

# Dynamic changes in modern English discourse

by Olga V. Aleksandrova, Elena O. Mendzheritskaya and Victoria L. Malakhova

**Olga V. Aleksandrova** Lomonosov Moscow State University [ovaleksandrova@gmail.com](mailto:ovaleksandrova@gmail.com)

**Elena O. Mendzheritskaya** Lomonosov Moscow State University [discourse@mail.ru](mailto:discourse@mail.ru)

**Victoria L. Malakhova** Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO University) [mv313@yandex.ru](mailto:mv313@yandex.ru)

**Published in Training, Language and Culture** Vol 1 Issue 1 (2017) pp. 92-106 doi: [10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.6](https://doi.org/10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.6)

**Recommended citation format:** Aleksandrova, O. V., Mendzheritskaya, E. O., & Malakhova, V. L. (2017).

Dynamic changes in modern English discourse. *Training, Language and Culture*, 1(1), 92-106. doi:

[10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.6](https://doi.org/10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.6)

*The study looks into the developments in modern linguistic science, its new branches and trends, emphasising the importance of language study on the basis of the unity of all language areas. The authors briefly characterise recent changes in linguistics, paying particular attention to the grammatical system of the English language. The study aims to show the expediency and even necessity of applying the functional approach and the cognitive-discursive paradigm to the study of different linguistic phenomena. The main method used in the study is of functional discourse analysis. Research material is represented by texts of Internet discourse, mobile communication discourse and print media discourse. The study concludes that the use of functional approach in studies of the lexical and grammatical system of the language, and of the cognitive-discursive paradigm in the analysis of discourse helps represent the language in a new dimension, trace new possibilities of human speech activities and new features of the functioning of different levels of linguistic units.*

**KEYWORDS:** *lexical system, grammatical system, functional approach, cognitive-discursive paradigm, Internet discourse, mobile communication discourse, print media discourse*



This is an open access article distributed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited (CC BY 4.0)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The second half of the 20th century was marked by the rapid development of linguistics and the emergence of new branches and trends. During this period, new areas of language studies appeared, such as semiotics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and others. At the end of the last century the development and deepening of different aspects of knowledge showed that the language should be studied in connection with contact zones (points where

different languages and cultures meet) and that it should be seen as part of human cognitive activity. It is helpful to review some of the most significant approaches to language study, which have emerged and influenced the development of different areas of linguistic science at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Development and change in linguistic science

First of all, it is reasonable to focus on functional

studies, which have a solid history. These studies are rooted in the 1950s. However, the appearance of cognitive linguistics has stimulated rapid functional studies and encouraged a fresh look at many linguistic phenomena.

The functional approach to the study of language phenomena has not received a clear definition to date, although most linguists all over the world emphasise its importance in modern linguistics. This is largely due to the already-established underlying premises in language studies, which recognise the relative immutability of the grammatical system, which has many common features in different languages and is only slowly modifiable. In linguistics, functionalism is usually considered as the approach to language study that is concerned with the functions performed by language, primarily in terms of cognition (relating information), expression (indicating mood), and conation (exerting influence) (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

Functionality is defined as the use of generally fixed phrases to fulfil a particular function. For example, to express the function of an apology a speaker of English might use a variety of fixed expressions ranging from 'Sorry' to 'I do apologise' depending on the incident and the people you are talking to. Functionality is most evident in the field of lexicology. It is connected with the problem of the correlation of words and concepts, the use of

*'Functionality is defined as the use of generally fixed phrases to fulfil a particular function'*

words in different languages and it is also their conceptual framework, the body of knowledge, which is a part of the users' worldview. It is also the verbal expression of a conceptual system. As a result, research in the field of cognitive linguistics, which combines and integrates different areas of human knowledge and experience in the process of study of cultural, historical, social, anthropological and other knowledge about the life and the environment, has an objective form and subjective perception.

As we know, functionalism is based on different sciences – linguistics, psychology, sociology and philosophy. It was the most significant feature of linguistics at the turn of the 20th and the 21st centuries and it has stimulated studies of language not just as a system, but also as a functioning mental phenomenon, which helps a person to categorise and to perceive the world.

Functionalism and functional linguistics have acquired considerable importance and many scholars use them for studying various linguistic phenomena as one of the most promising trends (see, for example, Fawsett, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2012; Ponomarenko & Malyuga, 2012).

Despite the conservatism of grammar, by the turn of the century a functional and pragmatic approach to language had emerged. Traditionally, the study of syntax, based primarily on structural and semantic principles, dates back to the philosophy of language. Some scholars aptly note that grammar consists of syntax, vocabulary, and morphology (Halliday, 1994). The functional nature of grammar shows itself according to the way the language is used: any statement, any text is connected with the context in which it is used. The meaning of a word is given in a dictionary, but its actual meaning appears only in the particular context, just like in the following example:

*The cavalry made a charge down the hill.*  
*They are going to charge me for the drinks.*  
*The battery needs a charge* (Crystal, 2006).

In the first and last sentences the word 'charge' is used as a noun but with very different meanings, whereas in the middle sentence it is used as a verb. If all three sentences used 'charge' as a verb, in each case its meaning would change – in the first example, an attack carried out full speed, in the second to give someone a bill to pay and in the third to raise the level of electrical power in a battery.

A language satisfies human needs, and its structure and organisation comply with these needs. The language system is used with two main objectives:

### *'The new trend in linguistics stimulated a new functioning of the already existing term discourse, defined as spoken or written communication'*

(1) for understanding the world, and (2) for interaction between people. In the latter case the most important element is a textual component which, in fact, enlivens the use of language. Of course, functional and system approaches to the study of language must coexist.

But functionality always assumes dynamics. That is why the analysis of a functional model of verbal communication requires a dialectical approach. From this point of view, the discursive specificity of speech composition is of great importance and significance.

Many researchers emphasise the dynamic properties of discourse. For different groups of languages' composition units of different linguistic levels gain significant importance. Discourse helps to make a predicative connection between the world and the direct expression of this connection via language. The aim of discursive research is to understand the functioning of a language as a reflection of mental processes, communicative perspective and statements containing cohesion and coherence.

## 2.2 The cognitive-discursive approach to language studies

In the depths of functional linguistics, a new trend appeared – a cognitive approach to language studies. It emerged due to the increased interest of science in human consciousness in the late 20th century. Language plays an important role in cognitive activity. In the Russian linguistic tradition, cognitive linguistics focuses on the language itself and various aspects of its functioning, but it is clear that cognitive science is based on semiotics, psychology, the theory of communication, the modelling of artificial intelligence, and other disciplines.

Cognitive science is an interdisciplinary field of knowledge combining both traditional areas (mathematics, philosophy, linguistics, physiology, etc.), and new areas (theory of information and computer research). Thus, a language's cognitive function is part of the general functional paradigm which is characteristic of modern linguistic research.

The new trend in linguistics stimulated a new functioning of the already existing term *discourse*, defined as spoken or written communication. The tendency to go beyond the framework of a sentence was already noted in linguistic research in the 1970s and can be explained by the emergence of such trends in language studies as pragmatics, semiotics, and textual linguistics.

The term discourse has frequently been discussed in the scientific literature. Discourse is a broader concept than text as it describes both a process of linguistic activity and its results, and the result is a text (Fairclough, 1992). Perception of the world is systemic. It is organically connected with the indissolubility of knowledge, which, in respect of the language, is expressed through discourse – a dynamic process by which the predicative connection between the phenomena of the world and a direct expression of this connection through the language is made. Discourse is studied in many branches of human knowledge, and there are different interpretations of this notion resulting in different understandings and definition. In the study of language, this phenomenon has proved its functional significance for linguistic research.

## 2.3 The grammatical system of the language and its significant changes

Let us dwell for a moment on the grammatical phenomena observed in recent decades. We have already mentioned that grammar is reputedly the most conservative aspect resistant to linguistic change. However, as studies in recent years have shown, in this area the situation is also changing. First of all, it should be noted that grammar has moved away from the traditional division into normative and practical. Some time ago (mainly in the 1970-1980s) it became clear that grammar could not be isolated from the semantics of lexical units which belong to its structure, as well as of

lexical units, which are a part of the semantic composition of a text as a whole.

If we look at the recent history of changes in grammar studies, it should be noted that at the turn of the century many new grammatical theories were created. In this chain of changes, the greatest importance is attached to generative grammar, which played a very important although not very productive role in English linguistics and exerted a considerable influence on the current state of linguistic research.

At the same time, grammatical studies represented such trends as Word Grammar, Space Grammar and others. Word Grammar is a theory developed by Richard Hudson (1984) of University College London, which states that grammar is a network of knowledge about words. Space Grammar describes the use of markers to break up sentences, such as punctuation and ellipsis. The emergence of these new grammars can be attributed to the dissatisfaction of scientists with the limitations of the grammar structural framework and their struggle to find a way of analysing longer speech extracts, i.e. the discursive features of the analysis of speech.

The key terms in linguistics of the second half of the 20th century were colligation and collocation. Colligation was attributed to British linguist Firth (1957), a classic figure in English linguistics and

founder of the London Linguistic School. He described it as the interrelation of grammatical categories in syntactical structure. Collocation describes a familiar grouping of words which convey meaning by their association. German linguist Römer (2005) went on to sum up the relationship between colligation and collocation as follows. *'What collocation is on a lexical level of analysis, colligation is on a syntactic level. The term does not refer to the repeated combination of concrete word forms but to the way in which word classes co-occur or keep habitual company in an utterance'* (Römer, 2005, p. 120).

It was Firth who stressed the need to consider the lexical-semantic and morphosyntactic construction of speech in their unity (Firth, 1957). Subsequently, these terms in their Russian language transliteration were introduced into the scientific use of Russian linguistics by Professor Akhmanova, who showed in many of her works and the works of her students the need to consider speech in the unity of collocation and colligation (Akhmanova & Mikaelan, 1969).

Up to the comparatively recent past, grammar used to be divided into academic and practical. Today almost all grammar can be used as a basis of both scientific and practical research. All modern English grammar is based on corpus data (as well as all modern dictionaries of the English language), and corpus data represent equally both

*'Today almost all grammar can be used as a basis of both scientific and practical research'*

written speech and oral data. It is no accident that the authors of *Grammar of the English Language* reflect the topics of spoken and written grammar even in the title of their work (Biber et al., 2000). Indeed, despite the opinion that spoken language is primary while written language is secondary, both forms of speech have their own distinctive features. Historically, the spoken language is primary in relation to the written. However, when you create a written text, the latter exists only in the form of so-called auditory images, which are represented in a collapsed view in the author's inner speech and are incorporated in the text along with the style. Thus, the reverse process of auditory, the transformation of auditory images into successive chains of intonation features while transferring a text from the written form into the oral form, is directly related to the analysis of the language and the style of speech units.

Grammar, together with vocabulary, holds a leading position in linguistic studies. Scholars point out that there is a need to reconsider fundamental principles of the grammatical descriptive canon, the latter implying sustainability of the system of principles and rules developed over centuries. Researchers also state that the

expansion of grammatical study is reflected not only in the development of new linguistic areas, but also in the expansion of the empirical research base (Bybee & Fleischman, 1995). This research base affects the latest trends in the study of language existence and its functioning.

It is interesting to note that it is at the turn of the century that changes in the grammatical system of the English language became especially prominent. There are many examples of such changes. Thus, Leech et al. (2009) point to changes in the category of number, e.g.: *postman/postmen* but *walkman/walkmans*. They also note the use of both analytical and synthetic ways of forming degrees of comparison:

*It would be pleasanter if such cruel and feudal performances as tiger and rhino hunts were dropped from future Royal programmes / It would be more pleasant to go to the country.*

Moreover, a significant reduction in the use of modal verbs has been observed. They are increasingly being replaced by quasi-modal verbs. Thus, the modal verb *must* is used less and less regularly. It is replaced by *want to* or *need to* (Leech et al., 2009).

So, what factors influence changes in the grammar system of language? Scholars distinguish the following processes: grammaticalisation,

*‘No doubt American English exerts a great influence on the English language because the grammatical system changes much more rapidly, which in turn affects all other varieties of English’*

colloquialisation, content compression, and changes caused by interaction of diatopic variants (variations in language use in different geographical regions), especially of British and American English (Americanisation), and other varieties.

Regarding grammaticalisation, it relates to the language system itself. Grammaticalisation, introduced by French linguist Meillet (1912), is a historical linguistics term which refers to way in which a word changes its function to become a grammatical marker or a grammatical marker itself changes its function or use over time. This process is going on very slowly and has its roots in the history of the language. For example, the to-Infinitive, which is still frequently used in English, was formed back in the Old English period.

It may be noted that such processes change much faster in oral speech and much slower in written speech. This is reflected in the process of colloquialisation. This describes the process by

which words and expressions used in colloquial spoken English gradually make their way into the written language. Introduced by Mair (1997), he describes it as the linguistic expression of a ‘general societal trend, namely an informalisation of manners and codes of conduct’ (Mair, 1997, p. 195). Such processes are much faster in the oral speech and much slower in the written one.

No doubt American English exerts a great influence on the English language because the grammatical system changes much more rapidly, which in turn affects all other varieties of English. Thus, even now we can speak about the trend towards the disappearance of the Past Perfect form, and scientists predict the complete disappearance of the Past Perfect system in the near future. In addition, the verb *will* is increasingly displacing *shall* for the first person singular and plural forms with the possible exception of British legal English.

#### **2.4 Internet linguistics and mobile communication**

At the beginning of the 21st century a completely new trend in linguistic studies, Internet linguistics, appeared. It has been proved that the emergence of the Internet has had a tremendous impact on the functioning of English and other languages. On the Internet, one can find a variety of texts and discourses and in this respect the development of cognitive and discursive paradigms in the study of this new kind of language is becoming

increasingly important. On the Internet, there is a large variety of materials, including those where there is maximum convergence of oral and written speech. First of all, it concerns online communication. A similar situation can be traced in mobile communication, when there is a two-way link and one can expect a reaction either directly after obtaining a message by the recipient, or a distant answer later, or no reaction at all for varying reasons. Oral communication always implies some situation which is common to the participants in the communication. In the case of the Internet or mobile phone, this is not necessarily the case. The phenomenon of the Internet is not just a matter of new technologies, but also a problem of radical changes in human life and therefore, the language changes.

Researchers note changes in spelling, grammar, the function of punctuation marks, an ever-increasing use of abbreviations and acronyms and other phenomena which have come with the advent of the Internet and mobile communications. Thus, scientists point to the emergence of new punctuation marks, such as the asterisk, which is frequently used in a quotation function, not just in English but also in Russian, emoticons which function not only as an equivalent of the full stop but also as exclamation and question marks. In general, one can note a common trend in the use of existing and new symbols to show expressiveness of speech, such as

dots and the use of uppercase and lowercase letters. All of this results in a convergence of oral and written speech in Internet communication. The existence of the cognitive-discursive paradigm in Internet linguistics is evident and it is used for intensive research into this type of material.

### **2.5 Dynamic processes in print media discourse**

Along with research into the specifics of discourse of Internet resources and mobile communication from the point of view of the cognitive-discursive paradigm, modern linguistics tries to apply the principles and methods of a cognitive approach to the analysis of print media discourse.

### **2.6 Peculiarities of discourse analysis**

Discourse analysis in general and media discourse analysis in particular warrant the special attention of linguists these days. This interest may be accounted for by the tendency to apply the term discourse to various sciences and academic disciplines. It is possible to trace its dispersion both horizontally, i.e. in different sciences, and vertically, i.e. on various linguistic levels.

It should be pointed out that all those interpretations of the term discourse which one comes across in the works of modern scholars appear mainly to be due to the interdisciplinary character of language study within the cognitive paradigm in linguistics. The problem of discourse has been thoroughly examined by many scholars.

## *'Discourse analysis in general and media discourse analysis in particular warrant the special attention of linguists these days'*

Different definitions, specific features and characteristics, functions of discourse analysed from various viewpoints can be found in scientific works (see, eg., Cook, 1989; Widdowson, 2007; Potter, 2013; Khramchenko & Radyuk, 2014). If we turn to modern British and American studies in the sphere of discourse and discourse analysis, we will find out that some scholars differentiate between discourse analysis which focuses mainly on oral speech used in interviews, talks, commentaries, and speeches, and text analysis of written speech samples in books, reviews, and social sight signs (e.g. road signs) (Coulthard, 1993; Crystal, 2003; Ponomarenko, 2016).

According to van Dijk (1992), discourse is not concerned with language alone. It also examines the content of communication, who is communicating with whom and why, in what kind of society and situation and through what medium, how different types of communication evolved and their relations to each other. He believes that it is not only linguistic features that make discourse properly formatted and comprehensible in terms of semantics and pragmatics.

Another approach to the problem of discourse and discourse analysis concentrates on text coherence and cohesion, characteristics considered crucial for adequate interpretation. For example, Cook (1994) defines discourse analysis as '*a discipline which studies how people achieve meaning through texts*' and '*the study of what it is that makes texts meaningful and coherent for their users*' (Cook, 1994, p. 19-23). Also according to Cook, '*Discourse analysis concerns the interaction of texts with knowledge of context to create discourse*' (Cook, 1994, p. 23). Thus, the author suggests treating discourse as an interplay of text and context which creates and passes on meaning. Many other scholars consider discourse to be a social (Fairclough, 1995).

One of the most reliable definitions of discourse is the one suggested by Krasnykh (2003), who considers it to be a verbal and cogitative activity, unity of process and outcome, which has linguistic and extralinguistic sides. If we render it in English it will sound as follows: '*Discourse is a verbalised speaking and thinking activity treated as the unity of process and result, and embracing both linguistic and extra-linguistic levels. It means that discourse should be understood as a cognitive process, as a reverberation of thinking with the help of a particular language means*' (Krasnykh, 2003, p. 82).

This range of opinions may be justified by the fact

that discourse study presupposes a multidisciplinary approach, embracing all the tendencies in the development of such areas of studies as computational linguistics, artificial intelligence, theoretical linguistics, social semiotics, psychology, logic, philosophy, historical studies, political studies, anthropology, ethnic studies, theory and practice of translation and literary criticism. Moreover, discourse, which is a keystone of the cognitive paradigm in linguistics, is a synthesis of the two leading trends in modern research – cognitive and communicative.

*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* offers the following definition of discourse: 1) a long serious treatment or discussion of subject in speech or writing: e.g. *a discourse on issues of gender and sexuality; He was hoping for some lively political discourse at the meeting;* 2) the use of language in speech and writing in order to produce meaning; language that is studied, usually in order to see how the different parts of a text are connected: e.g. spoken/written discourse; discourse analysis (Deuter et al., 2015). It follows, then, that alongside the traditional interpretation of discourse as a long serious treatment or discussion of a subject in speech or writing the dictionary registers a more recent meaning of it as the use of language in speech and writing in order to produce meaning; language that is studied in order to see how the different parts of a text are connected together.

*'Discourse is a verbalised speaking and thinking activity treated as the unity of process and result, and embracing both linguistic and extra-linguistic levels'*

### **2.7 Specific features and analysis of print media discourse**

In case of media discourse this approach seems extremely fruitful because it enables the researcher to single out the parameters differentiating various types of media discourse in accordance with the cognitive background of the addresser or producer (i.e. ideological bias of the text, those ideas and attitudes which are implied in the text), those characteristics of the target audience which this text is aimed at, and finally those linguistic and extra-linguistic strategies of presenting information which are implied in the text.

Cognitive process discourse incorporates the characteristic features of accumulating, storing and presenting information together with the characteristic features of its perception. It means that all these peculiarities may be traced within a particular national discourse in general and within a certain edition (in case of print media) in particular. Otherwise stated, the ways of presenting information in this particular edition may differ from the strategies of presenting

information within this type of discourse in general, but they are still identified as belonging to this particular culture. In order to be able to perceive information one needs to possess some background knowledge and a set of concepts at one's disposal which are shared by all the members of a particular national community and are reflected in the medium of communication (e.g. print journalism) as a type of discourse. Guided by these principles, we can differentiate between the following types of print media discourse: quality press discourse; popular press discourse (separating tabloids' discourse and glamour magazines' discourse); and specialised editions discourse (specialised journals and popular scientific journals).

All these editions differ both in terms of cognitive backgrounds of the addressers and the abilities of their perception by the target audience which is reflected in the ways of presenting information (linguistic and extra-linguistic alike) in the text itself.

## **2.8 Language play as a cognitive impacting device**

It is a common belief that the main function of mass media is informative. But if we treat journalism as a type of discourse, which does not only employ various strategies of communicating information but also presents different ways of influencing opinions of reality, the function of impact comes to the fore. Certainly, the degree of

realisation of this function will depend on the type of the medium and even on the type of article, particularly in the case of print media.

The ways of impacting readers may be universal or culture specific. As experience shows, the most powerful and pervasive device used in media these days is language play. As a linguistic phenomenon, it is widely researched in the modern science of discourse analysis (see, for example, Cook, 2000). Play in general is a universal feature. Language play in particular is cognitively based on the ability of any human community to convey ideas with the help of devices which rely on connotation, ambiguity, shifts in words and violation of habitual combinations. Language play is employed in nearly every type of discourse but especially in mass media discourse. Comprehension can be a formidable task because all kinds of print media use language play in their articles, relying on their target audience's cognitive abilities to understand the ideas behind them. Even the titles of articles may require background knowledge and a set of concepts which are shared by all the members of a community.

Language play is often based on the dismantling of cognitive stereotypes. By cognitive stereotypes we mean standard ways of using clichéd expressions, quotations, titles well known to the speakers of this language and typical in national discourse.

They are associated with the habitual context of their use, and their application to other situations as well as the violation of combinations within them, which changes stereotypes in the minds of readers and listeners and often contains irony. This device is widely used both in the British and Russian press, which leads us to infer it is a universal feature of mass media communication. Some headlines allude to the titles of works of literature or films, musicals or well-known quotations from them. In this case the ability of a reader to decipher the underlying metaphors depends on the so-called shared code of sender and receiver of information.

*The French Lender's Woman*  
(*The French Lieutenant's Woman*, John Fowles)

*The Unbearable Lightness of Finance*  
(*The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, Milan Kundera)

*Paradise Threatened in Mauritius*  
(*Paradise Lost*, John Milton)

*Once Upon a Time on Wall Street*  
(*Once Upon a Time in the West* – movie title)

It is also possible to find a handful of instances of connotations, idioms, set expressions and metaphors and specific devices, such as oxymorons.

*Needles in giant haystacks*  
(*a needle in a haystack*)

*Of devils, details and default*  
(*the devil is in the detail*)

*Unsecret agent*  
(*secret agent*)

These features characterise informed publications like *Times Magazine* and *Newsweek*. This cognitive strategy impacts the readers with sharp witty references using well-known cultural references and altering them to create a witty headline or phrase often adapted to a completely different context than was intended in its original use. Here are some more examples:

*The battle after the bell*  
(*the battle after Pearl Harbour*, *the Battle of Britain*)

*Doers and shapers*  
(*Movers and shakers*)

*Schools for Scandal*  
(*'School for Scandal'*)

*The Times*, one of the most authoritative British broadsheets, used to employ straightforward predictive sentences as the titles of serious articles, now also uses this kind of language play, as in:

*Romeo, wherefore art thou talking stupid?*  
*(Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou, Romeo?)*  
*Our schoolchildren are too sick to appreciate*  
*Shakespeare, according to one of our educational*  
*publishers.*

*The birth of a leg end (birth of a legend)*  
*Our obsession with feet predates Wayne Rooney,*  
*says Rachel Campbell-Johnston.*

It is a common belief that only the quality press provides us with samples of modern speech worth analysis. But even the tabloid press and glamour magazines are rich sources for investigating linguistic means of presenting information. Popular press discourse enjoys the same enthusiasm for language play as in these *Daily Mail* headlines:

*The roar of the Royals*  
*(the roar of the crowd)*

*Death by snack attack*  
*(death by drowning)*

*Life's a beech!*  
*(Life's a bitch)*

### 3. DISCUSSION

Hence, even this brief survey of the modern understanding of discourse and discourse analysis displays a diversity of approaches. Cognitive studies facilitate the process of investigation in this

field. While scholars continue to discuss the set of problems worth studying within the scope of cognitive linguistics, we cannot ignore this beneficial trend in language research. It allows us not only to single out various aspects of linguistic research but also to integrate different approaches to language analysis into viewing text in its complexity as a global whole.

Summing up the discussion of the term *discourse* and its interpretation in modern linguistics it is important to mention that it involves triad of 'actors': the addresser of information, the addressee of information and the text through which the addresser's and /or the media organisation's message is passed on. Ideally, the author expects the recipient to get the message adequately. But in real life it is not always the case, and the addressee may either read in some information which the original text lacks, or considerably reduce the amount of he or she absorbs. Having analysed some examples of various types of media discourse we conclude that language play has become a pervasive device. Its forms and ways of impacting readers are based on the cognitive processes of the perception of reality and their linguistic implementation.

### 4. CONCLUSION

Cognitive research in conjunction with the features of discourse analysis, and applying the cognitive-discursive paradigm to linguistic phenomena are

becoming more popular in modern linguistic science. It makes it possible to review the discourse in terms of speech acts and speech events, as well as to analyse its linguistic properties and relevant extralinguistic (social and pragmatic) factors. On the other hand, it also allows us to describe structures of representation of different kinds of knowledge which determine speech strategies of communicants and the choice of exact language forms in the process of discursive activity. In doing so, understanding the national worldview and knowledge of the culture and environment of the targeted linguistic community is important. The cognitive-discursive

paradigm has already proven its value in modern language studies. It touches almost all areas of language and opens up new opportunities for language study. A study of the lexical and grammatical system of the language from the standpoint of its functional features, especially through the analysis of Internet materials, mobile communication, and print media discourse from the cognitive-discursive point of view makes it possible to see and understand the language in a new dimension, to trace new possibilities of speech activities and new features of the functioning of linguistic items at different levels and in different types of communication.

## References

- Akhmanova, O. S., & Mikaelan, G. B. (1969). *The theory of syntax in modern linguistics* (No. 68). Mouton.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2000). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bybee, J. L., & Fleischman, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Modality in grammar and discourse* (Vol. 32). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and literature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1993). *An Introduction to discourse analysis*. Longman.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *The fight for English*. Oxford University Press.
- Dijk, T. van. (1992). *Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman.
- Deuter, M., Bradbery, J., & Turnbull, J. (2015). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.

- Fawcett, R. P. (2008). *Invitation to systemic functional linguistics through the Cardiff grammar: An extension and simplification of Halliday's systemic functional grammar* (3d ed.). London, UK: Equinox.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers on English linguistics*. London University Press.
- Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Hudson, R. A. (1984). *Word grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Khramchenko, D., & Radyuk, A. (2014, March). The synergy of modern business English discourse: Holistic approach to teaching unconventional rhetoric. In *Proceedings of INTED2014: 8th International Conference on Technology, Education and Development* (pp. 6779-6783). Valencia, Spain: IATED.
- Krasnyh, V. V. (2003). *Svoi sredi chuzhikh mif ili realnost? [Proxy allies: Myth or reality?]*. Moscow, Russia: Gnozis.
- Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. (2009). *Change in contemporary English. A grammatical study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mair, C. (1997). Parallel corpora: A real-time approach to the study of language change in progress. In M. Ljung (Ed.), *Corpus-based studies in English* (pp. 195-209). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Meillet, A. (1912). L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di scienza)*, 12(26), 384-400.
- Ponomarenko, E. V. (2016, August). Functional properties of English discourse in terms of linguosynergetics. In *Proceedings of SGEM2016* (pp. 355-362). Albena, Bulgaria: SGEM.
- Ponomarenko, E. V., & Malyuga, E. (2012, November). Business English and functional linguistics: Teaching practical English in perfect harmony with theory. In *Proceedings of ICERI2012: 5th International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation* (pp. 4524-4529). Madrid, Spain: IATED.
- Potter, W. J. (2013). *Media literacy* (6th ed.) Sage Publications.
- Römer, U. (2005). Progressives, patterns, pedagogy. A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions and didactics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 12(1), 119-131. doi: 10.1075/ijcl.12.1.09lin
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2012). Systemic functional linguistics: Exploring meaning in language. In J. P. Gee, & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 21-34). New York: Routledge.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.