

**Андашова Р.М.**

филология илимдеринин кандидаты, доценттин м.а.  
И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз мамлекеттик университети

Бишкек ш.

[r.andashova@gmail.com](mailto:r.andashova@gmail.com)

**Беделбекова Г.М.**

магистрант

И. Арабаев атындагы Кыргыз мамлекеттик университети

Бишкек ш.

[bdlgul@mail.ru](mailto:bdlgul@mail.ru)

### АНГЛИС ТИЛИНДЕ ЭМПАТИЯНЫ БИЛДИРҮҮ КАРАЖАТТАРЫ

**Аннотация.** Макалада эмпатияны туюндуруунун тилдик каражаттары жана эмпатиянын башка металлингвистикалык ээ болучулук жана байкоочулук категориялары менен болгон байланышы баяндалган. Туруктуу кош сөздүн мета-түшүнүгүн киргизүү менен, эмпатиянын фокусу менен билдирүүнүн коммуникативдик ашыкчалыгы ортосундагы байланыш көрсөтүлөт. Кабыл алуу процесстеринин лингвистикалык чагылдырылышы үчүн жооп берген предикаттардын жана лексемалардын семантикалык сүрөттөлүшүнө эмпатиянын мета-концепциясынын фокусун киргизүүнүн зарылчылыгы далилденген. Эмпатия сезимдеринин сөз менен чагылдырылышын изилдөө симпатикалык мамиле адамды негизги сүйлөө иш-аракеттерин жасоого түртүшү мүмкүн деп ырастоого мүмкүндүк берет - боор ооруу же симпатия сезимдерин билдирүү. Изилдөөнүн жүрүшүндө алынган натыйжалардын негизинде эмпатия мета-түшүнүгүн лексемалардын, синтаксистик түзүлүштөрдүн, айтымдардын сүрөттөлүшүнө киргизүү анын тил илиминде колдонулуш чөйрөсүн кыйла кеңейте ала тургандыгы аныкталган.

**Негизги сөздөр:** эмпатия, байкоочу, симпатия, ээлик кылуу, көңүл буруу, көңүл айтуу.

**Андашова Р.М.**

кандидат филологических наук, и.о. доцента  
Кыргызский государственный университет имени И. Арабаева

г. Бишкек

[r.andashova@gmail.com](mailto:r.andashova@gmail.com)

**Беделбекова Г.М.**

магистрант

Кыргызский государственный университет имени И. Арабаева

г. Бишкек

[bdlgul@mail.ru](mailto:bdlgul@mail.ru)

### СРЕДСТВА ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ ЭМПАТИИ НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

**Аннотация.** В статье описываются языковые средства выражения эмпатии и связи эмпатии с другими метаязыковыми категориями: посессивностью, наблюдателем. С помощью

введения метапонятия устойчивая пара иллюстрируется связь фокуса эмпатии с коммуникативной избыточностью высказывания. Обосновывается необходимость введения метапонятия фокус смещения эмпатии в семантическое описание предикатов и лексем, отвечающих за языковую репрезентацию процессов восприятия. Изучение вербального выражения чувства эмпатии позволяет утверждать, что сочувственное отношение может побудить человека к основным речевым актам - выражению чувства симпатии или сочувствия. На основании полученных в ходе исследования результатов устанавливается, что включение метапонятия эмпатии в описание лексем, синтаксических структур, высказываний позволяет значительно расширить рамки его использования в лингвистике.

**Ключевые слова:** эмпатия, наблюдатель, устойчивая пара, possessiveness, смещение фокуса эмпатии, соболезнование.

**Andashova R.M.**

candidate of philological sciences, acting associate professor  
Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev  
Bishkek c.

[r.andashova@gmail.com](mailto:r.andashova@gmail.com)

**Bedelbekova G.M.**

master's student  
Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev  
Bishkek c.

[bdlgul@mail.ru](mailto:bdlgul@mail.ru)

## MEANS FOR EXPRESSING EMPATHY IN ENGLISH

The article describes the linguistic means for expressing empathy and relations of empathy with the other metalinguistic categories: possessiveness, Observer. Introducing a meta-conception of a stable pair the author exemplifies the interrelation of an empathy focus with the communicative redundancy of a statement. The paper justifies the necessity for introducing a meta-conception of a focus of empathy shift in the semantic description of predicates and lexemes responsible for linguistic representation of the processes of perception. The study of the verbal expression of sympathy allows to assert that a sympathetic attitude can induce a person to the following speech actions - the expression of sympathy or condolences. On the basis of the research findings the author identifies that introducing a meta-conception of empathy in the description of lexemes, syntactic structures, statements allows to extend considerably the limits of its use in linguistics.

**Key words:** empathy; observer; stable pair; possessiveness; shift of an empathy focus, condolence.

Empathy is the ability to emotionally understand what other people feel, see things from their point of view, and imagine yourself in their place. Essentially, it is putting yourself in someone else's position and feeling what they are feeling. The term empathy was first introduced in 1909 by psychologist Edward B. Titchener as a translation of the German term *einfihlung* (meaning "feeling into"). Empathy means that when you see another person suffering, such as after they've lost a loved one, you can envision yourself going through that same experience and feel what they are going through. While people can be well-attuned to their feelings and emotions, getting into someone else's

head can be more difficult. The ability to feel empathy allows people to "walk a mile in another's shoes," so to speak. It permits people to understand the emotions that others are feeling.

The accuracy and adequacy of the semantic description of words is largely determined by the development and accuracy of the meta-language of description, the creation of which is the main task of linguistics.

Creation and replenishment of the meta-language of description is a primary and important task of linguocognitive science. The terminological system of cognitive linguistics includes not only new terms, but also refined and unified terms already existing in linguistics or borrowed from other sciences. One of such terms - empathy - came to linguistics from psychology.

The term 'empathy' is used in linguistics to describe one of the ways of transmitting information from the speaker's point of view (in W. Chafe's terminology, 'ways of packaging' information [15, p.32]) and implies the possibility of varying the ways of packaging the transmitted information. Taking into account 'empathy' is important for the semantic description of units oriented to the linguistic representation of perception processes. The term 'empathy', along with linguistics, is also found in philosophy and psychology; it was initially used in philosophy, then began to be used in psychology and only then in linguistics. It is clear that the content of the term in these three fields of knowledge has significant differences.

In philosophy and psychology, empathy is associated primarily with sympathy, 'feeling', while in linguistics the term is used to describe the ways in which information is communicated. Empathy is not the only term that 'came' to linguistics from other sciences. V. I. Shakhovskoy explains such borrowing of terminology (as a result of which the original meaning of terms is modified) by the underdevelopment of the meta-language of linguistics [14, p.125], which is difficult to agree with.

The problem is that the system of 'quantitative assumptions' [6, p.76], with which description is carried out, for example, in such sciences as physics, mathematics, in fact, cannot be applied to language. The study of language requires the development of a detailed system of qualitative representations that would constitute the conceptual apparatus of description [11, p.280]. Undoubtedly, the replenishment of the meta-apparatus of linguistics with terms used in psychology and philosophy seems quite understandable, since the study of language in the twentieth century has transcended the boundaries of traditional linguistics and acquired an interdisciplinary character [1, p.62]. There is certainly a common ground between the understanding of empathy in linguistics and psychology, if we take into account that Z. Freud long before S. Kuno and other linguists. Kuno and other linguists connected the concept of empathy with identification, under which (unlike S. Kuno) he understood 'unconscious imitation of adult behaviour by a child, allowing him to master the moral norms of society' [14, p. 167].

In linguistics, the term 'empathy' appeared in functional syntax, one of the first to be used by S. Kuno for 'characterization in degrees of comparison, identification of the speaker with the participant of the event being presented' [3, p. 87; 15, p. 313; 10, p. 4].

Let us consider the way empathy is represented within the framework of linguistic theory. First of all, it can be characterised as a manifestation of anthropocentrism of language, since the idea of anthropocentricity implies the reflection of objective reality from the point of view of the perceiving subject's attitude to it and emphasises the predominant role of a human being in transmitting the perceived information. Thus, empathy can be understood as 'identification of the speaker with the participant or object of the reported event, presentation of something from a certain point of view' [9, p. 9; 13, p. 425].

The content side of the concept of ‘empathy’ consists in attributing to a person the ability ‘to imagine oneself looking at the world through another person's eyes or from another person's point of view, and this ability appears to influence the use of language’ [15, p. 313].

However, empathy as a linguistic term (this is the main difference between its use in linguistics) should not be understood as sympathy or as a merging of the speaker's viewpoints with one of the objects of the utterance. According to W. Chafe, in the sentence *John hit his wife*, the speaker describes the event from John's position without necessarily taking John's side. The narration of an event may take place from a neutral point of view. In such a case, zero empathy occurs. The speaker can show empathy towards another person, describing the event from the position of a participant of the reported event: *John hit Mary* - objective presentation of the event; *John hit his wife* - the speaker shows empathy towards John, as the whole utterance is oriented towards John, Mary in this utterance is his wife; *Mary's husband hit her* - empathy towards Mary, she is the centre of the utterance, John here is Mary's husband. The speaker can also show empathy towards himself. Thus, in the example *I hit John* the speaker's position will be expressed, the situation is presented in this case from his point of view. The focus of empathy is understood as ‘the bearer of the point of view, the starting point in which the speaker places himself, constructing names for other objects’ [10, p. 205]. In a typical situation, the speaker holds his own point of view. In the sentence *Fedor beats his wife* the focus of empathy is marked by the component Fedor. In the statement *Irina's husband beats her*, the focus of empathy shifts to Irina. If (in the above examples) Irina is identified as Fedor's wife, Fedor plays the main role in the utterance; if, on the contrary, Fedor is identified as Irina's husband, Irina becomes the centre of significance of the utterance. In all likelihood, representing a situation through ‘shifting the focus of empathy’ is a fairly common phenomenon in language. There are various ways and means of expressing empathy. Let us consider some of them.

### **Empathy and possessiveness**

Possessiveness plays an important role in the expression of empathy, which manifests itself in the referential use of possessive pronouns (*John hit his wife*) and nouns acting as ‘possessives,’ i.e., possessive, or ‘possessive’ words (*Mary's husband* (Whose husband?) hit her). If, for example, in the above sentences marked by the empathy focus, the corresponding possessive pronoun and noun are removed, these sentences will also lose the empathy focus: *Stepan hits his wife* - *Stepan hits wife*; *Mary's husband hits her* - *Her husband hits her*. According to S. Kuno [14, p.65], there cannot be two viewpoint carriers (i.e. two empathy focuses) in a sentence, otherwise the sentence becomes incorrect:

*Mary's husband hit his wife. – Mary's husband hit her.*

In each of the unmarked examples, the possessive noun and pronoun refer to different referents. Importantly, these referents constitute what we call a stable pair. The members of a stable pair may be related by a familial relationship, e.g. *her sister* (*she is her sister*), *Mary's husband* (*Mary – Mary's husband*), etc., or by other non-random relationships, e.g. *the wallet owner and his wallet*: *Return my wallet to its owner*. In the sentence *Irina's husband asked his wife* such a stable pair is Irina and her husband. The presence of a possessive noun or pronoun in each of the participants of the stable pair leads to communicative redundancy. In other words, these statements contain information that is obviously superfluous for the successful communication process, and one of the possessive words carries the redundancy. As soon as one of them is removed from an utterance, the latter is deprived of redundancy and becomes marked. Let us illustrate it by an example: *My daughter asked her mother* (the stable pair daughter - mother). The phrase *my daughter* implies that: 1) *I have a*

*daughter*; 2) *my daughter has a mother (and it is me)*. The phrase *my mother* implies that: *someone has a mother*.

Thus, on the one hand, examples 2) and 1) actually carry the same information, i.e. one of the possessive pronouns is communicatively excessive; and on the other hand, it is not clear from whose point of view the event is narrated (from the mother's or the daughter's point of view), so there are two empathic focuses in the sentence. If one of the possessive pronouns is removed from the utterance: *My daughter asked her mother* or *My daughter asked me*, it loses communicative redundancy and becomes correct. In case the referents do not belong to the same stable pair, the presence of two possessive nouns/ pronouns referring to different referents does not lead to communicative redundancy and the presence of two empathy focuses. Cf: *Tom's wife asked his sister* (different stable pairs wife  $\Leftrightarrow$  Tom; Tom  $\Leftrightarrow$  his sister) or *Tom's wife asked her sister* (different stable pairs wife  $\Leftrightarrow$  Tom; Tom's wife  $\Leftrightarrow$  her sister), where there is a possessive noun and a pronoun belonging to different stable pairs, thus avoiding communicative excess.

Communicative redundancy, however, cannot be reduced only to the presence of two focuses of empathy in an utterance. Cf. the unmarked: *Blame it on his mother's only daughter* (in special cases, e.g. in the presence of stylistic coloring, this sentence can be considered correct) and the marked *Blame it on himself* or *Blame it on his only sister*, which does not have two focuses of empathy despite its communicative redundancy. It seems that the relationship between communicative redundancy and empathy needs further research.

### **Empathy and the Observer**

In a number of cases, empathy is captured in terms of lexical content. Thus, the English verbs *come* and *go*, among other things, differ in their communicative perspective (empathy): *come implies movement towards the speaker, go - movement away from the speaker* [14, p.27]. These verbs in their semantics contain deictic components orienting the utterance towards the Observer. In other words, the speaker (the Observer) sets a certain 'point of reference' relative to which the movement takes place, *Then he brushed his suit carefully, fixed his tie straight, and went in to the hall* [13, p. 423], where the action is orientated towards the Observer, who is at the point from which the subject of the action starts moving, or *He had come on this hunting safari as Barton's guest* [21, p. 124], in which the Observer is supposed to be at the place indicated by the circumstance of place, i.e. the movement is orientated towards the Observer.

J. Lyons refers verbs denoting movement in the direction from/to the speaker to 'empathic deixis' [2, p. 177]. Let us compare the verbs *come* and *go* with the verb *emerge* (in the sense of appear, emerge): *The swimmer emerged from the lake*, where also appears 'syntactically unexpressed subject of perception (Observer)' [5, p. 26], who places himself in a place from where the lake is visible and the swimmer's movement, after the movement, comes into the Observer's field of vision, or *The moon emerged from behind the clouds*, where the preposition *from* also orients the utterance in relation to the Observer, who, in all probability, is in an open space or in a room close to a window from where he can observe the moon (which, after the clouds moved, began to be in his field of vision).

Thus, sentences with the word *emerge* implicitly contain information about the presence of the Observer. It is the Observer who informs about the object/subject of movement when the object moves and starts to be in its field of vision. The Observer is an orientation, he is at the point where he can see the given movement of the object of perception and report about it. And the orientation to the Observer is so strong that in the situation of displacement there is not just the effect of the presence of the Observer, but this situation of displacement of some object is described from his point of view

(the emphasis is not on what happens to the observed subject/object, but on what the subject/observer sees). Thus, the above statements with the verbs *emerge*, *come* and *go* represent a certain way of perception and conceptualization of the surrounding world by the subject of perception (the Observer), and the reflection of objective reality takes place from the point of view of the attitude of the Observer - a human being. He is in the point of reference of spatial and temporal coordinates.

Observer and empathy clearly illustrate the anthropocentricity of language. However, these categories are essentially different things. In the presence of the Observer (hidden/explicit), the situation is described from his/her point of view. In the presence of empathy, the author of an utterance describes an event from the point of view of the attitude of one of its participants. Y. Cheif rightly refers empathy not to the content itself, but to the ways of its transmission by the speaking / perceiving subject (or, in his terminology, 'packaging phenomena') [11, p. 314]. Empathy is used in one way or another to denote the most significant information in the speaker's utterance and thus determines the predominant role of a person in its transmission.

### **Empathisation by means of you-forms**

According to E. S. Yakovleva, Russian you-forms along with vivid dialogically (cf. various kinds of you in 'self-description': *I can't say anything, he is good!* / *Look how he is dressed up* / *That's how you live like on a volcano* / *How can you sit still here?*) also possess empathy [14, p.48]. The linguist believes that empathy as a property of figurative you-forms is easily derived from the direct meaning of the pronoun you. In fact, you is, 'firstly, an indicator of alienation from the author's I, going beyond this I (i.e. an indicator of dialogue), and secondly, you is an indication of the first, closest interlocutor to the I, which, of course, is this I itself (hence empathy is born: you-world is one's own, close, understandable to the speaker)'

Empathisation with the help of you-forms of events and situations of the external world is clearly visible in the use of pseudo-imperative: Wait for letters again, stay up all night, worry, make phone calls (these are 'sympathetic' statements; empathy is shown by the author in relation to himself); Student take exams, and the teacher will go to theatres (the speaker's sympathy, as the imperative form informs, is on the side of the student). The choice of this particular model of description makes us understand the statement as an expression of sympathy towards the student and, in a sense, condemnation of the teacher. The form of the imperative suggests that the subject (the student) is imposed a corresponding difficult and unpleasant - action. Thus, in the above example, the focus of sympathy (empathy) is marked by the student component.

'Empathy focus shift' may occur when using predicates specifically oriented to convey the Agent's subjective attitudes to the events described. Let us compare the utterance *I like*, marked by 'shift of empathy focus', and *I love*, in which 'shift of empathy focus' does not occur: *I like her style* / *I love music*. In the statement Tom likes Ann, a certain characterization of both Tom and Ann takes place and two elements of information are introduced: 1) Tom is such that he has certain properties; 2) Tom gets a positive impression from Ann (Tom's properties are such that he makes a positive impression on Ann).

'Shifting the focus of empathy' seems to be manifested in the fact that the syntactic structure of the utterance Y likes X is such that the subject of perception does not coincide with the subject, and, accordingly, the focus of the speaker's empathy is shifted to X. The utterance Y likes X, on the contrary, assumes the coincidence of the perceptual subject and the subject, thus the emphasis is on the perceiving subject, and there is no 'shift of empathy focus'. Example: *I love Kyrgyzstan* / *I love ice-cream*, where only the information that 'Y gets a positive impression from X (or Y has positive emotions towards X)' is introduced; no information about X itself (its properties, features) is

introduced. In this case, there is no 'shift of the empathy focus' (the shift occurs only in the case of the presence of two elements of information).

'Shifting the focus of empathy' in the description of individual lexemes

Taking empathy into account is important for the semantic description of units responsible for the linguistic representation of visual perception processes, for example, the word *clear*. As noted earlier, empathy implies the possibility of variation in the ways of packaging the transmitted information. This possibility of variation can lead to the fact that among the information on which the consciousness of the perceiving subject is focused (during visual perception of some object), a more significant element of it is singled out, which is reflected in the 'ways of its packaging' (according to W. Chafe [11, p. 314]) and affects the use of this or that unit to describe visually perceived objects.

In the situation of visual perception described by the word *clear*, the Observer performs a visual evaluation in which there are two significant elements of information: first, an emphasis on the quality of the perceptual environment of the object (S) (the nature of the environment is such that *Y can see object X and other objects well*); second, an evaluation of the visually perceived characteristics of the object itself. Let us show this with examples. In the sentences *In the clear sky here and there were outlined construction masts and booms of cranes* [7, p. 136] / *Far ahead, in the clear sky, there was a light streak glow of the nearby polar ice* [15, p. 205] / *His feeling was not told anything by these buildings, friendly white on the half-mountain, a huge garden, exactly frozen in the clear air* the more significant element of information is the assessment of the quality of the environment (*sky, air*) in which the object is perceived, and the focus of the perceiving subject's empathy shifts to this assessment [8, p. 437].

To illustrate the presence/absence of empathy focus shifting, let us compare the situations of visual perception presented in the statements *clear X* (*clear sky*) and *bright X* (*bright sky*). In the statements, *the sweet warmth was felt even more strongly outside, and the light poured not only from the sun, but also from the whole blue bright sky* [5, p. 90] / *Paul squinted his eyes looking at the unusually bright summer sky* visual perception of the sky is presented as successful, and no information is introduced about the quality of the sky as a natural environment for perception of objects, the emphasis is primarily on the intensity of the sky's impact on the observer's visual receptors. Thus, when using the word *bright* to describe visual impressions, the evaluation of the visual characteristic of the object itself (the intensity of the impact on the Observer's visual receptors) is emphasised; it is only stated what X is like. This suggests that there is no shift in the focus of empathy when attributing the qualitative characteristic *bright* to the object.

Condolence is stylistically more emotionally charged than sympathy and is used most often in a formal setting, orally or in writing. Condolence is a kind of empathy, but it has its specifics of expression and use that are different from the use of empathy. As a rule, condolence is appropriate to use only as an expression of sympathy for great misfortune, grief. In a ritual situation, condolences are more stereotypical and stereotyped. Condolence has certain characteristics, it is appropriate for several days after death and, therefore, loses its relevance several months or years after the sad event. Considering the practical foundations of expressing empathy in English communicative discourse, several conclusions have been drawn. Empathy and condolence are used in human speech as a reaction to negative situations. Condolence is a kind of empathy and has its characteristics. Situations of using condolence are different from situations in which empathy is used. All situations in which a sympathetic reaction was encountered can be divided into two groups. The first group includes situations that do not depend on a person and are caused by external circumstances.

The second group includes situations in the occurrence of which the person himself is to blame. The specificity of English culture is the love of the British for animals. We learned that people show sympathy and condolences not only to people but also to animals. It also became known as tradition, and custom was reflected in the expression of sympathy in the English language. We know that tea is a traditional English drink. They find tea to be soothing and nurturing and warm. This is reflected in English idioms. There is an idiom associated with expressing sympathy “tea and sympathy”. We also found that the most common word for expressing sympathy in the English language is the word “sorry “. And also very often, especially in the press, no special words are used to express sympathy. The author constructs the narrative in such a way that it becomes clear to the reader from the context. Condolence is used only as an expression of sympathy for great misfortune or grief.

Condolences are the most stereotypical and stereotyped characters. Also, condolence has certain characteristics: it is appropriate for several days after death and, therefore, loses its significance a few days after the event. The condolences we have analyzed can be divided into two types, which correspond to two types of communication.

In conclusion, we would like to note that the multidimensionality of the term empathy allows it to be used to describe the ways of transmitting information from the speaker's point of view, pseudo-imperatives and figurative you-forms, predicates, as well as for the cognitive interpretation of the semantics of linguistic means reflecting anthropocentric linguistic representations focused on the human figure, including its visual perception. At the same time, the inclusion of this term in the model of description of other units and semantic or syntactic structures can significantly expand the scope of its use. The study of the verbal expression of sympathy allows us to assert that a sympathetic attitude can induce a person to the following speech actions - the expression of sympathy or condolences. Various factors influence the choice of a specific speech act. Emotions such as sympathy and condolence are aimed at establishing speech contact and maintaining speech and social relations with the interlocutor, at regulating them. An important task of empathy in colloquial speech is to play the role of a means of maintaining the conversation. For sympathy, the most important thing is the self-expression of the addressee, for condolence - the fulfillment of a social act.

#### **List of used literature**

1. Андашова Р.М. Основные признаки дискурсивных текстов информационных технологий / Р.М. Андашова // Вестник КРСУ. 2023. Т. 23. № 10. – С. 59-63.
2. Англо-русский словарь по лингвистике и семиотике (АРСЛС) / сост. и ред. А. Н. Баранов, Д. О. Добровольский. – М.: Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН, 2003. – 640 с.
3. Горлина А. С. Фокус контраста // Лингвистический вестник. – Ижевск, 2000. Вып. 2. – С. 85-92.
4. Куно С., Кабураки Э. Эмпатия и синтаксис // Общественные науки за рубежом. РЖ. Сер. 6. Языкознание. – М., 1979. № 2. – С. 154-156.
5. Лосев А. Ф. В поисках построения общего языкознания как диалектической системы // Теория и методология языкознания (методы исследования языка). – М.: Мысль, 2008. – С. 5-92.
6. Николаева Т. М. Эмпатия // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990.
7. Падучева Е. В. Высказывание и его соотнесенность с действительностью. – М.: Наука, 2015. – 272 с.

8. Селиверстова О. Н., Сулейманова О. А. Эксперимент в семантике // Изв. АН СССР СЛЯ. 2018. Т. 47. № 5. – С. 431-443.
9. Сусов И. П. Интеграционный этап в развитии лингвистической теории и сущность вклада когнитивной лингвистики // Когнитивная лингвистика: Современное состояние и перспективы развития. – Тамбов, 2020. Ч. 1. – С. 5-19.
10. Цветкова О. И. Эмпатия как профессиональная характеристика в деятельности психолога дошкольного учреждения: дисс. ... к. психол. н. – Тверь, 2017. – 208 с.
11. Чейф У. Данное, контрастивность, определенность, подлежащее, топики и точка зрения // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 2012. Вып. 11. – С. 277-317.
12. Huxley A. Brave New World. London: Longman, 2022. – 245 p.
13. Kuno S. Subject, Theme, and the Speaker's Empathy // Subject and Topic / C. N. Li (ed). N. Y.: Acad. Press, 2021. – P. 417-444.
14. Laumer K. A Trace of Memory. N. Y.: Tor Books, 2012. – 170 p.
15. Lyons J. Semantics. London, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2017. – 371 p

**Рецензент: кандидат филологических наук, доцент Эргешбаева Н.А.**