

ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ

Natalia N. BELOZEROVA¹

UDC 81

THE NAME OF ACTION

¹ Dr. Sci. (Phylol.), Professor,
Department of the English Language,
University of Tyumen
natnicbel@gmail.com

Abstract

Having singled out the conceptual opposites “Man of Thought” and “Man of Action” from the episteme of the Elizabethan Renaissance, the author scrutinizes one of these opposites to clarify the meanings and values that Shakespeare ascribed to the conceptual entities the “name of action” and “man of action”.

This research centers on two semantic components of these entities: *homo ludens* (through analysis of the comedy “As You Like It”) and Man of Venture (through analysis of lexical contexts from the Shakespearean corpus). Conceptual, epistemological, and contextual analyses of the lexemes from the semantic field “economic activity” reveal that the Shakespearean notion “The Name of Action” manifests itself within the scope of the syncretic domain “Man of Action + Love = The Good”. A semiolinguistic approach based upon semantic and pragmatic analyses of the linguistic sign “The Name of Action” enables the author to understand how the complementarity principle works when new meanings of lexemes appear as a result of lexis transmission from the semantic cluster “economic activity” into other clusters denoting human actions. The corpora approach enables to trace symmetric “mirror” contexts of the conceptual opposites “Man of Thought / Man of Action” throughout the Shakespearean corpus, which proves that they were written by the author who considered the Name of Action to be the major epistemic value.

Citation: Belozerova N. N. 2018. “The Name of Action”. Tyumen State University Herald. Humanities Research. Humanitates, vol. 4, no 4, pp. 6-25.
DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2018-4-4-6-25

Key words

Renaissance episteme, conceptual opposites, name of action, *homo ludens*, semantic cluster, “mirror” texts.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2018-4-4-6-25

Introduction

The title of this article is a quotation from Hamlet’s soliloquy “To be or not to be”. Below is the context of this quotation.

“Thus conscience does make cowards [of us all],
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o’er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose **the name of action**” [45, p. 1160].

The analysis of this piece reveals the verbal representation of the major renaissance set of opposites: “Man of Thought” *versus* “Man of Action”. In the soliloquy this set is presented aporically, *i.e.* by a question that is impossible to answer. Here the Renaissance values and opposites are rolled into one [7, 24], they are perceived through the mind of a single personage: Hamlet. As is evident from the isotopic sequel (“enterprises of great pitch and moment <...> their currents turn awry”), the phrase “the name of action¹” and the word “resolution” are not the expressions of the determination to slay vicious king

¹ **Definition of ACTION** (1): “the initiating of a proceeding in a court of justice by which one demands or enforces one’s right; also: the proceeding itself”; (2): “the bringing about of an alteration by force or through a natural agency”; (3): “the manner or method of performing: a: an actor’s or speaker’s deportment or expression by means of attitude, voice, and gesture <...>; b: the style of movement of the feet and legs (as of a horse); c: a function of the body or one of its parts”; (4): “an act of will”; (5) “a: a thing done: deed; b: the accomplishment of a thing usually over a period of time, in stages, or with the possibility of repetition; c... plural: behavior, conduct ‘unscrupulous actions’ d: initiative, enterprise ‘a man of *action*’”; (6) “a (1): an engagement between troops or ships (2): combat in war ‘gallantry in action’ b (1): an event or series of events forming a literary composition <...> (2): the unfolding of the events of a drama or work of fiction: plot <...> (3): the movement of incidents in a plot <...>; c: the combination of circumstances that constitute the subject matter of a painting or sculpture; (7) a: an operating mechanism; b: the manner in which a mechanism or instrument operates <...> (8) a: the price movement and trading volume of a commodity, security, or market; b: the process of betting including the offering and acceptance of a bet and determination of a winner; c: financial gain or an opportunity for financial gain ‘a piece of the action’; (9): sexual activity; (10): the most vigorous, productive, or exciting activity in a particular field, area, or group <...>” [25].

Origin of ACTION: “Middle English *accioun*, from Anglo-French *accion*, <...> from Latin *action-*, *actio* <...>, from *agere* “to <...> do” <...>. First Known Use...: 14th century <...>” [25]

Claudius. Here the notion of Action, even being opposed to the notion of Thought, is one of the two intermingled components of the Renaissance concept of Man. Shakespeare expounded this inseparable unity in another “conceptual” piece from Hamlet:

“What [a] piece of work is a man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving, how express and admirable in action, how like an angel in apprehension, how like a god! the beauty of the world; the paragon of animals; and yet to me what is this quintessence of dust?” [45, p. 1156]

In these lines, the whole cluster of conceptual opposites can be viewed. The “umbrella” phrase here is the exclamation “What [a] piece of work is a man”, where a collocation “piece of work” semantically embraces both the idea of God’s creation and Nature’s creation. This semantic entity conforms entirely to the philosophy of pantheism, remarkable for its idea of the identity between God the Creator and Nature the Creator. The phrases “how **noble in reason**” and how **infinite in faculties**” semantically unite the conceptual set of opposites “Man of Thought” and “Man of Action”, and can be treated as the two vectors of conceptual development. One of these vectors will be scrutinized further, to establish the components of meaning that Shakespeare put into the notions “The Name of Action” and “The Man of Action”.

Methods

(1) Conceptual analysis and epistemological analysis. The starting point to perform the conceptual analysis is to distinguish between the two semantic components of the notion of concept. The first is a unit of thought (Stephen Pinker) that we tackle as a certain mental engine whose function is to differentiate one object or phenomenon from another, or to single them out from the multiplicity of other entities¹. The second is a mental construct shaped as a set of ever-developing ideas. In this regard, the concept as a mental construct is close to the platonic *eidōs* that presents simultaneously the idea of a thing and the form of the thing [29, p. 352]. It is necessary to note that animals also have a certain mental structure, whose function is to differentiate one object or phenomenon from another, or to single them out of the multiplicity of other entities. Similarly, humans and animals share the process of apperception and assessment. Even in the case of a linguistic sign (any utterance), we can talk of its performativity or of its perlocutionary impact upon domestic animals. In any case, the concept as a unit of thought is at the core of the signified (*signifié*) both in the Saussurian and Derridian senses of the term. With regard to a second notion of the concept, *i.e.* as an idea or construct, solely human mental activity should be under scrutiny. Either a conceptual metaphor, based upon cross-domain mapping (Lakoff) or blending [22, pp. 202-251] or a construct that comes as a set of verbalized ideas of an object or a phenomenon, appears as a result of human cognitive and discursive activity. In this regard, both texts from Shakespeare’s “*Hamlet*” suggest a verbal representation of a mental construct of Man. Moreover, our research rests upon Aristotle’s idea [1, p. 1064-

¹ The concept is treated differently in [2, 3, 6, 10, 20, 51] and several other works.

1112] that human activity shapes the core of any concept or construct¹ within a definite time-space domain. The structure of any episteme, in its turn, depends upon the changes in the dominance of activity, such as heroic deeds or a quiet domestic life (hence: constants and variables). The structure of a concept as a mental unit rests upon sets of opposites: good/evil, dangerous/secure, life/death, pleasure/sin, thought/action, instinctive actions/conscious actions.

(2) **Semiolinguistic analysis** is performed according to the sign and codes theories developed by Ch. S. Pierce, Ch. Morris, Yu. Lotman and A. Greimas. Besides, some elements of fractal analysis (points of growth and vectors of development) are included.

(3) **The analysis of the poetic function.** The author shares Roman Jakobson's view that linguistics and poetics should not be separated [17, 18, 19].

(4) **Corpora approach.** The corpus for analysis was selected with the help of the search tool in the electronic library of the *Complete Encyclopedic Works of William Shakespeare*.

Part 1. Homo ludens

The first text to be analyzed is connected with the main professional activity of Shakespeare, *i.e.* with the theatre.

“All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances,
And one man in his time plays many parts,
His acts being seven ages. **At first the infant,**
Mewling and puking in the nurse's arms.
Then the whining schoolboy, with his satchel
And shining morning face, creeping like snail
Unwillingly to school. **And then the lover,**
Sighing like furnace, with a woeful ballad
Made to his mistress' eyebrow.
Then a soldier, Full of strange oaths, and bearded like the pard,
Jealous in honor, sudden, and quick in quarrel,
seeking the bubble reputation
Even in the cannon's mouth.
And **then the justice,**
In fair round belly with good capon lin'd,
With eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances;
And so he plays his part.
The sixth age shifts
Into the lean and slipper'd pantaloon,
With spectacles on nose, and pouch on side,
His youthful hose, well sav'd, a world too wide

¹ In this regard, we fully share the view of E. I. Golovanova [13].

For his shrunk shank, and his big manly voice,
 Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
 And whistles in his sound. **Last scene of all,**
 That ends this strange eventful history,
 Is second childishness, and mere oblivion,
 Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans every thing" [31, act 2, scene 7, pp. 381-382].

The comedy "As you like it", the source of this monologue, is remarkable for its actants: not only personages perform actions in this play. This ability is also granted by Shakespeare to Space and Time. The chronotope [4, pp. 121-262] of the play as a categorical unit of "*space — time — person*" is perlocutionary in its essence. The place of action — the Forest of Arden — being a classical "pastoral space", can frighten its dwellers and test them by frost, beasts, and snakes, and it is capable of weeping for wounds, hiding social outcasts and noble exiles, uniting lovers and improving the behavior of villains by turning them into Christians. On the other hand, the Forest of Arden also figures in the comedy as a metaphorical model of the world compared to the theatre, where every person plays a role.

The category of Time is in turn presented allegorically, the marker of the allegorization being the capital letter of the word "Time": "**creeping** hours of time", "**lazy foot** of Time", "the **swift foot** of Time", "Time **travels** in divers paces with divers persons. I'll tell you who Time **ambles** withal, who Time **trots** withal, who Time **gallops** withal, and who he **stands** still withal."

Time in these examples plays the function of the major agent (semantic subject). It creeps, runs, drags, trots, gallops, stands still. David and Ben Crystal, who have restored in their works the original pronunciation (OP) of Shakespearean texts [9], point out that the current variant of pronunciation destroys here a fairly improper pun that rested upon homophony, *i.e.* upon similar pronunciation in Early Modern English of the words *hour* and *whore* [49]:

"how the world **wags**. / 'Tis but an hour ago since it was nine, / And after one hour more 'twill be eleven, / And so from **hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,** / And then from **hour to hour, we rot and rot;** / And thereby hangs a tale" [31, p. 380].

In these passages, Time has the function of an accelerator of human transformations. Moreover, semantic fusion of the personal and temporal deixis may be observed. The verbs *ripe* (Modern English: *ripen*) and *rot*, in spite of their adherence to the same semantic field of "fruit growth", are differently directed in their "sememes of action". The same presentation of age transformation is characteristic for the text "Seven Ages". Both long utterances render the speech behavior of the same personage, that of the melancholic Jacques.

The figure of Jacques can be regarded within the group of Shakespeare's personages whose behavior is beyond the norm. Even in the idyllic and subnormal space of the Forest of Arden, he is shown as a stranger whose behavior cannot be treated as normal — he weeps seeing the torments of a wounded dear, he has sold his estate only

to become a “traveler” or a vagabond – a sort of social outcast in Elizabethan England. Thus presented, this personage may be considered within the same semantic scope as Richard the Second and Hamlet. His figure conforms to the model of the “Wise Madman”, embodied by every Renaissance figure (fictitious ones included) whose words and actions are inexplicable and unpredictable, but paradoxically reveal the truth. Behavior of this type was characteristic of a person of false pretence or for a person who played different parts (*homo ludens*), which is evident in “Hamlet” and in other plays where stage scenes are present (for instance “The Taming of the Shrew”, “A Midsummer’s Night’s Dream”).

Though direct stage scenes are absent in the comedy “As you like it”, this theatre metaphor should be approached as a semantic constant. It starts to unfold in the utterance preceding the “Seven Ages” monologue: “DUKE S. Thou seest we are not all alone unhappy: / This **wide and universal theatre** / Presents more woeful **pageants** than the scene / Wherein we play in.” Both utterances can be treated as a classical example of conceptual metaphor [23] textualization according to every constituent of its map: source domain, target domain, slots connected by mapping, as well as by a metaphorical scenario. The words or expressions “**wide and universal theatre**”, “**pageants**”, “**stage**”, “**players**”, “**exits**”, “**entrances**”, “**many parts**”, “**acts**” denote the slots of the target-domain. In their turn, the expressions “This **wide and universal theatre**”, “All the world”, “And all the men and women”, “And one man in his time plays many parts”, “His acts being seven ages” denote the slots of the source-domain. Cross-domain mapping is obvious from the contents of overlapping slots and semantic fields.

The “Seven Ages” scenario develops according to the “person – fruit” metaphor, that rests on the opposite set RIPE/ROT (see above). The seme RIPE unfolds during the description of the first four ages (infant, schoolboy, lover, soldier). The fifth age where the justice is portrayed marks the seme of maturity (full growth) that completes the unfolding of the RIPE-metaphor. The seme ROT unfolds in the description of the sixth and seventh ages.

When analyzing the epistemological component of this metaphorical set, it is necessary to differentiate between the pastoral practices of the Forest of Arden and Elizabethan practices, including theatre. The sole coincidence takes place in the practices of wooing. On the whole this monologue reflects the social life of 16th century England with its family life practices, schooling, wooing, warring, and legal proceedings.

This ironic and sarcastic presentation is dynamic. Predominantly, this dynamism is the result of the usage of the verbs of action in their finite and non-finite forms: “mewling and puking” (1), “whining”, “creeping” (2), “sighing” (3), “seeking” (4) “plays” (5), “shifts”, “Turning” (6), “ends” (7). Secondly, both dynamism and irony come as a result of the agent change. If we consider the actant dominants of the RIPE process we can state that they reveal themselves in the life roles of the same person, *i.e.* “the infant”, “the whining schoolboy”, “the lover”, “a soldier”, “the justice”. When considering the actant dominants of the ROT process, we should note that age itself is a dominant actant (“The sixth age”), as well as the final scene (“Last scene of all”) from the cross-domain mapping “human life = tragicomedy”.

Sarcasm and irony find their expression in the negative denotation and connotation of lexemes that textually outline this cross-domain mapping. Out of the vast semantic field of INFANT only physiological functions are delineated. Similarly ironically, the seme of schooling is presented. Perhaps Shakespeare draws on his own experience, when he as a child was obliged *with a shining morning face* (probably washed by his mother or nurse) to crawl like a snail to school to stay there from 6 in the morning till 7 in the evening¹. The activity of wooing is described no less ironically. Semantically, it contrasts sharply with romantic “balcony” scenes of “Romeo and Juliette”, or with “pastoral scenes” in the play under analysis (“As you like it”). The art of singing of a young lover is compared to the noise produced by a furnace, which completely ruins the romantic atmosphere of the scene. It also recalls ancient British practices of metal production in furnaces installed even in small homesteads. Linguistically, this practice is reflected in the set phrase “to sigh like a furnace”².

Honour- and reputation-seeking activity is connected in the monologue with the figure of the soldier. Structurally, this dynamic sketch rests upon homogeneous attribute phrases, semantically, upon the isotopy of “a brave warrior”. Another peculiarity of Shakespearian word-usage, *i.e.* the simultaneous employment of every meaning of a given within the same context, can be observed while analyzing the contextual meaning of the word “oath”³ in the phrase “*Full of strange oaths*”. Within it, the semes of vow, promise, and rude swearing are rolled into one. This semantic blend results in the axiological ambivalence of the whole phrase. The same sort of semantic fusion can be traced in the phrase “*Jealous in honour*”, where the word *honour* simultaneously means (1) a symbol of distinction and (2) the concept of knightly honour, axiological dominance of Middle Ages. The phrase “*Jealous in honour*” thus bears witness to the soldier’s desire to obtain honors (distinctions) and to ardent adherence to the values of knighthood,

¹ The School, known to have been in existence from 1295 and re-founded by a Charter of King Edward VI, has a reputation for high academic standards and an outstanding co-curricular programme. See more <http://www.kes.net/>

² **Definition of FURNACE:** “One for melting metals”. “Middle English *furnas*, from Anglo-French *forneise*, from Latin *fornac-*, *fornax*; akin to Latin *formus* warm”. “First Known Use: 13th century <...>” [25].

³ **Definition of OATH:** (1): “A solemn promise, often invoking a divine witness, regarding one’s future action or behaviour: ‘they took an oath of allegiance to the king’.

Synonyms: vow, sworn statement, promise, pledge, avowal, affirmation, attestation, word of honour, word, bond, guarantee, guaranty.

Archaic *troth*. <...>

(1.1): A sworn declaration, such as the promise to tell the truth, in a court of law: ‘each *took the oath* and then gave evidence’. <...>

2. A profane or offensive expression used to express anger or other strong emotions: ‘he exploded with a mouthful of oaths’, ‘he was muttering foul oaths’.

Synonyms: swear word, profanity, expletive, four-letter word, dirty word, obscenity, imprecation, curse, malediction, blasphemy; vulgarism, vulgarity; swearing, bad language, foul language, strong language, *informal* cuss, cuss word” [26].

Origin of OATH: “Old English *āth*, of Germanic origin; related to Dutch *eed* and German *Eid*”. [26]

such as servitude to God, to his Master, and to his Donna. Such ambivalence disappears in the phrase “*the bubble reputation*”. The adjective “*bubble*” semantically destroys this ambivalence; the oxymoron introduces irony and sarcasm.

The absence of dynamism in the presentation of the fifth age

“And **then the justice**, / In fair round belly with good capon lin’d, / With eyes severe and beard of formal cut, / Full of wise saws and modern instances; / And so he plays his part” [31].

is caused by the analogy with ripe fruit. This visual similarity is expressed by the phrase “fair round belly” (with a “capon” in it). The word “capon” contextually realizes its second meaning, that of “fool”, “dolt”, from the lowest stylistic register.¹ The sarcastic representation of the justice is evident in the adjectives and phrases “severe” (“With eyes severe”), “modern” (“wise saws and modern instances”). As David and Ben Crystal state in the “*Dictionary of Shakespeare’s Words*”, the meaning of the word “modern” differed in the Elizabethan period from its contemporary meaning. Throughout Shakespearean texts, the following meaning of the lexeme is realized: “ordinary, trite, commonplace, everyday” [12]. Therefore, taking into consideration the simultaneous realization of every seme of the word “instances”, the justice is characterized not only as a connoisseur of wise proverbs, but as the author of ill-founded arguments and trite precepts. In this portrait, the form of the beard is used to mark a social switch: a brave honour-seeking soldier is bearded like a “pard”, *i.e.* ill-groomed. Formal cut for a beard signals the end of adventure, of self-satisfaction, of an accomplished ripening process.

“The name of action” is completely absent from the presentation of the sixth and seventh ages. The seme of Man as a whole human being is no longer used in the function of an agent. As patience, parts of the human body and particular functions of it are named (nose, side, voice). Semiotically, they are presented through indexes, *i.e.* by the nomination of natural and cultural age-diagnostical signs, such as “lean and slipper’d pantaloon”, “spectacles <...>”, and pouch on side”, “shrunk shank”, and “childish treble” that denote traits of inevitable ageing.

The same type of age-diagnosis may be observed in the passage from “Hamlet”, where the sixth age is presented directly from the point of view of “wise madness”:

As you like it

“**The sixth age shifts**

Into the lean and slipper’d pantaloon,
With spectacles on nose, and pouch on side,
His youthful hose, well sav’d, a world too wide
For his shrunk shank, and his big manly voice,
Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
And whistles in his sound”

[31, act 2, scene 7, pp. 381-382].

Hamlet

HAM. Slanders, sir; for the satirical
rogue says here that old men (1) **have
grey beards**, that (2) **their faces are
wrinkled**, (3) **their eyes purging thick
amber and plum-tree gum**, and that
they have (4) **a plentiful lack of wit**,
together with (5)¹ **most weak hams**”

[45, p. 1155].

¹ “Castrated cockerel; so: fool, dolt [as term of abuse]” [12].

² Numbering by the present author.

Both descriptions are united by the seme “the loss of the name of action”.

The seventh age, marked by the agent “Last scene of all” and by the successive repetition of the preposition “sans”, meaning “without” (“Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans every thing”), is characterized not only by the loss of the name of action, but also by the loss of existence itself.

Preliminary conclusion

The analysis of the concept *homo ludens* performed upon the text of the comedy “As you like it” reveals that the categories of Time, Place and Personage are interrelated. At the level of utterances, the conceptual blend [50] of the categories of personages and time is evident. Time occupies the function of agent. Besides, the Renaissance model of “Wise Madness” is rendered in the text. The point of view of a sarcastic personage, whose behavior is far from the norm, enables Shakespeare to demonstrate the gradual rise and loss of the name of action while presenting seven ages of human life.

Part 2. The Man of Action

Homo ludens in the history of the “Globe” theatre was a true Man of Action. In fact, the Elizabethan theatre was a profitable business, its actors being not only simple stakeholders, but theatre owners. Thus Richard Burbage, for whom Shakespeare wrote most of his tragic parts, inherited together with his brother the theatre business from John Burbage, his father, in 1597 [8, 14, 15, 21]. The success of the theatre business rested upon not only its great social demand but also upon purely linguistic phenomena. Among these phenomena, the most important were: (1) Early Modern English pronunciation and (2) word-usage peculiarities.

In his book about the experimental original pronunciation (OP) production of “Romeo and Juliette” in the summer of 2004, David Crystal writes of the unexpected impact of OP upon actors, stage directors, and the audience [9, ch. 6, pp. 161-171]. Nearly all of them noted that OP, that comprises sounds of practically every existing dialect of the English language, helped to destroy social barriers between actors and the audience that arise when RP is used. Some of the responses were as follows:

“I found the OP perspective very liberating. I also loved the way that it “rooted” the language and gave it a “gutsy” and “earthy” quality. <...>

It is the colloquial aspect of the OP that I think will stick with me most. I have always felt that Shakespeare should be spoken as real people speak” [9, p. 167].

Every author of the feedback remarked that OP had helped to unite people of different social layers and to destroy class barriers imposed by RP.¹ We should note, however, that in Shakespearean texts, social differentiation is constructed with the help of word usage. For instance, in the comedy “Much Ado About Nothing”, noble personages “discourse” while the vulgar “talk”. Moreover, Shakespeare preserved the antique theatre device of social differentiation: gods and noble personages speak in

¹ This class barrier of standard English is best reflected in George Bernard Shaw’s play “Pygmalion” and Sue Townsend’s novel “The Queen and I”.

verse, the vulgar communicate in prose. In the way of pronunciation (OP), as the research of David and Ben Crystal reveals, social differentiation was not observed. Elizabethan actors, who played different parts, including kings, spoke the same language as the motley audience that swarmed in the “Globe”. Such language usage facilitated both the popularity of the theatre and the prosperity of the company.

Word-usage peculiarities of Shakespeare’s texts can serve as a testimony that the playwright shared the same language with his audience, the majority of whom were craftsmen, tradesmen and merchants. The analysis reveals that in Shakespeare’s tragedies the discursive behavior of virtuous personages is delivered by words and images from the semantic cluster of economic activity. Even the amorous impatience of Juliette is rendered through the concept of purchase and sale: “O, I have bought the mansion of a love, / But not possess’d it, and though I am sold, / Not yet enjoy’d” [47, p.1077]. Another benchmark is Sonnet 4, where usury and accounting become the source domain for metaphorical mapping the word “audit”¹ being a major lexical attractor. This term together with the term “quietus” (summing up) occurs in Sonnet 127, where Nature’s actions are metaphorically characterized: “Her audit (though delay’d) answer’d must be, / And her quietus is to render thee” [40, p.1772].

The selection of economic lexis throughout other sonnets reveals that the semantic cluster of economic activity is metaphorically blended with the semantic cluster of procreation (“For where is she so fair whose unear’d womb / Disdains the tillage of thy husbandry ?”) [34, pp. 1749-1750]. To the same sphere belongs the collocation “thy store’s account” [42, p. 1774] in Sonnet 136. The blend with the same semantic cluster results in the positive presentation of the semantic cluster of usury (“That use is not forbidden usury, / Which happies those that pay the willing loan”) [36, p. 1750]. The lexemes “happies” and “willing”, as well as the negative particle “not”, nullify the negative denotative meaning of the collocation “forbidden usury” and the word “loan”. The positive coloring of the lexemes from the semantic field “usury” is completely lost in Sonnet 134, where the poet constructing the metaphor of a “wrong loan” blames himself (“Thou usurer, that put’st forth all to use, / And sue a friend came debtor for my sake, / So him I lose through my unkind abuse”) [41, p. 1774].

A metaphoric complex “Love + Leasing” can be regarded as another result of semantic blending. This complex is a semantic structural basis is Sonnets 18, 107 and 125:

“Shall I compare thee to a summer’s day? / Thou art more lovely and more temperate: / Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May, / And **summer’s lease** hath all too short a date” [37, p. 1752].

Here summer is the leaser of a short-blooming beauty.

“Can yet the lease of my true love control, / Suppos’d as forfeit to a confin’d doom” [38, p. 1768].

¹ “Formal examination of an organization’s or individual’s accounts or financial situation” [25].

In this sonnet the true love itself is the leaser.

“Have I not seen **dwellers** on form and favor / **Lose all, and more, by paying too much rent**” [39, p. 1772].

Here the lexemes from the semantic cluster “leasing” come into blend with the semantic cluster “eternity”.

All these semantic spheres are rolled into one in Sonnet 143: “And seal’d false bonds of love as oft as mine, / Robb’d others’ beds’ revenues of their rents.” [43, p. 1775]. It is evident that in the sonnets, the torments of love are described in the terms of economic activity wherein the semantic spheres are syncretically inseparable.

To see whether this type of syncretism is valid for the whole corpus of Shakespearean texts, a search for the lexis of the semantic sphere “economic activity” was performed using the *Complete encyclopedic works* database. Twenty-six lexemes from Hamlet’s soliloquy cluster (see above) were chosen, then with the help of concordance browsing their contexts were singled out. To define their contextual usage the following dictionaries were utilized: *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, *New Oxford Dictionary*, *On-line Etymological Dictionary*, and the *Dictionary of Shakespeare’s Words*, compiled by David and Ben Crystal. The search resulted in the following number of concordances:

action (124), audit (9), **business** (247), chattel (2), contract (27), creditor (5), debt (48), debtor (13), enterprise (35), **household** (15), **husbandry** (15), **income** (1), **goods** (24), largess (5), money (189), partner (18), **pitch** (40), profit (44), quietus (2), resolution (32), revenue (18), **share** (32), **tilth** (2), traffic (13), usurer (9), venture (30).

Etymological analysis revealed that seven lexemes (in bold type) are of Anglo-Saxon origin. This origin proves good grounds to conclude that on the territory of Great Britain, business practices were exercised during the Early Medieval period before the Norman Conquest. It is evident from the analysis of textual usage that new lexemes of this semantic sphere that penetrated into Early Modern English from Latin via Old French did not fill in semantic lacunas but started to be used to denote specific spheres of business activity.

Furthermore, contextual analysis of these lexemes revealed that due to their metaphorical usage, additional components of meaning appear. For instance, the word “audit” in the context of Hamlet’s soliloquy in the scene of King Claudius’ prayer, besides the primary meaning of “formal examination of an organization’s or individual’s accounts or financial situation” [25], acquires an additional sense of “an individual’s accounts before God”: “And how his audit stands who knows save heaven?” [45, p. 1167]. The word “quietus” from Hamlet’s soliloquy “To be or not to be” similarly acquires an additional component of meaning: “When he himself might his quietus make / With a bare bodkin” [45, p. 1160]. Etymological dictionaries record the following meaning “discharge, **clearing of accounts**”, the date of entry being 1530 [27]. In the 17th century, beginning with this text of Shakespeare, this word acquires a supplementary sense of “death”¹.

¹ Short for Medieval Latin phrase *quietus est* — “he is quit” [27].

Representation in **Isotopic Clusters** is another peculiarity of the “economic activity” semantic sphere. For instance, Sonnet 4 reveals an eleven-lexeme cluster. Such cluster representation is characteristic of the plays “The Comedy of Errors” and “Merchant of Venice”, where merchants and usurers are major personages. Even King Richard II, whose primary occupation is far from economic activity, utters in the scene of abdication: “For that my sovereign liege was in **my debt**, / Upon **remainder** of a dear **account**” [46, p. 1147]. This cluster also penetrates into the discourse of a person, who can never be regarded as a Man of business – a priest: “A **contract** of eternal **bond** of love” [44, p. 437].

The analysis of assessing components in adjectival collocations reveals that both positive and negative assessments rest upon the figure of personification. Predominantly the semantic component of action undergoes personification which results in metaphorical epithets (Table 1).

Some of these metaphorical epithets are terminological set expressions, for instance, “acceptable audit”, “common profit”, “broken debtors”. Their personification is caused by their adherence to the blended mental domain “love + economic activi-

Table 1

Adjectival collocation components

Таблица 1

Компоненты фраз с прилагательными

positive	neutral	negative
acceptable audit	earthly audit	broken debtors
serious business	my worldly business	sodden business
some great and trusty business	this weighty business	heavy business
careful business	with curious business	my importunate business
a gentle business	mortal business	sleepy business
mighty business	common profit	unlawful business
swift business	a peculiar profit	guilty business
healthful and good husbandry	a manly enterprise	my bloody creditor
good husbandry	a more equal enterprise	the enterprise is sick
sweet partner	money gratis	a warlike enterprise
noble partner	any kindred action	a damned enterprise
the wide world's revenue		dangerous action
ripe revenue		waspish action
true debtor		ridiculous and [awkward] action
mighty enterprises		graceless action
bold enterprise		fearful action
bold or noble enterprise		The stiff-borne action
a true contract		unnecessary action
a contract of true love		unchaste action
honorable action		
pretty action		
sober action		

Source: [48].

Источник: [48].

ty + virtue". Also, paradoxical employment of adjectival collocation with the word "action" should be noted. The concepts of "the Name of Action" and "Man of Action" form the centre of the Renaissance episteme. At the same time, negative metaphorical epithets prevail: "honorable action", "pretty action", "sober action" vs. "graceless action", "fearful action", "the stiff-borne action", "unnecessary action", "unchaste action". This paradoxical usage is caused by the Elizabethan Renaissance demand for quality in an action. For instance, it could not be "stiff-borne".

The last thing to be noted is the semantic mirror effect of epistemological dominants in the texts of Shakespeare. For example, Hamlet's brooding, the idea that constant doubts can make cowards of brave people and lead to the loss both of resolution and the very name of action found its expression already in the chronicles "Henry VI" and "Henry IV":

Hamlet

"Thus conscience does make cowards [of us all],
And thus the **native hue of resolution**
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose **the name of action**" [45, p. 1160].

Henry VI

"Now, York, or never, steel thy **fearful thoughts,**
And **change misdoubt to resolution**".
[33, p. 647]

Henry IV

"The **stiff-borne action**" [32, p. 889].

Thus the semanteme "action" has been scrutinized in this article. It may seem that the semanteme "name" was left beyond the analytical scope. In this regard, as our analysis of the contexts containing the lexemes "word" and "words" revealed [5, pp. 5-15], Hamlet's edification to actors "Suit the action to the word, the word to the action" [45, p. 1161] can be treated as the key to understanding. Contextual analysis helps to conclude that in the poetics of Shakespeare, the loss of name causes the loss of referent, and hence leads to the emergence of all-destroying nothingness.

Conclusion

Having singled out the conceptual opposites "Man of Thought" and "Man of Action" from the episteme of the Elizabethan Renaissance we have scrutinized one of these opposites to clarify the meanings and values that Shakespeare ascribed to the conceptual entities "Name of action" and "Man of Action".

Conceptual and Epistemological analysis performed upon the contexts of word-usage from the semantic field "economic activity" have helped to conclude that the concept "name of action" finds its manifestation within the syncretic semantic domain "man of action + love + virtue". In its turn, semiolinguistic analysis brought to light the work of the complementary principle behind the emergence of new meanings and senses when the domain "economic activity" is used in conjunction with other domains of human activity. The corpus approach made it possible to single out symmetrical "mirror" contexts of the conceptual set of opposites "Man of Thought/Man of Action"

throughout Shakespeare's texts, which proves their association with the author who considered the "name of action" to be the crucial value of his age.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses her deepest gratitude to Dr. David James Cocksey of J.-F. Champolion University Centre (Albi, France) for his correction of the English version, technical aid and priceless remarks.

REFERENCES

1. Aristotle. 1998. "Poetika, Ob iskusstve poetiki" [Poetics. On the Art of Poetry]. In: Aristotle. *Etika. Politika. Ritorika. Poetika. Kategorii*. Minsk: Literatura.
2. Askoldov-Alekseyev S. A. 1997. "Kontsept i slovo" [The Concept and the Word]. *Russkaya slovesnost'. Ot teorii k strukture teksta*, p. 267-279. Moscow.
3. Babushkin A. P. 1997. "Obshcheyazykovyye kontsepty i kontsepty yazykovoy lichnosti" [General Linguistic Concepts and the Concepts of the Linguistic Identity]. *Vestnik VGU, Seria 1, Gumanitarnyye nauki*, no 2, pp. 114-118. Voronezh: VGU.
4. Bakhtin M. M. 1986. "Formy vremeni i khronotopa v romane" [Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel]. In: Bakhtin M. M. *Literaturno-kriticheskiye stat'i*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
5. Belozerova N. N., Marillaud P. 2014. "A Lord of language". *Tyumen State University Herald. Humanities Research. Humanitates*, no 1, pp. 5-15.
6. Boldyrev N. N. 2000. *Kognitivnaya semantika: kurs lektsiy po angliyskoy filologii* [Cognitive Semantics: A Course of Lectures on English Philology]. Tambov: TSU Publishing House.
7. Bruno G. 1934. *O prichine, nachale i edinom* [On Cause, Principle, and Unity]. Moscow: Polygrafika.
8. Chambers E. K. 1923. *The Elizabethan Stage in 4 vols*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
9. Crystal D. 2005. *Pronouncing Shakespeare: The Globe Experiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511487019
10. Demyankov V. Z. 2001. "Ponyatiye i kontsept v khudozhestvennoy literature i nauchnom yazyke" [Notion and Concept in Fiction and in Scientific Language]. *Voprosy filologii*, no 1 (7), pp. 5-46. Moscow: Institut inostrannykh yazykov.
11. Derrida J. 1972. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences". In: Macksey R., Donato E. (eds.). *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
12. *Dictionary of Shakespeare's Words*. Accessed 15 March 2015. <http://www.shakespeareswords.com/>
13. Golovanova E. I. 2008. *Kategoriya professional'nogo deyatelya: Formirovaniye. Razvitiye. Status v yazyke* [The Category of a Professional Worker: Formation. Development. Status in Language]. Moscow: Elpis.
14. Gurr A. 1992. *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Halliday F. E. 1964. *A Shakespeare Companion 1564-1964*. Baltimore: Penguin.

16. Huizinga J. 1997. Homo Ludens. Stat'i po istorii kul'tury [Homo Ludens. Articles on the History of Culture]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya.
17. Jakobson R. 1975. "Lingvistika i pojetika" [Linguistics and Poetics]. Strukturalizm: "za" i "protiv". Moscow: Progress.
18. Jakobson R. 1987. Raboty po poetike: Perevody [Works on Poetics: Translations]. Moscow: Progress.
19. Jakobson R. 1999. Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniya [Texts, documents, research]. Moscow: RSUH Publishing House.
20. Karasik V. I. 2002. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs: monografiya [The Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse. Monograph]. Volgograd: Peremena.
21. Keenan S. 2002. Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230597549
22. Lakoff G. 1993. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In: Ortony A. (ed.). Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Lakoff G., Johnson M. 1987. "Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem" [Metaphors We Live By]. In: Petrov V. V. (ed.). Yazyk i modelirovanie sotsial'nogo vzaimodejstviya. Moscow: Progress. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013
24. Losev A. F. 1978. Estetika vrozhdeniya [The Renaissance Aesthetics]. Moscow: Mysl'.
25. Merriam-Webster. Accessed 21 March 2015. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
26. New Oxford Dictionary. Accessed 15 March 2015. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/>
27. On-line Etymological Dictionary. <http://www.etymonline.com/>
28. Petrov V. V., Gerasimov V. I. (eds.). 1988. Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike [The Latest in Foreign Linguistics]. Vol. 23. Kognitivnye aspekty yazyka [Cognitive Aspects of Language]. Moscow: Progress.
29. Plato. 1998. Gosudarstvo. Zakony. Politik. [The Republic. Laws. Statesman]. Moscow: Mysl'.
30. Saussure F. de. 1977. Trudy po jazykoznaniiyu [Works on Linguistics]. Moscow: Progress.
31. Shakespeare W. 1974. "As You Like It". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
32. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Henry the Fourth", part 2. In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
33. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Henry the Sixth", part 2. In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
34. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 3". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
35. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 4". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
36. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 6". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
37. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 18". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
38. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 107". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

39. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 125". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
40. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 127". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
41. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 134". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
42. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 136". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
43. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Sonnet 143". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
44. Shakespeare W. 1974. "Twelfth Night, or What You Will". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
45. Shakespeare W. 1974. "The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
46. Shakespeare W. 1974. "The Tragedy of King Richard the Second". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
47. Shakespeare W. 1974. "The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet". In: Blakemore Evans G. (ed.). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
48. Shakespeare W. 2003. *Shekspir. Polnoye entsiklopedicheskoye izdaniye [Shakespeare: Complete Encyclopedic Works]*. Moscow: IDDK-Adept.
49. The Open University. "Shakespeare: Original pronunciation".
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPlpphT7n9s>
50. Turner M., Fauconnier G. 2002. *The way we think. Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
51. Vorkachev S. G. 2003. "Kontsept kak 'zontikovyy termin'" [The Concept as an "Umbrella Term"]. *Yazyk, soznaniye, kommunikatsiya*, vol. 24, pp. 5-12. Moscow.

Наталья Николаевна БЕЛОЗЁРОВА¹

УДК 81

ИМЯ ДЕЙСТВИЯ

¹ доктор филологических наук, профессор,
кафедра английского языка,
Тюменский государственный университет
natnicbel@gmail.com

Аннотация

Вычленив концептуальную оппозицию «человек мыслящий» (Man of Thought) и «человек действующий» (Man of Action) из эпистемы позднего Возрождения, автор обращается к одной из сторон этого оппозиционного единства, чтобы ответить на вопрос, какие смыслы заложены Шекспиром в концептуальные образования ИМЯ ДЕЙСТВИЯ и ЧЕЛОВЕК ДЕЙСТВИЯ. В работе рассматриваются два семантических компонента этих образований: ЧЕЛОВЕК ИГРАЮЩИЙ (на основе текста комедии «Как вам это понравится») и ЧЕЛОВЕК ДЕЛА (на основе выборки контекстов из Шекспировского корпуса). Концептуальный и эпистемологический анализ, проведенный на контекстах словоупотреблений лексем из семантического поля «экономическая деятельность», показал, что имя действия реализуется в пределах синкретической понятийной области «человек дела + любовь = добро». Семиолингвистический анализ при выделении сем и прагмем «имени действия» позволил выявить действие принципа дополнительности при образовании новых смыслов, которые возникли в результате экстраполяции лексики из семантического поля «экономическая деятельность» на другие области активности человека. Корпусный подход позволил вычленил симметричные «зеркальные» контексты концептуальной оппозиции MAN OF THOUGHT / MAN OF ACTION во всем корпусе текстов Шекспира, что доказывает их принадлежность автору, который считал ИМЯ ДЕЙСТВИЯ основной ценностью своей эпохи.

Ключевые слова

Эпистема Возрождения, концептуальная оппозиция, имя действия, человек играющий, семантическое поле, зеркальные тексты.

Цитирование: Белозёрова Н. Н. Имя действия / Н. Н. Белозёрова // Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Гуманитарные исследования. Humanitates. 2018. Том 4. № 4. С. 6-25.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2018-4-4-6-25

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2018-4-4-6-25

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Аристотель. Поэтика. Об искусстве поэзии / Аристотель // Этика. Политика. Риторика. Поэтика. Категории. Минск: Литература, 1998.
2. Аскольд-Алексеев С. А. Концепт и слово / С. А. Аскольд-Алексеев // Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста. М.: Наука, 1997. С. 267-279.
3. Бабушкин А. П. Общеязыковые концепты и концепты языковой личности / А. П. Бабушкин // Вестник ВГУ. Серия 1. № 2. Гуманитарные науки. Воронеж: ВГУ, 1997. С. 114-118
4. Бахтин М. М. Формы времени и хронотопа в романе / М. М. Бахтин. Москва: Издатель, 1986.
5. Белозёрова Н. Н. A lord of language / Н. Н. Белозёрова, П. Марио // Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Филология. 2014. № 1. С. 5-15.
6. Болдырев Н. Н. Когнитивная семантика: Курс лекций по английской филологии / Н. Н. Болдырев. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г. Р. Державина, 2000.
7. Бруно Дж. О причине, начале и едином / Дж. Бруно. Москва: Полиграфика, 1934. 227 с.
8. Chambers E. K. The Elizabethan Stage / E. K. Chambers. Vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
9. Crystal D. Pronouncing Shakespeare: The Globe Experiment / D. Crystal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 208 p. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511487019
10. Демьянков В. З. Понятие и концепт в художественной литературе и в научном языке / В. З. Демьянков // Вопросы филологии. 2001. № 1. М.: Институт иностранных языков, 2001. С. 5-46.
11. Derrida J. Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences // The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man / J. Derrida, ed. R. A. Macksey, E. Donato. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1972.
12. Dictionary of Shakespeare's Words. URL: <http://www.shakespeareswords.com/>
13. Голованова Е. И. Категория профессионального деятеля: Формирование. Развитие. Статус в языке / Е. И. Голованова. М.: Элпис, 2008.
14. Gurr A. The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642 / A. Gurr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
15. Halliday F. E. A Shakespeare Companion 1564-1964 / F. E. Halliday. Baltimore: Penguin, 1964.
16. Хёйзинга Й. Homo Ludens: Статьи по истории культуры / Й. Хёйзинга. 1938. М.: Прогресс — Традиция, 1997. 416 с.
17. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика / Р. Якобсон // Структурализм «за» и «против». М.: Прогресс, 1975.
18. Якобсон Р. Работы по поэтике: Переводы / Р. Якобсон. М.: Прогресс, 1987.
19. Якобсон Р. Тексты, документы, исследования / Р. Якобсон. М.: Изд-во РГГУ, 1999.

-
20. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В. И. Карасик. Волгоград: Перемена, 2004.
 21. Keenan S. Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England / S. Keenan. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. DOI: 10.1057/9780230597549
 22. Lakoff G. The Contemporary theory of Metaphor / G. Lakoff, ed. A. Ortony // Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
 23. Лакофф Дж. Метафоры, которыми мы живем / Дж. Лакофф, М. Джонсон // Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия. М.: Прогресс, 1987. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013
 24. Лосев А. Ф. Эстетика Возрождения / А. Ф. Лосев. М.: Мысль, 1978. 623 с.
 25. Merriam-Webster. 2016. URL: <http://www.merriam-webster.com>
 26. New Oxford Dictionary. URL: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english>
 27. On-line Etymological Dictionary. URL: <http://www.etymonline.com/>
 28. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике / ред. В. В. Петров, В. И. Герасимов. Выпуск 23. Когнитивные аспекты языка. М.: Прогресс, 1988.
 29. Платон. Государство. Законы. Политик / Платон. М.: Мысль, 1998. 352 с.
 30. де Соссюр Ф.. Труды по языкознанию / Ф. де Соссюр, пер. с франц.; под ред. А. А. Холодовича. М.: Прогресс, 1977. 695 с.
 31. Shakespeare W. As You Like It / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 32. Shakespeare W. Henry the Fourth, Part II / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 33. Shakespeare W. Henry the Sixth, Part II / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 34. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 3 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 35. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 4 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 36. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 6 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 37. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 18 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 38. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 107 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 39. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 125 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 40. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 127 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 41. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 134 / W. Shakespeare // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 42. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 136 // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
 43. Shakespeare W. Sonnet 143 // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
-

44. Shakespeare W. Twelfth Night, or What You Will // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
45. Shakespeare W. The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
46. Shakespeare W. The Tragedy of King Richard the Second // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
47. Shakespeare W. The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet // The Riverside Shakespeare / ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
48. Шекспир: Полное собрание сочинений. CD-Rom. М.: ИДДК, Адепт, 2003.
49. The Open University. Shakespeare: Original pronunciation.
URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPlpphT7n9s>
50. Turner M. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities / M. Turner, G. Fauconnie. New York: Basic Books, 2002
51. Воркачев С. Г. Концепт как «зонтиковый термин» / С. Г. Воркачев // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. Вып. 24. М., 2003. С. 5-12.