

*Or they for ony money do take or tell.
Synfull preestes gyueth
the synners example bad:
Theyr chyldren sytteth by other mennes fyres, I haue harde;
And some haunteth womens company
With vnclene lyfe, as lustes of lechery.
These be with synne made blynde* [9, p. 5].

As for the linguistic means, it would be instructive to have a look at the passage concerning the lecherous life of the priests. The author decided to use two images to concretize the abstract situation of fornication – one of children brought up by foster-parents, and the other of priests haunting women to win pleasure [3, p. 25].

One more important strategy concerning the structure of this passage is addition of particular motifs. There is a reminiscence on the first epistle of Saint Peter, where it is written: Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as gold or silver, from your vain conversation of the tradition of your fathers: But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled [3, p. 25].

Thus, both the linguistic and structural peculiarities of «Everyman» seem complicated and inaccessible to modern audience because of the socio-cultural attitudes of the age encoded in images, allusions and symbols. But we clearly see that the structure and the language of the play fulfil a didactic function – to teach a reader a lesson about the Christian idea of salvation and make him realize his sinfulness.

Література:

1. Bevington, David Medieval drama / David Bevington. – London: Houghton Mifflin, 1975. – 1075 p.
2. Knoell, David The Resurrection of Everyman / David Knoell. – University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2002. – 157 p.
3. Poláčková, Eliška Everyman and Homulus: Analysis of Their Genetic Relation / Eliška Poláčková – Masaryk University Faculty of Arts: Department of English and American Studies, 2010. – 44 p.
4. Potter, Robert The English Morality play: Origins, History and Influences of a Dramatic Tradition / Robert Potter. – London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975. – 295 p.
5. Szabados, Ádám The Way of Salvation in Two Allegorical Works: a Comparison of Everyman and the Pilgrim's Progress / Ádám Szabados. – University of Veszprem: Department of English and American Studies, 1999. – 94 p.
6. Tóth, Miklós Everyman in Contemporary European drama / Miklós Tóth. – University of Theatre and Film Arts, 2013. – 78 p.
7. Van Laan, Thomas F. Everyman: A Structural Analysis / Thomas F. van Laan // Modern Language Association. No. 5 (Vol. 78). – December. – N.Y., 1963. – PP. 465-75.
8. Weimann, Robert Shakespeare and the popular tradition / Robert Weinmann. – Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. – 325 p.

Ілюстративний матеріал:

9. Franks, Kate Everyman / Kate Franks. – Boston: Bedford, 1999. – 34 p.

УДК 81.373.6:811.111

Valery V. Mykhaylenko,

King Danylo Galytsky University of Law, Ivano-Frankivsk

FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS OF APPPOSITION IN THE AUTHOR'S DISCOURSE: CONTRASTIVE ASPECT

This paper first defines the notion of apposition and the state of the art in linguistics. The fact is that its etymology reveals vagueness which comes from Latin apponere 'to put aside' and it is still retained in the Modern English definition 'a syntactic relation in which an element is juxtaposed to another element of the same kind, especially between noun phrases that do not have distinct referents' (P.H.Mathews, 1987). Our aim is to investigate apposition constructs – their formal, syntactic, distributional, semantic and pragmatic characteristic – as for its status in language system and discourse structure. The contrastive analysis of the data shows in English (SL) and Ukrainian (RL) that close appositions are mainly retained in the process of translation, loose apposition structures are frequently changed due to the difference in the grammatical structure of the two languages. The semantic relationship between units in apposition functioning in various registers of discourse can be described in a variety of ways. The two units of an apposition can be characterized by the semantic relations existing between them – either referential or non-referential. These issues can be set as a perspective of our further investigation.

Key-words: apposition, structure, function, semantics, pragmatics, distribution author's discourse.

ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНА СЕМАНТИКА ПРИКЛАДКИ В АВТОРСЬКОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: КОНТРАСТИВНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Стаття має на меті визначити поняття прикладки у процесі критичного аналізу літератури. Наша мета – дослідити апозитивні конструкції – їхні формальні, синтаксичні, дистрибутивні, семантичні та прагматичні характеристики – щодо її статусу у системі мови та структурі дискурсу. Контрастивний аналіз фактичного матеріалу свідчить про те, що в англійській (МД) та українській (МІ) фіксована прикладка зазвичай не змінює своєї позиції у процесі перекладу, тоді як нефіксована прикладка може змінювати позицію та функцію під впливом відмінних рис граматичної структури обидвох мов.

Ключові слова: прикладка, структура, функція, семантика, прагматика, дистрибуція, авторський дискурс.

ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ СЕМАНТИКА ПРИЛОЖЕНИЯ В АВТОРСКОМУ ДИСКУРСЕ: КОНТРАСТИВНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Цель данной статьи – определение понятия приложения в процессе критического анализа существующей литературы, а также его формальные, синтаксические, дистрибутивные, семантические и прагматические характеристики для определения её статуса в системе языка и структуре дискурса. Контрастивный анализ фактического материала свидетельствует о том, что в английском языке (ЯИ) и украинском языке (ЯП) фиксированное приложение как правило не меняет своей позиции у процессе перевода; тогда как в украинском языке приложение может менять позицию и функцию в предложении под влиянии грамматических различий обоих языков

Ключевые слова: приложение, структура, функция, семантика, прагматика, дистрибуция, авторский дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

With every new interpretation of the category of apposition it becomes more and more vague [see: 13]. The term comes from Latin *apponere* 'to put aside' which bears some vagueness [25, p. 121–123]. Divergences of opinions have emerged when deciding what is or is not an apposition. Primarily there is a formal criterion of apposition in the clause: A noun which explains or characterizes another is placed alongside to fit and from its position is accordingly called an appositive [8, p.129]. Cf.: Otto Jespersen considers that apposition is a structure without any explicit coordination [14, p.13]. To make opposition more complicated O. Curme and O. Jespersen refer other linguistic units like phrases, clauses, and sentences to the appositional structures in English [see: 18, p. 195–211]. Besides, O. Curme differentiates between close and loose types of apposition that he names loose apposition: (1) an apposition is a construction consisting of two or more adjacent units that have identical referents; (2) an apposition is a grammatical construction in which two typically adjacent nouns referring to the same person or thing stand in the same syntactical relation to the rest of a sentence [23, p.83–95]. Apposition is best defined as a grammatical relation realized by constructions having specific syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics [19, p.1-9]. Apposition is a kind of syntactic relationship where two units, which carry out the same syntactic function, have the same status and the same referent in the external world Abruneiras [2, p.122-123], for instance, the subject and its apposition are co-referential because both refer to the same person in the external world, and neither is dependent on the other. Both Ch. Fries [10, p.187] and W.N. Francis [9, p.301] restrict the category of apposition to coreferential noun phrases that are juxtaposed and there are appositions proper which can be loose or close and apposition as a grammatical relation and appositive adjectives [9, p. 93; 11, p. 25–60].

A survey of the literature from A.J. Brill (1852), H. Poutsma (1904), O. Jespersen (1909-49), O. Curme (1947), J. Bitesa (1977), C.F. Meyer (1991), J.C. Acuna-Fariña (1996), Javier García Ruano (2011) to Hermanus Heringa (2012) shows that «grammarians vary in the freedom with which they apply the term 'apposition'...» [24, p.:1302]

DISCUSSION

Traditionally, apposition has been considered a relation consisting of two units that are coreferential [cf.: 10, p.187; 12, p.101; 24, p.1301; 6, p.405f.]. However, as is argued in C.F. Meyer (1987) that not all apposition constructions consist of coreferential units, therefore we must refer the relation of apposition to only those constructions whose units are coreferential, consequently, it severely limits the number of constructions that can be admitted as appositions. At present morphological, syntactical, functional, and semantic features of the sentence including an apposition have found their adequate description in English. However, the correlation of apposition and other parts of the sentence in reflecting a referent needs a more thorough study [1].

Unlike B. Roberts [6, p. 389–419] only the surface structure of apposition will be taken into account when applying integral criteria. H. Sopher was the first to define apposition as a relation with specific formal, syntactical and notional properties. Later, H. Sopher's notion of apposition was expanded [26, p/401f., see also: R. Quirk et al, 1985, and C.F. Meyer, 1987, 1987, 1991]. The authors distinguish between degrees of apposition and include within apposition members appearing in unjuxtaposed position. However, the main novelty of both R. Quirk et al.'s and C.F. Meyer's theories is the expansion of semantic relations and, accordingly of apposition markers. In Quirk's view, apposition comprises not only co-reference but also synonymy and attribution. To these C.F. Meyer would add the relation of hyponymy. Apart from the semantic expansion, C.F. Meyer also stands out for the pragmatic constraint in terms of which he defines apposition. We put forward a hypothesis that the apposition as the adjunct of the NP has to supply new information about the head word of the NP.

INVESTIGATION

Appositions become a useful tool in discourse, namely in interactive registers or genres for the provision of additional information for readers. Since these genres are aimed at readers of various levels of cultural knowledge, and the amount of shared knowledge must be different. Therefore, in order to supply the knowledge needed to follow the flow of written discourse, the author includes information in the second member of the apposition which may be more, less or equally specific as that provided in the first member, e.g.:

1. Maximilian Kohler, director general of CERN, was known behind his back as Knig-King. The NP including the apposition underwent the following structural transformation in the TL: [SL] NP + APP → [TL] → APP + NP, see: «Генерального директора Максиміліана Колера за спиною називали Королем.»

In the TL the apposition moved into the preposition to the subject – the translator stresses the importance of the man's ranking in the institution, however, the author stresses the man's personal character. This apposition belongs to a group of 'close' appositions, which are not bounded by commas therefore both units constitute an overt NP with the Adjunct + Head Word Structure where the adjunct agrees with the head word in number, case and gender as Russian is as a flecional language.

The subject of the sentence is expressed by the proper name *Maximilian Kohler* (NP) which correlates contensively with the apposition (APP) expressed by the noun phrase (NP) both nominal phrases are co-referents of the same person. There are no other syntactical relationships between these phrases, the SL APP is bounded by commas, the TL APP is not punctually marked, that also proves the close unity of the subject and apposition. P.H. Mathews gives a very vague definition of apposition as 'a syntactic relation in which an element is juxtaposed to another element of the same kind, especially between noun phrases that do not have distinct referents' [12, p. 22] which requires a more detailed analysis on the syntactic level. The head words (or anchor) of both units refer to the same lexical-grammatical class of nouns. Syntactically the apposition *director general of CERN* is neither coordinated with nor subordinated to *Maximilian Kohler*. The presence of the singular verb 'was' points out that there may be a grammatically single subject. Though by its position apposition – as an adjunct of the subject – is structurally independent and can itself function as subject of the sentence, cf.:

1.1. * Maximilian Kohler was known behind his back as Knig-King.

1.2. *The director general of CERN was known behind his back as Knig-King.

Without change of meaning we may rewrite the sentence may be re-written.

The two noun groups Maximilian Kohler → Kohler and director general of CERN → director are syntactically equivalent: either can function as the subject, cf. (2-3):

2. A sharp beeping sound cut the air, and Langdon looked up. Kohler reached down into the array of electronics on his wheelchair. He slipped a beeper out of its holder and read the incoming message. «Раптом щось різко запищало. Ленгтон здригнувся. Колер витягнув із футляра пейджер і почитав повідомлення»

3. The director propelled his wheelchair back into the fog-filled living room.

«Директор рушив назад до вітальні, наповненої крижаним туманом».

On the notional level *Kohler and director* due to their single referent are interchangeable. These nouns are therefore notional equivalents, i.e. of equal rank [5, p. 113–130]. Though, in the same sentence they are interchangeable but not equal.

The fact is that Subject (S) and Apposition (APP) are notionally equivalent when any of the following conditions is satisfied: S and APP are interchangeable; APP can replace S. Pragmatic features of APP provide new information about S, thus contributing to the flow of discourse. The piece of information provided may be more, less or equally specific that supplied by S. It is worth emphasizing that apposition only refers to non-restrictive or loose apposition [20, p.122-123]. APP provides some additional information by the Speaker. Cognitively, the Hearer or the Reader interprets the apposition as an informational complement of the subject, for instance: [SL] NP (Italy's most enlightened men) + APP (physicists, mathematicians, astronomers) → [TL] NP (найученіші мужи Італії)+ APP (фізики, математики, астрономи), e.g.:

4. Some of Italy's most enlightened men--physicists, mathematicians, astronomers--began meeting secretly to share their concerns about the church's inaccurate teachings. «Деякі найученіші мужи Італії – фізики, математики, астрономи–почали таємно зустрічатися й обмінюватися думками про хибність учення Церкви.»

Apposition is a relation in which the second unit of the apposition either wholly or partially provides new information about the first unit. In (4) the author expresses a positive evaluation of the referents with the help of post-positional apposition, see also:

5. But now, in keeping with the sacred tradition, fifteen days after the death of a Pope, the Vatican was holding II Conclavo – the sacred ceremony in which the 165 cardinals of the world–the most powerful men in Christendom – gathered in Vatican City to elect the new Pope. «Дотримуючись священної традиції, через п'ятнадцять днів після смерті Папи Ватикан скликав конклав. Ця давня церемонія, суть якої полягає в тому, що всі 165 кардиналів – найвпливовіші люди у християнському світі – збираються у Ватикані, щоб обрати нового Папу.»

The translator transforms the complex sentence into a sequence of a simple sentence and a complex sentence – the first apposition of SL is transformed into a subject of the first clause but the second pair of NP + APP is retained, see:

[SL]CLAUSE 1 → NP1 + APP 1 + CLAUSE 2 → NP2 + APP2 → [TL] S1 → NP1 + NP2 /S → CLAUSE1 + CLAUSE2 → NP + APP.

Traditionally, restrictive and nonrestrictive appositions are differentiated: a restrictive apposition is necessary to maintain the meaning of the sentence and does not require commas. There must be a communicative need for some new information to be provided about the first unit of the apposition. Usually, a restrictive apposition is a single word closely related to the preceding word. It restricts or narrows the meaning of the word it modifies, e.g. (6-8):

6. A moment later, the phone on Camerlegno Ventresca's desk began to ring. The camerlegno rapped his finger down on the speaker-phone button. It retains its structure in TL: [SL] APP + NP » [TL] APP + NP, e.g.: «За мить на столі в камерарія Вентрески задзвонив телефон. Камерарій натиснув на кнопку «динамік». The proper name restricts the general meaning of 'camerlegno.'

7. Vittoria looked surprised by his question. – Of course. Proposed by a Catholic monk, Georges Lematre in 1927. «--Звичайно. Її висунув у 1927 році монах католик на ім'я Жорж Леметр.

8. But, I thought... he hesitated. Wasn't the Big Bang proposed by Harvard astronomer Edwin Hubble? «--А я думав... – Хіба автор цієї ідеї не гарвардський астроном Едвін Габбл?»

The meaning of the head words in the function of the indirect object in (7) the apposition a *Catholic monk*, *Harvard astronomer* in (8) is restricted by the appositions expressed by proper names *Georges Lematre* in (7), *Edwin Hubble* in (8). See the transformation: [SL] NP (Indirect Object)+ APP → [TL] (Indirect Object)+ APP.

Approximately three-quarters of these appositions were evenly distributed among the written samples of British and American English. A much smaller percentage occurred in the spoken samples [15, p. 389–419; 4, p. 173–181; 7; 25, p. 121–123].

The semantic relationship between units in apposition can be described in a variety of ways. The two units of an apposition can be characterized by the semantic relations existing between them, relations that are either referential or non-referential [see: 3, p.59–81]. In addition, appositions can be classified into various semantic classes, depending upon whether the second unit of the apposition provides information about the first that is more specific less specific or equally specific. In appositions containing first units that are noun phrases, the apposition can be categorized according to whether or not the second unit of the apposition restricts the reference of the first unit. And finally, appositions form semantic gradients, with some appositions being semantically more appositional than others. Due to the thematic characteristic, appositions can be better suited to some contexts than to others and were therefore distributed differently across the genres of the corpora [15, p. 389–419; 16, p. 113–130; 22].

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

We have carried a descriptive comparative analysis of apposition based on a corpus from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic points of view. While appositions are of interest in their own right, such investigation is also relevant to broader questions concerning their relationship with discourse register. The semantic relationship between units in SL apposition functioning in various registers of discourse and its transference into TL and can be described in a variety of ways. The two units of an apposition can be characterized by the semantic relations existing between them – either referential or non-referential. These issues of the apposition semantic classification can be set as a perspective of our further investigation.

References:

1. Мишина Ю. Е. Приложение в английском языке: структура, семантика, просодия: автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук: спец.10.02.04 «Германские языки» / Ю. Е. Мишина. – Самара, 2007. – 24 с.
2. Abruneiras Paula Rodriguez. Apposition vs. Exemplification with Including and Included as Markers: Some or Different Categories / Paula Rodriguez Abruneiras // Javier Ruano Garcia et al. (eds.). Current Trends in Anglophone Studies: Cultural, Linguistic and Literary Research. – Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2011. – Pp.121– 130.
3. Acuna-Farina J. C. On Apposition // English Language and Linguistics. – 1998. – Vol.3. – Issue1. – Pp. 59– 81.
4. Aijmer Karin, Altenberg Bengt. English Corpus Linguistics / Karin Aijmer, Bengt Altenberg. – London, New York: Routledge, 2014. – 352 p.
5. Bitea Joan. N. An Attempt at Defining Apposition in Modern English / Joan N. Bitea // Revue Romaine de Linguistique. – 1977. – Vol.13. – Issue 4. – Pp.453– 477.
6. Burton-Roberts N. Nominal Apposition / N.Burton-Roberts // American Speech. –1953. –28. – Pp.389– 419.
7. Bussmann Hadumod. Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. / Hadumod Bussmann. Translated and edited by Gregory Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi. – London, New York: Routledge, 2006. – 560 p.
8. Curme G.O. English Grammar / G.O. Curme. – New York: Barnes and Noble, 1947. – x. 308 p.
9. Francis Winthrop Nelson. The Structure of American English / W. N. Francis. – New York: Ronald Press Co., 1958. – 614 p.
10. Fries Charles Carpenter. The Structure of English: An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences / C. C. Fries. – New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952. – 304 p.
11. Heringa Hermanus. Appositional Constructions / Hermanus Heringa. – Groningen: Groningen University, 2012. – 251 p.
12. Hockett C. F. Attribution and apposition / C.F. Hockett // American Speech. – 1955. – Vol.30. – Pp. 92– 102.

13. Huddleston Rodney, Pullum Geoffrey K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language / Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 1860 p.
14. Jespersen Otto. Analytic Syntax / Otto Jespersen. – New York : Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, – 1969.–xv. 160p.
15. Koktova E. Apposition as a Pragmatic Phenomenon in a Functional Description / E. Koktova // UEA Papers in Linguistics.– 1985. – Vol. 23. – Pp. 389–419.
16. Martinez Esperanza Rama. Loose Apposition in Journalistic Style / Rama Esperanza Martinez // BELLS (Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies). – 1995. –Vol. 6. – Pp. 113–130.
17. Matthews P. H. Concise Dictionary of Linguistics / P. H. Matthews. – Oxford Oxford University Press, 1987. – 411 p.
18. McCawley J. D. An Overview of «Appositive» Constructions in English /J.D. McCawley // Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics. – 1996. – Vol. 12. – Pp.195–211.
19. Meyer C. F. Apposition in English / C.F. Meyer // Journal of English Linguistics. – 1987. – Vol. 20. – Pp. 101– 121.
20. Meyer C. F. Restrictive Apposition: An Indeterminate Category // English Studies. – 1989. – Vol. 70. – Pp. 147–66.
21. Meyer C. F. Apposition in Contemporary English / C. F. Meyer // Aijmer, K. and Alten–Berg, B. (eds.) English Corpus Linguistics. – London : Longman, 1991. – Pp.166–181.
22. Mykhaylenko Valery V. On Semantic Relationship in Apposition Structures / Valeriy V.Mykhaylenko //Прикладные научные разработки. – Sofia : Rusnauka, 2009.
23. Penas María Dolores Gómez. Apposition in English: A Linguistic Study based on a Literary Corpus / María Dolores Gómez Penas // Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses. – 1994. –Vol.4. – Pp. 83–95.
24. Quirk Randolph, Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English language / R. Quirk et al. – London: Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.
25. Ruano Javier García. Current Trends in Anglophone Studies: Cultural, Linguistic and Literary Research / Javier García Ruano. – Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2011. – 264 p.
26. Sopher H. Apposition / H.Sopher. – English Studies. – 1971. – Vol. 52. – Pp. 401–412.

УДК 811.11'42

O. V. Yemelyanova, S. M. Shulik,
Sumy State University, Sumy

PRAGMATIC POTENTIAL OF OCCASIONAL INNOVATIONS IN MASS MEDIA DISCOURSE

The article deals with the study of pragmatic potential of occasional innovations in mass media discourse. It was found out that media texts are the richest sources of occasional innovations. The conducted research defines the features of functioning of occasionalisms, their inseparability from the context, existence in speech in a certain speech situation, restriction of further spread. The ways of occasional innovations coining were determined, as well as the reasons of their creation.

Key words: mass media discourse, occasional innovations, communicativeness of the text, pragmatic potential, word-formation derivation.

ПРАГМАТИЧНИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ ОКАЗИОНАЛЬНИХ ІННОВАЦІЙ У ДИСКУРСІ ЗАСОБІВ МАСОВОЇ ІНФОРМАЦІЇ

Стаття присвячена вивченню прагматичного потенціалу оказіональних інновацій у дискурсі засобів масової інформації. Було з'ясовано, що тексти засобів масової інформації є одними з найбагатших джерел оказіональних інновацій. Проведене дослідження визначає особливості функціонування оказіоналізмів, їх неподільність з контекстом, існування в мовленні в певній мовленнєвій ситуації, обмеженість поширення. Було визначено способи утворення оказіональних інновацій, причини їх появи.

Ключові слова: дискурс засобів масової інформації, оказіональні інновації, комунікативність тексту, прагматичний потенціал, словотворча деривація.

ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЙ ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ОККАЗИОНАЛЬНЫХ ИННОВАЦИЙ В ДИСКУРСЕ СРЕДСТВ МАСОВОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ

Статья посвящена изучению прагматического потенциала окказиональных инноваций в дискурсе средств массовой информации. Было выяснено, что тексты средств массовой информации являются одними из самых богатых источников окказиональных инноваций. В процессе исследования были определены особенности функционирования окказионализмов, их неотделимость от контекста, существование в речи в данной речевой ситуации, ограниченность дальнейшего использования. Были определены способы образования окказиональных инноваций, причины их появления.

Ключевые слова: дискурс средств массовой информации, окказиональные инновации, коммуникативность текста, прагматический потенциал, словообразовательная деривация.

The society is always in motion as well as the language. Lexis is constantly changing, new words appear and are being coined, old words are revived. At various times language looks different. The most clearly we can observe the processes of this change in the texts of mass media. Radio, television, newspapers respond to the language change nearly immediately. Mass media activates language features, and derivational, in particular, in full scale.

A lot of Ukrainian and Russian linguists, namely: N. H. Babenko, M. A. Bakina, H. A. Vinokur, O. A. Habinska, L. B. Hattalova, V. S. Himpelevich, L.I. Ploshikova and others focus their research interest on occasionalisms studies.

Despite a significant number of scientific papers, an interest to the study of occasional innovations is growing every day. It is stipulated by the fact that occasionalism coining is a continuous process that requires thorough consideration. From the pragmalinguistics perspective occasional innovations in mass media discourse still do not have complex character and this fact determines the relevance of this work.

The subject area of this study is the pragmatic peculiarities of occasional innovations in mass media discourse. The specific topic is English mass media discourse.

Discourse (French. *discours*, Eng. *discourse*, from Latin. *discursus* ‘running back and forth, movement, cycle, conversation, talk’) is the process of speech activity, way of speaking. This term has many meanings and is used in a number of sciences, the object of which directly or indirectly involves the study of language functioning, that is linguistics, literary criticism, semiotics, sociology, philosophy, anthropology and ethnology [1, p. 438].

An important feature of a discourse is the concept dynamics, that gradually unfolds over time. The theme of discourse is its content, which is concentrated around the so-called reference concept. The theme largely relates to the social world, feelings of