



УДК 378.016:811.111(072)

М54

Схвалено до друку Вченою радою  
ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»  
протокол № 10 від від 30 червня 2025 року

**Рецензенти:**

**Нестелєєв М. А.** – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»

**Бурковська О. Й.** – канд. філол. наук, доцент кафедри мовних та гуманітарних дисциплін ТОВ «Технічний університет «Метінвест Політехніка»

Методичні рекомендації до вивчення навчальної дисципліни «Теоретичні проблеми сучасної англістики» для здобувачів другого (магістерського) рівня вищої освіти *спеціальності А.4 Середня освіта (за предметними спеціальностями)* за освітньо-професійною програмою «Середня освіта (Українська мова і література). Середня освіта (Англійська мова та зарубіжна література)» / уклад. О. В. Піскунов. Слов'янськ; Дніпро: ДДПУ, 2025. 56 с.

Методичні рекомендації призначені для здобувачів вищої освіти, що вивчають навчальну дисципліну «Теоретичні проблеми сучасної англістики». Видання містить дидактичний комплекс для організації курсу: паспорт дисципліни, тематичний план, теоретичний зміст, завдання до практичних занять, питання до заліку та список рекомендованої літератури.

## ЗМІСТ

Передмова.....	4
ПАСПОРТ НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ.....	6
ТЕМАТИЧНИЙ ПЛАН НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ.....	7
ЗМІСТ КУРСУ.....	8
ЗАВДАННЯ ДЛЯ ПРАКТИЧНИХ ЗАНЯТЬ.....	53
ОРІЄНТОВНІ ПИТАННЯ ДО ЕКЗАМЕНУ.....	55
РЕКОМЕНДОВАНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА.....	56

## ПЕРЕДМОВА

Цей навчальний предмет є логічним продовженням теоретичних дисциплін у системі фахових предметів філологічного напрямку, який сприяє узагальненню і систематизації знань, отриманих на попередньому освітньо-кваліфікаційному рівні, таким чином поглиблюючи лінгвістичну компетенцію майбутнього філолога. Базовими знаннями для вивчення цього предмету є блок лінгвістичних дисциплін бакалаврату: лексикологія, стилістика та теоретична граматики англійської мови. У процесі вивчення курсу студенти повинні ознайомитися з організацією та функціонуванням дискурсу англійської мови, зокрема, з особливостями письмового академічного англомовного дискурсу.

*Мета курсу* – введення здобувачів у проблематику сучасних наукових розробок у галузі германського мовознавства та ознайомлення їх з сучасним станом дослідження теоретичних проблем фонетики, граматики, лексикології, стилістики у вітчизняній і зарубіжній лінгвістичній науці.

Навчальна дисципліна пов'язана з такими дисциплінами як проблеми комунікативної лінгвістики.

*Процес вивчення дисципліни спрямований на формування таких компетентностей:* розуміння проблематики германського мовознавства; володіння основними концепціями германістики; вміння застосовувати методологію наукових досліджень в галузі іноземної філології; здатність застосовувати категорійно-термінологічний апарат дисципліни в процесі дослідження актуальної філологічної тематики.

*Програмні результати навчання:*

знати: актуальні проблеми германського мовознавства; основні тенденції та напрями дослідження у мовознавстві;

уміти: аргументувати когнітивні підходи до застосування аналітичних алгоритмів дослідження актуальної проблематики германістики; застосовувати концептуальну методологію наукових досліджень в галузі германістики;

володіти: навичками пошуку необхідної інформації; знаннями сучасних досліджень теоретичних проблем германістики.

## I. ПАСПОРТ НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ

*Метою* вивчення навчальної дисципліни «Теоретичні проблеми сучасної англістики» є опанування здобувачами другого (магістерського) рівня вищої освіти основними термінами, підходами та теоріями лінгвістики та англістики, вміння аналізувати проблеми сучасної англістики, а також їх прикладне застосування у професійній діяльності, розширення знань про сучасні парадигми лінгвістичних досліджень, а також формування навичок практичного застосування відповідних методів під час аналізу англійськомовного лінгвістичного матеріалу. У межах курсу здобувачі також отримують базові уявлення про інтегративну теорію тексту й вербальної комунікації, їхнє методологічне забезпечення і систему ключових понять і категорій.

Основними *завданнями* вивчення дисципліни є такі: змістовно орієнтовані: набуття студентами знань про мовну картину світу, сучасні медіа комунікації і методи їх дослідження, а також інтегративну теорію тексту й вербальної комунікації; мовно орієнтовані: оволодіння відповідними терміносистемами для застосування у дослідницькій практиці, розвинення комунікативних стратегій презентації аналізу дослідженого матеріалу та відповідних вербальних тактик

### **Обсяг дисципліни та види навчальної роботи:**

- Загальний обсяг – 120 годин (4 кредити).
- Лекції – 16
- Практичні заняття – 20 годин.
- Самостійна робота – 84 годин (підготовка до практичних занять, читання художньої та наукової літератури, виконання індивідуального завдання, підготовка до підсумкового контролю).

### **Форми контролю:**

- Підсумковий контроль – екзамен.

## ТЕМАТИЧНИЙ ПЛАН НАВЧАЛЬНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ

Назви тем	Кількість годин									
	Денна форма					Заочна форма				
	усь ого	зокрема				усь го	зокрема			
л		п	лаб	с.р.	л		п	лаб	с.р.	
Тема 1. Introducing English Theoretical Linguistics. The object, subject, tasks and the aim of the discipline	14	2			10	14	2			12
Тема 2. English language as an object of modern linguistic studies. Language Universals	16	2	4		10	16	2	2		12
Тема 3. Changes in the modern English Language as a problematic area of theoretical linguistics	16	2	4		10	14		2		12
Тема 4. The problems of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics.	14	2	2		10	12				12
Тема 5. The problems of semantics and pragmatics	14	2	2		10	16	2	2		12
Тема 6. The problems of functional and communicative linguistics.	14	2	2		10	14		2		12
Тема 7. The problems of cognitive linguistics and discourse	14	2	2		10	14		2		12
Тема 8. The principles of linguistic analysis. The methodology of linguistic analysis of the English language.	14	2	2		14	20		2		18
<b>Усього годин</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>102</b>

### ЗМІСТ КУРСУ

#### **Tema 1. Introducing English Theoretical Linguistics. The object, subject, tasks and the aim of the discipline.**

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.

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.

In the 1980s, strong influences have come from developments in linguistics in the fields of PRAGMATICS and DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. Such influences

have reinforced descriptions of style as a predominantly suprasentential, textual, phenomenon, and have broadened the base for the applications of stylistics (for general reference, see Dillon, Freeman, Leech, Brumfit and Carter).

The main orientations of stylistics are toward literary studies. Stylistics provides the ways of exploration of a language through a systematic and principled attention to language.

Effects of language give rise to readers' intuitions about texts; stylistics enables such intuitions to be formalized, then modified and refined.

Let us consider the meaning of the term **language** and to what it refers. In *DL:DE* Jeffries makes a distinction between language as a system and language use. A language system refers to an idealised form of the language which is separate from how a language is actually used, and *DL:DE* concentrates upon describing language as a system. In *TL:TE* Chapman considers 'language' from different theoretical perspectives: as a type of behaviour, as a state of mind and as a form of communication. A sociolinguistic approach to the study of language considers language as behaviour, particularly in taking account of the regional and social situations in which language occurs, and the social as well as linguistic factors that affect how speakers relate to one another. Consequently, a sociolinguistic approach to language behaviour, rather than being concerned with language in a more general or abstract way, asks questions such as: 'what is *a* language?' and 'what is language *for*?' Language is not just about communication, but also about identity, a factor which is paramount in sociolinguistics. Deciding which criteria to adopt for defining a language, however, is far from straightforward. Take the example of the language called 'English'. Who are the speakers of English? Are they the people living in a particular country, England, where the language is spoken? One popular way of deciding the boundary of a language and boundaries between languages is to consider their geography. We generally assume that people living in a particular geographically defined country speak the language associated with it: French in France, German in Germany and so on. 'English' by this definition is the language spoken by people living in

England, Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) and the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland). However, it is not always the case that people living in a geographically defined area all speak the same language, or that one language is the exclusive ‘property’ of a particular country. This is certainly not the case with ‘English’, which is spoken not only in countries that make up the UK, but is also widely used across many countries around the globe, including the United States. Another factor which has to be taken into account is that English today is widely used in many countries across the globe as the language of business, diplomacy, medicine and the internet. We should also take account of the fact that there are many countries in the world which are not monolingual: that is, they have not one nationally recognised language, but several. For example, in Switzerland, there are three major languages: German, French and Italian. Switzerland recognises itself as multi-lingual society whereas most of us would agree that Britain (with the exception of Wales) unlike Switzerland, is a monolingual society in that ‘everyone speaks English’. The same could also be said of other countries across the globe, such as the USA, where English is the language of official communication, used in educational contexts, the law, government, the media and so on. However, if we look at the actual languages spoken in areas such as the UK, USA or Australia today, then they include many others besides English. Far from being monolingual, these countries, including those that make up the UK, are actually multilingual, with many inhabitants speaking languages other than English. So although the UK has an official language, ‘English’, its inhabitants actually come from a vast range of language backgrounds, making the UK linguistically diverse. This is further complicated by the fact that one of the countries which makes up Great Britain and the UK, the principality of Wales, has two officially recognised languages, Welsh as well as English, and all its inhabitants are taught to be bilingual. This situation is similar to the one in Canada, where people are taught to be bilingual in French and English. In the United States of America, there is no officially recognised national language, and legislating to impose one is forbidden by its constitution, although to

all intents and purposes English functions as a national language through its use in public institutions such as education, business and the law. What these examples all illustrate is that what counts as a language then, is not only dependent upon geography, but also upon history, politics and economics.

The association between language and nation or nationality is a very strong and powerful one. The association between language and identity of all kinds, regional and social as well as national, is also very powerful. The language, languages or varieties of a language that we speak form an integral part of who we are, and attempts at imposing one language or variety of a language on the population of a nation are often bound up with issues of power and ideology. The reasons why one language or one variety of a language becomes associated with a particular nation are many and varied, resulting from a combination of historical and social changes. Throughout history, one of the first things an invading force of another country imposes upon the conquered people is its language, particularly in terms of political, economic and educational institutions and suchlike. For example, The Norman Conquest of 1066, the Roman invasion of the first century BC and the altering of country boundaries in Eastern Europe post 1945 to form the United Soviet States of Russia. What counts as the language of a country at any particular moment in time, therefore, is not as simple and straightforward as it might at first seem. The term 'language' is also a very difficult, if not impossible, one to define linguistically.

## **Tema 2. English language as an object of modern linguistic studies.**

### **Language Universals**

Towards the end of Middle English, a sudden and distinct change in pronunciation (the Great Vowel Shift) started, with vowels being pronounced shorter and shorter. From the 16th century the British had contact with many peoples from around the world. This, and the Renaissance of Classical learning, meant that many new words and phrases entered the language. The invention of

printing also meant that there was now a common language in print. Books became cheaper and more people learned to read. Printing also brought standardization to English. Spelling and grammar became fixed, and the dialect of London, where most publishing houses were, became the standard. In 1604 the first English dictionary was published.

### **Late Modern English (1800-Present)**

The main difference between Early Modern English and Late Modern English is vocabulary. Late Modern English has many more words, arising from two principal factors: firstly, the industrial Revolution and technology created a need for new words; secondly, the British Empire at its height covered one quarter of the earth's surface, and the English language adopted foreign words from many countries.

### **Varieties of English**

From around 1600, the English colonization of North America resulted in the creation of a distinct American variety of English. Some English pronunciations and words "froze" when they reached America. In some ways, American English is more like the English of Shakespeare than modern British English is. Some expressions that the British call "Americanisms" are in fact original British expressions that were preserved in the colonies while lost for a time in Britain (for example *trash* for rubbish, *loan* as a verb instead of lend, and *fall* for autumn; another example, *frame-up*, was re-imported into Britain through Hollywood gangster movies). Spanish also had an influence on American English (and subsequently British English), with words like *canyon*, *ranch*, *stampede* and *vigilante* being examples of Spanish words that entered English through the settlement of the American West. French words (through Louisiana) and West African words (through the slave trade) also influenced American English (and so, to an extent, British English). Today, American English is particularly influential, due to the USA's dominance of cinema, television, popular music, trade and technology (including the Internet). But there are many other varieties of English

around the world, including for example Australian English, New Zealand English, Canadian English, South African English, Indian English and Caribbean English.

West Germanic language of the Indo-European language family that is closely related to Frisian, German, and Netherlandic languages. English originated in England and is now widely spoken on six continents. It is the primary language of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, and various small island nations in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean. It is also an official language of India, the Philippines, and many countries in sub-Saharan Africa, including South Africa.

### **Origins and basic characteristics**

English belongs to the Indo-European family of languages and is therefore related to most other languages spoken in Europe and western Asia from Iceland to India. The parent tongue, called Proto-Indo-European, was spoken about 5,000 years ago by nomads believed to have roamed the southeast European plains. Germanic, one of the language groups descended from this ancestral speech, is usually divided by scholars into three regional groups: East (Burgundian, Vandal, and Gothic, all extinct), North (Icelandic, Faeroese, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish), and West (German, Netherlandic [Dutch and Flemish], Frisian, English). Though closely related to English, German remains far more conservative than English in its retention of a fairly elaborate system of inflections. Frisian, spoken by the inhabitants of the Dutch province of Friesland and the islands off the west coast of Schleswig, is the language most nearly related to Modern English. Icelandic, which has changed little over the last thousand years, is the living language most nearly resembling Old English in grammatical structure. Modern English is analytic (i.e., relatively uninflected), whereas Proto-Indo-European, the ancestral tongue of most of the modern European languages (e.g., German, French, Russian, Greek), was synthetic, or inflected. During the course of thousands of years, English words have been slowly simplified from the inflected variable forms found in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Russian, and German, toward invariable forms, as in Chinese and Vietnamese. The German and Chinese words for “man” are exemplary. German

has five forms: Mann, Mannes, Manne, Männer, Männern. Chinese has one form: jen. English stands in between, with four forms: man, man's, men, men's. In English only nouns, pronouns, and verbs are inflected. Adjectives have no inflections aside from the determiners “this, these” and “that, those.” (The endings -er, -est, denoting degrees of comparison, are better regarded as non inflectional suffixes.) English is the only European language to employ uninflected adjectives; e.g., “the tall man,” “the tall woman,” compared to Spanish *el hombre alto* and *la mujer alta*. As for verbs, if the Modern English word *ride* is compared with the corresponding words in Old English and Modern German, it will be found that English now has only five forms (*ride, rides, rode, riding, ridden*), whereas Old English *ridan* had 13, and Modern German *reiten* has 16 forms. In addition to this simplicity of inflections, English has two other basic characteristics: flexibility of function and openness of vocabulary.

**Flexibility of function** has grown over the last five centuries as a consequence of the loss of inflections. Words formerly distinguished as nouns or verbs by differences in their forms are now often used as both nouns and verbs. One can speak, for example, of “planning a table” or “tabling a plan,” “booking a place” or “placing a book,” “lifting a thumb” or “thumbing a lift.” In the other Indo-European languages, apart from rare exceptions in Scandinavian, nouns and verbs are never identical because of the necessity of separate noun and verb endings. In English, forms for traditional pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs can also function as nouns; adjectives and adverbs as verbs; and nouns, pronouns, and adverbs as adjectives. One speaks in English of the Frankfurt Book Fair, but in German one must add the suffix *-er* to the placename and put attributive and noun together as a compound, *Frankfurter Buchmesse*. In French one has no choice but to construct a phrase involving the use of two prepositions: *Foire du Livre de Francfort*. In English it is now possible to employ a plural noun as adjunct (modifier), as in “wages board” and “sports editor”; or even a conjunctive group, as in “prices and incomes policy” and “parks and gardens committee.”

**Openness of vocabulary** implies both free admission of words from other languages and the ready creation of compounds and derivatives. English adopts (without change) or adapts (with slight change) any word really needed to name some new object or to denote some new process. Like French, Spanish, and Russian, English frequently forms scientific terms from Classical Greek word elements. English possesses a system of orthography that does not always accurately reflect the pronunciation of words.

**Questions:**

1. Which family of languages does the English language belong to? What relationship does it have with other languages spoken in Europe, Asia etc?
2. What is the most striking feature of the orthography of the English language?
3. What has contributed to the flexibility of the language?

**Tema 3. Changes in the modern English Language as a problematic area of theoretical linguistics**

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 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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, Fawcett, 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: (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 20<sup>th</sup> century. Language plays an important role in cognitive activity. In the domestic 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 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, 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.

#### **Tema 4. The problems of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics.**

*Psycholinguistics* is the study of the psychological and neurobiological factors that enable humans to acquire, use, and understand language. The boundary between linguistics and psycholinguistics is difficult, perhaps impossible, to draw. So too is the boundary between psycholinguistics and psychology. What characterizes psycholinguistics as it is practiced today as a more or less distinguishable field of research is its concentration upon a certain set of topics connected with language and its bringing to bear upon them the findings and theoretical principles of both linguistics and psychology.

Psycholinguistics is concerned with the psychological mechanism underlying speech production and perception. It also studies how children acquire their first language, speech perception, and loss of the ability to use and understand language. Modern research makes use of biology, neuroscience, cognitive science, and information theory to study how the brain processes language. There are a number of sub-disciplines; for example, as non-invasive techniques for studying the neurological workings of the brain become more and more widespread, neurolinguistics has become a field in its own right.

Psycholinguistics covers the cognitive processes that make it possible to generate grammatical and meaningful sentence out of vocabulary and grammatical structures, as well as the processes that make it possible to understand utterances, words, text, etc. Developmental psycholinguistics studies infants' and children's ability to learn language, usually with experimental or at least quantitative methods.

***Language acquisition by children*** is one of the topics most central to psycholinguistic research. The term acquisition is preferred to 'learning', because 'learning' tends to be used by psychologists in a narrowly technical sense, and many psycholinguists believe that no psychological theory of learning, as currently formulated, is capable of accounting for the process whereby children, in a relatively short time, come to achieve a fluent control of their native language.

***Speech perception*** is another important area of psycholinguistic research that has been strongly influenced by theoretical advances in linguistics and, more

especially, by the development of generative grammar. It has long been realized that the identification of speech sounds and of the word forms composed of them depends upon the context in which they occur and upon the hearer's having mastered, usually as a child, the appropriate phonological and grammatical system.

Other areas of psycholinguistics that should be briefly mentioned are the study of *aphasia* and *neurolinguistics*. *Neurolinguistics* should perhaps be regarded as an independent field of research rather than as part of psycholinguistics. The neurolinguist addresses the research question: how is linguistic knowledge represented in the brain? We firmly believe that cognitive capacities are the product of structures in the brain. However, the direct study of the human brain is fraught with difficulties. Most obvious among these is the fact that ethical considerations forbid intrusive experimentation on human brains.

Psycholinguistics has provided numerous theories that explain how a person acquires a language, produces and perceives both spoken and written language. The theories have been used in the field of language teaching. Some experts use them as the basic theories in developing language teaching methods. It is known as psycholinguistics approach. Psycholinguistic approach views learning as a cognitive individual process happening within the individual and then moves to the social dimension. As an approach, there are some methods which were developed based on psycholinguistics theories such as natural method, total physical response method, and suggestopedia method. These methods apply psycholinguistic principles that how a person acquires his/her mother tongue or first language (First Language Acquisition), learns his/her second or third language (Second Language Learning), perceives a language (Language Perception), and produces language (Language Production). Language perception refers to listening and reading, while the language production refers to speaking and writing. Listening, reading, speaking and writing are called as the four of language skills. Specifically, psycholinguistics helps to understand the difficulties of these four skills both intrinsic difficulties and extrinsic difficulties. Psycholinguistics also helps to explain the errors students do in the language learning. Moreover psycholinguistics

also defines some kinds of brain disorders that affect language learning performance such as agraphia and aphasia which must be treated properly. Psycholinguistics mainly helps teachers to consider the use of appropriate method to teach that four language skill.

Psycholinguistics is an integration of two disciplines; psychology and linguistics. Psychology is the study of mind and behavior; linguistics is the study of language. So, in general, psycholinguistics can be defined as the study of mind and language. It is concerned with the relationship between the human mind and the language as it examines the processes that occur in brain while producing and perceiving language.

Psycholinguistics covers three main points; language production, language perception and language acquisition. Language production refers to the processes involved in creating and expressing meaning through language. Language perception refers to processes involved in interpreting and understanding both written and spoken language. Language acquisition refers to processes of acquiring a native or a second language.

Psycholinguistics has provided numerous theories that explain the three points above. The theories have been very useful in the field of language teaching. Some experts use them as the basic theories in developing language teaching methods. It is known as psycholinguistics approach. Psycholinguistic approach views that language and thought as related but completely independent phenomena. Learning is viewed as a cognitive individual process happening within the individual and then moves to the social dimension.

Psycholinguistics as a study of the psychology of language is realized in language teaching. It helps to study the psychological factors that are possibly involved in languages learning. Psycholinguistics focuses on the application of the actual language and communication. It is necessary to make a decision in applying various methods that allow students to easily understand a language.

As an approach, there are some methods which were developed based on psycholinguistics theories and the methods have been used widely in the field of

language teaching over the countries. Some kinds of the method will be explained in this paper. To avoid misconception, some terms related to psycholinguistics and language learning and teaching will also explain in this paper.

Psycholinguistics is simply defined as the study of the relationship between human language and human mind (Maftoon and Shakouri, 2012). In short, three important processes are investigated in psycholinguistics: (1) language production, (2) language comprehension, and (3) language acquisition. From many questions that psycholinguistics attempts to answer, it, specifically, addresses two questions (1) what knowledge of language is needed for us to use language? and (2) what cognitive processes are involved in the ordinary use of language?

Psycholinguistics has developed rapidly and expanded into several sub-disciplines as cited in Chaer (2015) below:

1. Theoretical psycholinguistics. It focused on theories of language relating to human mental processes in language, such as phonetics, diction, syntax design, discourse, and intonation.

2. Developmental psycholinguistics. It is related to language acquisition, both first language acquisition (L1) and second language acquisition (L2). It examines phonological, semantic, and syntactic acquisition, process in stages, gradually, and integrated.

3. Social psycholinguistics related to the social aspects of language, including social identity.

4. Educational psycholinguistics discussed general aspects of formal education at school, including the role of language in teaching reading teaching proficiency, and improving language ability to express thoughts and feelings.

5. Neuro-psycholinguistics focused on the relationship between language, language production, and the human brain. Neurology experts have managed to analyze the biological structure of the brain and analyzed what happens with the input language and how language output programmed and set up in the brain.

6. Experimental psycholinguistics covered and experimented in all language productions and language activities, language behavior, and language outcome.

7. Applied psycholinguistics concerned with the application of the findings of six sub-disciplines of psycholinguistics explained before in certain areas that require it, including psychology, linguistics, language learning, neurology, psychiatry, communications, and literature.

Psycholinguistic approach views language and thought as related but completely independent phenomena (Claros, 2009). In the psycholinguistic approach, the individual internal cognitive processes are activated so that activation allows the individual to access the comprehensible input needed to further advance in the acquisition of the L2 (Long, 1996 cited in Claros, 2009). Krashen (1985) argues that to understand and learn language, s/he must be exposed to the linguistic input that is a little beyond his/her current level of competence. Krashen explains his view in his famous  $i+1$  concept which indicates that the input the learner receives must contain some slight amount of new information in addition to what s/he already knows. To Krashen, a comprehensible input is not just a necessary condition, but it is the sufficient condition.

In relation to language teaching, developmental psycholinguistics and applied psycholinguistics play significant roles in formulating effective ways of teaching. Psycholinguistics theory covered the language development of humans, in accordance with humans' physical and mental development. These theories are considered in designing language teaching programs and materials in order to be effective for the second language learners master the target language.

Harras and Andika (2009) mention three kinds of language teaching methods which are developed according to psycholinguistics principles: natural method, total physical response method, and suggestopedia method.

*Sociolinguistics* is the study of society on the way language is used. The main aim of sociolinguistics is to study language in its Social and Cultural context. This includes the study of language in a society or speech community; language varieties; and language functions. Sociolinguistics relates the differences observed in language use to the problems that arise from those social aspects. Examples include the study of how individual's pronunciations differ between groups that are

separated by certain social variables such as ethnicity, religion, status, gender, etc. The variation of a language from one region to another is called dialect while variation of language among social classes is referred to as sociolects.

## **Tema 5. The problems of semantics and pragmatics**

### **SEMANTICS AS A SCIENCE. POLYSEMY. SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF THE WORD. TYPES OF SEMANTIC COMPONENTS. PRINCIPLES OF SEMANTIC ANALYSIS**

#### **SEMANTICS AS A SCIENCE**

*Language is the amber in which a thousand precious and subtle thoughts have been safely embedded and preserved.*

(From *Word and Phrase* by J. Fitzgerald)

As it has already been said, the internal structure of the word is its meaning or semantics.

The linguistic science at present is not able to put forward a definition of meaning which is conclusive. However, there are certain facts of which we can be reasonably sure, and one of them is that the very function of the word as a unit of communication is made possible by its possessing a meaning. Therefore, among various characteristics of the word, meaning is certainly the most important.

Generally speaking, meaning can be more or less described as a component of the word through which a concept is communicated, in this way endowing the word with the ability of denoting real objects, qualities, actions and abstract notions. The complex and somewhat mysterious relationships between *referent* (object, etc. denoted by the word), *concept* and *word* are traditionally represented by the following triangle [Fig. 1].

By the symbol here the word is meant; by thought or reference stands the concept. The dotted line suggests that there is no immediate relation between the

word and the referent: it is established only through the concept: in different languages one and the same referent is designed with the help of different signs.

The concept is a mental image of a certain object, action, phenomenon, etc., which may and may not be implemented verbally, i.e. in the language. The mechanism by which concepts (i. e. mental phenomena) are converted into words (i. e. linguistic phenomena) and the reverse process by which a heard or a printed word is converted into a kind of mental picture are not yet understood or described.

The branch of linguistics, which deals with in the study of meaning is called *semantics*.

The modern approach to semantics is based on the assumption that the inner form of the word (i. e. its meaning) presents a structure, which is called the *semantic structure* of the word.

Yet, before going deeper into this problem, it is necessary to make a brief survey of another semantic phenomenon, which is closely connected with it.

### **POLYSEMY. SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF THE WORD. PRINCIPLES OF SEMANTIC ANALYSIS**

Semantic structure of the word does not comprise an indissoluble unity (that is, actually, why it is referred to as "structure"), nor does it necessarily stand for one concept. It is generally known that most words implement several concepts and thus possess the corresponding number of meanings. A word having several meanings is called *polysemantic*, and the ability of words to have more than one meaning is described by the term *polysemy*.

Two somewhat naive but frequently asked questions may arise in connection with polysemy:

1. Is polysemy an anomaly or a general rule in English vocabulary?
2. Is polysemy an advantage or a disadvantage so far as the process of communication is concerned?

Let us deal with both these questions together.

Polysemy is certainly not an anomaly. Most English words are polysemantic. It should be noted that the wealth of expressive resources of a

language largely depends on the degree to which polysemy has developed in the language. Sometimes it is claimed that a language lacks words if the need arises for the same word to name different phenomena. Actually, it is exactly the opposite: if each word is found to be capable of conveying at least two concepts instead of one, the expressive potential of the whole vocabulary increases twofold. Hence, a well-developed polysemy is not a drawback but a great advantage in a language.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that the number of sound combinations that human speech organs can produce is limited. Therefore at a certain stage of language development the production of new words by morphological means becomes limited, and polysemy becomes increasingly important in providing the means for enriching the vocabulary. Hence, the process of enriching the vocabulary does not consist merely in adding new words to it, but, also, in the constant development of polysemy.

The system of meanings of any polysemantic word develops gradually, mostly over the centuries, as more and more new meanings are either added to old ones, or oust some of them. So the complicated processes of polysemy development involve both the appearance of new meanings and the loss of old ones. Yet, the general tendency with English vocabulary at the modern stage of its history is to increase the total number of its meanings and in this way to provide for a quantitative and qualitative growth of the language expressive resources.

When analysing the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, it is necessary to distinguish between two levels of analysis.

At the first level semantic structure of a word is treated as a system of meanings. For example, semantic structure of the noun *fire* could be roughly presented by this scheme (only the most frequent meanings are given) [Fig.2].

The above scheme suggests that meaning I holds a kind of dominance over the other meanings conveying the concept in the most general way whereas meanings II—V are associated with special circumstances, aspects and instances of the same phenomenon.

Meaning I (generally referred to as *the main meaning*) presents the centre of the semantic structure of the word holding it together. It is mainly through meaning I that meanings II—V (they are called *second-ary meanings*) can be associated with one another, some of them exclusively through meaning I, as, for instance, meanings IV and V.

It would hardly be possible to establish any logical associations between some of the meanings of the noun *bar* except through the main meaning. (Only a fragment of the semantic structure of *bar* is presented so as to illustrate the point) [Fig.3].

Meanings II and III have no logical links with one another whereas each separately is easily associated with meaning I: meaning II due to the traditional barrier dividing a court-room into two parts; meaning III due to the counter serving as a kind of barrier between the customers of a pub and the barman.

Yet, it is not in every polysemantic word where such a centre can be found. Some semantic structures are arranged according to a different principle. In the following list of meanings of the adjective *dull* one can hardly hope to find a generalized meaning covering and folding together the rest of the semantic structure [Fig.4].

One distinctly feels, however, that there is something that all these seemingly miscellaneous meanings have in common, and that is the implication of deficiency, be it of colour (m. III), wits (m. II), interest (m. I), sharpness (m. V), etc. The implication of insufficient quality, of something lacking, can be clearly distinguished in each separate meaning.

In fact, each explanation of the meaning in the given scheme can be transformed to prove the point [Fig.5]. The transformed scheme of the semantic structure of *dull* clearly shows that the centre holding together the complex semantic structure of this word is not one of the meanings but a certain *component* that can be easily singled out within each separate meaning.

This brings us to the second level of analysis of the semantic structure of a word. The transformational operation with the meaning definitions of *dull* reveals

something very significant: the semantic structure of the word is "divisible", as it were, not only at the level of different meanings but, also, at a deeper level.

Each separate meaning seems to be subject to structural analysis in which it may be represented as sets of semantic components. In terms of *componential analysis*, one of the modern methods of semantic research, the meaning of a word is defined as a set of elements of meaning (*semes*) which are not part of the vocabulary of the language itself. The basic quality of a seme is an ability to combine in various ways with other similar elements (semes) in the meaning of different words: seme 'inferior' may be present not only in the meanings of the word *dull* but also in that of other words: *bonehead* (vulg.)

Thus, the scheme of the semantic structure of *dull* shows that the semantic structure of a word is not a mere system of meanings, for each separate meaning is subject to further subdivision and possesses an inner structure of its own.

Therefore, the semantic structure of a word should be investigated at both these levels: a) of different meanings, b) of semantic components within each separate meaning. For a monosemantic word (i. e. a word with one meaning) the first level is naturally excluded.

### **TYPES OF SEMANTIC COMPONENTS**

The leading semantic component in the semantic structure of a word is usually termed *denotative component* (also, the term *referential component* may be used). The denotative component expresses the conceptual content of a word. It conceptualizes and classifies our experience, that is designates that a certain named phenomenon refers to this or that class of objects.

The following list presents denotative components of some English adjectives and verbs. [Fig.6].

It is quite obvious that the definitions given in the right column only partially and incompletely describe the meanings of their corresponding words. To give a more or less full picture of the meaning of a word, it is necessary to include in the scheme of analysis an additional semantic component, which is called *connotation* or *connotative component*. Connotation may be defined as pragmatic

communicative value the word receives by virtue of where, when, how, by whom, for what purpose and in what context it is or may be used.

Look at the complete semantic structures of the words given above introducing connotative components into the schemes of their semantic structures [Fig.7]. The examples show how by singling out denotative and connotative components one can get a sufficiently clear picture of what the word really means. The schemes presenting the semantic structures of *glare*, *shiver*, *shudder* also show that a meaning can have two or more connotative components.

Connotative components are classified into stylistic (poetic, learned, vulgar, etc.): *stupid*, *fool*, *bonehead*, *retarded*; emotional or affective: *aggravate* – *spoil*, *kill*; evaluative: *patriot* – *nationalist*; ideological: *communist*.

### MEANING AND CONTEXT

Discussing polysemy we touched upon the advantages and disadvantages of this linguistic phenomenon. One of the most important "drawbacks" of polysemantic words is that there is sometimes danger of misunderstanding when the word is used in one meaning but understood by the listener or reader in another. It is only natural that such cases provide stuff for jokes like the following:

*Customer. I would like a book, please.*

*Bookseller. Something light?*

*Customer. That doesn't matter. I have my car with me.*

In this conversation the customer is honestly misled by the polysemy of the adjective *light* taking it in the literal sense whereas the bookseller uses the word in its figurative meaning "not serious; entertaining".

In the following joke one of the speakers pretends to misunderstand his interlocutor motivating his angry retort by the polysemy of the noun *kick*:

*The critic started to leave in the middle of the second act of the play.*

*"Don't go," said the manager. "I promise there's a terrific kick in the next act."*

*"Fine," was the retort, "give it to the author."*

Generally speaking, it is common knowledge that context is a powerful preventative against any misunderstanding of meanings. For instance, the adjective *dull*, if used out of context, would mean different things to different people or nothing at all. It is only in combination with other words that it reveals its actual meaning: *a dull pupil, a dull play, a dull razor-blade, dull weather*, etc. Sometimes, however, such a minimum context fails to reveal the meaning of the word, and it may be correctly interpreted only through what Professor N. Amosova termed a second-degree context, as in the following example: *The man was large, but his wife was even fatter*. The word *fatter* here serves as a kind of indicator pointing that *large* de-scribes a stout man and not a tall one.

These observations give ground for so called *contextual analysis*, which concentrates on determining the minimal stretch of speech and the conditions necessary and sufficient to reveal in which of its individual meaning the word in question is used.

## **Тема 6. The problems of functional and communicative linguistics.**

1. Функціональна лінгвістика та її теорії
2. Празька школа функціональної лінгвістики
3. Лондонська школа функціональної лінгвістики та її ідеї
4. Женевська школа, її представники
5. Функція як головне поняття функціонального мовознавства
6. Функціональна граматики О. В. Бондарка та її завдання;
7. Наукові школи американської лінгвістики, їх сутність
8. Поняття ФСК та ФСП.

Функціональна лінгвістика — це наука про мову в дії. Це сукупність шкіл і напрямів, що виникли як одне із відгалужень структурної лінгвістики, які характеризуються увагою до функціонування мови як засобу спілкування. Попередниками функціональної лінгвістики вчені вважають І. О. Бодуена де Куртене, Ф. де Соссюра, О. Есперсена. Головний принцип функціональної лінгвістики — розуміння мови як цілеспрямованої системи засобів вираження — запропонований Р. О. Якобсоном, М.С. Трубецьким, С. О. Карцевським у «Тезах Празького лінгвістичного гуртка» (1929 р.), і згодом розвинутий у працях інших представників Празької лінгвістичної школи, а також у працях німецького психолога К. Бюлера, котрий обґрунтував концепцію трьох функцій мови — експресивної, апелятивної та

репрезентативної. Філософські корені функціоналізму як методології знаходимо в працях І. Канта, В. Джемса, Ф. Шіллера, Л. С. Виготського, В. Франкла та ін., у дослідженнях з квантової фізики, у теорії відносності А. Ейнштейна [Селіванова, 1999].

Поворот мовознавства до людини в мові, до її мовленнєвої діяльності визначив активізацію в лінгвістиці методології функціоналізму, найбільш яскравими виразниками якої до того були представники Казанської, Празької та Лондонської мовознавчих шкіл. Розрізняючи функціоналізм як методологію і як методику, вчені виходять із того, що перше в лінгвістиці визначає сучасний стан і існування як способу руху до дослідження мови — енергії, друге є однією з методик аналізу, напрямом першого, новою галуззю мовознавства — функціональною лінгвістикою [Селіванова, 1999].

Як стверджує проф. О. О. Селіванова, функціональний підхід передбачає аналіз множинної функціональної природи мовних явищ, виходячи з їхньої семантики, структури, взаємодії з іншими одиницями, категоризації, функціонування в мовленні [В. Г. Гак, О. В. Бондарко, Г. О. Золотова та ін.]. За останнє десятиліття відбулося поєднання певних аспектів функціональної лінгвістики з когнітологією та теорією мовної комунікації, особливо у зв'язку з актуалізацією концепції універсальних граматик.

Поняття категоріальної ситуації спрямовує функціональний аналіз до сфер комунікації. Зразок поєднання функціоналізму та когнітивізму дають Х. Зайлер, Кельнська школа лінгвістики, В. Б. Касевич, О. С. Кубрякова [Селіванова, 1999].

Неконфонтативність когнітивної парадигми в лінгвістиці визначена її відновлюючою роллю, хоча між когнітивізмом та функціоналізмом як методологіями існує глобальна суперечність: якщо функціоналізм передбачає наявність у свого об'єкта (інваріантної та індивідуальної мовленнєвої діяльності) залежності від досвіду, практичної діяльності особистості, то когнітивізм у багатьох своїх напрямках характеризується апріорним логіцизмом або інтуїтивізмом [Лещак, 1997].

На думку О. Селіванової [Селіванова, 1999], американський когнітивізм (Джекендофф, Л. Талмі), зазнаючи впливу породжу-вального синтаксису Н. Хомського, обмежує кількість функцій синтаксичними правилами граматики та правилами семантичної інтерпретації. Європейська когнітологія є більш гнучкою щодо застосування досвіду функціональної лінгвістики. Отже, лише функціоналізм здатний вивести когнітивну лінгвістику за межі концептуалізації мови на рівень її справжньої мети — пізнання когніції мовленнєвої діяльності (Т. ван Дейк, В. Кінч, У. Леннерт).

Лінгвістичний функціоналізм має давні традиції, хоч у багатьох наукових працях часом остаточного його становлення як окремої галузі вважається червень 1976 р. (Франція), коли на 3-му Міжнародному колоквиумі мовознавців-функціоналістів було створено Міжнародне товариство функціональної лінгвістики, до складу якого увійшли А. Мартіне, М. Мамудян, Дж. Харві та ін. У 1979 р. опубліковано 2 колективні

монографії, у яких викладено засади функціональної школи описовості. Функціоналізм сформувався як альтернатива ідеалізму, дескриптивізму Л. Блумфілда, і ісссмаїці л. сльмсєлєва, ушьєроалиму [функциональное направление, 1980].

Як уже зазначалося, певні завдання функціонального підходу були визначені ще в ХІХ ст. та на поч. ХХ ст. у наукових працях Ф. І. Буслаєва, О. О. Потебні, І. О. Бодуєна де Куртєне, Ф. Брюно, Л. В. Щєрби, В. Скалічки, В. В. Виноградова та ін. [Бондарко, 1984].

Як стверджує проф. О. О. Сєліванова [Сєліванова, 1999], радянська функціональна лінгвістика найбільш вагомими щодо теорії функціоналізму вважала вчення про поняттєві категорії І.І. Мєщанінова, концепцію активної та пасивної граматики Л. В. Щєрби та зразок ґрунтового функціонального дослідження категорії модальності В.В. Виноградова.

Перебуваючи під впливом «Філософії граматики» О. Еспєрсєна (його двобічного підходу до дослідження мовних явищ), І. І. Мєщанінов у праці «Поняттєві категорії у мові» (1945 р.) запропонував свій погляд на категоризацію мови через поняття, що отримують «безпосереднє вираження у людському мовленні, фіксуєчись у схемах формальних та семантичних побудов. Ці поняття відображають загальні категорії мислення у його реальному вияві — мові» [Проблемы грамматики, 1985].

Ідеї активної і пасивної граматики Л. В. Щєрби, що були продовженням думки І. О. Бодуєна де Куртєне про співвідношення того, що виражено мовою, та мовних засобів вираження, також вплинули на створення концепцій функціонально-семантичних категорій і полів. В.В. Виноградов, узагальнивши досвід попередників, охарактеризував засоби модальності різного рівневого статусу та розмежував об'єктивну і суб'єктивну модальність залежно від граматикизації. Це стало першою спробою комплексного функціонального аналізу з мовних категоріальних сфер [Сєліванова, 1999].

Як зазначалося, головний принцип функціональної лінгвістики — «цільове призначення мови» — став домінуючим у тезах Празького лінгвістичного осередку, внесок якого до функціоналізму полягає у стратифікації мовних ситуацій (Р. Й. Якобсон), у створенні функціональної ономотології (В. Матєзіус), у концепціях зв'язку функції та середовища (М. С. Трубєцької) тощо.

Коментуючи сказане, зазначимо, що в працях Р. Якобсона подано шість функцій мовної комунікації, які орієнтовані на різні компоненти мовного акту: мовця, адресата, контакт, ситуацію, код і повідомлення. Запропонована вченим теорія «динамічної синхронії» дозволила розкрити паралелізм між історичною еволюцією мови, процесом оволодіння мовою, процесом мовного порушення при афазії і типологічною диференціацією мов. Значним внеском у фонологію була система із 12 бінарних акустичних ознак, запропонована Р. Якобсоном, Г. Фантом, М. Халм.

Лондонська школа (Х. Батлер, М. Холлідей, Р. Ферс) на відміну від Празької, зосередила увагу з мови на людину як суб'єкт комунікації та суспільства. Вплив біхевіоризму зумовив загальні погляди лондонців на комунікативну ситуацію як один із проявів внутрішнього стимулу природи людини — мови у сукупності її 3-х функцій: змістової, інтерактивної (міжособистісної), текстуальної (М. Холлідей).

Саме Лондонській школі належить право у з'ясуванні ролі динамічно-мовленнєвого аспекту, контекстуалізації слова, адаптації мовних одиниць стосовно середовища та мовної особистості (Р. Ферс).

Женевська школа (Ф. де Соссюр, Ш. Баллі, А. Сеше, Х. Фрей) також зробила певні кроки в розвитку функціонального підходу (теорія функціональної транспозиції як переходу мовних одиниць залежно від зміни функції Ш. Баллі, ідея ієрархії мовної системи і а її мовленнєвої динаміки А. Сеше, граматики помилок Х. Фрея) [Селіванова, 1999].

Французька функціональна традиція акцентувала увагу на раціональній організації мовного змісту в мовленні з урахуванням можливої взаємодії одиниць (закон економії, теорія монем А. Мартіне).

На думку О. Селіванової [Селіванова, 1999], А. Мартіне, виходячи з принципів комплементарності, варіативності мовлення, звертається до аналізу мовної дійсності в її необробленому природному вигляді, маргінальності, непослідовності, надмірності згідно з людськими потребами, соціальними чинниками, екстралінгвістичним середовищем.

Дослідник пропонує перспективну методику дослідження функціональної природи компонентів висловлювання на підставі їхньої трансформації, підміни, вилучення. Його теорія

членами висловлювання.

Об'єднуючи теоретичний доробок різних дослідників та наукових шкіл як підґрунтя функціоналізму, проф. О. Селіванова зазначає [Селіванова, 1999], що світова функціональна лінгвістика розвивалася в різних варіантах залежно від початкової традиції.

Західноєвропейський функціональний напрям сформувався на підставі біхевіоризму, генеративізму, антропологізму та соціологізму як наука про функціонування мовної системи в мовленнєвих актах, виходячи з їхньої антропоцентричності, психологічного механізму та суспільної орієнтації.

У радянській функціональній лінгвістиці (нині в межах СНД) головним, на думку О. Селіванової, став напрям функціонально-семантичної категоризації мовленнєвих та мовних явищ, принципи якого запропоновано лєнінградською школою О. В. Бондарка під впливом наукових знань Ф. Брюно, Г. Гійома, Е. Бен-веніста та ін.

Функціональна граматики О. В. Бондарка мала певні стадії розвитку. Найпершим її завданням було створення системи функціонально-семантичних полів (ФСП) [Богушевич, 1985; Бондарко, 1983; Бондарко, 1984; Загнітко, 1991; Мусиєнко, 1997]. Другою стадією теорії О. В. Бондарка та його послідовників стало дослідження функціонування моделей поля в

тексті, мовленні [Бу-лыгина, 1989; 12, 19, 22]. Згодом з'явилася значна кількість наукових розробок функціонального моделювання мовленнєвої діяльності (Г. М. Ільїн, О. В. Падучева, Б. М. Лейкіна, О. М. Селівестро-ва та ін.).

Як стверджує проф. О. Селіванова [Селіванова, 1999], наукові школи американської лінгвістики по-різному сприймають ідеї функціоналізму (йдеться про дискусії між когнітивним та типологічним напрямками). Сутність їхньої дискусії полягає у ступені використання положень функціоналізму (представників породжувальної семантики) в інтуїтивізмі [Ньюмейер, 1996]. Радянська лінгвістика не зазнала таких суперечностей, оскільки складалося так, що катетеризація мовних явищ відбувалася на основі їхньої функціональної природи в мові та в процесі комунікації [Селіванова, -1999]. Г. О. Золотова пропонувала визна-

- 1) системності, оскільки мовні засоби взаємно організовані;
- 2) функціональності, оскільки мовні засоби функціонують з метою здійснення комунікації;
- 3) семантичності, оскільки мовні засоби, функціонуючи, передають певний зміст з метою здійснення комунікативності [19].

Таке тлумачення забезпечує у сучасній лінгвістиці інтегральну наявність різних функціональних підходів:

- 1) мовної функціональної категоризації та польового моделювання;
- 2) аналізу функціонування категоріальних засобів у мовленні;
- 3) функціональні дослідження комунікативної ситуації на підставі її складників та загальних стратегій мовної особистості, прагматичних чинників тощо [Бондарко, 1984]. Лише поєднання цих принципів аналізу може забезпечити ефективний вияв у науковій парадигмі методології функціоналізму [Селіванова, 1999].

Вагомим з огляду на це стало розроблення теорії функціональної граматики, зокрема, створення описів певних функціонально-семантичних категорій, полів на матеріалі різних мов: аспектуальності — Ю.С. Маслов, О.В. Бондарко, О.О. Холодович, Л.К. Дмитрієва; модальності — С. М. Цейтлін, І. С. Андреева, О. І. Беляева; таксису -С. М. Полянський, Т. Г. Акімова, Н. О. Козінцева; стану —Л.Л. Буланій; персональності; прогресивності; суб'єктивності; міри; ло-кативності; темпоральності тощо. Остаточно функціонально-семантична категоризація не завершена [20], немає навіть повного списку функціонально-семантичних категорій конкретних мов, що свідчить про потребу нових досліджень цієї сфери функціоналізму.

На думку О. Селіванової [Селіванова, 1999], актуалізація у функціональній лінгвістиці категорії комунікативності спричинила перехід від аналізу конструктів, одиниць полів до синтаксичних структур — речень, а далі й до висловлювань у різних комунікативних ситуаціях, що зумовило формування функціонального синтаксису (Г.О.Золотова, Н.О.Слюсарєва, Є.М.Ширяєв). Головним поняттям функціонального мовознавства вчені

про функцію в числі найважливіших. Багато вчених роблять спроби визначити дефініційний обсяг цього поняття, встановити співвідношення функції та значення (В.Г. Гак, О.В. Бондарко, Б.О.Абрамов, В. Дресслер, З.М. Шаляпіна та ін.). На думку В. У. Дресслер, «однозначності і навіть одно-однозначності терміну «функція» немає навіть у межах однієї функціональної школи і тим більше не спостерігається у дискусіях між лінгвістичними школами» [Дресслер, 1990].

Існують різні аспекти щодо поняття «функція»: потенційний (Празька школа, В. Г. Гак); цільовий (В.О. Звєгінцев); рольовий (Ш.Баллі, О.В.Бондарко); реляційний загальний, граматичний, монематичний (А.Мартіне); позиційний (Л.Блумфілд, К.Пайк); семантичний (В.Скалічка) тощо.

Як стверджує проф. Селіванова [Селіванова, 1999], обсяг поняття функції поширюється до кінцевого результату мови — комунікативної ситуації.

Узагальнюючи всі підходи до тлумачення функції, В. Г. Гак встановлює опозиції функціонального — протилежному як: узуального — загальному, мовленнєвого — мовному; ономасіологічно-го — семасіологічному; частотно-кількісного — структурному; формально-граматичного — лексико-семантичному [19].

На думку О. Селіванової [Селіванова, 1999], якщо функція є категоризацією мовних явищ, то її можна визначити як репрезентацію концепту, який позначається різними мовними засобами. Якщо сприймати функцію як властивість мовних знаків передавати певну інформацію в акті комунікації, то її концептуальна сутність виходить за межі мовної системи і стає поняттям свідомості (В. М. Павлов). Позамовна природа функції стає предметом розгляду у функціональній лінгвістиці у зв'язку з її доповнюваністю когнітологічною парадигмою. О. В. Бондарко у статті 1992 р. характеризує два типи функціонального підходу вже не на підставі співвідношення форми та значення, а опосередковано — від зовнішнього світу через свідомість та мислення до мовних форм з їхніми значеннями або навпаки [Бондарко, 1992]. На сьогодні дискусійним є питання не ототожнення — розмежування значення і функції, а співвідношення смислу та функції.

Отже, функція має знакову природу настільки, наскільки вона може передаватися мовними засобами. Отже, функція є основою категоризації концептуальної системи людської свідомості, та, зокрема, внутрішнього лексикону мовців і мовних явищ, що проявляються в комунікативному акті [Селіванова, 1999]. Тому функціонально-семантична категорія визначається вченими як «...концептуально інтегрована система різнорівневих мовних та комунікативних засобів, здатних виконувати одну спільну функцію» [Селіванова, 1999].

Як стверджує проф. О. Селіванова, функціонально-семантичні категорії не адекватні формально-логічним, хоча деякі можуть відповідати фрагментам

логічної категоризації; частково на цій основі будується сучасна теорія функціональних граматик [Мусиенко, 1997].

На основі функціонально-семантичних категорій моделюються ФСП як система різнорівневих мовних засобів, мовленнєвих конструкцій [Минкин, 1987]. «ФСП — це поняття, що відображає мовний зміст та мовне вираження в єдності стосовно структури певної мови» [22].

«ФСП — це угруповання граматичних та лексичних одиниць, а також різних комбінованих (лексико-синтаксичних) засобів мови, що ґрунтуються на певній семантичній категорії та взаємодіють на основі спільності їхніх семантичних функцій» [21]. Як констатує О. Селіванова [Селіванова, 1999], дослідження одночасного функціонування різних засобів певного ФСП у мовленнєвій діяльності нині є актуальними і перспективними відносно до методології функціоналізму, вивчення мови в дії. Засоби однієї категорії формують у мовленні своєрідне поле, яке найбільше відповідає первинному змісту саме фізичного поля як особливої форми матерії, що створюється частками, які взаємодіють. Польове моделювання є предметом не лише функціональної лінгвістики: у мовознавство поняття «поле» прийшло з фізики через психологію, біологію та соціологію і вперше було введене до наукового обігу семасіології Г. Упсеном (1924 р.), Й. Тріром (1931 р.). Теорія поля поширилася й на інші галузі лінгвістики [Щур, 1974]. і.^идур оіисуь лексичні ^с. косеріу;, поняттєво-тематичні (С.Д.Кацнельсон), синтаксичні (Г.О.Золотова), трансформаційні (СМ.Шаумян), граматичні (Ф.Брюно, О.Есперсен), лексико-се-мантичні (Є.І.Шендельс), словотворчі (О.Г.Ревзіне), фонологічні (Б. Я. Плоткіна), морфосемантичні (П. Гиро), паратаксичні (В. Пор-циг) поля [Щур, 1974]. Існують ще й мікрополя як угруповання засобів передавання конкретного смислу. ФСП мають центр та периферію. На підставі цього О. В. Бондарко виділяє два структурні типи ФСП:

1) моноцентричні із центром — граматичною категорією (аспектуальність, темпоральність, модальність, компера-тивність, персональність);

2) поліцентричні, що спираються на певну сукупність різних мовних засобів, які не утворюють єдиної гомонен-ної системи фор-і (локативність, таксис) тощо [19].

Важливим, на думку О. Селіванової, щодо поліцентричних полів є з'ясування ознак центру ФСП. О.В.Бондарко характеризує центр ФСП як сферу найповнішої емпліцитної реалізації змісту. Проте така характеристика є нечіткою. Установлення центральних компонентів полів можливе лише на підставі таких критеріїв: експліцитності, яскравості семантики, регулярності форми тощо [Селіванова, 1999].

На думку В. Г. Адмоні [Адмоні, 1998], сфера периферії характеризується послабленням змісту, нерегулярністю форми тощо. Елементи периферії здатні переходити до периферійних сфер інших полів залежно від ситуації. «Дослідження імпліцитного у цих двох ракурсах має давні традиції (І.О. Бодуен де Куртене, О.О. Потебня, І.І. Мещанінов, Ш.

Баллі, О. Експерсен, Е. Кошмидер та ін.) і визначило, по-перше, відокремлення нової галузі граматики — імпліцитної морфології (О. М. Соколов), по-друге, виділення в межах лінгвістики тексту особливої проблеми — імплікації (Т. В. Бу-лигіна, М.Ю. Федосюк, Т. І. Сильман, Є. І. Шендедьс та ін)» [Селіванова, 1999]. Як бачимо, використання під час моделювання ФСП імгагіцитних ознак компонентів є досить перспективним, особливо в разі залучення теоретичного потенціалу когнітології [Бацевич, 1997].

#### ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Бацевич Ф. С, Космеда Т. А. Очерки по функциональной лексикологии. Львов, 1997.

Загнітко А. Основи функціональної морфології. К., 1991.

Загнітко А. Теоретична граматика української мови. К., 1993.

Селіванова О. О. Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики. К., 1999.

### **Тема 7. The problems of cognitive linguistics and discourse**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a text-analytical tradition which studies the way language use encodes and enacts ideologies leading to social power abuse, dominance and inequality (Van Dijk 2001; Wodak 2001). Grounded in post-structuralist discourse analysis and Critical Theory, it comes with its own conceptualisation of the relationship between language and society in which language use, discourse, is seen as socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned). That is, discourse exists in a dialectic with social situations and relations, both reflecting and reinforcing social structures. From a socio-cognitive rather than purely post-structuralist perspective, Van Dijk has argued that any cogent account of the relationship between discourse and social structure requires an explanation which first and foremost connects structures in text and talk with structures in the mind (e.g. 1998). To study the social action effects of language use, then, entails looking at the cognitive or conceptual effects of text and talk in social, economic and political contexts.

Cognitive Linguistics, of course, comes with its own explicitly theorised account of the relationship between language and conceptualisation (Langacker 1987, 1991; Talmy 2000). The incorporation of Cognitive Linguistics in CDA is

therefore well motivated. However, the marriage between them may be mutually constructive. It needs to explain the relationship between discursive and social practices. But on the other hand, CDA offers Cognitive Linguistics the opportunity to extend its analyses beyond linguistic and conceptual structure to include the constraints that these place on societal structure.

The body of work converging on a cognitive approach to language and ideology can thus be seen to come from both cognitive linguists turning to CDA and critical discourse analysts turning to Cognitive Linguistics.<sup>1</sup> Such work in the space between the two disciplines can, according to Dirven et al. (2003: 2), be seen as an invitation to CDA scholars not yet familiar with the tenets and analytic tools that Cognitive Linguistics has to offer to find out more about them as well as an invitation to cognitive linguists to look beyond the traditional areas of language structure to study the social belief and value systems (ideologies) that linguistic structures serve to maintain and perpetuate. More recently, cognitive linguists have recognised and elaborated in greater detail the relation between language use, mental representations of and attitudes toward language varieties, and society.

The synergy between Cognitive Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, however, which focuses more on functional variation in text and talk, is entirely in line with, and may be regarded as being part of, the movement toward a broader Cognitive Sociolinguistics (Dirven 2005; Kristiansen and Dirven 2008). The principle aim of CDA is to bring to the surface for inspection the otherwise clandestine ideological properties of text and talk and in so doing to correct a widespread underestimation of the influence of language in shaping thought and action (Fairclough 1989; Fowler 1991: 89). In Cognitive Semantics which, in opposition to structuralist and generativist semantics, has shown that the cognitive models, in the form of categories, frames and conceptual metaphors, which underpin lexical relations, coherence and metaphor in language, are subjective and culturally specific (Lakoff 1987). Like CDA, then, Cognitive Linguistics has revealed that the knowledge structures we take for granted as corresponding with reality in fact mediate and organise reality for us in ways which accord with our

language habits. This is most clear in the case of metaphor. One of the fundamental findings of Cognitive Linguistics has been the extent to which complex and abstract knowledge domains are structured, metaphorically, by more basic, familiar domains of experience (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Ontological correspondences in the source domain get mapped on to elements in the target domain to provide it with internal structure. This input, in turn, provides the basis for reason and inference within the target domain. These *conceptual* metaphors are evidenced by the systematic way that they are reflected in metaphorical *expressions*. ideologies.<sup>5</sup> Cognitive Linguistics, in other words, can serve as an analytical lens through which the latent ideologies expressed in, and enacted through, discourse can be brought to critical consciousness. Unsurprisingly given its centrality in the development of Cognitive Linguistics, the earliest and most influential appropriation of Cognitive Linguistics in CDA is in the guise of Critical Metaphor Analysis (Chilton 1996; Santa Ana 2002; Charteris-Black 2004; Koller 2004; Musolff 2004; Maalej 2007). As readers of this handbook will know, however, there is much more to the Cognitive Linguistics box than metaphor theory. Cognitive Linguistics offers a number of theories which have in common a specific set of assumptions including that linguistic (semantic and grammatical) structures are based on the same general cognitive abilities as other domains of cognition, that linguistic knowledge is conceptual in nature, that meaning is grounded in experience, and that words and constructions both construe experience. These theories address a range of linguistic/conceptual phenomena, including categorisation, schematisation, metaphor, salience, selection and perspectivisation, all of which can be seen, in certain discursive contexts, to function ideologically.<sup>6</sup> The broader synergy between Cognitive Linguistics and CDA aims to account for ideology in discourse in terms of form-meaning pairings across all of these parameters. This synergy thus offers an explanatory framework in which the ideological dimensions of language are related to general conceptual principles (Dirven et al. 2007: 1236). Indeed, it is a particular strength of the Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA that a wide array of ideological phenomena

in discourse, which may appear to be diverse, can be accounted for against a common theoretical backdrop (ibid.). Whilst metaphor studies have dominated Cognitive Linguistic investigations of ideology in CDA, then, other theories in Cognitive Linguistics have been applied,

### **Language as discourse**

The term **discourse** has several meanings in linguistics. In traditional descriptive linguistics, **discourse** is used to describe manifestations of speech and **text** to describe manifestations of writing. In discourse analysis it has been used to describe the physical, aural and visual manifestation of speech and writing, and the study of its management in relation to structure and grammar, taking account of the interactive nature of speech and writing between speaker and listener and writer and reader, and 3. There is, however, a further meaning of the word derived from social and cultural theory, particularly from the work of theorists such as the French social theorist and philosopher Michel Foucault. Here, the use of the term 'discourse' applies to what is said and written, but it also applies to the invisible structures and forces through which the ideas - the ideology - of a society are shaped. These ideas are also subject to change, and alter across time. Discourse in this sense has two dimensions: the first is the **visible** aspect; that is, speech and writing which is produced from within the structures of language we have at our disposal. The second is the **invisible** one of the underlying assumptions and practices which govern our production of language. Any discourse at any given moment in time is structured as much by the assumptions about what constitutes it as a discourse as well as the boundaries of language itself. As an example, Foucault cites institutional practices associated with education. He points out that: 'Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or modifying the appropriateness of discourses with the knowledge and power they bring with them' (Foucault 1972 : 46).

For Foucault, discourses are to do with the ways sets of statements are systematically organised in order to give expression to the meanings and values of an institution or a society. Discourses in this sense thus define and delimit what it

is possible to say or do and not possible to say or do with respect to the concerns of particular institutions and societies. To take an example cited in O' Halloran (2003:12), 'different religions have their own discourses which delimit explanation of natural behaviour. Catholicism now accepts that the universe began with the 'Big Bang' (scientific discourse) but believes that the Christian God initiated it (a mixture of scientific and religious discourse)'. Drawing upon social and cultural theories of discourse such as those of Foucault has given rise in linguistics, and especially within CDA, to different ways of interpreting the terms **discourse** and **text**. So far, the term **discourse** has been used to describe either the manifestation of speech and its organisation (discourse and conversation analysis), or as invisible structures that shape what is said (social and cultural theory). A **text** is then anything which is actually produced by language, both spoken and written. In cultural and social theory this notion is taken even further, and the term *text* is used to describe any manifestation of human communication. As the cultural theorist Fornas (1995) describes them, *texts* are: ... signifying practices (that) combine meaningful signs into complexly structured and ordered symbolic units. These are referred to as *texts*, whether they consist of spoken or written words, images, sculptural or architectural forms, musical sounds, body movements or any combination of these or other symbolic entities. Fornas (1995:149). Consequently, the term *text* may be extended beyond the written word to include any visual manifestation in the material world - images, the way we furnish our houses, the clothes we wear, even our bodies, can all be read as *texts*. As CDA is primarily concerned with linguistic analysis, then the *texts* with which it is concerned are those produced by speech and writing. Unlike traditional discourse analysis however, in CDA the use of the term does not differentiate between speech and writing, calling manifestations of both *texts*. Within CDA then, *discourse* (or discursive practices) refer to the underlying structures that shape what is said: pedagogic discourse, religious discourse, political discourse and so on, and *text* to a manifestation or realization of that discourse: a lesson, a sermon, a speech and so on. These uses of the term *text* and *discourse* have been applied to the analysis of

language by two different recent linguistic traditions: firstly, the work of critical linguists undertaken during the 1970s by Fowler (1979) and Hodge and Kress (1979). From the 1980s onwards this work has been subsumed and developed by critical discourse analysts, most notably Norman Fairclough (1989), a collection edited by Rosa Carmen Caldas- Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (1996) Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), and van Dijk (2001).

### **Tema 8. The principles of linguistic analysis. The methodology of linguistic analysis of the English language.**

Linguistic analysis involves the scientific study of language structure and use through empirical observation across levels like phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. The methodology for English includes descriptive (synchronous), comparative, and functional approaches aimed at understanding how language is structured, produced, and understood in context. Key principles emphasize systematicity, objectivity, and formality, often using models or corpora to analyze language.

#### **Principles of Linguistic Analysis**

- **Scientific Objectivity:** Analysis is based on empirical observation of actual language use, not on philosophical, subjective, or prescriptive assumptions.
- **Systematicity:** Language is treated as a structured system, where units (phonemes, morphemes, words) are studied in relation to one another.
- **Level-Based Structure:** Analysis operates across distinct, hierarchical levels, typically including phonetics/phonology (sounds), morphology (word structure), syntax (sentence structure), semantics (meaning), and pragmatics (context).
- **Formality and Modeling:** Linguistic models are often constructed to represent language, which must be formal, consistent, and logically derived from data.
- **Descriptive Approach:** The focus is on describing language as it is used, rather than prescribing how it should be used.

## Methodology of Linguistic Analysis of English

The methodology for analyzing English involves breaking down text to examine its components:

- **Descriptive Method**: Synchronous analysis of English at a specific point in time to describe its current state.
- **Comparative Method**: Comparing different forms, dialects, or related languages to understand language change and structural differences.
- **Textual/Functional Analysis**: Analyzing how language features (figures of speech, sentence structure, tone) convey meaning.
- **Levels of Investigation**:
  - **Phonetics/Phonology**: Examining the sound system and pronunciation of English.
  - **Morphology**: Analyzing word formation, such as inflections (e.g., *walk* -> *walked*) and derivations.
  - **Syntax**: Studying word order and sentence structure (e.g., SVO structure).
  - **Semantics & Lexicology**: Studying word meaning and the interaction between vocabulary and grammar.
  - **Pragmatics**: Analyzing meaning in context.

Language aims at communication. The study and analysis of language provide us an insight into how we communicate, how we think and feel and how we behave in social contexts. Linguistics which studies language is a by-product field where the linguist strives to study structural values of language. A sub-field of linguistics emerged in the 1970s which later came to be known as 'Pragmatics'. Communication done in one community in one situation with a certain set of sentences may vary in some other community in some other situation with the same lot of sentences. It is essentially because of this that one needs to dive deep into the matters of pragmatic analysis of communication. In modern linguistics, there is a tendency of enhanced studying of language as an instrument of communication and expressing thoughts and intentions. The present study which is based on German laws highlights the issues connected with studying language structure, properties, and functions as well as analyzing legislative genre. There are

also important issues of examining the substance, system and structure of the language and its functions which are discussed in the present paper.

**The latest research analysis.** The study of pragmatic functions of language is crucially important for understanding legislative texts' functionality in language and speech. The classical view on general pragmatic language functions was presented in the theories of J. R. Searle and J. Habermas. J. R. Searle determines five pragmatic functions corresponding to five classes of speech acts: assertives (the pragmatic function is to commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition); directives (the pragmatic function is an attempt by the speaker to make the listener perform an act); commissives (the pragmatic function is that the speaker commits himself to perform an act); expressives (the pragmatic function is to express the speaker's psychological state about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content of the speech act); declaratives (the pragmatic function implies that a successful performance guarantees that the propositional content of the speech act corresponds to the world). J. Habermas singles out only 3 major classes: constatives (the pragmatic function is to present states of affairs); expressives (the pragmatic function is to present something from the subjective world of the speaker); regulatives and imperatives united in a single class (the pragmatic function is to regulate the interaction between the actors in the social world)

A pragmatic analysis of discourse would be immensely important in order to eradicate the idiosyncrasies and ridiculous nature of language employed in it. discourse seems to have failed in communicating thoughts with common men and women. discourse is known for its obscurity, ambiguity, and complexity. In order to make language easy to understand, one needs to follow certain principles of communication as advised by pragmatics. Grice, a noted pragmatics, has discussed four principles for effective and rational communication.

They are as under:

1. Principle of Quality
2. Principle of Quantity

### 3. Principle of Relevance

### 4. Principle of Manner

Most of the the times all these four principles of communication are violated in legal discourse which ultimately leads to confusion. This paper shall discuss and examine legal discourse comprehensively in the light of above four principles of communication and shall derive following conclusions.

1. All the four principles of communication discussed above should be sincerely executed in discourse.

2. Obscure writing not only makes the language unintelligible but also wastes time of the reader.

3. The teaching of linguistics, pragmatics, and semantics is of prime importance for if at all we wish to reform the age old fashion of discourse.

4. Omission of unnecessary words, use of proper basic verbs, much use of active than passive voice, shorter sentences, proper punctuation and proper arrangement of words will surely lead one to a more successful communication in legal language.

The main statements of lingo-pragmatics were set out in the work of J. Austin “How to do things words” (“Word as action”). In this work, J. Austin draws attention to the fact that not all statements of natural language describe something, affirm or deny, that is, not all are judgments, there is a separate group of statements, which already at the time of pronunciation is certain actions – oaths, promises, guarantees, etc. Calling similar statements are performative, J. Austin describes them, suggests own typology of performative statements and determines the specifics: performatives are characterized by equationality, equitemporality, verifiability, specific grammatical expression and the presence of certain powers of the speaker. Linguopragmatics is used as a branch of linguistics a set of methods. F. Batsevich identifies five main methods of linguopragmatics [1, p. 37–41]:

1. Structural analysis, which consists in the study of components components of a particular linguistic phenomenon and arose within the systemstructural scientific paradigm. It is implemented in the form specific

methods of distributive analysis, component, transformation, immediate components, including in linguopragmatics actively use the component and transformational. Structural analysis has a long history and due to the traditional approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena, however, do without it when studying “language in action” it is practically impossible, because it is aimed at revealing the essence of a holistic language formation through its study individual components. O. Selivanova defines structural analysis as one that serves “knowledge of the internal organization of language as systems with inherent invariant elements that in speech correlate with regulated specific realizations” [4, p. 55], and in this sense structural analysis is indispensable in linguopragmatics;

2. Discourse analysis related to the manifestation of the subjective factor in communication, in the study of primarily spontaneous oral communicative interaction and different types of discourses. The most popular methods of discourse analysis are conversational analysis and analysis of adjacent pairs. Due to terminological fluctuations in the definition of discourse, the same situation is observed and with discourse analysis, within which critical is distinguished discourse analysis (N. Ferklo) and historical discourse analysis (R. Vodak). Critical discourse analysis “conceptualizes language as a form of social practice” and is designed to demonstrate that language and social structure interact with each other. According to O. Selivanova, the tasks of discourse analysis are “the study of social, textual and psychological contextualization of discourse, its patterns and genres with a certain a set of variables (social norms, roles, statuses of communicators, their conventions, strategies, indicators of interactivity and the effectiveness of communication), the study of patterns of communication of communicative cooperation or factors generation of communicative conflict, methods of implementation communicative rivalry; description of institutional forms and types discourses, etc” [4, p. 626–27].

3. Content analysis provides a quantitative description of communication, the certain calculations of functioning language units in texts and discourses. Besides it gives fairly objective results concerning elementary language units and

their features semantics and functioning in the communicative process. Units of content analysis are the smallest components of texts in which find out the frequency and nature of variables (properties of categories) [5, p. 94]. Preferably content analysis is used in research of mass media communication, which allows to trace objective indicators of changes in the functioning of language units in dynamics;

4. Intent analysis involves identifying real intentions of communicators “according to the peculiarities of their speech, communicative behavior in general with the use of special methods and techniques of analysis of live speech”. So the traditional linguistics has studied what has been said or written, i.e. the result of speech activity, and intention of the speaker, often hidden, remained unnoticed by researchers. In linguopragmatics, the illocutionary phase, which corresponds to the intention of the speaker, is one of the most important, so it is considered in various aspects. Thus, S. Shabat-Savka defines the intention as communicative category that “represents the mental world human in syntactically delineated, modelrelevant sentence realizations” [7, p. 50], updating the syntactic aspect. Intent analysis is a priority method of PC research: at the first stage determine the specific content of the text and the obviousness of its intentional plan, and at the second stage –submit “expert qualification of the intention underlying the analyzed statement” –this procedure is obtained. \_\_ Regarding the existence of a separate pragmatic analysis, it should be noted that most do not recognize the existence of such a separate method, which should include the study of strategies and tactics communication, axiological aspects of communication, speech genres, laws, and rules of communication, etc. F. Batsevych emphasizes: “it should be noted that so far the methods and techniques of language analysis inherent only in this method have not been created, and therefore to speak of the existence of a separate pragmatic method of language analysis at the present stage of development of linguistics is too early” [1, p. 41]. However, it should be noted that the latter sometimes scientific investigations appear, where the method of pragmatic analysis is defined

as separate (R. Vavrinchik, V. Pustovalova). However, it is too early to talk about the existence of pragmatic analysis as a specific method.

Language is the most natural way for the expression of the human mind and heart. The study and analysis of language provide us an insight into how we communicate, how we think and feel and how we behave in a social context. De facto, language lies at the heart of understanding all aspects of human culture, human behavior, human thinking, and human psychology. Linguistics which studies language is a product field where the linguist tries to study language and its structural values. But it was still left for some others to study and understand how language performs differently and invites various communications in various contexts – social, behavioral, psychological, or cultural. As a result, a sub-field of linguistics emerged in the 1970s which later came to be known as “Pragmatics”. Communication done in one community in one situation with a certain set of sentences may vary in some other community in some other situation with the same lot of sentences. A pragmatic analysis of legal discourse would be immensely important in order to eradicate the idiosyncrasies and ridiculous nature of language employed in it. When it comes to approving or disapproving a point in the court or when it comes to claiming their clients’ right, the lawyers, it has been observed, leave no stone unturned to interpret or misinterpret the words written in law. This is precisely because of the ambiguous and obscure language of law. This paper does not in any way aim at disqualifying and condemning the lawyers and their tactics.

Language fails to communicate the moment these all or one of these principles are violated, which actually happens in legal discourse. Firstly, one must follow the principle of quality, that is, one should neither say what he/she knows it is false nor speak something the evidence of which he/she does not have.

The conducted linguistic and pragmatic analysis develops a deeper understanding of the fundamental features of the language system and, to a certain extent, may be applicable to the studies of texts belonging to different genres in other languages. Pragmatics of the XXI century can be described as an actively

developing branch with the multiple sources of new theoretical problems and applied tasks. The functions of language reflect its essence, purpose and social nature. The main basic language functions are split into special language functions. The latter can be considered the specific actualization of a communicative act's certain elements. The number of special language functions varies in different studies. These functions determine either the basic kinds of speech acts or definite types of speech activity. Thus, the information presented in the legislative text affects the attention, and memory of the text's recipient.

Regarding the existence of a separate pragmatic analysis, it should be noted that most do not recognize the existence of such a separate method, which should include the study of strategies and tactics communication, axiological aspects of communication, speech genres, laws, and rules of communication, etc. F. Batsevych emphasizes: "it should be noted that so far the methods and techniques of language analysis inherent only in this method have not been created, and therefore to speak of the existence of a separate pragmatic method of language analysis at the present stage of development of linguistics is too early". However, it should be noted that the latter sometimes scientific investigations appear, where the method of pragmatic analysis is defined as separate (R. Vavrinchik, V. Pustovalova). However, it is too early to talk about the existence of pragmatic analysis as a specific method.

## ЗАВДАННЯ ДЛЯ ПРАКТИЧНИХ ЗАНЯТЬ

### ПИТАННЯ ДЛЯ САМОКОНТРОЛЮ

1. Коли виникло поняття "концепт"? Стараннями яких учених це поняття було опрацьовано у сучасному когнітивному розумінні?
2. Як визначає поняття концепту академік Д.С. Лихачов? Чи збігається його розуміння концепту з вченням С.О. Аскольдова-Алексєєва?
3. Як розуміє термін "концепт" О.С. Кубрякова?
4. У чому полягає так званий "семантичний підхід" до визначення концепту?
5. Як трактують поняття концепту російські лінгвісти Ю.С. Степанов і В.М. Телія?
6. Які два основні підходи щодо тлумачення терміна *концепт* виділяються у сучасному мовознавстві?
7. Як Ви розумієте термін "лінгвокультурема"? Хто запровадив це поняття в лінгвістиці?
8. Як Ви розумієте термін "логоепістема"? Які вчені запровадили це поняття в лінгвістиці?
9. У чому полягає лінгвокультурологічне осмислення концепту?
10. Які основні принципи можуть сприяти об'єктивізації вибірки слів-концептів?
  11. Як Ви розумієте поняття "ключові слова культури"?
  12. У чому полягає відмінність між термінами "концепт", "поняття" і "значення"?
  13. Надайте визначення терміну "концепт".
14. Які складові концепту як гетерогенного ментального утворення Ви можете виділити?
  15. Які ознаки у структурі концепту виділяє Ю.С. Степанов?
16. Які компоненти, на думку В.А. Маслової, складають структуру концепту?
17. Чому термінологічне сполучення "концептуальний аналіз" є ам-

бівалентним?

18. Охарактеризуйте основні етапи методики опису концептів.

### Питання до екзамену

1. Make a list of problems of Psycholinguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
2. Make a list of problems of Sociolinguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
3. Make a list of problems of Cognitive Sociolinguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
4. Make a list of problems of Cognitive Linguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
5. Make a list of problems of Functional Linguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
6. Make a list of problems of Semantics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
7. Make a list of problems of Pragmatics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
8. Make a list of problems of Communicative Linguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
9. Make a list of problems of Structural Linguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
10. Make a list of problems of Generative Linguistics and dwell on some of them in more detail.
11. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure.
12. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of Noam Chomsky.
13. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of Edward Sapir.
14. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of Leonard Bloomfield.
15. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of W. Labov.
16. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of J.R. Firth
17. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of M.K. Halliday.
18. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of Paul Grice.
19. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of J. Searle.
20. Dwell on the life, works and contribution into linguistics of R. Jakobson
21. Особливості англомовного дискурсу
22. Англомовний науковий дискурс: сучасний стан та перспективи подальших досліджень
23. Сучасний англомовний дискурс соціальних мереж.
24. Social Media Discourse through the Lens of Linguistics
25. Digitally Mediated Dialogue: Semiotic and Genre Features
26. Неологізми в англомовному дискурсі пандемії Ковід-19
27. Лінгвальні характеристики сучасного англомовного політичного дискурсу
28. Сучасний англомовний художній дискурс
29. The problems of functional and communicative linguistics.
30. The problems of semantics and pragmatics

## РЕКОМЕНДОВАНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

### Основна

1. Saxena, S. (2018, April 23). *What is Social Media and what are its main features*. Retrieved November 08, 2020, from <https://www.easymedia.in/socialmedia-main-features>
2. Brian Solis (2017, April 19). *The Hashtag Economy*. Retrieved November 08, 2020, from <https://www.briansolis.com/2011/06/hashtag-this-the-culture-of-socialmedia-is/>
3. Кобякова І. К. Механізми перекладу складних речень як мінімальної одиниці перекладу в англійській мові. *Topical issues of the development of modern science: The 4<sup>th</sup> International scientific and practical conference (December 11–13, 2019)*. Sofia: ACCENT, 2019. С. 412–420.
4. Бондаренко Ю. Словесно-стильовий аналіз літературного твору в школі. *Дивослово*. № 5. 2020. С. 11–16
5. Laurie Bauer *An Introduction to English Lexicology (Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language)*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh. 2021.

### Допоміжна

1. *Cambridge Dictionary: English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 08, 2020, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
2. *Glossary of multimodal terms*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 08, 2020, from <https://multimodalityglossary.wordpress.com/>
3. Kravets O., Proskurina N. Mythological World in D. Lessing's Dilogy «Mara and Dann». *Південний архів (Збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки)*. Херсон, 2019. Вип. 78. С. 52–56.

### Інформаційні ресурси в Інтернет

Англїстика: <https://flibusta.su/book/90130-sovremennyiy-angloyazychnyy-akademicheskii-diskurs-genezis-i-zhanrov/read/>  
 Britain vs the US. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=waZy08wvPKU>  
 Do's and don't's in Britain. URL: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_joW8biol9Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_joW8biol9Q)