

## АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВА

УДК 811.161.2

### LANGUAGE MANIPULATION MEANS IN ENGLISH LOVE DISCOURSE AND ITS TRANSLATION INTO UKRAINIAN

HATALSKA M.S.

*Kyiv National Linguistic University*

Стаття присвячена вивченню системи засобів мовленнєвої маніпуляції в текстах художнього любовного дискурсу в комунікативно-прагматичному аспекті та способів відтворення їх українською мовою. Проаналізовано методи й тактики мовного маніпулювання. Описано граматичні, лексико-семантичні та лексико-граматичні трансформації, які застосовують для відтворення мовних маніпуляцій у перекладах творів любовного дискурсу. З'ясовано, що модуляція та диференціація як найбільш уживані лексико-семантичні перетворення допомагають у вираженні ухилень, тону грайливості, кокетливості персонажів, натомість граматичні перетворення (додавання, пропущення, заміщення) застосовуються для передавання байдужості, грубості, нехтування і глузування у висловлюваннях і увиразнюють їхній маніпулятивний характер. Усі типи лексико-граматичних перетворень (антонімічний переклад, повна реорганізація та компенсація) використовують з метою формування гумористичного та маніпулятивного тону висловлювань. Доведено, що для досягнення семантичної еквівалентності в перекладі засобів мовної маніпуляції в текстах любовного дискурсу варто прискіпливо обирати способи їх відтворення.

**Ключові слова:** мовленнєва маніпуляція, любовний дискурс, мовна особистість, переклад, лексико-семантична трансформація, граматична трансформація.

**HATALSKA Maryna Serhiiivna**

Lecturer,

Kyiv National Linguistic University,

e-mail: marina.gatalska@gmail.com

### LANGUAGE MANIPULATION MEANS IN ENGLISH LOVE DISCOURSE AND ITS TRANSLATION INTO UKRAINIAN

**Introduction.** The article is dedicated to one of topical issues of modern linguistics – language manipulation in fictional texts of love discourse, and highlights the specifics of applying translation strategies while rendering language manipulation means into Ukrainian. **Purpose.** The paper aims to describe the system of language manipulation means in love discourse and ways of their reproduction in the Ukrainian language. **Methods.** The nature of language manipulation as well as its techniques, tactics and methods used by the manipulator have been analyzed. The grammatical, lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical transformations applied to convey language manipulation performed by different types of linguistic personalities in love discourse are described. **Results.** Conveying language manipulation means in translation is a complicated process that involves a number of difficulties, and therefore requires professional skills from a translator. Three main types of translation transformations are identified: lexical-semantic transformations; grammatical transformations; lexical-grammatical transformations, through which the system of language manipulation means in the texts of love discourse is rendered. Modulation and differentiation as the most frequently used lexical-semantic transformations help to render evasion, tone of playfulness, coquetry in characters' utterances that have manipulative potential. As shown by the analysis of the research material, grammatical

transformations (addition, omission, substitution) are applied to convey indifference, rudeness, neglect, and ridicule in utterances of characters and clearly render their manipulative power. All types of lexical-grammatical transformations (antonymic translation, total reorganization and compensation) have been applied with the aim of providing expressive, humorous and manipulative tone of utterances. **Conclusions.** It should be concluded that various translation transformations are required for achieving semantic equivalence in translation of language manipulation means in texts of love discourse.

**Keywords:** language manipulation, love discourse, linguistic personality, translation, lexical-semantic transformations, grammatical transformations.

**Introduction.** The modern stage of development of linguistic science once again indicates that the study of influence of potential of the language, its ability to regulate people's behavior, manage decision-making processes, and, in particular, its ability to act as an instrument for manipulating the consciousness of both the individual and society in general draws the attention of not only linguists (A.D. Dmitruk, K.V. Nikitina, V.V. Star, N.A. Ostroushko), but also psychologists (S.I. Burnstein, D. Bryant, S. Thompson, A.L. Dotsenko, T.M. Drydze, O. Leontiev, B. Sherdon), political scientists (S. Kara-Murza, G. Lassuell, G.G. Pocheptsov, G.Schiller), sociologists (B.I. Motuzenko). In the field of translation studies this vector of modern linguistics is extrapolated as a study of language manipulation reproduction mechanisms, which requires a comprehensive study of love discourse texts in a plane of interaction of the semantic, expressive and pragmatic levels of its structure.

The topicality of the study is determined by the fact that the problem of language manipulation means in love discourse texts as well as the ways of their rendering into Ukrainian, are insufficiently elaborated in contemporary linguistics and translation studies.

**The aim of the article** is to analyze manipulative effect of linguistic form and structure in communicative and pragmatic aspect and specifics of English-Ukrainian rendering of language manipulation in love discourse.

The aim determines the objectives of the research which are the following:

- to examine the nature of language manipulation;
- to define techniques, behaviours, tactics and methods used by manipulators;
- to define the concept of love discourse;
- to define linguistic strategies and means of language manipulation in love discourse;
- to define and analyze ways of their rendering into Ukrainian;
- to identify verbal behaviour strategies of different types of linguistic personalities;
- to analyze the use of transformations to convey language manipulation in the texts of love discourse.

Every scholar approaching the field of manipulation, either in linguistics, discourse analysis, psychology or political science, is aware of the vagueness, the semantic complexity and the lack of clear-cut definition for the concept manipulation. There are many reasons for that, but the most important of them are the complexity and ambiguity of the research object, determining the true utterance objectives and effectiveness of conversational moves in a particular situation of communication.

Language manipulation can be perceived as the conscious use of language in a devious way to cause the other person's (manipulated victim) specific conduct in a certain matter, in accordance with own self-serving wishes of manipulator. Language manipulation is based on the use of indirect speech acts, which are focused on perlocutionary effects of what is said.

Manipulation of linguistic form and structure implies that linguistic material beginning with the smallest or most discrete of segments or forms (phonetic, morphological units) and leading to quite large linguistic entities (lexical, syntactic units) will be fashioned to undergo some changes, transformation, mutilation, mutation that is relatively unexpected on the part of the viewer / reader. This is done clearly with the purpose of providing another means of directing the viewer's/reader's attention squarely onto what are the subject and substance of the particular discourse in which the manipulation occurs [8, p. 120].

The psychological component in manipulation is obvious: manipulative influence on human behavior is characterized by special emotionality and expressiveness. Such influence is based on feelings, emotions, mood of the addressee.

The mechanisms that provide effectiveness of influence include a number of intrapsychic processes that facilitate the implementation of certain block diagrams, which lead to the neutralization of the actions of psychological safety of the individual, to the loss of vigilance and facilitate the implementation of manipulative influence.

Since any interaction of people associated with communication involves the use of language and means of its expression, manipulation may well be considered not only as social or psychological phenomenon, but also as a phenomenon of sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic nature [8, p.136].

The purpose of manipulation is to achieve a specific communicative goal, in particular, to impose a certain vision of the situation described, the formation of new ideas, aspirations, desires, goals. Thus, language structures acquire manipulative content in specific discursive conditions [3, p. 27].

The strategies used by the manipulator in order to block truth, conceal information, distract an object from the main goal, are first linked to the necessity of blocking the identification of the manipulative intention of the speaker. Manipulation involves a certain external stimulus that captures the attention of the object, and hidden incentive that encourages object to the action, which they would not have done voluntarily. The use of stylistic devices (tropes and figures such as metaphor, metonymy, simile, hyperbole, anaphora, epiphora) also contributes to the creation of manipulative effect.

Manipulative abilities of language are extremely rich, and manipulative techniques in everyday interaction are becoming more refined and disguised. Each psychological mechanism is specific and applied under certain conditions. The manipulator can deliberately bring the victim to the desired mental state by using impatience, lack of self-confidence, vanity, concentration, compassion, frustration, confusion, indecision, euphoria, greed, boasting, patterns, effects and illusions of perception, stereotypes of perception and behavior, etc. The choice of the appropriate methods of manipulation is associated with moral and psychological culture of communication [2, p. 134-137].

Manipulation plays an extremely important role in structure of fictional text and, as a rule, is preserved in translation, while simultaneously demonstrating the influence of the language and personality factors (coming from the linguistic personality of the translator). The influence of the actual linguistic factors on conveying manipulative effects of one character to another is manifested, in particular, in the translation process, the phonetic layer is the most complex and least preserved in the process of conveying the manipulative nature of communication. The pragmatic potential of a manipulative situation is preserved at the expense of compensation by means of other layers.

A translator can amplify, weaken or adequately convey the manipulative (or actualizing) character of the statements of characters. It is important to note that in the translation process there is a danger of creating double manipulation: preserving techniques for manipulating the original and creating new ones in the text of the translation.

In order to describe the translation, process the concept translation strategy is widely used by scholars. The review of professional literature conducted by us allows us to assert that today two basic types of translation strategies are distinguished: universal and aspectual. Universal translation strategies can be defined as general rules and norms that a translator must adhere to, regardless of the language and type of text. In addition to the universal strategies in modern translation studies, there are also aspectual strategies that deal with the fundamental principles of solving partial problems within the framework of the general guidance (that is, the general strategy of translation).

Love discourse is practically unexplored in terms of its organization – linguistic structures that reflect a particular cognitive state. This type of discourse is interpreted by linguists as a complex phenomenon of human life, a philosophical hypothesis, a non-individualistic experience, on which lies the imprint of class, social and temporal affiliation. It serves the sphere of romantic communication.

Love discourse is defined as an area of intimate and personal communication between men and women, based on the feeling of love between individuals who interact emotionally, exchange emotional verbal and nonverbal signs. The main characteristic features of love discourse include increased emotionality, situational conditionality, cooperative politeness strategy, manipulation, etc. [7, p. 9].

Speech of lovers is conditioned by social, cultural, historical, and psychological factors, which makes it possible to separate it as a type of discourse, which has both verbal and non-verbal features. Verbal expression of love is associated with socio-cultural norms of society. The study of love discourse requires the widespread use of various research methods and techniques.

Available studies of love discourse allow us to talk about its genre conditionality, which consists in interpersonal relations of subjects of communication in a certain emotional situation, for example, situations of acquaintance, courtship, declaration of love, etc. Analysis shows that the speech formation of intimate relations is functionally conditioned by “special” language – the language of trust, tenderness, emotionality, accessible to everyone, despite the fact that this language is oriented to a particular person. In intimate communication between partners there is more than mere transmission and perception of words. The linguistic activity of lovers consists in code signals that transmit information rich in thoughts, promoting the development of communication of ideas and feelings from person to person [7, p. 10].

The communication of lovers combines elements of both personal and socially deterministic discourses. On the one hand, communication between lovers is defined as personalized communication / idiomatic communication, which is characterized by the use of lexical units or statements that have a symbolic meaning only for two lovers (relationship-specific messages, personal idioms). The use of these lexical units or statements by someone else can be regarded as a breach of privacy, since they embody the tendency of speakers to create emotional closeness, “secrecy”.

The language of a lovers is, as a rule, metaphorical, which adds a special poetic tone to love discourse. A loving person can never be completely sure about how his/her words will be perceived, how his/her partner will react to them, whether he / she will understand what kind of content was laid in love confession, etc. The discourse features of the speech of lovers depend on the psychological portrait of each participant of such communication [3, p. 176].

The concept of “linguistic personality” serves as the theoretical basis for singling out typical personalities-participants in the communication of lovers in love discourse. There are 4 types of linguistic personalities (romantic lover, ludus lover, pragmatic lover, maniac lover and agapic lover), which, in turn, are characterized by some manipulative strategies. Emotional lexicon is the most traditional, widely used and important component of manipulative strategies. Due to such standardization it becomes possible to describe typical communicative situations in which these individuals appear, identify the main genres of communicative interaction, analyze stylistic registers, the emotional tone of communication and the use of manipulative strategies of each type of linguistic personality [4].

The analysis of practical material leads to the conclusion that ludus lovers usually employ such manipulative strategies and tactics as seduction, evasion, deliberate use of vagueness, compliments, humor etc. Moreover, this type of linguistic personality can demonstrate the weakness with certain manipulative intentions. Exclamations, intensifiers, language metaphors serve as verbal means of manipulative strategies and tactics:

*'How beautifully you make love,' she said.*

*That was what he thought himself.*

*'Oh, if I could only say all the things that burn my heart!' he murmured passionately [13, p. 24–28].*

Maniac lovers often use such techniques as verbal abuse, shaming, language metaphor, simile, repetition, provoking feelings of guilt, playing the victim role to gain pity, sympathy, or compassion from their victim etc. They are implemented by the use of adjectives, modal words, verbs in the present indefinite and present perfect indefinite tense, tag questions, elliptical questions:

*'Perhaps you would rather not sit any longer on my knee, Miss Eyre?'* was the next somewhat unexpected observation.

*'Why not, Mr. Rochester?'* [10, p. 114].

*'... Miss Eyre. I repeat it, you can leave me. How often am I to say the same thing? Why do you remain pertinaciously perched on my knee, when I have given you notice to quit?'*

*'Because I am comfortable there'* [10, p. 67].

Tactics of false modesty, lying, information concealment (giving irrelevant, rambling responses, deliberate use of vagueness and lying by omission) belong to the most common manipulative strategies of pragmatic lovers. These strategies are realized by such language means as adjectives, modal verbs, negations, tag questions, epiphora.

*'I don't want you in that capacity anymore.'*

*The promptness of his answer irritated her, but she adopted a relieved air and said, 'Honestly?'*

*'If I did, do you think I could have borne to keep away from you so long? You were a passing fancy in that way, but I still think of you as a dear friend, and miss you as a dear friend'* [12, p. 61–62].

Agapic lovers prefer such techniques as use of epithets, guilt tripping, evasion. These manipulative techniques are employed through such language tools as interrogative sentences, tag questions, imperatives:

*'Don't disappoint me tomorrow, Philip. I've been looking forward so much to spending the day with you. The Gordons want to see you, and we'll have such a jolly time.'*

*'I'd love to if I could.'*

*'I'm not very exacting, am I? I don't often ask you to do anything that's a bother. Won't you get out of your horrid engagement – just this once?'* [13, p. 15–18].

The analysis of manipulative strategies used by romantic lovers shows the following most common and widespread techniques: flattery and compliments, evasion, demonstration of knowledge and skills to others. These methods are realized by parcellation, interrogative sentences, conditional sentences, adverbs, intensifiers, comparisons.

*'I know lots o' girls. AH sorts. None like you.'*

*'Taren't so awful hard to find.'*

*'I never 'ave. Before.' There was another silence. She would not look at him, but at the edge of her apron.*

*'Ow about London then? Fancy seein' London?'*

She grinned then, and nodded—very vehemently.

*'Expec' you will. When they're a-married orf hupstairs. I'll show yer round'* [11, p. 84–86].

The ability to choose and make the right transformation is one of the translator's main professional skills, one that requires exercise in imagination and cultural outlook. A successful translation is largely comprised of successful transformations. Achieving equivalence in translation is connected with the ability to identify a translational problem correctly and to make a suitable transformation.

Three main types of translation transformations were identified (lexical and semantic transformations; grammatical transformations; lexical and grammatical transformations) with the help of which the system of language manipulation means was rendered in the texts of love discourse.

The usage of grammatical transformations in the translation of love discourse texts has been determined by various reasons, mostly by the discrepancies of English and Ukrainian language systems. The following most frequent grammatical transformations were distinguished: addition, omission and replacement.

According to the analysis of the material grammatical transformations are used to convey indifference, rudeness, contempt, ridicule in characters' utterances as well as their manipulative power.

<p><i>'But that's just beastly.'</i>  <i>'What of it?'</i>  <i>'I thought you were a gentleman in every sense of the word.'</i>  <i>'You were mistaken.'</i> [13, p. 42-43].</p>	<p><i>'Знаєш, це просто огидно!'</i>  <i>'Ну то й що?'</i>  <i>'А я-то думала, що ти джентльмен в повному розумінні цього слова!'</i>  <i>'От і помилилася!'</i> – Засміявся він.</p>
--	---

Particles provide different connotations to certain words or groups of words, express speaker's attitude towards the described situation, towards a recipient and their utterances. Therefore, in order to convey imitated indifference and mockery in the character's words, we use such grammatical transformation as addition: particles *ну* and *от* express the character's emotions aimed at evoking anger in woman.

Modulation and differentiation belong to the most frequently used lexical-semantic transformations. Lexical-semantic transformations are often used to render evasion, tone of playfulness, coquetry in characters' utterances that have manipulative potential.

<p><i>'Do you know, I believe we've never discussed your sex life before? Fascinating! What's she like?'</i>  <i>'Fair, fat, forty and flatulent'</i> [12, p. 52].</p>	<p><i>'А знаєш, здається, ми ще ніколи не обговорювали твоє інтимне життя. Як дивно! А яка вона, твоя коханка?'</i>  <i>'Русьва сорокарічна ротуха з хворим шлунком'</i> [9, p. 378].</p>
--	---

This excerpt arouses our interest because there are two stylistic devices – anaphora and alliteration used by the character. Anaphora serves the purpose of furnishing artistic effect to the passages of prose, makes it sound similar to poetry. Both figures of speech are means of emotional and manipulative influence. The translator managed to convey this utterance into Ukrainian with the help of alliteration.

While rendering language manipulation all kinds of lexical and grammatical transformations were applied: antonymous translation, total reorganization, compensation. These transformations provide expressive, humorous and manipulative tone of utterances.

<p><i>'All they fashionable Lunnon girls, 'ee wouldn't want to go walkin' out with me.'</i>  <i>'If you 'ad the clothes, you'd do. You'd do very nice.'</i>  <i>'Doan believe 'ee.'</i>  <i>'Cross my 'eart.'</i>  <i>Their eyes met and held for a long moment. He bowed elaborately and swept his hat to cover his left breast.</i>  <i>'A demang, madymosseile.'</i>  <i>'What's that then?'</i>  <i>'It's French for Coombe Street, tomorrow mornin' – where yours truly will be waitin'</i> [11, p. 89-93].</p>	<p><i>'У Лондоні усюди модні дівуці. Ви зі мною й пройтися не захочете.'</i>  <i>'Якщо Вас як слід одягнути – будете як лялечка.'</i>  <i>'Та не брешіть!'</i>  <i>'Провалитися мені на цьому місці, якщо брешу!'</i>  <i>Вони обмінялися довгим поглядом. Сем картинно вклонився і притиснув капелюх до лівій стороні грудей.</i>  <i>'А demang, мамзель.'</i>  <i>'Що?'</i>  <i>'Це означає – завтра на Кумі-стріт. По-французькому. Де Ваш покірний слуга буде чекати.'</i></p>
--	--

The excerpt above illustrates the use of compensation and total reorganization in Ukrainian translation. According to the plot of the novel characters Sam and Mary are the representatives of London's lower social class and speak cockney. Therefore, it's extremely important to convey the character's accent adequately in translation. This becomes possible with the help of compensation.

It is used to render speech peculiarities of characters, to translate puns, rhyming words. A bright example of compensation is Ukrainian translation of the phrase 'Doan believe 'ee – 'Та не брешіть!' which conveys semantic and stylistic nuances of the original.

Another lexical and grammatical transformation is total reorganization which serves as a universal means of translating idioms and set expressions what can be proved by an example from our fragment: 'Cross my 'eart' – Провалитися мені на цьому місці, якщо брешу!

**Conclusion.** Consequently, the results of the comparative analysis of the English love discourse texts and the texts of translation suggest that in order to achieve the content affinity between the original text and its translation and to convey manipulative potential of the characters' words, it is necessary to use lexical-semantic and grammatical transformations. The most frequent of them are modulation, addition and omission. Studying gender-specific strategies of manipulation and language means of their realization in the texts of love discourse as well as ways of their rendering belong to the prospects for further research.

#### REFERENCES

1. Блакар Р.М. Язык как инструмент социальной власти / Р.М. Блакар // Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия. – М. : Наука, 1987. – 200 с.
2. Быкова О.Н. Языковое манипулирование : материалы к энциклопедическому словарю "Культура русской речи" / О.Н. Быкова // Теоретические и прикладные аспекты речевого общения: Вестн. Российской риторической ассоциации. – Красноярск : Красноярский гос. ун-т, 1999. – № 1(8). – 250 с.
3. Веретенкина Л.Ю. Лингвистическое выражение межличностных манипуляций (к постановке проблемы) / Л.Ю. Веретенкина // Предложение и слово: Докл. и сообщ. международной научной конференции, посвященной памяти профессора В.С. Юрченко / Отв. ред. О.В. Мякшева. – Саратов : Научная книга, 1999. – 350 с.
4. Зелинский С.А. Современные психотехнологии манипулирования [Электронный ресурс] / С.А. Зелинский. – 2009. – Режим доступа: [http://lit.lib.ru/z/zelinskij\\_s\\_a/text\\_0670.shtml](http://lit.lib.ru/z/zelinskij_s_a/text_0670.shtml).
5. Кара-Мурза С. Манипуляция сознанием / С. Кара-Мурза. – М. : Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2001. – 832 с.
6. Киричук Л.М. Прагмакогнітивні особливості стереотипів як засобів маніпуляції в публіцистичному дискурсі / Л.М. Киричук // Науковий вісник Волинського нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки. – Луцьк : Науковий вісник ВНУ імені Лесі Українки, 2009. – №6. – С. 195–199.
7. Кузнецова Л.Э. Любовь как лингвокультурный эмоциональный концепт: ассоциативный и гендерный аспекты : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. : специальность. 10.02.19 "Теория языка" / Л.Э. Кузнецова. – Волгоград : Парадигма, 2005. – 13 с.
8. Михайлюк Е.Б. Психология влияния / Е.Б. Михайлюк. – Ростов : Феникс, 2003. – 160 с.

#### LITERARY SOURCES

9. Маккалоу К. Ті, що співають у терні / К. Маккалоу. – Х. : Клуб сімейного дозвілля, 2011. – 513 с.
10. Brontë Ch. Jane Eyre / Ch. Brontë. – Radford, Virginia: Wilder Publications, 2008. – 650 p.
11. Fowles J. The French Lieutenant's Woman / J. Fowles. – New York : Little, Brown and Company, 1998. – 480 p.
12. McCullough C. The Thorn Birds / C. McCullough. – New York : Avon, 2005. – 688 p.
13. Somerset Maugham W. Of Human Bondage / W. Somerset Maugham. – New York : Bantam Classics, 1991. – 736 p.

#### REFERENCES

1. Blakar R.M. Yazyk kak instrument sotsial'noj vlasti / R. M. Blakar // Yazyk i modelirovanie sotsyal'nogo vzaimodejstviya. – M. : Nauka, 1987. – 200 s.
2. Bykova O.N. Yazykovoie manipulirovanie : materyaly k entsyklopedicheskomu slovariю “Kul'tura russkoj rechy” / O.N. Bykova // Teoreticheskiye i prikladnyie aspekty rechovoho obscheniya: Vestn. Rossijskoj ritorycheskoj assotsyatsyy. – Krasnoiarsk : Krasnoiarskiy gos. un-t, 1999. – № 1(8). – 250 s.
3. Veretenkina L.Yu. Lingvisticheskoe vyrazhenye mezhlichnostnykh manipulyatsyj (k postanovke problemy) / L.Yu. Veretenkina // Predlozhenie i slovo: Dokl. i soobsh. mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferentsyi, posviaschennoj pamiati profesora V.S. Yurchenko / Otv. red. O.V. Miaksheva. – Saratov : Nauchnaja kniga, 1999. – 350 s.
4. Zelinskij C.A. Sovremennye psixhotekhnologyy manipulyrovaniya [Elektronnyj resurs] / C.A. Zelinskij. – 2009. – Rezhym dostupa: [http://lit.lib.ru/z/zelinskij\\_s\\_a/text\\_0670.shtml](http://lit.lib.ru/z/zelinskij_s_a/text_0670.shtml).
5. Kara-Murza S. Manipulyatsiya soznaniem / S. Kara-Murza. – M. : Yzd-vo EKSMO-Press, 2001. – 832 s.
6. Kyrychuk L.M. Prahmakohnytny osoblyvosti stereotypiv iak zasobiv manipulyatsii v publitsystychnomu dyskursi / L.M. Kyrychuk // Naukovyj visnyk Volyns'koho nats. un-tu im. Lesi Ukrainky. – Luts'k : Naukovyj visnyk VNU imeni Lesi Ukrainky, 2009. – №6. – S. 195–199.
7. Kuznetsova L.E. Liubov' kak lingvokul'turnyj emotsyonal'nyj kontsept: assotsyativnyj i gendernyj aspekty : avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk. : spetsyal'nost'. 10.02.19 “Teoriya iazyka” / L.E. Kuznetsova. – Volgograd : Paradigma, 2005. – 13 s.
8. Mikhajliuk E.B. Psikhologiya vliyaniya / E.B. Mykhajlyuk. – Rostov : Feniks, 2003. – 160 s.

#### LITERARY SOURCES

9. Makkalou K. Ti, scho spivaiut' u terni / K. Makkalou. – Kh. : Klub simejnogo dozvillia, 2011. – 513 s.
10. Brontл Ch. Jane Eyre / Ch. Brontл. – Radford, Virginia: Wilder Publications, 2008. – 650 p.
11. Fowles J. The French Lieutenant's Woman / J. Fowles. – New York : Little, Brown and Company, 1998. – 480 p.
12. McCullough C. The Thorn Birds / C. McCullough. – New York : Avon, 2005. – 688 p.
13. Somerset Maugham W. Of Human Bondage / W. Somerset Maugham. – New York : Bantam Classics, 1991. – 736 p.

*Дата надходження до редакції 17.11.2017*