

DIRECT SPEECH'S IDIOMATIC RESOURCES IN CH. DICKENS' NOVELS

Пряме мовлення як корпус цитат, приписуваних тотожному персонажеві, утворює словесну маску. Розуміння сенсу діалогічних реплік передбачає залучення цілої множини висловлювань партнера. Розмовні разові вислови стають ідіомами і зумовлюють ефект просвітлення (ага-феномен).

Ключові слова: *словесна маска, семантичний ланцюг, мовленнєвий реєстр, разові вислови, просвітлення, метонимія, іронія, натуралізм, пекло.*

Прямая речь как корпус цитат, приписываемых тождественному персонажу, образует словесную маску. Понимание смысла диалогических реплик предполагает вовлечение целого множества высказываний партнера. Разговорные разовые высказывания становятся идиомами и вызывают эффект озарения (ага – феномен).

Ключевые слова: *словесная маска, семантическая сеть, речевой реєстр, разовые высказывания, озарение, метонимия, ирония, натурализм, ад.*

Direct speech as a corpus of quotations ascribed to identical character builds up a verbal mask. The comprehension of a dialogical cue's meaning presupposes the involvement of the whole set of partner's utterances. Colloquial casual enunciations become idioms entailing the effect of illumination (aha-phenomenon).

Key words: *verbal mask, semantic net, speech register, casual enunciation, insight, metonymy, irony, naturalism, inferno.*

There is a wondrous and miraculous property of inverted commas: they designate not only the segments of speech conceived as alien but also the deviations from direct meaning (including those ensuing from speech's alienation). Therefore both direct speech and idioms are marked with the same signs attesting the mutuality of these textual phenomena. Together with idiomatic shift the motifs are designated that belong to the latent contents of narration and provide its integration. Numerous examples of the interplay between direct and idiomatic meanings are to be found in Ch. Dickens' "Pickwick" in the cues of Weller and Jingle. In particular colloquialisms are converted to idioms that become a code's conventions due to their use within the tissue of direct speech. In particular such a marvelous transfiguration is promoted with the discussion where the antithetic enunciations are confronted taken directly from colloquial practice as the so called "casual enunciations" [1: 83]. It is known that G. Flaubert "used to be involved in the game of 'garçon' where the players had to use in a conversation the banalities only" [7: 255]. This device of restricting speech with colloquial commonplaces is widely applied by Dickens in such a way that they turn into local idioms. One can say of a kind of psychological "aha-phenomenon" or illumination (insight) in such cases.

Direct speech as a corpus of quotations builds up a kind of anthology that can be conceived as a background of lyrical digressions within an epic narrative. Subsequently such enunciations

are regarded as alien and promote textual stratification in the same manner as speech registers where generalities and particulars are segregated and confronted. Besides, direct speech can be regarded as the device of textual division into parcels and therefore as the excerpts from some previously existent alien text. In this respect such a textual corpus of a portrayal can be regarded as a verbal mask put upon the face of a person. The idea of mask has been introduced in the theory of semantic nets as “the neighborhood within an ordered set of parameters” and as “an excerpt from a matrix of direct product” [6: 103-104] so that being applied to lexical units it represents their compatibility within the given text: “Each mask represents a viewpoint for the restrictions put upon the basic variables” [6: 106]. Respectively it means inevitably bringing forth irony as the consequence of the discrepancy with the genuine portrait. Thus the conflict of portrayal vs. disguise arises that becomes the necessary satellite of each direct speech entailing the constant presence of ironical hue. In its turn it is the strategy of metonymic drift that prevails both in the referential ties between the distant enunciations and between the adjacent cues of discussion.

As far as the cues of direct speech within a dialogue do not represent a mere exchange of phrases but delineate a whole portrayal of persons, it is the interaction of personalities that takes place in dialogue; therefore it is not single occasional cues but members of the sets of utterances ascribed to a person that are to be born in mind in dialogues and confronted together. Dialogue can be described with what has been called “semantic resolution” [3: 123] as far as the references acquire the outlook of ramified structures (branching) in opposite to concatenation proper for monologues. In each dialogue one has to deal with the intersection of scene and role as the textual corpses. It entails the problem of identity of the person to whom all enunciations are ascribed. In particular the experience common to the both partners is supposed to be known that enables these enunciations being integrated. The strategy and structure of a dialogue ensuing from such latent presupposition has been described still by S.D. Balukhaty [2: 24] and in K.S. Stanislavsky’s doctrine of textual perspective.

The convenience of Dickens’ text for direct speech’s analysis ensues not only from the abundance of characters’ enunciations but also from the melodramatic simplification, exaggeration of a puppet-like portrayal taken from theatre. The chaotic conglomeration of cues (ensuing from the fact that novels are overcrowded with secondary persons) makes up a dense tissue that is a certain encumbrance for the detection of the action’s filament. It has already been stressed that “there’s nothing problematic for the writer himself” [5: 119] so that problematic complications are replaced with melodramatic puzzles to be solved; respectively the characters are taken as constant in the manner of masks’ theatre (as that of Pecksniff from “Chuzzlewit”) [5: 210]. As the precursor of naturalism with its inclination towards the ugliness Dickens demonstrates the same bestial approach to human nature [8: 212] that Balzac has declared but the bestiality becomes here the bridge to still aggravated vision of infernality. Apparently Dickens has paved the path towards the flourishing of detective novel of nowadays with its peculiar dialogues of interrogation that come back to the initial form of catechism. Murder’s investigation is the obligatory element in the majority of Dickens’ texts in contrast to “pure” adventures of earlier times. In this respect one can say of the so called Balzac’s paradox in regard to Dickens, that’s of the contradiction between the initial intentions and terminal results so that “the creation educates the creator” and “the previous pre-artistic attitude towards the object becomes refuted” [4: 29, 66]. It concerns attempts to reconcile the characters that turn out to be overthrown with their own words.

As to the peculiarities of the characters' communicative strategies ensuing from such aesthetic approach they concern first of all the motivational problem. A spontaneous chaotic conglomeration of enunciations can be regarded as the zero level of motivation within a dialogic speech. The seeming disparateness of speech represents actually the strict order of inferno concealed under melodramatic mask. As an example one can take "Oliver Twist" that has appeared simultaneously with E. Sue's "The Mysteries of Paris" where the underground of urban society as the genuine wellspring of detective criminal background was scrutinized. It is the inner societal chaotic disorder that endangers the life as the continuation of the old images of vanity and quite different from those of adventurous perturbations as the plot-making events. Such environment is conceived as hell so that the old and widely explored motif of VANITY becomes intensified to the degree of INFERNALITY.

Such is for example the scene with Nancy's hysteric fit ("Oliver Twist", Chapter 39) that precedes her repentance as the decisive turning point of narration. It begins with ill Sikes' complaints and demands for help with the phrase of "*lend us a hand and let me get off this thundering bed anyhow*" As the girl has given the help he replies with curses of her awkwardness and provokes her cry. Then the exchange of cues follows introducing Nancy's tirade. Sikes expresses himself with exclamation "*Whining, are you?*" and forbiddance of "*sniveling*" retorted with Nancy's rhetoric question of the "*fancy*" in his "*head*". Sikes replies that it is she who "*thought better of it*" with her suggesting him "*be hard upon me to-night*". It becomes here that Nancy's overt words follow: "*Such a number of nights as I've been patient with you, nursing and caring for you as if you had been a child: and this the first that I've seen you like yourself: you wouldn't have served me as you did just now*". Here the concealed experience is half-opened so that Sikes' callousness and ingratitude become disclosed. The person is not only dissatisfied with Nancy's attendance; he demands her keeping silence as a slave. Thus first seemingly casual phrases acquire deeper explanation as the traits of character. There seems nothing to be uttered but spontaneous colloquial phrases, and the consequences they entail are fatal. Nancy's words on NURSING & CARING are here clearly confronted to those of Sikes on WHINING & SNIVELLING. Thus mere colloquial means delineate the moment when Nancy becomes ready for radical transfiguration. HARD is the retort to her being PATIENT at night, and it inevitably provokes her turning from her former comrades and future perishing.

Another example of spontaneous flow of colloquialisms becoming idioms can be found in "Martin Chuzzlewit" – a story of the examination of heirs with happy end and suicide of the rascal Jonas. Meanwhile this plot affords evolving the portrayal of a perfect hypocrite Pecksniff whose speeches are built as a sentio of commonplaces with the destination of concealing his genuine purposes. One finds a bright example of communicative strategy in a kind of a "dialogue between a liar (Pecksniff) and a robber (Jonas)" (Ch. 20). The rascal begins trice with a stupid repetition of the same question – "*what do you mean to give your daughter*". The liar avoids answer with references to "*singular inquiry*", "*many considerations*", "*the kind of husbands*". Then Jonas calls "*me*" as "*son-in-law*", and again Pecksniff retorts with the reference to "*years*" that "*tame down*" his daughter so that Jonas is constrained to agree that the partner "*not obliged*" to reply. At last after a silence Jonas addresses "*Why the devil don't you talk?*" giving thus a pretext for Pecksniff to attempt at mentioning "*your departed father*" whom the rascal is suspected to kill. After the short retort of "*drop it*" he tries to say of "*tender strings*"

and obtains resolute warning of not “*to be crowed over*”. Brutality can be said to be confronted with perfidy in this dialogue. The strategy of diverting conversation from direct answers used by Pecksniff betrays the wide use of metonymic transition (HUSBANDS – *TIME and then *DEATH – TENDERNESS): the seemingly spontaneous flow of commonplaces is directed towards the searches of circumstances that would conceal the secret.

The samples of distant metonymic references are to be found in the novel “Great Expectations” that has a typical melodramatic plot of mysterious heritage: a certain boy, Pip, is benefited with the unknown person who turns out to be the imprisoned criminal Magwich (Provis) to whom he once happened to give an aid while his escape. After the illegal return of the benefactor is disclosed and he perishes, all the miracle of richness disappears as well. Meanwhile this plot (that has also attachments to a known tale of “a king for a night” as the examination of character) gives only the pretext for mapping the world as a latent hell. The genuine axial personality of the novel is Estella who is gradually disclosed as the daughter of the mentioned Magwich and the woman who has been rescued by the lawyer Jaggers (Magwich’s attorney) from gallows and who is now his maidservant. This circumstance has somewhat common with the fate of Barnaby Rudge who was also the “illegal” son of the mother condemned to death and of a lord. In its turn Estella has been adopted (while being three years old) and brought up by a certain lady Havisham once seduced by Compeyson (Magwich’s antagonist). This pair of feminine personalities represents feminine vampires. The overt hint towards such approach is especially stressed in the very beginning with the description of Havisham’s desolate place (with a table) destined for her future burials: “*An epergne or center-piece... was so heavily overhung with cobwebs that its form was quite undistinguishable... I saw speckled-legged spiders with blotchy bodies running home to it, and running out from it...*” (Ch. 11). This map of ugliness is resonant with the first impression of Havisham as an embodiment of death – “*a skeleton in the ashes of a rich dress*” (Ch. 8). Such exposition of vampirism is to be taken in consideration as the initial point of reference for all enunciations of these characters. Moreover, this motif of COBWEB returns in the portrayal of the lawyer (who becomes Estella’s bridegroom) in the dialogue between Pip and Jaggers: “– *Who’s the Spider?– The spider? – The blotchy, sprawly, sulky fellow. – That’s Bentley Drummle*”. Thus the same words of BLOTCHY SPIDER reappear twice with apparent reference to infernal attributes.

The attributes of infernal vampirism are overtly represented in direct speech. To begin with, Havisham introduces herself to the boy Pip as “*a woman who has never seen the sun*” (Ch. 8) and then asks him: “– *What do I touch? – Your heart. – Broken!*” And it is the same words that are repeated in the dialogue with Estella immediately afterwards: “*You can break his heart*” (concerning Pip). Thus the two motifs appear – HEARTBREAK & SUNLESS. They dominate in the utterances of the both feminine persons. They also return in Estella’s own self-portrayal: “... *I have no heart – if that has anything to do with my memory*” (Ch. 29). In this respect the words about love uttered by Havisham acquire a perverted meaning: “*If she tears your heart to pieces – ... love her...! I adopted her to be loved*” (Ch. 29). Actually such love designates a LURE for a victim. Such motif is to correlate with the initial image of cobweb. This attitude to potential victims gives grounds for the respect attitude towards laughter. Estella says about “*satisfaction it gives to me to see those people thwarted, or what an enjoyable sense of the ridiculous I have when they are made ridiculous*”, and in particular she refers to the sunless and

nightly mood of life of Havisham as “*that impostor of a woman who calculates her stores of peace of mind*” (Ch. 33). It is the final scene of Havisham’s desperation where the transformation of human beings into vampires is disclosed. After the sincere talk with Pip she addresses him: “*I meant to save her from misery like my own... But as she grew, and promised to be very beautiful, I gradually did worse..., I stole her heart away and put ice in its place*” (Ch. 49). It goes about *GOOD INTENTIONS that plaster the way to hell – be here the proverb mentioned. It is here that the confirmation of the birth of Estella is given: “– *But Mr. Jaggers brought her here, or sent her here? – Brought her here. ... – Might I ask her age then? – Two or three*”. Thus the decisive proof of Estella’s is obtained by Pip in view of his competence: it is the motif of AGE known for him that has the fatal significance.

That Jaggers becomes the forerunner of detective authorities is attested with his monologue (Ch. 51). One of the peculiarities of direct speech in detective stories is an obligatory explanatory monologue that terminates the narration, and here one deals with an early specimen of the kind. Jaggers’s solemn harangue arises as a retort to Pip’s audacious remarks concerning Estella: “*I have seen her mother... And you have seen her still more recently... Perhaps I know more of Estella than even you do. I know her father, too*”. The harangue is built as anaphoric construction: each sentence is introduced with the initial apostrophe “*put the case that...*”. And then the awful infernal picture of the world is evolved seen with the lawyer’s eyes: “*...all he saw of children was, their being generated in great numbers for certain destruction... here was one pretty little child out of the heap who could be saved*”. This picture represents the motif of INFANTICIDE together with that of MIRACULOUS SALVATION: let the apparent hints to Malthusian phraseology put apart, it becomes quite obvious that the mentioned motifs can refer to the fate of the Innocents from the Gospel (as opposed to Malthusianism). And the conclusion attests the importance of latency: “*The secret was still a secret, except you have got wind of it*”. Here Jaggers obviously confronts with his vocational regularities (mentioning with despise “wind” that Pip has managed to “get of”) and warns against brutal intrusion into privacy.

The significance of the words used in direct speech can be demonstrated with the story of the meeting of the principal hero with his benefactor retold to Mr. Jaggers (Ch. 40). It begins with meaningful warnings “*don’t commit anyone*” and “*don’t tell me anything*” on the reasons of the addressee not being “curious”. Then a very notable pair of cues follows – those between Pit (“*I merely want [...] to assure myself what I have been told, is true*”) and Jaggers (“*But did you say told or informed? Told would seem to imply verbal communication. You can’t have verbal communication with a man in New South Wales, you know*”). It comes to a remarkable advice of Jaggers: “*take nothing on its looks; take everything in evidence*” that easily can be transformed into a proverbial sentence as a typical trace of insight with evident irony.

“Bleak House” gives a story of a woman from high society (Lady Dedlock) who is persecuted and chased to death for the passion of sincere love and therefore is comparable to Madame Bovary or Anna Karenina. At the same time it is the distinctive feature of detective novel that makes a difference to its counterparts: the final persecution of the woman is carried out with the participation of the detective officer Mr. Bucket. The first cues of Lady Dedlock introduce the principal motif of TEDIOUSNESS which is a counterpart to VANITY as the properties of infernal infamy. “*Bored to death*” is the Lady’s first enunciation and then while the fatal recognition of the manuscript of her former lover her remark follows: “*Anything to*

vary this detestable monotony” (Ch. 2). Meanwhile in reality it goes about opposition to the motif of PASSION that is to be referred to the Lady’s confession at her last (and the first overt) conversation with daughter: “... *think of your wretched mother conscience stricken, underneath that mask*” (Ch. 36). Thus the motif of MASK vs. genuine PORTRAIT appears to be represented with the mentioned opposition of TEDIOUSNESS vs. PASSION.

The Lady’s inadequate reaction to the handwriting couldn’t elope from the observant look of Tulkinghorn who initiates the persecution and then cooperates with such overt rascals as Snagsby and Bucket. He does also bear verbal mask of a devoted servant in the manner of *pereat mundus fiat iustitia* for whom “*sparing the girl, of what importance... is she?*” (Ch. 48). Meanwhile it is in the conversation with Hortense (the Lady’s servant having given them an aid in their persecutions) where he becomes disrobed as a petty rogue and hypocrite forgetting completely pathetic phrases: “*You are a vixen, a vixen! Well, whench, well. I paid you*” (Ch. 42). The staunch lord puts aside all his eloquence and uses the most vulgar phrases. Hortense accuses Tulkinghorn with the particular locution: “*You have attrapped me*” (Ch. 42). The motif of TRAP refers not only to the sphere of hunting. Tulkinghorn’s meanness and vulgarity reveal themselves also in the menaces that he begins to express overtly in regard to women. A very meaningful remark sounds in the conversation with Hortense. She discloses the genuine contents of Tulkinghorn’s activity and calls it with appropriate names: “... *employ me to pursue her, to chase her... It is what you do. Do I not know that?*” His answer refers to an overt threat: “*You appear to know a good deal*” (Ch. 42). Another menace is addressed to the Lady: “*It is no longer your secret. It is my secret...*” (Ch. 48). “*Miserable wretch*” – it is the most appropriate definition of Tulkinghorn made by Hortense (Ch. 42). Paradoxically the tragedy of Hortense accused with the murder of Tulkinghorn consists in the same passionate and affectionate vital attitude that moves the Lady. That is why in spite of the writer’s obvious intentions Hortense appears to be a protestant feminine personality as well as Bucket belongs to the gallery of detestable and perfidious characters. “*You are a devil*”, Hortense says to Bucket, and it becomes true in view of the world’s infernality.

With the death of the Lady’s sweetheart and Esther’s father Hawdon (Nemo) and the appearance of Jo the motif of CONNECTION is introduced that refers to the societal entirety. For the first time it is mentioned by Tulkinghorn in his account of his searches for the copyist: “*I speak of affording some clue to this connexion*” (Ch. 12). Then it appears in the author’s narration together with the motifs of MUD and POWDER (Ch. 16). All these images are summed up in the Lady’s utterance: “*O what a scene of horror!*” (Ch. 16) that almost repeats that used after Tulkinghorn’s account – “*Certainly, the collection of horrors*” (Ch. 12). The motif appears later in “Our mutual friend” designated as that of DUST that becomes there the source of enrichment referring apparently to Ecclesiastes. A very meaningful dialogue attests the invisible connection arising between the Lady and Jo: “– *I am not a lady. I am a servant. – You are a jolly servant!*” (Ch. 16). It obviously refers to the images of a Dame and a Page. It is Jo’s voice that introduces the motifs of hunting and chasing, it is his complaints that foresee the future fate of his Dame: “*they’re all a-watching and a-driving me*” (Ch. 26); “*I’m a-moving on to the berrying (= burying) ground*” (Ch. 46). Ecclesiastical dust of this “burying ground” devours then the Lady. Still more mendacious become then the words of the policeman Bucket who confesses himself (in the conversation with Esther) to be the

cause of Jo's death with "*having warned him out of London*" (Ch. 57). What he calls WARN Jo has felt as DRIVE. And it this motif of PURSUIT that again has united the fates of the Lady and Jo as those of PERPETUAL FLIGHT.

A portrait of a protestant and vindictive personality is to be found in Alice Marwood from "Dombey". It is her voice that accuses the society (Ch. 34) in her recollections of the judicial trial where "*it has always been of my duty*" and there were no mention as to "*whether no one ever owed any duty to me*". She "*was sent to learn her duty. Where there was twenty times less duty and more wickedness*". Such overt confidence is a rare case in the writer's texts. The motif of DUTY is here revealed as the power that makes further her mother become the conscious force of retribution. It obviously implies the unmentioned antonym *RIGHT, therefore it gives grounds to esteem the further conduct as righteous deeds. The decision of the righteousness of revenge finds its substantiation at the encounter with Carker (Ch. 46). The exchange of cues between the mother and the daughter leads to the decision: Mrs. Brown's notice of "*not changed!*" is replied with the notice "*what has he suffered?*" as for Alice there were "*changes enough for twenty*"; then the motif of envy is expressed by the mother ("*And him so rich! And us so poor!*") and resolutely refuted by the daughter ("*not being able ... to pay the harm we owe*"). One could come to the conclusions *to change means to suffer & *poverty is inability to revenge so that the chain arises SUFFER – POISON (*money) – *REVENGE (OWED (= DUTIED) HARM). Thus the motif of FEMININED VINDICATION appears that throws a bridge to Alice's encounter with Dombey (Ch. 52) where any supposition of envy is overtly refuted: "*more powerful than money*" is "*woman's anger*", therefore although "*you should pay her*" as the mother is concerned, "*that is not motive*". The use of the last term attests here Alice's full unselfishness of the planned revenge where the old Mrs. Brown becomes only the tool. The succeeding conversation between Mrs. Brown and Carker's servant Rob is especially interesting as the example of metonymic shifts in interrogation. First of all the "*birdcage*" with "*our parrot*" that "*belongs to... Master*" as the conversation's topics are mentioned. Then follow Rob's warning against "*stroking feathers the wrong way*" and Mrs. Brown comes to immediate questions about Carker: both "*out of place*" and "*didn't take you with him*" are failed (Rob denied to talk), so the attack of invectives followed with the curses of "*insulting dog*", "*ungrateful hound*" mentioning "*talk no more*", "*talk at all*". Rob has become afraid and consents to be "*careful of talking*" and at last gives the answers. Here the transition is traceable of BIRD – FEATHERS – MASTER – HOUND – TALK. Rob hesitates between the fears to be dismissed by Carker and chased by Mrs. Brown, and it is his irresoluteness that provides success. Although the writer makes further all his best to blacken Alice as he does with Hortense making her extravagant person, the Balzac's paradox reveals in the fact that Alice remains one of the brightest characters of Dickens' gallery.

"Our mutual friend" is a story of a heir (John Harmon) who wants to examine the conditions of the inheritance and, in particular, to test the person (Bella Wilfer) predestined as a bride to him. Therefore he pretends to vanish and to appear under alien name (Rocksmith). One takes John Harmon for the killed person found in Thames but finally the mysteries are disclosed with happy end. This plot gives only a pretext for another and much more serious narration of the fate of those who were only partly involved in these adventures: the genuine heroine of the

novel is Lizzy Hexam, the daughter of the person who has found the mentioned killed person identified as Harmon. First persecuted, then protected by the detective Eugene Wrayburne, she delineates the axial line of the novel.

In its turn she enables mapping one of the most wonderful portraits of Dickens' gallery – that of a little doll's dressmaker Jenny Wren who continues such feminine images as Nell from "Old Curiosity Shop" or "Little Dorrit". Here the motif of PATIENCE comes into play. It is by no means of masochistic humility. Vice versa, the unlucky cripple remains a very risible girl full of humor and wit. Her cues attest her as a very observant person revealing the wisdom of the use of the plainest colloquialism in appropriate moment. What's of importance, they attest her opposition to what she repeatedly calls "*tricks and manners*" of cruel and derisive children. While retelling her childhood to Wrayburn she "*used to see early in the morning*" (that's after a sleep) "*the children*" that were "*all in white dresses*" and "*never mocked me*" (Ch. 2.2). This apparent hint to the unmentioned *ANGELS (as well as the further praises to the dead in Ch. 2.5) gives witness for conceiving the reality as an inferno or at least as a purgatory.

To sum up, it is numerous implications that are generated with those skimpy words that the characters are entrusted to pronounce. The surface of their enunciations conceals latent contents to be comprehended and to give rise to sometimes unexpected conclusions. Each cue is only a nod of the invisible semantic net and as such it provokes reader for continuing them with own conjectures.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Адмони, В.Г. Система форм речевых высказываний / Владимир Григорьевич Адмони. – СПб.: Наука, 1994 – 154 С.
2. Балухатый, С.Д. Вопросы поэтики / Сергей Дмитриевич Балухатый. – Л., 1990 – (Ленинградский гос. университет) – 320 С.
3. Вагин, В.Н. Дедукция и обобщение в системах принятия решений / Вадим Николаевич Вагин. – М.: Наука, 1988 – (Проблемы искусственного интеллекта) – 384 С.
4. Вайман, С.Т. Бальзаковский парадокс / Семен Теодорович Вайман. – М.: Советский писатель, 1981 – 368 С.
5. Елистратова, А.А. Гоголь и проблемы западноевропейского романа / Анна Аркадьевна Елистратова. – М.: Наука, 1972 – 304 с.
6. Клир, Дж. Системология. Автоматизация решения системных задач / Джордж Клир. М.: Радио и Связь, 1990 – 542 С.
7. Реизов, Б.Г. Творчество Флюбера / Борис Георгиевич Реизов. М.: Гослитиздат, 1955 – 524 С.
8. Сильман, Т.И. Чарльз Диккенс / Тамара Исааковна Сильман – / Из истории английского реализма. М.: Изд. АН СССР, 1941 – С. 189-244