linguistique spécifique, est inévitable. La question du lien inévitable entre idéologie et langue a attiré l'attention de nombreux chercheurs (principalement des linguistes).

Sur la base de ce lien entre le langage (et même la parole) et l'idéologie, nous pouvons poser plusieurs hypothèses importantes dont le dénominateur commun sera l'interaction et l'interdépendance de ces deux concepts. D'une part, il faut reconnaître que l'idéologie et la structure idéologique de la pensée humaine ne sont accessibles à l'analyse (ou du moins principalement, si l'on tient compte de l'idéologisation d'autres systèmes de signes et de leur utilisation) qu'à travers le langage et sa mise en œuvre dans la parole, et donc que toute étude de l'idéologique est au moins une étude linguistique (ou sémiotique). D'autre part, nous devons également reconnaître que la langue – tant dans sa structure systémique que dans les différents aspects de son utilisation concrète – porte les caractéristiques de l'idéologie, et que ces caractéristiques peuvent être détectées par le biais de l'analyse linguistique [1].

À première vue, le discours est plus important que la langue. Nous choisissons les mots que nous voulons, nous ajustons leur sens. Le discours dominant influence le discours de tous les locuteurs, c'est-à-dire la langue dans son ensemble. Sur la base de nouvelles réalités idéologiques dans la langue, une nouvelle image du monde est créée, la réalité est arrangée d'une nouvelle manière, qui est transmise aux autres générations déjà comme une donnée. Mais la langue est plus qu'un discours, elle a déjà recyclé un grand nombre de discours dominants, nationaux et "importés de l'étranger. La langue doit inévitablement recycler le discours "étranger" dans son propre esprit, le modifier en partie. La langue est à la fois la base de la création du discours et le moyen de son expression et de son interprétation. Ainsi, on peut parler non seulement de "l'idéologie française" comme d'une construction artificielle, mais aussi de "l'idéologie française comme d'une construction artificielle. idéologie française" en tant que construction artificielle créée par l'État français, mais aussi de "l'idéologie française" créée par la langue française dans laquelle (pour paraphraser M. Heidegger) vit la nation française.

Bibliographie:

1. Boutros-Ghali B. Francophonie: vers un espace de cooperations politiques et economiques//Revue francaise de Geoeconomie. 2019. № 10. P. 18-27.

THE NOTION OF MANIPULATION IN LINGUISTICS: BASIC APPROACHES TO ITS STUDY

Гарасим Т. О.
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської
мови, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка,
м. Тернопіль, Україна

Довбуш О. І.
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської
мови, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка,
м. Тернопіль, Україна

Скорейко-Свірська І. П.
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської
мови, Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка,
м. Тернопіль, Україна

Gradual change in the scientific paradigm in the humanities – from the general linguistic to the cognitive-discursive one – has led to the shift in focus from the language system to human speech activity and its communicative realization. Language communication is an orderly phenomenon that is based on planning speech actions and choosing the best way to achieve the communicators' aims. All utterances and their sequence perform many functions and have a certain number of goals, on the basis of which the speaker chooses the linguistic means best meeting the communication purpose and the achievement of the expected result. Accordingly, the study of linguistic manipulation means is a priority in the theory of speech interaction, which is based on the target regulating the activity of interlocutors and ensuring the realization of the speaker's manipulative influence on the recipient.

Manipulation is the most universal concept reflecting the mechanisms of hidden psychological influence. It has two basic meanings – direct and figurative or metaphorical. Recently, it is the figurative meaning of manipulation that has become the main content of manipulation and has attracted increasing attention of researchers. In its figurative meaning, it has a rather high differentiation, i.e. we can consider a conceptual system where manipulation is a generic concept. The system of these concepts includes manipulative influence, psychological manipulation, manipulation of public opinion and consciousness, interpersonal manipulation, social and political manipulation, etc. [2, p. 10].

Manipulative techniques have been used since ancient times in different cultures. However, the doctrines and sophisticated theories of mind manipulation have developed recently, in the 20th century: it was during this period that the emphasis in the study of the influence on human consciousness through natural language shifted from ideology to language techniques. This happened due to the rapid development of the humanities and the growth of interdisciplinary research. In the last decades of the 20th century, a new field of linguistics, psycholinguistics, has emerged, and it has been actively studying the problems of speech influence, focusing on the influence on the addressee from a linguistic point of view [2, p.16]. At the same time, the problem of manipulation of consciousness as a type of social and psychological influence is considered within the

framework of such disciplines as sociology, psychology, political science, management, and journalism.

Linguists are interested in the phenomenon of manipulation as manipulative influence, carried out with the help of natural language through the skillful use of linguistic resources in order to influence covertly the cognitive, emotional and behavioral spheres of the addressee's life. The scholar R. Goodin first defined the term manipulation as a deceptive and hidden influence used by a speaker (manipulator) to intentionally directly influence someone's beliefs, desires and/or emotions, usually not in his or her interests or at least not in his or her interests in the current context [6, p. 59]. So, the manipulator's beliefs, desires, and emotions dominate. Moreover, the linguist A. Weir defines manipulation as a kind of the speaker's hidden influence on the addressee, who does not know or understand the ways in which the manipulator influences his choice [7, p. 149].

Thus, manipulation is a kind of psychological influence that is not obvious to the target audience, as they believe they make decisions and choices on their own. As a rule, manipulation tools are often based on the principle of sincerity and the addresser's trust in the addressee. In linguistics, there is an approach to interpreting manipulation not only as a negative phenomenon since it all depends on the purpose the addressee pursues: the process of manipulation often develops not because there is malice, but because there is a sincere belief of its organizers in a particular idea or program [3, p.102].

Therefore, modern understanding of manipulation is the programming of the thoughts and aspirations of the masses, their moods and even their mental state in order to ensure their behavior as required by those who own the means of manipulation. This is the art of controlling people's behavior through targeted influence on their consciousness and instincts, the skillful imposition of intentions on other people that do not necessarily coincide with their own desires and needs. Therefore, we define language manipulation as the purposeful use of language means to covertly influence the addressee in the way the speaker desires.

Manipulative influence as a subject of linguistic research has its own peculiarities. When studying manipulation, linguistics focuses on the process of exerting influence, on the linguistic means chosen to ensure its effectiveness. Unlike other sciences, where manipulative strategies are presented schematically, without describing specific examples, linguistics analyses the cases of using language tools for one-sided presentation of information. The language tools used on a regular basis constitute certain tactics being a part of manipulative strategies. The latter have a lot in common with general communication strategies and tactics (the strategy of political correctness, evasion, falsification, distortion, etc.). The difference lies in the overall macro-intention of the addresser: manipulative strategies are ultimately designed to create a positive or negative perception of the object.

Structurally, linguistic influence as an act of communication implies the presence of a subject/addresser (the one who seeks to influence the interlocutor with the help of language), an object/addressee (the one who experiences this influence) and communication goals (*informational* in order to transfer a message to the addressee and

make sure it is received; *substantive* to get, learn something or change the interlocutor's behavior; *communicative* to establish, maintain contact with the interlocutor) [1, p. 9].

There are two types of manipulation in terms of its subjects: - interpersonal manipulation, i.e. the use of various means and information technologies and psychological influence on an individual; - collective manipulation, the suppression of people's will by means of spiritual influence on them through programming their behavior [7]. This influence is aimed at the mental structures of a person and is carried out covertly and aims to change people's thoughts, motives and intentions the way a particular group of people want.

The typology of language manipulation with reference to the following kinds is revealed in the following variations: 1) manipulation of options (environment options are modified by increasing or decreasing the available variants, rewards or punishment threat); 2) manipulation of information (a person's perception of opportunities is changed by unconvincingly influencing the individual's understanding of the situation); 3) psychological manipulation (a person is influenced by mental processes different from those involved in comprehension) [5, p. 70].

Different forms of influence on the addressee are also distinguished: 1) manipulative and incorrect speech influence (it is customary to use sophisms to persuade or to resort to bribery, seduction, and provocation inducing in incorrect speech influence); 2) manipulative and actualizing influence (the main features of the actualizer are respect for the interlocutor's personality, honesty, freedom to express his thoughts; whereas the manipulator often does not take into account the addressee's interests); 3) productive and unproductive (conflict) manipulation (productive manipulation involves the creation by the addresser of a positive emotional basis for the addressee to make the desired decision or perform appropriate actions beneficial to both participants in the manipulation process; unproductive manipulation involves achieving a result by demonstrating superiority over the interlocutor, etc.) [1, p.13].

It is worth noting that ensuring the effectiveness of any type of manipulative influence requires taking into account a number of extra-linguistic factors that determine a person's tendency to fall under the influence of psychological manipulation – internal and external. Internal factors include those directly related to the content of messages and their general linguistic arrangement (this is primarily the selection of messages, as it is directly related to the manipulative effects and the evaluative emphasis of the message: it is important how the information is presented and who presents it).

The group of external factors combines socially determined features of the perception of a message by a particular audience, i.e. procedures for manipulating the social characteristics of the audience. Manipulations within social systems are technologies built in ascending complexity: from operating with signs and symbols of social reality to manipulating stereotypes (patterns of speech, behavior, ethnic and social patterns etc.), to manipulative use of mythologies as sacralized stereotypes, value systems of certain audiences and groups [4].

The group of external factors of manipulative influence also includes economic factors, which determine the potential dependence of the media on specific social

members who, by virtue of their authority, are able to influence the spreading and coverage of information in the perspective they need.

Thus, from the linguistic point of view, manipulation is interpreted as the purposeful use of language features to covertly influence the addressee in the way the speaker desires it. The main signs of manipulation are the hidden nature of the influence; the desire to subordinate the addressee to one's will, to change his/her ideas, views; the mastery of linguistic and psychological skills; a special linguistic organization of the text; the lack of the addressee's defensive reaction and the creation of the illusion of independent decision-making. And since the study of manipulation in linguistics is closely related to the problem of communication effectiveness and speech influence on the addressee, we see the prospects of further research in the study of communication strategies and tactics used to effectively influence the recipient.

REFERENCES

1. Аккурт В. Методи маніпулятивного впливу у лінгвістиці. *Науковий вісник ПНПУ ім. К. Д. Ушинського.* Одеса. 2020. №30. С. 6–18.

2. Дмитрук О. В. Маніпулятивні стратегії в сучасній англомовній комунікації (на матеріалі текстів друкованих та Інтернет-видань 2000–2005 років) : дис. … канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Київ, 2006. 229 с.

3. Зайцева М. О. Засоби маніпулятивного впливу в сучасному політичному дискурсі. *Лінгвістичні дослідження* : зб. наук. праць ХНПУ ім. Г.С. Сковороди. 2012. Вип. 34. С. 101–104.

4. Мотузенко Б.І. Маніпуляції як соціальна технологія. *Соціальні технології: актуальні проблеми теорії та практики.* Вип. 4. Київ – Запоріжжя – Одеса. 2000.С.111–124.

5. Faden M. S., Beauchamp T. L. A History and Theory of Informed Consent. New York : Oxford University Press, 2014. 365 p.

6. Goodin R. E. Manipulatory Politics. New Haven and London : Yale University Press, 1980. 234 p.

7. Ware A. The Concept of Manipulation : Its Relation to Democracyand Power. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1981. 228 p.

ІМЕННИКОВІ КОМПОЗИТИ-НОВОТВОРИ У НІМЕЦЬКОМОВНІЙ ПРЕСІ: СИНЕРГЕТИКА КОДУВАННЯ І ДЕКОДУВАННЯ

Дребет В. В.
*доктор філологічних наук,
професор кафедри німецької філології
та методики навчання німецької мови
Тернопільський національний педагогічний университет
імені Володимира Гнатюка
м. Тернопіль, Україна*