

POLITICAL PHRASEOLOGY AND FEATURES OF ITS TRANSLATION IN MODERN ENGLISH JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE

O. V. Yemelianova

Candidate in Philology, Associate Professor

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3277-1227>

T. M. Maga

Student

Sumy State University

2, Rymtskyi-Korsakov St., Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

yelenayemelyanova@ukr.net

Nowadays, journalistic discourse takes one of the leading places in public life. One of its main aims is to influence the recipients and form their views and opinions with the help of pragmatic function of persuading. Here one can find a combination of concise logical thoughts that reflect the objective state of affairs and subjectivity, which reflects the author's personal feelings and emotions in the subject matter under discussion. Phraseological units are an integral part of journalistic discourse, due to which there is a possibility to express the opinion or position of the author more clearly, or to form a positive or negative attitude to events, to reveal the emotional state of the speaker and to emphasize the attention of the recipients on the subject of the message.

The richest modern phraseological layer concerns political life. These are the terminological names of the phenomena of political life, traditional phraseological units and proverbial phrases used by politicians in their speeches in order to give them a certain expression and increase the influence on the recipient, capture their attention. Political phraseology has not been studied extensively, therefore, it is necessary to identify its characteristic features and the specifics of its decoding in the language of translation. The translation of such linguistic units is quite complicated and delicate task, because a translator should convey the original author's idea and preserve pragmatic effect of the text. Following methods of decoding are distinguished: phraseological equivalent, phraseological analogies, word-for-word translation and descriptive translation of phraseologisms. The correct perception and understanding of the phraseologisms also depend on the background knowledge and psychological sense of the recipients.

Keywords: *discourse theory, journalistic discourse, typology of phraseology, political phraseological units, methods of translation.*

Introduction. The new century gave momentum to an even more dynamic way of life, that resulted in the emergence of massive information flows. That, in its turn, made the journalistic discourse be of high importance. Phraseology that is often used in this type of discourse constantly attracts the attention of publicists, politicians, who are eager to use its expressive stylistic capabilities. The richest modern phraseological layer relates to political life.

Political phraseology, traditional phraseological units, proverbial phrases used by politicians in their speeches in order to add expressiveness and strengthen the influence on the recipient are not properly analyzed. That is why there is a need to investigate these linguistic phenomena, its role in the journalistic discourse and ways of conveying the meaning to the recipient.

The necessity of **the research is foregrounded** by the fact that political phraseology is becoming more and more widespread in the journalistic discourse, the reason for which is

that politics is the sphere of human activity, the importance of which increasingly attracts the attention of people. Moreover, there are currently quite a few works on the study of political phraseology and, in particular, the specificity of translating their meaning into the target language. Thus, there is a need for their in-depth study and analysis. **The subject area of the research** is English phraseology in the journalistic discourse. **The specific topic** is political phraseology in modern English journalistic discourse and the features of its translation into Ukrainian.

The research material consists of phraseological units contained in speeches or publications and statements of various politicians within the framework of English journalistic discourse. **The aim of the research** is to identify the characteristic patterns of political phraseology and effective ways of decoding them in the language of translation. In accordance with the purpose of the study **the following tasks were formulated**: to characterize the features of the journalistic discourse; to analyze the role of political phraseology in the modern English journalistic discourse; to outline the regularities of the implementation of the translation methods of political phraseology. During the study, **the following methods were used**: discourse analysis, descriptive analysis, a method of comparative analysis.

Results of the research. Linguists, literary scholars, philosophers, and psychologists have analyzed the concept of discourse for centuries. In-depth study of this concept began with the second half of the XX century in a number of disciplines in the field of humanities and social sciences. It was at this time that they began to study the language not only from the point of view of its grammatical structure, but also its direct use in the social context. The phenomenon of “discourse” is rather ambiguous, because its meaning is associated with any manifestation of communication in society and is considered to be the bearer of information in the communicative process.

The emergence of the theory of discourse greatly influenced the development of the science of language and set a difficult task to researchers to give a linguistic description of this phenomenon. The theory of discourse arose in the context of linguistics and never lost its connection, but consistently went to the differentiation of the subject of its study, to the distinguishing between the concepts of “text” and “discourse”. For example, the linguist V. H. Borbotko notes that discourse is a text composed of communicative units of the language – sentences and their associations in larger unities, that are in the linear semantic connection, which permits it to be perceived as an integral entity [3, p. 8].

Discourse is interpreted as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes the social context, information about participants in communication, knowledge of the process of production and the perception of texts [6, p. 31]. T. A. van Dijk notes that discourse is a complex communicative event, “an essential component of socio-cultural interaction which characteristics are interests, goals, and styles” [6, p. 32].

In modern linguistics, discourse is understood as a complex phenomenon, consisting of participants of communication, the situation of communication and the text itself [3, p.9]. In other words, discourse is an abstract invariant description of structural-semantic features that are implemented in specific texts.

Today journalistic discourse takes a particularly important place in public life. Mass communication is a system of social interaction of a specific type. The significance of this communicative sphere is stipulated by the fact that its focus is on human society, which acts as a limited social space with specific internal processes and cultural characteristics.

Back in 1946, the American researcher H. Lasswell proposed a scheme of mass communication, that is considered to be a classical one: “who said what, through what channel of communication, to whom, with what result” [16, p. 33]. The main aspects that are fundamentally important for characterizing the process of mass communication are pointed out precisely and clearly.

Publicism is an open speech of the author, addressed to the reader and full of social information [8, p. 24]. This implies that the author “necessarily deals with social issues or considers private issues, but certainly from a social perspective” [14, p. 76].

The journalistic discourse is considered to be the most dynamic, lively, active, ever-changing type of discourse. It is associated with real events and phenomena occurring in the life of society, reflects particular actions in a certain period of time. The journalistic discourse necessarily involves a dialogue between the addresser and the addressee, it influences, convinces, directs in a certain direction of reflection.

N.A. Pavlushkina believes that the journalistic discourse is a certain text, foregrounded in a specific situation, and associated with a certain event taking place at the same time and in the same space. The differentiating features of the journalistic discourse are dynamism, dialogue and openness [12, p. 254]. The journalistic discourse is seen as any text that has political and ideological overtones, designed to influence the subject [9, p. 70].

Nowadays expressive stylistic capabilities of phraseology are of great appeal to publicists and politicians. Phraseology is also of high interest to linguists who try to unveil the secrets of this linguistic phenomenon. Prerequisites for establishing of phraseology as a scientific discipline had been already found in the works of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay [2], A. A. Potebnya [13], N. M. Shansky [15], and other researchers, who singled out in the speech “compressed verbal groups” that have irregular meaning and are syntactically indivisible.

The task of phraseology includes a comprehensive study of the phrasicon of a particular language. Important aspects of the study comprise the stability of phraseological units, the consistency of phraseology and the semantic structure of phraseological units, their origin, and basic functions. A particularly difficult area of phraseology is the translation of phraseological units, that requires considerable experience in this field of knowledge.

Phraseological units are defined as combinations that are firmly established in the language [15, p. 48]. I. K. Kobyakova sees phraseological units as “a stable combination of tokens with a completely or partially reconsidered meaning” [10, p. 84]. There is a number of phraseological clustering classifications both in terms of semantic fusion and function they perform, or in terms of the type of context in which they are used. Phraseological units are classified according to the semantic principle, that is to the degree of motivation of its meaning (the relation between the meaning of the whole unit and the meaning of its constituents). Three groups are distinguished: phraseological fusions, phraseological unities, phraseological combinations [4, p. 26].

Phraseological fusions are non-motivated units. The phraseological fusion is a semantically indivisible phraseological unit in which its integral meaning is completely noncorrelated with the meanings of its constituents. For example, *to get the ax means вилетіти з роботи, бути звільненим, to bang heads together – розмірковувати разом*.

Phraseological unities are motivated through the image expressed in the whole construction. They are based on the metaphors, which are transparent. Phraseological unity is a semantically indivisible and holistic phraseological turn, the meaning of which is motivated by the meanings of its constituents [4, p. 27]. The indivisible meaning of a phraseological unity arises as a result of the merging of the meanings of its constituent words into a single generalized-figurative. Phraseological unity allows the insertion of other words. For example: *to put a (small) Band-aid over the problem – намагатися вирішити проблему*.

Phraseological combinations are motivated; one of their components is used in its direct meaning while the other can be used figuratively. The phraseological combination is “a phraseological turn in which there are words with both free meaning and phraseologically related ones. Phraseological combinations are formed from words with free and phraseologically related meanings” [4, p. 27]. For example: *to drive down the price – знизити ціну* (“Trump offered a plan to drive down the price Medicare pays for some drugs...”) (The Wall Street Journal, Oct 26, 2018).

Phraseological fusions and unities are semantically indivisible formations, the meaning of which corresponds to a word or combination. Phraseological combinations represent a semantically differentiable formation, the meaning of which is equal to the meaning of their constituent words.

Phraseological units are usually related to a particular sphere of human activity. Thus, the phraseological units associated with science, history, art, economics, politics, etc., are distinguished. One of the richest modern phraseological layers is the one related to social and political life. These are terminological denominations of social and political life, traditional phraseological units and proverbial phrases used by politicians in their speeches to add expressiveness and increase the influence on the recipient, capture his attention. The modern English journalistic discourse abounds in such phraseological units as *grip on power* meaning “тримати вузди правління в своїх руках”, *crowded field* – передвиборча гонка з великою кількістю учасників, *turderous reign* – кровопролитне правління etc.

Political phraseology plays an important role in the life of modern society. We listen to radio propaganda speeches of well-known politicians, follow the debates of state figures on television, read in newspapers articles that propagate or criticize power. The modern English journalistic discourse is characterized by the wide use of phraseological units, thanks to which there is an opportunity to express the opinion or position of the author more clearly, or to form a positive or negative attitude to events, to reveal the emotional state of the speaker and to emphasize the attention of the recipients on the subject of the message.

For a political text to have a planned pragmatic effect on an addressee, it must meet certain requirements, such as presentation, political passion, and imagery. All this can be achieved using certain stylistic, rhetorical and linguistic means, among which there are stable combinations of words or idioms [1, p. 28].

Moreover, political phraseological units provide the most important contact-reestablishment function, and they also give politicians the opportunity to be “close to the people”. We can easily find out some phraseological units, some fixed phrases in the headlines. The vivid and unexpected combination of words is often used in headlines to attract the attention of the potential recipient (reader, listener, viewer).

Translation of phraseological units from English into other languages presents significant difficulties. This is due to the fact that many of them are bright, figurative, concise and polysemantic. When translating, it is necessary not only to convey the meaning of the phraseological unit but also to display its imagery, while not losing its stylistic function. It is also necessary to take into account the features of the context [1, p. 32]. Decoding phraseological units is a very laborious work for every translator. Firstly, phraseological units are characterized by ambiguity. Secondly, many phraseological units represent the so-called turnovers with a distinguished national character. Thirdly, the translator should take into account the features of the context in which the phraseological units are used.

There are three key cases of a fixed phrase translation:

(1) complete congruence of expressions in two languages (equivalents are similar in syntactic structure and lexical composition).

For example: “*Bush urges end to oil 'addiction'*” (Feb 6, 2006). The word “*addiction*” is translated as “*залежність*”. Addiction is a pathological form of behavior, which is expressed in the desire to escape from reality by changing your mental state by taking certain substances (alcohol, drugs) or constantly fixing attention on certain objects or activities (gambling, computer games), which is accompanied by the development of intense emotions. In this case, it is clear from the context that psychological dependence here is rather metaphorical since former President George W. Bush described the US dependence on imported oil and considers it a “serious problem” for the country, that is, “illness” that must be cured by any means.

(2) partial congruence (both expressions have a similar image, but differ in lexical-syntactic terms).

For example: “*The BBC's Justin Webb in Washington says his brief is to bang heads together and make sure that the things that went wrong in the early days of the relief effort are sorted out*” (“Bush declares Katrina prayer day” BBC News website, Sep 9, 2005). The phraseological unit here is the expression “*to bang heads together*”, which literally means “*стукнути голови разом*”. But after considering the context, it is clear that politicians' heads (their skills and expertise) are to be gathered in order to find out the best solution of

the problem at hand. Therefore, this phraseological unit is translated in this context as “*добре разом обміркувати*”.

(3) complete lack of equivalent in the language of translation [5, p. 46].

An example of the third case is the words of George W. Bush, who, speaking in the White House, announced that each family that had suffered from hurricane Katrina would receive initial cash assistance. And then “*he promised that the government would be with the survivors ‘for the long haul’*” (“Bush declares Katrina prayer day” BBC News website, Sep 9, 2005). The expression *for the long haul* is the phraseological unit and has no match in the language of translation, and therefore it should be translated descriptively: “*він обіцяв, що уряд буде разом з тими, хто залишаться живими протягом довготривалого періоду випробувань*”.

Most researchers, such as V. N. Komissarov, L. F. Dmitrieva, S. E. Kuntsevich, N. F. Smirnova distinguish four main ways of translating phraseological units. These include:

- 1) method of phraseological equivalent;
- 2) method of phraseological analogue;
- 3) literal translation or translation using calque;
- 4) descriptive translation of phraseology [7, p. 31].

A phraseological equivalent is such a figurative phraseological unit in the target language, which fully corresponds in meaning and stylistics to the phraseological unit in the source text and is based on the same image.

“*‘Jackal!’ the activists shouted as Matteo Salvini, the strongman of Italy’s populist government, arrived at the other end of the street. ‘Jackal!’*” The exclamation here is translated using the phraseological equivalent and sounds in Ukrainian like “*шакал*”. The direct meaning of the word “*jackal*” is a wolflike mammal, but in this context, of course, indignant people do not call this cunning wolf, and the word acquires a completely different, metaphorical meaning, namely “*підлий обманщик*”.

As V. N. Komissarov notes, the second type of phraseological correspondences is the so-called phraseological analogues. In the absence of a phraseological equivalent, a phraseological unit with the same figurative meaning, based on a different image, should be selected in the target language [10, p. 63]. For example: *to take the helm – взяти везду правління в свої руки* (“*Mr. Bolsonaro, who will take the helm of Latin America’s biggest nation, is farther to the right than any president in the region, where voters...*”) (“New York Times”, Oct 30, 2018).

The literal translation or translation using calque can be applied only if in the result of the calque there is an expression which figurativeness is easily perceived by the recipient and does not create the impression of unnatural and unaccepted norms in the language of translation [7, p. 52].

Another well-known political phraseological unit, “*Buck stops here*”, is the motto of Harry Truman, which is now often used in political articles and is translated as “*Фішка далі не йде*” (Jeet Heer “*Trump: The buck does not stop here!*” The New Republic magazine website). This phrase originates from a world-famous poker game. In this game, the buck is passed in a circle and each rose is placed in front of the player to whom the turn to take cards has come. If a player does not want to take a card, he transfers the buck to the next player. In a figurative sense, the buck is an attribute of a person responsible for making decisions. Speaking that “*Buck stops here*” (“*дали не йде*”), former president Harry Truman made it clear that he was the person who made the final decision. And since this inscription stood on his desktop, it meant that the most important decisions were made here (in his office).

It is accepted by the linguists that in order to explain the meaning of the phraseological unit that has neither equivalent in the translation language nor analogue, the translator must resort to descriptive translation. For example, the English idiom *hardcore voters* (“*Inside the minds of hardcore Trump supporters*” Pacific Standard Journal, Feb 15, 2018) is decoded as “*виборці, що постійно віддають свій голос за одну і ту ж партію*”. In this case, there is no equivalent or analogue in the Ukrainian language, and therefore the descriptive method of translation is used.

However, speaking about the process of perceiving phraseology, it requires some effort on the part of the recipient. Having analyzed the material, we can conclude that it consists of a number of stages, which include the direct perception of the text, understanding of its meaning and awareness of the addresser's intentions. At the same time, not everyone is able to adequately perceive phraseology. The recipient must have certain linguistic and background knowledge necessary for a successful interpretation of the implied message communicated via phraseological units.

For example, the expression “*Big Brother-style jail*” (“*Dutch open ‘Big Brother’ jail*” BBC News, Jan 19, 2006) in the article refers to the prison of the Lleistryad city, thoroughly equipped to control all prisoners. Such a comparison was made due to the similarity of this prison with the totalitarian system, one of the characteristic features of which was the total continuous spying on each citizen of the country. The notion of “Big Brother” as the personification of this phenomenon was first used in George Orwell's “1984” novel. To decipher this statement correctly, one must possess the necessary background knowledge, namely the content of the above-mentioned book and have the idea of the totalitarian regime.

Conclusions. The journalistic discourse is considered to be the most dynamic, lively, active, ever-changing type of discourse. It is distinguished by the wide use of phraseological units, which have certain pragmatic effects on the recipients. Decoding phraseological units presents quite a difficult task for every interpreter due to the fact that many of them are bright, figurative, concise and polysemantic. The conducted research shows that the most efficient ways of phraseological units' translation comprise: method of phraseological equivalent; method of phraseological analogue; literal translation or translation using calque; descriptive translation. The best translation solution is to find an identical phraseological unit. However, it should be recognized that the number of similar correspondences in English and Ukrainian is extremely limited, especially for nationally biased phraseological units, in this case, one is looking for analogue. However, for the nationally biased phraseological units calque and a descriptive translation is frequently used.

Perception of the phraseological unit by the recipient consists of a number of stages, which include the direct perception of the text, understanding of its meaning and awareness of the addresser's intentions. Translation of political phraseology presents certain difficulties, therefore one must be careful about translating these language units in order to convey to the reader exactly the same idea that was expressed in the source text and to ensure the same pragmatic effect.

ПОЛІТИЧНА ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЯ ТА ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЇЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ В СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ПУБЛІЦИСТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

О. В. Смельянова

Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3277-1227>

Т. М. Мага

Студентка

Сумський державний університет

вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна

yelenayemelyanova@ukr.net

Публіцистичному дискурсу на сьогоднішній день належить особливо важливе місце у суспільному житті. Він наділений прагматичною функцією переконання, спрямованою на вплив на реципієнта та формування його поглядів відповідно до аргументації автора. У даному типі дискурсу можна віднайти поєднання лаконічних логічних роздумів, які відображують об'єктивний стан речей та суб'єктивність, що відображає особисті почуття та емоції автора до питання, що обговорюється.

Фразеологізми є невід'ємною складовою публіцистичного дискурсу. Одним із найбагатіших сучасних фразеологічних пластів є той, що стосується політичного

життя. Це термінологічні найменування явищ політичного життя, традиційні фразеологізми та крилаті вислови, які використовуються політиками у своїх промовах задля надання їм певної експресії та посилення впливу на реципієнта, захоплення його уваги. Політики та публіцисти часто використовують фразеологічні одиниці, які надають можливість яскравіше виразити думку, позицію автора, або ж сформулювати позитивне чи ж то негативне ставлення до подій, розкрити емоційний стан мовця та акцентувати увагу реципієнтів на темі повідомлення.

Політична фразеологія мало досліджена, тому виникає необхідність у виявленні її характерних закономірностей та специфіки її декодування у мові перекладу. Переклад подібних мовних одиниць є досить трудомістким та кропітким заняттям перекладача, адже він має передати читачеві ту саму ідею, яка була закладена в оригіналі, та максимально зберегти наявний у тексті-оригіналі прагматичний ефект. До способів декодування, зокрема, належить метод фразеологічного еквівалента, метод фразеологічного аналога, дослівний переклад або калька, описовий переклад фразеологізмів. У свою чергу, реципієнти повинні мати певні фонові знання та психологічне чуття, щоб мати можливість зрозуміти фразеологізми відповідним чином.

Ключові слова: теорія дискурсу, публіцистичний дискурс, типологія фразеології, політичні фразеологічні одиниці, методи перекладу.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Ахманова О. С. Фразеологическая единица / О. С. Ахманова // Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М. : Институт языкознания РАН, 2009. – 141 с.
2. Бодуэн де Куртенэ И. А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. Т.1 / И. А. Бодуэн де Куртэнэ. – М., 1963. – С. 47–77.
3. Борботько В. Г. Элементы теории дискурса / В. Г. Борботько. – Грозный : Изд-во Чечено-Ингуш. Гос. Ун-та, 1981. – 113 с.
4. Виноградов В. С. Перевод: Общие и лексические вопросы / В. С. Виноградов. – М., 2004. – 115 с.
5. Гак В. Г. Теория и практика перевода: Французский язык: [Учебное пособие] / В. Г. Гак. – Изд. 9-у – М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. – 191 с.
6. Дайк Т. А., ван. Язык. Познания. Коммуникация / Пер. с англ. : Сб. работ / сост. В. В. Петров под ред. В. И. Герасимова; Вступ. ст. Ю. Н. Караулова и В. В. Петрова. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.
7. Дмитриева Л. Ф. Английский для студентов. Курс перевода. / Л. Ф. Дмитриева, С. Е. Кунцевич, Е. А. Мартинкевич, Н. Ф. Смирнова. – М. : Изд: МарТ, 2005. – 304 с.
8. Кайда Л. Г. Позиция автора в публицистике. Стилистическая концепция // Язык современной публицистики: сб. ст. / сост. Г. Я. Солганик. 3-е изд. – М. : Флинта: Наука, 2008. – 58 с.
9. Клушина Н. И. Интенциональные категории публицистического текста (в аспекте культуры речи) / Н. И. Клушина // Средства массовой информации в современном мире. Петербургские чтения: Тезисы межвузовской научно-практической конференции. – СПб, 2008. – С. 70–71.
10. Кобякова І. К. Фразеологічні витоки юридичного, політичного і військового дискурсу / І. К. Кобякова // Матеріали теоретичної конференції викладачів, аспірантів, співробітників та студентів гуманітарного факультету. Частина перша. – Суми : Сумський державний університет, 2008. – С. 84–85.
11. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты) / В. Н. Комиссаров. – М.: Высш. шк., 1990. – 253 с.
12. Павлушкина Н. А. Релевантность массовой прессы как основа взаимодействия с аудиторией / Н. А. Павлушкина // СМИ в современном мире: Петербургские чтения: тезисы межвуз. науч. – практ. конф. СПб., 2010. – С. 254–255.
13. Потебня А. А. Мысль и язык / А. А. Потебня. – Киев, 1962. – 191 с.

14. Солганик Г. Я. Автор как стилиобразующая категория публицистического текста / Г. Я. Солганик // Вестн. Моск. Ун-та. Сер. 10. Журналистика. №3. – 2001. – С. 76.
15. Шанский Н. М. Фразеология современного русского языка / Н. М. Шанский. – М. : Высшая школа, 1985. – 160 с.
16. Lasswell H. D. The structure and function of communication in society / H. D. Lasswell // Bryson (ed.). The Communication of Ideas. N.Y. 1948. – 212 с.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmanova O. S. Phraseological unit / O. S. Akhmanova // Dictionary of linguistic terms. – M.: Institute of Linguistics, 2009. – 141 p.
2. Baudouin de Courtenay I. A. Selected Works on General Linguistics. T.1 / I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay. – M., 1963. – P.47–77.
3. Borbotko V. G. Elements of discourse theory / V. G. Borbotko. – Grozny: Chechen-Ingush publishing house. State University, 1981.– 113 p.
4. Vinogradov V. S. Translation: General and lexical questions / V. S. Vinogradov. – M., 2004. – 115 с.
5. Gak V. G. Theory and practice of translation: French: [Tutorial] / V. G. Gak – Ed. 9th. – Moscow : LIBROCOM Book House, 2009. – 191 p.
6. Dyke T. A, van. Language. Knowledge. Communication / Translation from English: Collection of works / comp. by V. V. Petrov, ed. by V. I. Gerasimov; Intro.art. by Yu. N. Karaulova and V. V. Petrova. – M. : Progress, 1989. – 312 p.
7. Dmitrieva L. F. English for students. Translation course / L. F. Dmitrieva, S. E. Kuntsevich, E. A. Martinkevich, N. F. Smirnov. – M. : Izd : Mart, 2005. – 304 p.
8. Kaida L. G. The position of the author in journalism. Stylistic concept / L. G. Kaida // Language of modern publicism: collection of articles / comp. G. Y. Solganik. 3rd edition M. : Flint: Science, 2008. – 58 p.
9. Klushina N. I. Intentional categories of journalistic text (in terms of the culture of speech) / N. I. Klushina // Mass media in the modern world. Petersburg reading: Abstracts of the interuniversity scientific-practical conference. – SPb, 2008. – P. 70–71.
10. Kobyakova I. K. Phraseological sources of legal, political and military discourse / I. K. Kobyakova // Materials of the theoretical conference of teachers, postgraduates, staff and students of the humanitarian faculty. Part One – Sumy: Sumy State University, 2008. – P. 84–85.
11. Komissarov V. N. Theory of Translation (linguistic aspects) / V. N. Komissarov. – M. : Higher. Shk., 1990. – 253 p.
12. Pavlushkina N. A. The relevance of the mass press as a basis for interaction with the audience / N. A. Pavlushkina // Mass media in the modern world: Petersburg readings: abstracts intercollege. scientific-practical conf. SPb., 2010. – P. 254–255.
13. Potebnya A. A. Thought and language / A. A. Potebnya. – Kiev, 1962. – 191 p.
14. Solganik G. Ya. The author as a style-forming category of journalistic text / G. Ya. Solganik // Vestn. Mosk. Un-that. Ser. 10. Journalism. Number 3. – 2001. – P. 76.
15. Shansky N. M. Phraseology of the modern Russian language / N. M. Shansky. – M. : Higher School, 1985. – 160 p.
16. Lasswell H. D. The structure and function of communication in society / H. D. Lasswell // Bryson (ed.). The Communication of Ideas. – N.Y. 1948. – 212 p.