



Отримано: 4 червня 2026 р.

Прорецензовано: 15 червня 2026 р.

Прийнято до друку: 20 червня 2026 р.

Email: lpradiivlianna@vspu.edu.ua

ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1752-8613>

Email: kosetskayakarisha@gmail.com

DOI: [http://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2026-30\(98\)-73-77](http://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2026-30(98)-73-77)Pradiivlianna L. M., Kosetska K. A. Euphemisms as a mechanism of linguistic manipulation in Margaret Atwood's «The Handmaid's Tale» and Kazuo Ishiguro's «Never Let Me Go». *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія» : серія «Філологія»*. Острогор : Вид-во НаУОА, 2026. Вип. 30(98). С. 73–77.

UDC: 811.111'373.49:821.111-31.09

Liudmyla Pradiivlianna,
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University
Karina Kosetska,
Master's Student,
Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University

EUPHEMISMS AS A MECHANISM OF LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN MARGARET ATWOOD'S «THE HANDMAID'S TALE» AND KAZUO ISHIGURO'S «NEVER LET ME GO»

The article examines euphemization as a mechanism of linguistic manipulation in dystopian fiction, based on Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale and Kazuo Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go. The study is grounded in cognitive linguistics, semantics, and stylistics, as well as in theoretical approaches to the relationship between language, thought, and social control (Sapir, Pinker, Allan & Burridge). Euphemism is reconsidered not merely as a politeness strategy, but as a tool of conceptual framing that influences perception, evaluation, and moral judgment.

The paper reviews contemporary research on dystopian discourse, where language is understood as a means of ideological control, identity suppression, and, at the same time, a potential space of resistance. It identifies a research gap: while large-scale linguistic systems of control (such as Newspeak or institutional discourse) have been extensively studied, euphemisms have rarely been analyzed as an independent mechanism of manipulation.

The analysis distinguishes four types of euphemisms: religious-ideological, bureaucratic, medical, and deindividuating. It is demonstrated that in Atwood's novel euphemisms function primarily through sacralization and institutional legitimation of violence, whereas in Ishiguro's text they operate through medicalization and internalization, normalizing exploitation and suppressing ethical response. In both cases, euphemization contributes to moral neutralization, emotional distancing, and the production of compliant subjects.

The study concludes that euphemisms are a powerful instrument of cognitive and ideological control, operating through reframing and reinterpretation of reality. Further research may expand the corpus and deepen the analysis of linguistic manipulation strategies in dystopian and non-dystopian discourse.

Keywords: euphemism, linguistic manipulation, dystopia, language control, normalization of violence.

Прадівляння Людмила Миколаївна,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
Вінницький державний педагогічний університет імені Михайла Коцюбинського
Косецька Каріна Андріївна,
магістр,
Вінницький державний педагогічний університет імені Михайла Коцюбинського

ЕВФЕМІЗМИ ЯК МЕХАНІЗМ МОВНОЇ МАНІПУЛЯЦІЇ В РОМАНАХ МАРГАРЕТ ЕТВУД «ОПОВІДЬ СЛУЖНИЦІ» ТА КАДЗУО ІШІГУРО «НЕ ВІДПУСКАЙ МЕНЕ»

У статті досліджується евфемізація як механізм мовної маніпуляції в антиутопічній прозі на матеріалі романів Маргарет Етвуд «Оповідь служниці» та Кадзуо Ішігуро «Не відпускай мене». Теоретичну основу дослідження становлять положення когнітивної лінгвістики, семантики та стилістики, а також концепції взаємозв'язку мови, мислення й соціального контролю, розроблені Е. Сепіром, С. Пінкером, К. Алланом і К. Беррідж. Евфемізм розглядається не лише як засіб мовленнєвої ввічливості, а й як інструмент концептуального переосмислення дійсності, що впливає на сприйняття реальності та моральну оцінку суспільних явищ.

Проаналізовано сучасні підходи до вивчення мови в антиутопії, де вона постає засобом ідеологічного контролю, придушення індивідуальності та водночас простором для спротиву. Виявлено дослідницьку лауну: попри значну увагу науковців до мовних систем контролю, зокрема Newspeak та інституційного дискурсу, евфемізми рідко розглядаються як самостійна стратегія маніпулятивного впливу.

У результаті аналізу виокремлено чотири основні групи евфемізмів: релігійно-ідеологічні, бюрократичні, медичні та евфемізми деіндивідуалізації. Доведено, що в романі М. Етвуд евфемізми служать засобом сакралізації насильства та його інституційної легітимізації, тоді як у романі К. Ішігуро вони забезпечують нормалізацію експлуатації через використання медичної термінології та поступове прийняття нав'язаного контролю самими персонажами. В обох творах евфемізація сприяє моральній нейтралізації насильства, послаблює емоційне сприйняття репресивних практик і формує покірність установленому порядку.

Зроблено висновок, що евфемізми є важливим інструментом когнітивного та ідеологічного контролю, який діє через переосмислення та переоцінку реальності. Перспективи подальших досліджень пов'язані з розширенням корпусу текстів та поглибленням аналізу мовних стратегій маніпуляції.

Ключові слова: евфемізм, мовна маніпуляція, антиутопія, мовний контроль, нормалізація насильства.

Introduction. It has long been recognized that language functions not only as a means of communication but also as a mechanism that shapes how individuals perceive and interpret reality. As Edward Sapir famously observed, human beings are «very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society» (Sapir, 2008: 209). The scientist thus



suggests that language plays a crucial role in structuring worldviews and social experience. Contemporary linguists, however, tend to reject strong deterministic interpretations of this idea emphasizing instead that language influences rather than fully determines our thought. Thus, Steven Pinker notes that although language can «give us insight into who we are» (Pinker, 2007: vii), we shouldn't see language «as an insidious shaper of thought», because «it is not» (Pinker, 2010: 14). Language is not a simple intermediary between objective reality and subjective perception, but a system that actively guides our interpretation and evaluation of the world.

Within this framework, euphemisms (originating from Greek *euphēmía* – ‘use of words of good omen’ meaning «a pleasant replacement for an objectionable word that has pejorative connotations» (Bussmann, 2006: 388)) emerge as a particularly effective linguistic strategy, enabling speakers to reframe socially sensitive or disturbing phenomena in ways that reduce emotional impact, normalize problematic practices and, as Pinker observes, «veil» meanings through indirect expression (Pinker, 2007). This function becomes especially visible in dystopian fiction, where language is deliberately engineered as a tool of manipulation and ideological control.

Analysis of Recent Publications. Contemporary academic sources regard dystopian literature as a powerful medium for social and political critique, tracing its evolution from early 20th-century roots to contemporary fiction. The authors create oppressive settings to mirror real-world anxieties and examine the questions of totalitarianism, surveillance, and gender control.

By definition, dystopian literature depicts «any alarmingly unpleasant imaginary worlds, usually of the projected future» (Baldick, 2001: 74). Language in such fiction serves a strategic tool that ensures the survival of the totalitarian state. As Massaad states, «The manipulation of language in dystopian narratives offers a unique lens to examine how authoritarian regimes can shape reality, suppress individual autonomy, and maintain societal dominance» (Massaad, 2025: 71).

In the research on the «Sociolinguistics of Power and Identity Suppression», the scholar emphasizes that language in dystopian narratives functions as an instrument of power that can exercise total control over the individuals and thus reshape or suppress their identity (Massaad, 2025). These main functions of the language have been discussed in recent publications that analyse the works of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*, George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and 1984, Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*, Lius Lowry's *The Giver*, Ngugi wa Thiong'o *Matigari* and *Petals of Blood* (Khattak, 2025; Massaad, 2025; Mohmukwe, 2025; Murkett, 2026; Pradivlianna, Gladio, 2025).

Language in these novels functions as «a political weapon, designed to impose ideology; designate roles and entrench hierarchies; provoke mass hysteria; limit communication and freedom of expression, and maintain patriarchal authority» (Murkett, 2026: 1). It is used specifically to normalize «the exploitation and [it] suppresses resistance by presenting obedience, creativity and emotional restraint as virtues» (Khattak, 2025: 51). In such contexts, linguistic systems created by the novelists, whether in the form of Orwellian Newspeak, Atwood's controlled naming practices, Lowry's precision of language, or any other institutional discourse, operate by limiting the range of expression and normalizing specific interpretations of reality. As the researchers argue, language helps to create «an allusion of caring» (Pradivlianna, 2025: 179); it reproduces «the interests of dominant groups» that use «narrative of care, duty and inevitability» thus presenting ideological constructs as natural (Khattak, 2025: 49) and leading to the internalization of «exploitation, reinforcing the hegemonic structures that govern them» (Khattak, 2025: 43).

At the same time, scholars stress that language in dystopian fiction is not exclusively a tool of control, but also functions as «a means of challenging oppression» (Massaad, 2025: 71). Kristina Murkett argues that in Atwood's novel language offers «a route out of passive acceptance» (Murkett, 2026: 1). The main character, Offred, by writing down her memories, could «stop herself from being totally overwhelmed by this totalitarian system, and hold onto some semblance of freedom. For freedom of expression is exactly that: freedom» (Murkett, 2026: 5). Massaad, focusing on works of Orwell, Bradbury and Atwood, also proves that «despite linguistic control, language serves as a tool for resistance» (Massaad, 2025: 78). Pradivlianna notices that Lowry's main character's «newly-acquired ability to perceive language and to express himself in a more complex and linguistically diverse way» allows him to recognize the limitations of his community and ultimately leads to the protest against it (Pradivlianna, 2025: 177). In this way, the language becomes a space of resistance, where acts of writing, storytelling, or linguistic awakening enable characters «to preserve their identities and challenge the state's authority» (Massaad, 2025: 77).

Thus, contemporary approaches show language in dystopia as a means of control and identity deprivation but also as a way to challenge and overcome them. However, as we have shown above, modern researchers typically analyse large-scale linguistic systems focusing on major aspects of language control. Comparatively little attention has been paid to specific linguistic strategies within this process. Hence our interest in the role of *euphemisms*. In most analyses of dystopian fiction, euphemistic language is acknowledged only implicitly, as part of broader mechanisms of ideological manipulation, rather than examined as an independent object of study.

Yet euphemisms perform a crucial function within these systems: by replacing direct or emotionally charged expressions with neutralized or positively connoted alternatives, they make harmful or violent realities appear normal, neutral, justified, or even necessary. In this sense, euphemistic language does not merely soften expression but actively contributes to the construction of socially acceptable interpretations of violence, inequality, or control. Thus, the mechanisms of linguistic manipulation observed in dystopian fiction can be seen in the subtler, yet powerful, strategies that operate at the level of lexical choice.

The aim of the article is to analyze euphemization as a mechanism of linguistic control in dystopian literature, based on the novels *Never Let Me Go* and *The Handmaid's Tale*. To achieve this goal, the following **objectives** are addressed: to identify the functions of euphemisms; to analyze their realization in the selected texts; to determine their role in the normalization of violence.

Research Methods. This study adopts an integrated approach to the analysis of euphemization as a strategy of linguistic control in dystopian literature. The analysis combines perspectives from cognitive linguistics, semantics, and stylistics. Cognitive linguistics provides the theoretical framework for understanding how euphemistic expressions reshape perception. Semantic analysis focuses on mechanisms of meaning transformation, including lexical substitution and the manipulation of denotation and connotation. Stylistic analysis examines how these linguistic choices are embedded in narrative structures and contribute to the normalization of violence and control. Taken together, these approaches enable a comprehensive examination of how euphemisms function as a tool of manipulation in *Never Let Me Go* and *The Handmaid's Tale*.

Contemporary scholars define euphemisms widely – as «the set of communicative strategies we have evolved to refer to a topic under a taboo, without actually contravening its terms» (Ayto, 1993: 1), and more specifically – as «a polite, indirect expression



instead of a direct, offensive one» (Brown, 2013: 158), characterized by «avoidance language and evasive expression... [used] as a protective shield against... disapproval» seeking «to avoid being offensive» (Ayto, 1993: 3). Euphemization takes place on a lexical level, syntax and grammar (for example, the passive voice in place of the active for self-exculpatory reasons). Key elements of euphemisms are understatement and litotes.

Euphemistic force is often «heavily dependent on its context» (Ayto, 1993: 6). Keith Allan and Kate Burridge specify: «If this seems to imply that euphemism and dysphemism are matters of purely lexical choice, that is not in fact the case. [...] euphemism and dysphemism are principally determined by the choice of expression within a given context [...]. We cannot properly judge something as euphemistic or dysphemistic without this information» (Allan, Burridge, 1991: 4). Euphemisms function as a protective «shield» against social disapproval, operating through the strategic selection of expressions that obscure or mitigate potentially offensive realities.

While traditionally associated with politeness and taboo avoidance, such linguistic strategies also play a broader role in shaping perception, as different expressions of the same event can produce different cognitive and emotional responses. That is why, euphemism can be understood not merely as a stylistic device, but as a mechanism of control that aligns closely with the forms of linguistic manipulation depicted in dystopian fiction.

Findings and Discussion. Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* have been widely examined as paradigmatic texts for exploring the relationship between language, power, and identity in dystopian contexts. Research on Atwood's novel typically foregrounds the role of controlled discourse, including ritualized greetings, biblical intertextuality, and systematic renaming, as mechanisms that suppress individuality and naturalize ideological domination. Studies of Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* tend to focus on more subtle forms of linguistic conditioning, emphasizing how euphemistic terminology (e.g., «donations», «completion») contributes to the normalization of exploitation. While both texts are consistently analysed in terms of discourse control and identity formation, the specific function of euphemism as a distinct linguistic strategy is usually treated only implicitly, embedded within broader discussions of ideology, narrative voice, or institutional language. This reveals a gap in the research, where euphemism operates as a crucial mechanism of cognitive and emotional control.

In both novels, we observe different types and functions of euphemisms: religious-ideological expressions, bureaucratic, medical euphemisms, and euphemisms of deindividualization. In this part of the paper, we will look at these four categories of euphemistic terminology.

1. Religious-Ideological Euphemisms in *The Handmaid's Tale*.

One of the most prominent types of euphemistic language in Margaret Atwood's novel is represented by religious and ideological euphemisms, which are not merely lexical substitutions but instruments of ideological control. These expressions do not simply soften reality but also sacralise violence, making it morally justifiable and socially necessary.

A key example is the word *Ceremony*, which denotes the ritualized sexual act imposed on handmaids for reproductive reasons. The lexical choice completely eliminates any association with coercion, reframing the act as a formal and legitimate practice. This effect is reinforced in the narrative through its routine presentation:

«*The Ceremony goes as usual*» (Atwood, 1985: 80).

The phrase *as usual* normalizes this behavior, while the word *ceremony* evokes connotations of order, tradition, and religious duty. As a result, violence is not seen as such, but rather integrated into a system of sacred practices.

Another example is *Salvaging*, which refers to public executions:

«*This is a district Salvaging, for women only*» (Atwood, 1985: 243).

The word *salvaging* is typically associated with saving or preserving something valuable, but in this context it carries a completely opposite meaning. It symbolizes the destruction of human life, yet frames it as a form of moral purification. The brevity and neutrality of the utterance further suppress emotional reactions, presenting the execution as a routine, communal act.

Similarly, the neologism *Prayvaganza* (Atwood, 1985: 59), (a blend of *prayer* and *extravaganza*) designates mass religious gatherings associated with forced marriages and executions. This hybrid structure trivializes and aestheticizes oppressive practices, transforming them into public performances disguised as celebrations of faith. Additional examples such as *Particicution* (Atwood, 1985: 249), reinforce this pattern by merging participation with execution, encouraging collective involvement in acts of violence.

Therefore, religious-ideological euphemisms in Atwood's novel actually serve as a mechanism for sacralization. In other words, they do not conceal violence, but reconstruct it within a religious discourse that legitimizes and sustains the existing regime.

2. Bureaucratic Euphemisms in *The Handmaid's Tale*.

Another important group consists of bureaucratic euphemisms, which rely on administrative and institutional language to obscure the human cost of oppressive practices. Unlike religious euphemisms that glorify violence, bureaucratic language functions to abstract and dehumanize.

For instance, the term *Colonies* refers to toxic labour camps where people are sent to clean up radioactive waste, inevitably leading to their deaths. In the narrative, this is presented in neutral and procedural language:

«*The ones who've committed crimes... they're sent to the Colonies*» (Atwood, 1985: 53).

The passive voice excludes the agent of action, while the term *Colonies* evokes neutral or historical associations rather than suffering or death. Thus, a linguistic distance is created from the reality of violence.

Similarly, expressions like *Resettlement* and *sent away* (Atwood, 1985) function as administrative euphemisms, avoiding strong emotional impact. These terms shift the focus from individual experience to institutional procedures, reducing people from subjects of lived reality to objects of policy.

The key mechanism lies in achieving impersonality through abstraction. Bureaucratic language does not deny violence; instead, it renders it distant, technical and emotionally neutral.

In this way, bureaucratic euphemisms become a tool for creating emotional distance, transforming concrete acts of oppression into seemingly neutral administrative processes.

3. Medical Euphemisms in *Never Let Me Go*.

In Kazuo Ishiguro's novel, euphemistic language is primarily constructed within medical and institutional frameworks. These euphemisms normalize death by presenting it as part of a clinical and regulated process, thereby neutralizing its ethical implications.



The most striking example is the term *donation*, which refers to the forced removal of organs from cloned individuals. In the novel, the process is depicted in a calm and routine manner:

«*He'd just come through his third donation*» (Ishiguro, 2005: 9).

Using the adverb «just» and the ordinal structure (the third donation), the process is described as scheduled and expected, giving the impression of being similar to a standard medical treatment. The euphemism completely eliminates any elements of suffering, reframing exploitation as an act of contribution.

Similarly, the term *completion* is used to denote death:

«*I heard about Chrissie, I heard about how she completed during her second donation*» (Ishiguro, 2005: 150).

The verb *completed* suggests closure or fulfilment, rather than loss of life. In this way, death is linguistically transformed into a natural endpoint of a process, removing its heavy emotional and ethical weight.

The *recovery centre* (Ishiguro, 2005) in the novel is the place where donors are kept between operations. The phrase evokes associations with healing and care, while in reality these spaces are actually transitional stages leading to death.

Unlike Atwood's emotionally charged and ritualistic language, Ishiguro's style is subtle and restrained, characterized by calmness and neutrality. This stylistic choice reflects the characters' acceptance of their fate and their internalization of the system, without any overt resistance.

Thus, this medical-like, subtle language in Ishiguro's novel functions as a mechanism of normalization, transforming ethical horror into routine healthcare practice and promoting moral neutrality.

4. Euphemisms of Deindividualization.

One more category includes euphemisms that erase personal identity and replace it with socially imposed roles. These linguistic units function not merely as labels, but as instruments of construction and control.

In «*The Handmaid's Tale*», names like *Offred* (Of-Fred) and *Ofglen* (Of-Glen) signify possession, indicating that the woman belongs to a specific Commander. The protagonist explicitly reflects on this loss of identity:

«*My name isn't Offred, I have another name, which nobody uses now because it's forbidden*» (Atwood, 1985: 72).

This statement highlights the tension between imposed and authentic identity. The naming system reduces individuals to relational functions, effectively erasing their personal history and autonomy. This linguistic mechanism deletes personhood, facilitating the dehumanization necessary to treat individuals as utilitarian objects.

The term *handmaid* itself functions as a euphemism. While it suggests service or assistance, it masks the reproductive exploitation that defines this role. The word replaces the concept of a person with a functional one within the system.

In *Never Let Me Go*, a similar process unfolds through the terms such as *student* and later *donor*. At the beginning of the story, the main character says: «*...There were all kinds of possibilities open to us Hailsham students that weren't open to them*» (Ishiguro, 2005). The word *students* creates an illusion of normal life and development, masking the characters' predetermined fates. As the story progresses, this label is replaced by *donor*, which reduces individuals entirely to their biological function.

Thus, euphemism of deindividualization becomes a mechanism for identity manipulation. It replaces the concept of a person with that of a role, thereby facilitating control, obedience and the suppression of individuality.

Conclusions and Further Research. Analysis of euphemisms in *The Handmaid's Tale* and *Never Let Me Go* reveals that, despite differences in discursive frameworks, euphemisms in both novels perform a common function of the construction and maintenance of social control through linguistic manipulation.

In Atwood's narrative, euphemisms are primarily embedded in religious-ideological and bureaucratic discourse. Religious-ideological euphemisms sacralise violence and present coercion and punishment as morally justified and divinely sanctioned. In turn, bureaucratic euphemisms contribute to the abstraction and deindividualization of these acts, transforming concrete experiences of suffering into neutral administrative procedures. Together, these linguistic strategies create a system in which control is enforced through a combination of ritual, fear, and ideological pressure.

In contrast, Kazuo Ishiguro's novel relies predominantly on medical and institutional discourse. Medical euphemisms normalize exploitation and death by framing them as routine elements of healthcare practice, thereby eliminating their ethical dimension. This normalization is further reinforced by euphemisms of deindividualization, which gradually replace personal identity with functional roles. As a result, control in Ishiguro's narrative is not imposed through overt coercion, but rather seen by the characters as a natural and unquestionable aspect of reality.

Despite these differences, both novels demonstrate that euphemistic language plays a role in moral neutralization and cognitive regulation. Whether through sacralization, bureaucratic abstraction, or medical normalization, euphemisms reshape people's perception in such a way that violence and exploitation become acceptable, invisible, or even necessary. Both models ultimately produce the same outcome: compliant individuals no longer recognize the oppressive nature of the system to which they belong.

Further research may extend the present analysis by examining euphemization across a broader corpus of dystopian and non-dystopian texts in order to determine whether similar mechanisms of cognitive framing and normalization operate beyond explicitly totalitarian settings. A comparative approach incorporating political, media, and institutional discourse would allow for a more precise evaluation of how euphemistic strategies function in real-world contexts of power and persuasion.

References:

1. Allan, Keith, Burridge Kate (1991). *Euphemism and dysphemism: language used as shield and weapon*. Oxford University Press. 263 p.
2. Atwood, Margaret (1985). *The Handmaid's Tale*. McClelland and Stewart. Toronto. 311 p.
3. Ayto, John. *Euphemisms*. (1993). Over 3,000 ways to avoid being rude or giving offence. Bloomsbury. London. 332 p.
4. Baldick, Chris (2001). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford University Press. 280 p.
5. Brown, E. K. (2013). *The Cambridge dictionary of linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. 481 p.
6. Bussmann, Hadumod (2006). *Routledge Dictionary of language and linguistics*. Routledge. London. New York. 1304 p.
7. Ishiguro, Kazuo (2005). *Never Let Me Go*. Faber and Faber. London. 288 p.
8. Khattak, Junaid Ahmed, Adelina Yunita Sari, Idrees Talha (2025). Ideological Control and Power Dynamics in Kazuo Ishiguro's «Never Let Me Go»: A Critical Discourse Analysis through a Marxist Lens. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 5 No. 1. P. 43-54. DOI: 10.52622/joal.v5i1.421



9. Massaad, Madoline. (2025). Sociolinguistics of Power and Identity in Dystopian Fiction. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. Vol-10, Issue-2. P. 71-79. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.102.12>
10. Mohmukwe, Mansuru Usmanu. (2025). A Comparative Study of Dystopian Themes in the Works of George Orwell and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o: Exploring Power, Oppression and Resistance. *ISR J Arts Humanit Soc Sci*, 1(2). P. 57-79.
11. Murkett, Kristina. The Handmaid's Tale – The Power Of Language and The Language Of Power. English & Media Centre. URL: <https://www.englishandmedia.co.uk/e-magazine/articles/63966> (retrieved 20.04.2026)
12. Pinker, Steven (2010). *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*. HarperCollins Publishers. 546 p.
13. Pinker, Steven (2007). *The stuff of thought: language as a window into human nature*. Viking. USA. 499 p.
14. Pradivlianna L.M., Gladio S.V. (2025). Language of Control in Lois Lowry's Novel *The Giver*. *Нова філологія*, (100), 173-181. <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135-2025-100-22>
15. Sapir, Edward. (2008). *The collected works of Edward Sapir. 1, General linguistics* / edited by Pierre Swiggers. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin · New York. 582 p.