

11. Ardevol, E. Cyberculture: Anthropological perspectives of the Internet. Retrieved from: <https://eardevol.files.wordpress.com/2008/10/cyberculture.pdf>. [in Spanish].
12. Bauckhage, C. (2011) «Insights into Internet Memes». Proceedings of the Fifth International. AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media. 17–21 July 2011, Barcelona. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence). [in Spanish].
13. Blank, T. J. (Ed.) (2009). Folklore and the Internet. Vernacular Expression in a Digital World. Utah State University Press, Logan, Utah [in English].
14. Blank, T. J. (2012). Folk Culture in the Digital Age. The Emergent Dynamics of Human. Utah State University Press [in English].
15. Bould, M. (2010). Book review: Thomas Foster, The Souls of Cyberfolk: Posthumanism as Vernacular Theory. Canadian Journal of Communication, 35 (1), 181–183 [in English].
16. Brednich, R. W. (2005.) www.worldwidewitz.com. Humor im Cyberspace. Freiburg / Basel/ Wien [in English].
17. Chen, C. (2012). The Creation and Meaning of Internet Memes in 4chan: Popular Internet Culture in the Age of Online Digital Reproduction. Habitus, III, 6–20 [in English].
18. Domokos, M. (2014). Towards methodological issues in electronic folklore. Slovak Ethnology, 62, 283–295 [in Slovakian].
19. Dorson, R. (2004). Fakelore. Folklore: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies. A. Dundes. New York, Routledge, 1, 281–289 [in English].
20. Dorst, J. (1990). Tags and Burners, Cycles and Networks: Folklore in the Teleelectronic Age. Journal of Folklore, 27(3), 179–190 [in English].
21. Dougherty, S. (2001). Culture in the Disk Drive: Computationalism, Memetics, and the Rise of the Posthuman, 31(4), 85–102 [in English].
22. Foote, M. (2007). Userpics: Cyber Folk Art in the Early 21st Century. Folklore Forum, 37(1), 27–38 [in English].
23. Frank, R. (2013). Newslore: Contemporary Folklore on the Internet. University Press of Mississippi [in English].
24. Ryan, M. (2015). Narrative as Virtual Reality 2: Revisiting Immersion and Interactivity in Literature and Electronic Media. Johns Hopkins University Press [in English].
25. Silver, D. (2004). Internet/cyberculture/digital culture/new media/fill-in-the-blank studies. New Media Society, 6(1), 55–64 [in English].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.08.2016 р.

UDC 81'42.134.2

Shevchenko Liudmyla
PhD, Associate Professor,
Foreign Languages Department
Kiev National Taras Shevchenko University

THE CONCEPT OF POLITENESS AND THE PRONOMINAL FORMS OF TREATMENT AS ITS VERBAL REPRESENTATION IN SPANISH

The article analyzes the concept of "politeness" and the pronominal forms of address as its verbal representation in the Spanish language. The author tries to systematize the basic provisions concerning the concept of "politeness", in particular in the cross-cultural context. **Peculiarities of Methodology.** Trying to achieve the goal of the work, the author uses the following general scientific and special linguistic research methods: analysis, synthesis, psychological, descriptive, comparative, complex-procedural, etc. The use of the complex methods enables to consider the varieties of positive and negative politeness in the light of national specifics of verbal communication. The **scientific novelty** of the research is the analysis of the peculiar features of the address pronominal forms through the example of the Pyrenean Spanish-language areas. It was **concluded** that the study of pronominal forms of politeness is not only of theoretical use, but of practical too because it allows to find out the specific features of "language of thought", national and cultural specifics of language behavior and some aspects of the relationship between language and psychology. For example, in the opinion of psychologists in social dialogue the main principle of motivated behavior of people is a symmetry, which means that in the sociodemographic context a subordinate person has an equal partnership right.

Keywords: concept, politeness, communicative category, form of treatment, social communication.

Шевченко Людмила Олексіївна, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов економічного факультету Київського національного університету ім. Тараса Шевченка

Концепт "ввічливість" та займенникові форми звернення як його вербальна репрезентація в іспанській мові

Мета роботи. У статті аналізується концепт "ввічливість" і займенникові форми звернення як його вербальна репрезентація в іспанській мові. Автор намагається систематизувати основні положення щодо концепту "ввічливість", зокрема в міжкультурному аспекті. Особливості **методології дослідження** полягають у тому, що для досягнення мети статті використовувалися загальнонаукові та спеціальні лінгвістичні методи дослідження, зокрема: аналізу, синтезу, психологічний, описовий, порівняльний, комплексно-процесуальний і под. Використання комплексної методології дало автору можливість розглянути різновиди позитивної і негативної ввічливості й у світлі національної специфіки мовного спілкування. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає в аналізі особливостей вживання займенникових форм мовної поведінки на прикладі піренейського іспаномовного ареалу. Зроблено **висновок**, що дослідження займенникових форм ввічливості має не тільки теоретичний, а й практичний інтерес, оскільки дає змогу з'ясувати особливості "мовного мислення", національно-культурну специфіку мовної поведінки, а також окремі аспекти взаємозв'язку між мовою і психологією людей. Наприклад, на думку психологів, у соціаль-

ному діалозі головний принцип, мотивуючий поведінку людей, – це симетрія, яка має на увазі право "підлеглої" в соціально-демографічному аспекті людини на рівноправне партнерство.

Ключові слова: концепт, ввічливість, комунікативна категорія, форма звернення, соціальне спілкування.

Шевченко Людмила Алексеевна, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іностраних мов економічного факультета Київського національного університету ім. Тараса Шевченка

Концепт "вежливость" и местоименные формы обращения как его вербальная репрезентация в испанском языке

Цель работы. В статье анализируется концепт "вежливость" и местоименные формы обращения как его вербальная репрезентация в испанском языке. Автор пытается систематизировать основные положения относительно концепта "вежливость", в частности в межкультурном аспекте. Особенности **методологии исследования** заключаются в том, что для достижения цели использовались общие и специальные лингвистические методы исследования, в частности: анализа, синтеза, психологический, описательный, сравнительный, комплексно-процессуальный и под. Использование комплексной методологии дало возможность рассмотреть разновидности положительной и отрицательной вежливости также в свете национальной специфики речевого общения. **Научная новизна** исследования заключается в анализе особенностей употребления местоименных форм обращения на примере пиренейского испано-языкового ареала. Сделан **вывод**, что исследования местоименных форм вежливости имеет не только теоретический, но и практический интерес, поскольку позволяет выявить особенности "языкового мышления", национально-культурную специфику речевого поведения, а также отдельные аспекты взаимосвязи между языком и психологией людей. Например, по мнению психологов, в социальном диалоге главный принцип, мотивирующий поведение людей, – это симметрия, которая подразумевает право "подчиненного" в социально-демографическом аспекте человека на равноправное партнерство.

Ключевые слова: концепт, вежливость, коммуникативная категория, форма обращения, социальное общение.

Recently it has generally been thought that the main cause of misunderstanding in cross-cultural communication is not language difference but difference in communicants' national consciousness. The system of social stereotypes and subject values underlies the worldview of every nation, that is why the human mind is always ethnically conditioned.

The problem of differences in communicative behaviour lies in the peculiarities of communicative consciousness. Thus, for researching the communicative consciousness of people the study of communication categories as well as knowledge of concepts related to their communicative activities are of great importance.

The conceptual field of every nation has its own characteristics. According to Stepanov's definition, concepts represent the basic culture cell in the person's mental world, which makes their study particularly important when considering issues of cross-cultural communication [1, 40]. The notion of a concept in the scientific literature has different interpretations, and it often refers to different content. There are cognitive, psycholinguistic and linguo-cultural concepts. The last ones, which refer to the "conventional mental units aimed at a comprehensive study of the language, consciousness and culture" are most preferred for linguo-cultural research [2, 50].

When comparing the study of languages and cultures, concepts that have national peculiarities are of greatest interest. First, they are divergent concepts. Many of these concepts "guide" the perception of reality, form the characteristics of people's communicative behavior [3, 75].

The most unique the concept is, the harder it is to transfer its content by means of another language. However, those concepts that are not included into the conceptual field of both nations do not often coincide in content completely. And these divergent parts that contain information on the verbal and communicative consciousness of the people in research are important for cross-cultural communication.

Language and manner of thought are interrelated. On the one hand, the language reflects those features of the extra-linguistic reality that seem relevant to the bearers of a specific culture who use that language. On the other hand, while mastering the language and, in particular, the meaning of words, a native speaker begins to see the world from the point of view suggested by his or her native language, and coexists with the conceptualization of the world, characteristic of the culture. In this sense, the words containing linguospecific concepts, simultaneously "view" or "shape" native speakers' way of thinking [4, 7].

When considering the issue of politeness in the cross-cultural aspect it is necessary to realize that the understanding of politeness across cultures is different. For example, for certain nations politeness may be associated with reverence and honour, for others it means modesty or demonstrative attention to the milieu. Therefore, it is wrong to say that specific people is impolite or more polite than the other. Understanding and explaining what politeness is may be realized only by studying the culture and the peculiarities of social relations characteristic of its representatives. Politeness should be seen as a communicative category, which represents general communicative notions that arrange a person's knowledge about communication and the rules of its implementation [5, 5]. They reflect a person's communicative consciousness and contain some knowledge about communication.

The category of courtesy is one of the most important communicative categories because it plays an important role for ensuring harmonious communication. In the terms of cross-cultural communication, politeness is, first of all, compliance with communication requirements by using communicative strategies aimed at achieving harmony and understanding. Politeness includes everything that contributes to conflict-free communication. That is, politeness is a nationally specific communicative category, the essence of which is a system of strategies of communicative behavior (verbal and non-verbal) aimed at harmonious, conflict-free communication and compliance with socially accepted norms. The main purpose of polite behavior is to show the partner the friendly attitude to him or her. This goal is achieved through a variety of communicative strategies, the choice of which depends on many communicative factors – psychological, social and cultural ones.

As mentioned above, the content of politeness is nationally specified. This specificity is manifested not only by the use of different etiquette formulas, but through communicative strategies and actions, the orientation of which is determined by the type of social relations and prevailing cultural values. Ignorance of strategies specific for the other culture leads to communicants' making expressions with help of their own strategies, which can cause the interlocutors' misperception of their intentions and, as a result, can produce communicative failure [6, 19].

The most accurate and true definition of politeness can be found in Medynskiy's works, who considered politeness as a form of communication with people, which is based on self-esteem, as "an expression of restrained, correct, sensitive attitude towards people" [7, 110]. The ethics dictionary defines politeness as a moral quality that characterizes the behaviour of a human being for whom respect for people has become a daily norm of behaviour. Generally, politeness is an element of cultural behaviour requirements, which include attentiveness, the outward manifestation of goodwill, readiness to do a favor, delicacy. According to Medynskiy, politeness can take a particular emotional nuance and make a person friendly polite (to all others), respectfully polite (to the elderly), demandingly polite (to children), coldly polite (to people who, for whatever causes, are unpleasant).

Many researchers, including P. Brown and S. Levinson, regarded politeness as saving face and marked out positive and negative politeness [8, 122]. The concept of the person as the most important social value was introduced by E. Hoffmann for the first time [9, 101]. P. Brown and S. Levinson, developing this view of politeness, called the person the universal concept who represents a kind of social image, the preservation of which should interest every member of society. Indeed, in the Ukrainian language we can find the expressions relating in their meaning to the person and corresponding to the concept of social image: "save face", "lose face", "not to let a face fall in the dirt". In the communicative process the participants of communication are interested in saving as their faces as the personality of a partner. At the same time saving face is not the purpose of communication, but the condition without which the performance of normal communication is impossible. E. Hoffman vividly indicates that learning to save face is like learning traffic rules in the sphere of social communication.

Offering to distinguish between "negative face" and "positive face", P. Brown and S. Levinson regard the first one as everyone's wish to have freedom of action, the inadmissibility of interference from others' side, that is "the desire to be independent"; the second one is understood as "the desire to be desired" by others. The authors introduce such concepts as positive and negative politeness, which have different orientation. The first one is based on the approach and the second one is oriented to the distance. Each of these types of politeness represents a system of communicative strategies through which the main objectives of polite communication are achieved.

According to the authors, demonstration of solidarity and preserving distance are the essence of polite behaviour. They state that coming into contact, it is necessary to approach the interlocutor, to reduce the separating distance (the strategies of positive politeness), while the demonstration of mutual reverence and respect for the partner's independence is a strategy of negative politeness. In sociolinguistic literature, there are also other terms of these types of politeness. Positive politeness is called solidarity politeness or convergence politeness, while negative politeness is respect politeness or distance politeness. Convergence and distance can be called hyper-strategies of politeness that define the most general communicative goals. The studies on cross-cultural communication focus more on the strategies of negative politeness, as politeness, being a necessary condition of communication, is especially important when performing inducement. The strategies of positive and negative politeness cover basic techniques that are used by communicants in everyday communication. Taking them as a basis, we can assume that politeness is maintenance of the balance between intimacy and distance. At the same time, the point of this balance varies not only depending on the specific communicative context, but also on the type of culture in general. The communicants' task is the optimum choice of politeness strategies according to socio-cultural norms and the partner's expectations in order to be neither too formal nor too familiar.

The wrong interpretation of verbal behaviour of representatives of another culture (speakers of other languages) can cause "culture shock" [10, 156]. For example, a Ukrainian well-educated person can be shocked by his Spanish colleagues' using tú-treatment at their first meeting (and this potential sender can even be younger than the recipient). However, for the Spaniards nowadays such behaviour is almost a normative language. "Culture shock" is possible if there is ignorance of linguistic rules of etiquette or even if speakers use different national versions of the same language.

The very notion of national specificity of verbal communication in the scientific literature is only beginning to be developed, and we did not find its definition in respect of linguistic etiquette. Regarding the microsystem of the Spanish language it can be interpreted as the availability of specific features in the language units of speech etiquette that can display both intralinguistic (phonetic, lexical, grammatical, stylistic) and extralinguistic (primarily social, historical, cultural, psychological, ethnic) facts which are peculiar to Spanish speakers.

As treatment forms are one of the categories which demonstrates politeness, the analysis of simultaneous cutoff of the Spanish language (or to be more precise, its Iberian version) must be carried out because one or the other type of interpersonal relationships cannot be properly comprehended if it is not studied in a specific socio-historical situation. Such analysis will point out to the important changes taking place in the system of treatment forms. And now it makes sense to describe briefly the socio-historical processes of modern Spain.

In the second half of the XX century Spain from an industrially backward agrarian country turned into a developed industrial one. In 1986 it joined the EU. In 2004 Spain left behind its neighbours in the euro area

regarding the rate of economic growth. The process of industrialization, especially industrial "boom" of the 60s led to significant changes in the social structure of the Spanish population (currently in Spain there are about 44 million people, including 3.7 million foreigners (8.4%) [11, 45].

The changes in the economy have led to mass migration from underdeveloped provinces in more developed ones (Catalonia in particular), from the countryside to the cities. In recent years, thousands of Spanish farmers have ceased to farm and moved to the cities in search of higher earnings. The population of Madrid and Barcelona increased significantly.

The leading Spanish linguists A.Badia Margarit and M.Alvar while researching the modern Spanish language noted that a very important number of major demographic shifts over the past decades have been caused by "huge waves of migration".

While analyzing the contemporary linguistic state of the Iberian national version of the Spanish language (in particular, the forms of treatment) we cannot ignore the fact that in Spain, in addition to the Castilian nationality, the Catalan, Basque and Galician nationalities with their own languages, special administrative status, financial and legal privileges have existed from ancient times. What is more, although the Andalusian population speaks Spanish, the typical conversational norm is different from Castilian for this region.

Researchers of the Spanish state history have repeatedly drawn attention to a distinctive correlation between centrifugal and centripetal forces [10, 42]. If during the era of the Franco regime national movements were regarded as a crime and were severely punished, in the post-Franco period the autonomy process got a great importance. According to the new Constitution of 1978 the united Spanish state is divided into 17 autonomous communities, which led to radical changes in the language policy and the linguistic situation of the country. Today the official language of Spain is Castilian (castellano). All Spaniards are obliged to know it and entitled to use it. The other languages of Spain shall also be official in the respective Autonomous unions (Comunidades Autónomas) under the laws of the latter [10, 56].

Today the Statutes of autonomous communities recognize as the official (co-official) languages the following: Basque (vasco, euskera) in the Basque Country and Navarre, Catalan (catalán) in Catalonia, Valencia and the Balearic Islands, Galician (gallego) in Galicia and Aran (aranés) in Catalonia [10, 58].

The above mentioned allows to come to the conclusion that in modern Spain established social relationships, traditions, customs and psychological stereotypes of the past are gradually disintegrating.

One of the important forms of politeness demonstration is pronominal forms of treatment. The system of the Iberian pronominal address forms (excluding Western Andalusia) is represented by the opposition:

- tú / Usted (to one person)
- vosotros / Ustedes (to many people)

"In Western Andalusia in everyday conversational language the form vosotros (vosotras) is supplanted by the form ustedes: "¿Ustedes habéis visto lo que pasa aquí?" [11, 339]. The juxtaposition of the forms (from the standpoint of traditional literary norms) is based according to the sign of "politeness".

The description of the use of modern pronominal forms of treatment in Spain begins by examining tú-treatment in this area, which has undergone major changes in recent years. In the "Project of the Spanish language new grammar" we find the following lines: "The tú-treatment expresses intimacy, love and tenderness ("la intimidad", "el amor" y "la ternura")" [11, 343]. This semantic characteristic needs some additions.

The analysis of tú-treatment shows that the tú-form has an unequal semantic structure in different social situations, that is, depending on the social situation the redistribution of semes takes place. The semantic meaning of tú recorded in the Academic grammar of 1974 is possible today only in certain social situations, such as husband – wife, fiancé – fiancée, parents – children, friend – friend [12, 34]. At the same time in other social situations, tú-form can be characterized by different semantics. This issue requires further special studies; we note only certain types of non-codified semantic values of tú-treatment. Thus, in role relations such as landowner – farmer, master – servant, officer – soldier, employer – employee, the asymmetry in forms of treatment is traditionally predicted, in case of tú-treatment from the higher in the status to the lower the tú-form keeps the meaning of "social benefit" in its semantics.

In the last decade of the twentieth century in the above mentioned situations of "social benefit" we could observe the shift in the tú-form use, displaced (though not completely) by Usted-form, that is using Usted-treatment is often seen. The fact is that, according to psychologists, in a social dialogue one of the principles motivating people's behaviour is striving for symmetry, which asserts the right of a subordinate person in the socio-demographic rank on an equal partnership.

In the known grammar books there is no indication of such a semantic meaning of tú-treatment as "equality" that is found in many of today's widespread social situations. Nowadays in Spain the symmetrical tú has become almost universal among young people regardless of the degree of speakers' acquaintanceship and other factors. The striking example of tú-implementation in this sense is, for instance, such a social situation as "student – teacher". Students often use tú-treatment not only for young teachers, but also for middle aged people, and sometimes for the elderly, seeing it as a kind of democratization of relations, an expression of their right to equality in the socio-rank position [12, 38]. In role relations "student – teacher" the traditional Usted-treatment to the teacher is not always used either. As for the treatment "teacher – student", the using of both forms is observed.

It is appropriate to quote from the book "El habla de la ciudad de Madrid" [13, 253], which is a personalized texts collection of spontaneous speaking of people belonging to cultural layer of the residents of the Spanish capital:

INFORMANTE: "Ahora es lo que encuentro yo, que ahora la educación se ha perdido mucho. Ahora a todo el mundo se le habla de tú; a una persona mayor de respeto; todo el mundo de tú; oye, tú, tal, cual... A mi eso me choca mucho."

ENCUESTADOR: "Yo creo que no es muy general, ¿he?"

INFORMANTE: "Sí, sí, sí, sí. Ahora todo el mundo habla, de tú a todo el mundo."

ENCUESTADOR: "¿A las personas mayores?"

INFORMANTE: "Sí, ¡uh! Sí, sí, sí, sí."

In considered social situations there is a violation of the traditional scheme of pronominal forms of treatment, based on status differences. The observations show that changes in the use of tú-forms, acquiring new semantics, take place in a number of social situations where Usted-form was once widespread.

The asymmetric model of treatment that required from grandchildren the use of Usted-form with respect to their grandparents was typical for Spain until recently, but nowadays it has become archaic from the modern standards position. As for the treatment to parents and relatives (uncle – aunt), today in cities young people usually use unceremonious tú-form instead of polite Usted-form. Among the rural population as well as the urban representatives of older generation (especially among the lower strata of society), asymmetric Usted-treatment is not still completely lost:

TRINI: "Padre, ¡no diga eso!"

SEÑOR JUAN: "¡Sí, es la verdad, hija!"

Thus, the problem of politeness forms in a language has a theoretical interest along with practical actuality, because its study helps to reveal some peculiarities of "linguistic thinking", certain aspects of the relationship between a language and people's psychology, some features of national and cultural specificity of verbal behaviour.

Література

1. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования /Степанов Ю.С. – М., 1997. – 824 с.
2. Карасик В.И. Лингвокультурный концепт как элемент языкового сознания / Карасик В.И. //Методология совр. психоллингвистики: Сборник статей. – Москва, Барнаул: Изд-во Алт. унив-та, 2003.
3. Попова З.Д. Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике / Попова З.Д. – Воронеж: Истоки, 2001.
4. Javier Mariás. Los enamoramientos [Электронный ресурс] / Javier Mariás. – Режим доступа: <http://www.fiuxy.com/ebooks-gratis/1386890-descargar-los-enamoramientos-javier-marias-ebook-epub-gratis.html>.
5. Стернин И.А. Русское коммуникативное сознание/ Стернин И.А. // Русское и финское ком. поведение. Вып. 3. – Воронеж: изд-во Истоки, 2002.
6. Ларина Т.В. Категория вежливости в английской и русской коммуникативных культурах: Монография / Ларина Т.В. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 2003. – 315 с.
7. Коч Л.А. Я в мире...мир во мне... / Коч Л.А. // Классный руководитель. – 2005. – №3. – 133 с.
8. Brown Penelope and Stephen Levinson. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena//Ester Goody (ed.). Questions and Politeness: Strategies in social interaction – New York: Cambridge: Cam. Univ. Press. – 1987.
9. Goffman Erving. Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior – New York: Doubleday. – 1967.
10. Фирсова Н.М. Испанский речевой этикет /Фирсова Н.М. – М., 2001. – 184с.
11. Esbozo de una gramática nueva de la lengua española. – Madrid, 1974.
12. Глазова О.Г. Экспрессивные формы обращения в русском и испанском языках. АКД / Глазова О.Г. – М., 1992. – 22 с.
13. El habla de la ciudad de Madrid: Materiales para su estudio. (Ed. de E. Esgueva y M. Cantarero). – Madrid, 1981.

References

1. Stepanov, Yu.S. (1997). Konstanty. Slovar' russkoy kul'tury. Opyt issledovaniya. M. [in Russia].
2. Karasik, V.I. (2003) Lingvokul'turnyy kontsept kak element yazykovogo soznaniya. Metodologiya sovr. psikholingvistiki: Sbornik statey .Moskva, Barnaul: Izd-vo Alt. univ-ta. [in Russia].
3. Popova, Z.D. (2001) Oчерki po kognitivnoy lingvistike. – Voronezh: Istoki. [in Russia].
4. Javier, Mariás. Los enamoramientos [Retrieved from <http://www.fiuxy.com/ebooks-gratis/1386890-descargar-los-enamoramientos-javier-marias-ebook-epub-gratis.html>] [in Russia].
5. Sternin, I.A. (2002) Russkoe kommunikativnoe soznanie.Voronezh: izd-vo Istoki. [in Russia].
6. Larina, T.V. (2003) Kategoriya veshlivosti v angliyskoy i russkoy kommunikativnykh kul'turakhM.: Izd-vo RUDN. [in Russia].
7. Koch, L.A. (2005). Ya v mire...mir vo мне. [in Russia].
8. Brown (1987) Penelope and Stephen Levinson. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena//Ester Goody (ed.). Questions and Politeness: Strategies in social interaction. New York: Cambridge: Cam. Univ. Press. [in English].
9. Goffman (1967)/ Erving. Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior/ New York: Doubleday. [in English]
10. Firsova, N.M. (2001) Ispanskiy rechevoy etiket. INFRA M. [in Russia].
11. Esbozo de una gramática nueva de la lengua española.(1974) Madrid. [in English].
12. Glazova, O.G.(1992). Ekspressivnye formy obrashcheniya v russkom i ispanskoy yazykakh. M. [in Russia].
13. El habla de la ciudad de Madrid: Materiales para su estudio. (Ed. de E. Esgueva y M. Cantarero). (1981). Madrid. [in English].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.06.2016 р.