -
(30 %).
22. . , -
. (- - ,
-
. - - , - -).
[s] (39 % **23.** . -
), [s`], [s`], [ts`]. , -
. -
. [dž`],
[i] (50 %), [ts`], [s], [z`], [u].
[a], [u]. [r] (34 % [g],
), [], [s]. [k], []
[i]. : [ts`iok],
[sts`, [ts`rs], [sr]. [dsuarb*], [z`ig], [bz`i], [wis], [sš`iug]
. -
: , , : , . -
, , , , , , . -
(35 %). - []
. [], [], -
- [], [], []. []
[], [], [], [], - [] [].
[], [], [].
[] [].
- (+) +
[]. 20 % [i]/[] -
(, , , ,), -
. , (-
, 2006, .47).
(: + -
) + -
), , , -
(- [] -
).
24. . -
. -
: -

[x], [x`], [p], - (, ,).

[x], [g], [r]. - .

[i] (37 %), [a]. - [], [],

: [x̄r̄], [grax], [xr`ik], [prax]. - [].

[] [] - [], [], [].

[]. - , : , ,

- [] []. - . : , -

[], [], []. - .

: , , ,

, . ,

“[] +

[i]/[], -]”. () + [c -

. - (-

- ,). -

[u]/[], - -

“ ” - . -

(+ . -

), + (-

, , [x`], []), - - ([x],

[]. - [],

, , , -

“ - : , , .

” - (+

[+] +

), -

Заклучение

25.

[u:], [ui].

[x], [x`], [], - ,

[u], -

, [r]. , -

[x] -

. -

, -

: [iu], [ue], [uau], [uio]. -

. . . , - , -
 , - , -
 (, 2006, . 45). - , -
 () , -
 , -
 , -
 . -
 “ ” ; “ ”
 ; “ ” “
 “ ” ”
 , -
 -
 , -
 , - (, -
 , . . . 4 “
 ”, 13 “ ”, 14 “
 , , ”, 15 “ ,
 ”, 16 “ , ”, 21
 , “ ”, 24
 - “ ”).
 , , :
 . -
 - -
 , -
 . -
 - -
 , -
 . -
 (. . .) - 13-24-03002 “
 -
 . - ”.

Литература

1. . . : .— .: , 1987.

2. . . . () // . – 2011. – 1. – . 147–156.
3. . . . / – . 2- , – , 2006. – 248 .
4. – – , 1974.
5. – : , 2001.
6. , 2001. – 253 .
7. – : – , 2004.
8. – : – , 1973.
9. , : – : , 1989.
10. : – : – , 1995.
11. (. . . .) : – , 2013. – 242 .
12. – : , 2004. – 456 .
13. – . 1. – , 1953. – 173 .
14. [r/m] : – – , 2011. – 486 .
15. // – 1997. – 6. – . 100–120.
16. , : – : , 2009.
17. / , : , , , – – : , 2011.
18. : – , 2006.
19. – , 1987. – 184 .
20. I, II . – , 1992. – 401 .
21. III, IV, V . – , 1995. – 738 .
22. – , 1997. – 246 .
23. “ ” // “ ” (20–21 . 2011 .). – , 2011. – 76–81 .
24. – , 1967. – 183 .
25. : , 1988. 23. – 370 .
26. . “ ” - . – , 1957. – 158 .

27. , 2008. – 381 .
28. :
- , 2007. – 156 .
29. Fischer O. Evidence for Iconicity in Language // *Logos and Language: Journal of General Linguistics and Language Theory*. – 2004. – 5 (special issue on Aspects of Iconicity in Contemporary Linguistics). – P. 1–16.
30. Graham J.F. *Onomatopoeics: Theory of Language and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
31. Miron M.S. A Crosslinguistic Investigation of Phonetic Symbolism // *Journal Abnormal and Social Psychology*. – 1961. – Vol. 62. – 3. – P. 623–630. DOI: 10.1037/h0045212
32. Sapir E. A study in Phonetic Symbolism // *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. – 1929. – Vol. 12. – 3. – P. 225–239. DOI: 10.1037/h0070931
33. Taylor I.K., Taylor M.M. Phonetic Symbolism in Four Unrelated Languages // *Canadian Journal of Psychology*. – 1962. – Vol. 16. – 4. – P. 344–356. DOI: 10.1037/h0083261
34. Weiss J.H. The Role of Stimulus Meaningfulness in Phonetic Symbolism Response // *Journal of General Psychology*. – 1964. – Vol. 70. – 2. – P. 255–263. DOI: 10.1080/00221309.1964.9920596
35. Wertheimer M. The Relation between the Sound of a Word and its Meaning // *American Journal of Psychology*. – 1958. – Vol. 71. – 2. – P. 412–415. DOI: 10.2307/1420089

References

1. Vinarskaya, E.N. (1987). *Early child speech development and problems of defectology. Periods of forwardness. Emotional background of language acquisition* [Ranee rechevoe razvitie rebenka i problemy defektologii: Periodika rannego razvitiya. Emotsional'nye predposylki osvoeniya yazyka]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie (rus).
2. Vlasov, M.S. (2011). The occasional verbalization of emotional constituents of musical phrases of native speakers of Russian (the sound-frequency aspect). *Filologiya i chelovek* [Okkazional'naya verbalizatsiya emotivnoi sostavlyayushchei muzykal'nykh fraz nositelyami russkogo yazyka (zvukochastotnyi aspekt), *Filologiya i chelovek*], (1), pp. 147–156.
3. Voronin, S.V. (2006). *The basics of phonosemantics*. 2th ed. [Osnovy fonosemantiki. 2-e izd.]. Moscow: LENAND (rus).
4. Zhuravlev, A.P. (1974). *Phonetic meaning* [Foneticheskoe znachenie]. Leningrad: Leningrad University (rus).
5. Il'in, E.P. (2001). *Emotions and feelings* [Emotsii i chuvstva]. Saint-Petersburg: Piter (rus).
6. Kveselevich, D.I., Sasina, V.P. (2001). *Russian-English dictionary of interjections* [Russko-angliiskii slovar' mezhdometii]. Moscow: AST, Astrel (rus).
7. Kuz`menkov, E.A. (2004). *Phonological system of the modern Mongolian language* [Fonologicheskaya sistema sovremennogo mongol'skogo yazyka]. Saint-Petersburg: Saint-Petersburg University (rus).
8. Levitskii, V.V. (1973). *Semantics and phonetics* [Semantika i fonetika]. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi University.
9. Matveev, V.F. (1989). *The basics of medical psychology, ethics and deontology* [Osnovy meditsinskoï psikhologii, etiki i deontologii]. Moscow: Meditsina (rus).
10. Mikhalev, A.B. (1995). *The theory of phonosemantic field* [Teoriya fonosemanticheskogo polya]. Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University (rus).
11. Odonchimeg, . (2013). Perception and occasional verbalization of emotive components of

nonverbal signs by native speakers of languages of different structures (on the material of Russian and Mongolian languages). *Dissertation of candidate of philological sciences*. Ph.D. The Shukshin Altai State Academy of Education [Vospriyatie i okkazonal'naya verbalizatsiya emotivnykh sostavlyayushchikh neverbal'nykh znakov nositelyami raznosistemnykh yazykov (na materiale russkogo i mongol'skogo yazykov). Dissertatsiya kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Altaiskaya gosudarstvennaya akademiya obrazovaniya imeni V.M. Shukshina] (rus).

12. Pinker, S. (2004). *The Language Instinct*. Trans. from Eng. [Yazyk kak instinct. Per. s angl.]. Moscow: Editorial URSS (rus).

13. Sanzheev, G.D. (1953). *Comparative Grammar of Mongolian languages*. Vol. 1 [Sravnitel'naya grammatika mongol'skikh yazykov. T. 1]. Moscow (rus).

14. Sundueva, E.V. (2011). Verbalization of sensory perception by root consonants [r/m] in Mongolian languages. *Dissertation of doctor of philological sciences*. Ph.D. [Verbalizatsiya chuvstvennogo vospriyatiya sredstvami korneyvykh soglasnykh [r/m] v mongol'skikh yazykakh. Dissertatsiya doktora filologicheskikh nauk]. Ulan-Ude (rus).

15. Sigal, K.Ya. (1997). The problem of iconicity in language. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya* [Problema ikonichnosti v yazyke, Voprosy yazykoznaniiya], (6), pp. 100–120 (rus).

16. Trofimova, E.B., Sergeeva, M.E., Filippova, E.Yu. (2009). *Occasional verbalization of audio and visual signals by speakers of different languages* [Okkazonal'naya verbalizatsiya zvukovykh i zritel'nykh signalov raznoyazychnymi nositelyami]. Moscow: KRASAND (rus).

17. Trofimova, E.B., Trofimova, U.M., Sergeeva, M.E., Vlasov, M.S., Filippova, E.Yu., Odonchimeg, . (2011). *Usual and occasional semiotic space of emotions* [Uzual'noe i okkazonal'noe semioticheskoe prostranstvo emotsii]. Ulan-Bator – Biysk: Soembo printing (rus).

18. Shlyakhova, S.V. (2006). Phonosemantic marginalia in Russian speech. *Abstract of dissertation of doctor of philological sciences*. Ph.D. [Fonosemanticheskie marginalii v russkoi rechi. Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora filologicheskikh nauk]. Perm' (rus).

19. Bazarragchaa, M. (1987). Mongol khelnii avia selgekhe es. Terg n devter. Ulan-Bator (mong).

20. Bazarragchaa, M. (1992). Mongol khelnii giin garlyg m shgikh n'. I, II devter. Ulan-Bator (mong).

21. Bazarragchaa, M. (1995). Mongol giin garlyg m shgikh n' III, IV, V devter. Ulan-Bator (mong).

22. Badamdorzh, D. (1997). Mongol khelnii utga sudlalyn ndes. Ulan-Bator (mong).

23. Batchuluun, D. (2011). Dandandagvyn “Z rkhen tol'tyn tailbar” ba orchin tsagiin khelshinzhlel, paper presented at Conference “*Prirodnye usloviya, istoriya i kul'tura Zapadnoi Mongolii i sopredel'nykh regionov*”, Khovd, August 20–21, 2011, pp. 76–81 (mong).

24. Luvsanvandan, Sh. (1967). Orchin tsagiin mongol khelnii z i. Ulan-Bator (mong).

25. M nkhamgalan, Yu. (1988). Orchin tsagiin mongol khelnii baimzhiin ai. Nemen zasvarlasan khoerdakh' khevlel. Ulan-Bator: MONTsAME Agentlagiin khevlekh ildver. 23 (mong).

26. Pagva, T. (1957). “Z rkhen tol'tyn tailbar” -yg sudalsan tukhai temdeglel. Ulan-Bator (mong).

27. Tsooloo, Zh. (2008). Orchin tsagiin mongol khel. Avia z i. Ulan-Bator (mong).

28. Tserendavaa, B. (2007). Mongol khelnii olon utgat giin sudalgaa. Khel shizhnleliin doktoryn zereg gorilson b teel. PhD. Ulan-Bator (mong).

29. Fischer, O. (2004). Evidence for Iconicity in Language. *Logos and Language: Journal of General Linguistics and Language Theory*, (5), pp. 1–16 (special issue on *Aspects of Iconicity in Contemporary Linguistics*).

30. Graham, J.F. (1992). *Onomatopoeics: Theory of Language and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

31. Miron, M.S. (1961). A Crosslinguistic Investigation of Phonetic Symbolism. *Journal Abnormal*

and Social Psychology, 62 (3), pp. 623–630. DOI: 10.1037/h0045212

32. Sapir, E. (1929). A study in Phonetic Symbolism. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 12 (3), pp. 225–239. DOI: 10.1037/h0070931

33. Taylor, I.K., Taylor, M.M. (1962). Phonetic Symbolism in Four Unrelated Languages. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 16 (4), pp. 344–356. DOI: 10.1037/h0083261

34. Weiss, J.H. (1964). The Role of Stimulus Meaningfulness in Phonetic Symbolism Response. *Journal of General Psychology*, 70(2), pp. 255–263. DOI: 10.1080/00221309.1964.9920596

35. Wertheimer, M. (1958). The Relation between the Sound of a Word and its Meaning. *American Journal of Psychology*, 71(2), pp. 412–415. DOI: 10.2307/1420089