

2. Galperin I.R. (1981) *Stylistics*. – Moscow: Vyssaja Skola.
3. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2005 – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Swan M. (1996) *Practical English Usage: International Student's Edition*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NON-VERBAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS Oksana Mamatova (Kharkiv, Ukraine)

Modern linguistic research, which has anthropogenic tendency, focuses its attention on different processes of communication. There is a wide-spread idea that the behavior of a man is communication itself, as its different aspects bear information about communicants; and it's a well-known fact that the non-verbal means (NVM) of communication are much more informative than the verbal means.

It should be mentioned here that communication itself is a combination of 5 different disciplines, namely psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, sociology, ethnics, etc. This combination of disciplines which is human-oriented make a mixture where human communication is studied from the psychological, physical and cultural points of view at the same time. Namely because of it works in non-verbal communication study are rather an example of observation of people interaction in a real life than in the sphere of science and require knowledge of various methods of cognition that are used by these disciplines.

One should note here that the ever-growing interest to NVM is represented in a series of works that focus their attention on the given subject from a theory-of-communication-position, psycholinguistic position [Leonhard K.], sociolinguistic position, anthropo-culturology position [Birdswistle], non-verbal semiotics [Vereschagin, Kostomarov, Gorelov, Kreidlin, Piz, Trusov and others], etc. As the same time as far as we know, there is no systematic description of linguistic representation of non-verbal means of communication, except for some papers, devoted to separate aspects of the given problem. (e.g. [Yanova, Vasilenko, Bartashova]).

A number of linguists points out, that there are 2 main aspects of speech influence, namely verbal and non-verbal. [Sternin, Vatslavik II., Bivin J., Jackson D.]

The verbal speech influence, as for Sternin, is the influence with the help of words. In case of a verbal speech influence the powerful means are language means and their influential efficiency depends on their selection, arrangement and intonation. As well relevant for the verbal speech influence are both language means selection and the contents of speech itself – its meaning, the given argumentation, arrangement of text elements relatively to each other, speech influence technique use, etc. As a result of verbal influence a subtext is important as well – it's a concealed meaning of a message, which is transmitted indirectly with the text.

There is a point of view, that the verbal communication is impossible alone. The non-verbal communication (NVC) is a complementary to the verbal communication (VC), proving the mutual complementariness of the verbal and non-verbal behaviour. The latter is strengthened by the term use of "coverbal", as well as «non-verbal». [Sternin] Thus, we have 2 types of units: super-segment means that are in the symbol language field and defining it prosodic, rhythmic and intonation characteristics of an expression and also those that are out of this language field – kinetic elements of communication. Namely the synthesis of language (segment and super-segment series) and kinetic symbols that include mimics, that is, all the gestures of a face, gesticulation and body movements, which denotes the semiotic syncretism of phases in the process of spontaneous communication. [Chanysheva]

The non-verbal speech influence, as for Sternin, is the influence, made with the help of the verbal signals which accompany speech (gestures, mimics, behavior at the moment of speech, movements of a speaker, distance to an interlocutor, physical contact with an interlocutor, object manipulation, etc.). All these factors make the speech more vivid and are considered in a speech influence exclusively in their relation to speech which allows to use the term of non-verbal communication [Sternin]

A number of researchers considers that modern non-verbal semiotics is comprised in general of 3 main separate studies: para-linguistics (prosody) – the study of voice codes of non-verbal communication; kinesics (kinetic behaviour – the study of gestures (kinemas, kinetic signs, kinetic elements), gesture processes and gesture systems; proximity – the study of a communicative space and spaces of communicative behaviour of an individual.

References

1. Gorelov N. N. «Non-verbal means of communication» M, 1980, 75 p.
2. Piz A. The language of gestures, Voronezh, 1992, - P.74.
3. Sternin I. A. «The introduction to the verbal influence» Voronezh, 2001, - P.251.
4. An Overview of Nonverbal Communication in Impersonal Relationships www.nvc.net

PRAGMATIC POTENTIAL OF DEICTIC MARKERS Tetiana Maslova (Kyiv, Ukraine)

Coherence in discourse is developed in many ways. Sometimes the connections between various parts of the discourse are not very apparent and the knowledge of scripts, speech events and rhetorical organization of the texts is required to carry out a discourse analysis and explain why texts stick together as a unit. However, the study of deictic

markers may help make relations among sentences and clauses of the discourse more explicit and elucidate the pragmatic potential of grammar and syntax.

Deictic markers are linguistics elements that "point" the reader or listener to particular time and space reference frames, human relations and formal connections in the text and cannot be interpreted without an immediate discourse context. The name *deictics* comes from the Greek word "*deixis*", which means "pointing". Thus, deictic markers are used to anchor the speaker's current position in the discourse in relation to the surroundings and other participants of communication by referring to him/herself, to the others, to the objects, processes and events associated with communication. Deictic markers are typically personal and possessive pronouns, demonstratives, some time and place adverbs, articles, a few verbs of motion and tenses. These are words whose exact meaning cannot be given in a dictionary because they are dependent on context for interpretation. Charles J. Fillmore distinguishes five types of deictic markers, namely person, place, time, discourse and social [Batevich F., 2011; Volkova L., 2009].

Person deixis refers to grammatical markers of communicator's roles in a speech event. First person is the speaker's reference to him/herself, second person *you* is the speaker's reference to a listener, and third person is the reference to those who are neither speaker nor listener. Still, pragmatic meaning of personal pronouns is sometimes revealed only within the context of conversation. *We* and *us* can include or exclude the addressee(s) (Cf.: Shall *we* go and have a drink./ *We* are going for a drink. Will you join *us*?), *you* can be used to talk about people in general, including both the speaker and listener (e.g. *You* must tell the truth), and *they* may refer to a particular but rather vague group, often the authorities, the neighbours, etc. (e.g. I bet *they* put taxes up next year.).

Spatial, or place, deixis refers to the relationship between space and the location of individuals within the discourse. In English, the distinction between close to speaker (proximal deixis) and away from the speaker (distal deixis) is realized in demonstratives (*this/that*), adverbs (*here/there*), phrases (*in front, in back, at our place, out back*) and verbs used to mark movement to or from the speaker (*come/go, bring/take*). However, spatial deixis is based not only on physical distance between the speaker and the people or things referred to, but also on psychological distance, when the speaker wishes, say, to mark something which is physically close as psychologically distant. It is then a matter of speaker's attitude towards the referent, so that *this/these* can be used to show acceptance or interest, and *that/those* to show dislike and rejection [Swan M., 2009].

Temporal, or time, deixis refers to the time relative to the moment of speaking (*now* vs. *then, today, tonight, yesterday, tomorrow*, etc.). To interpret these expressions a definite calendar time reference must be indicated; otherwise, confusion may occur. For example, *then* can be used with both past and future time, and *next week* or *in a fortnight* can only be understood if you know what day the speaker is located in time.

Discourse deixis has to do with keeping a track of reference in the unfolding discourse. For instance, pointers such as *this/that* are used to indicate the distance between the arguments. *This/these* usually refers to the ideas just mentioned, while *that/those* refers back to more distant places in the discourse. In fact, there is a variety of deictic markers to point to different parts of the written discourse (*the former/ the latter, as previously mentioned, in this section, in the following chapter*, etc.). The frequency of such deictic markers varies across types of text. The more formal the discourse, the more markers may be needed to keep the text coherent [Hatch E., 1992].

Social deixis, which is used to code social relationships between the addresser and addressee, includes honorifics, titles of address, vocatives and pronouns. Absolute deictic markers are forms attached to a social role (e.g. Mr. President), while relational deictic markers locate persons in relation to the speaker rather than by their roles in the society (e.g. grandma). In English, social deixis is mostly represented by lexical items and is not normally coded in the pronoun system, except for the pronoun *we* used in announcements proclaimed by company offices, etc. (royal, editorial, author's "we").

It follows that much of the textual meaning and discourse pragmatics can be understood by looking at deictic markers, which have a pointing function in a given context and locate communication in a definite time, space and relationship reference.

THE USE OF EPITHETS IN FICTION TEXT (based on Harper Lee's novel "To Kill a Mockingbird") Ella Mintsys, Olesya Monyuk (Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)

Epithet, one of the most frequently used stylistic devices, has been in the focus of linguists' and literary critics' attention for many years. Such linguists as O.O. Potebnya, O.M. Morokhovskiy, I.R. Galperin, Yu.M. Skrebnev, V.A. Kukhareenko and others investigated the nature, structure and functions of epithets in their works. However, some of the epithet-related problems haven't been completely solved, among them is the approach to epithet classification, the issues of its emotive nature, its functioning in different styles of English, etc.

O.N. Veselovskyi was the first to analyze its ontological characteristics [2, 213]. L.I. Timofeyev states that any adjective can be considered to be an epithet [6, 217]. I.V. Arnold views epithet as a lexico-syntactical trope as it can perform the syntactical functions of attribute, adverbial modifier or address [1, 130]. I.R. Galperin defines epithet as a stylistic device based on the interaction of logical and contextual meanings in an attribute that can be expressed by a word, phrase or even sentence [3, 137]. According to V.A. Kukhareenko an object can be modified by an epithet with a metaphorical meaning and not just with a logical one [4, 53].

The given research is aimed at analyzing the epithets in the novel by the famous American writer Harper Lee "To Kill a Mockingbird" [5] which is characterized by the use of a variety of stylistic devices, epithet being central among them.