UDC 811.111'42:165.194:808.5

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF AUTHORIZATION
IN MODERN ENGLISH MAGAZINE DISCOURSE:
CONSTRUCTIONIST RHETORICAL APPROACH

S. I. Potapenko
(Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine)
K. I. Andriishyna
(O. Dovzhenko Hlukhiv National Pedagogical University, Ukraine)

S. I. Potapenko, K. I. Andriishyna. Linguistic Means of Authorization in Modern English Magazine Discourse: Constructionist Rhetorical Approach. The article discusses the linguistic means of authorization in English magazine discourse. It proposes a definition of authorization and its discursive realization with the implementation of rhetorical canons and ways of persuasion. The linguistic means of authorization is represented by constructions which due to the fusion of form and meaning or form and function reflect the authorship – individual, institutional or collective. The paper distinguishes two types of constructions: deictic indicating individual authorization and impersonal pointing to the institutional authorship. With respect to the referential meaning of its constituents, deictic constructions fall into orientational fixing the author's place in the environment: somatic relating to the author's body; perceptual rendering visual, auditory or tactile modalities; locational referring to the author's whereabouts. Constructions denoting an author's activity refer to different spheres: cognitive; communicative; professional. Constructions referring to social relations reveal the addressor's roles in two domains: immediate surroundings, covering family, friends, household as well as the wide public life encompassing politics and economics. Constructions appealing to pathos evoke evaluation, emotions or human needs uniting the author and readers. Constructions rendering institutional authorization represent the authors' distance from the contents by four subtypes of subjective constructions: nominal, pronominal, predicative referring to event participants as well as discursive. Moreover, the functioning of deictic and impersonal constructions as authorization devices is subordinated to disposition with differing frequency. The collective authorship, which can be bi- and multiple, results from the interaction of constructions rendering individual and institutional authorization.

Key words: authorization, construction, disposition, magazine discourse, pathos, rhetoric.

С. І. Потапенко, К. І. Андріїшина. Лінгвальні засоби авторизації в сучасному англомовному журнальному дискурсі: конструкційно-риторичний підхід. Стаття присвячена вивченню лінгвальних засобів авторизації в англомовному журнальному дискурсі. Запропоновано визначення авторизації, установлено підпорядкованість її дискурсивної реалізації риторичним канонам і способам впливу, диференційовано її індивідуальний та інституційний різновиди, експліковані лінгвальними засобами, що представлені дейктичними й безособовими конструкціями; розкрито послідовність і частотність уживання дейктичних і безособових конструкцій у різних блоках статей сучасного англомовного журнального дискурсу. З урахуванням семантики складників дейктичні конструкції поділяємо на підгрупи, що позначають орієнтування автора, його діяльність, суспільні відносини або апелюють до пафосу. Орієнтувальні конструкції фіксують взаємодію автора з навколишнім середовищем. Конструкції на позначення діяльності розшаровуються на три підгрупи, які відбивають різні аспекти активності автора: когнітивні, комунікативні, професійні. Конструкції на позначення суспільних стосунків розкривають соціальні ролі автора у двох сферах: безпосереднього оточення, що вміщує родину, друзів і власний побут, та широкого суспільного простору, що охоплює політику й економіку. Конструкції, що апелюють до пафосу, звернені до оцінок, емоцій, потреб автора або читачів. Конструкції на позначення інституційної авторизації відбивають відстороненість

автора від повідомлюваного трьома різновидами суб'єктних конструкцій – іменниковими, займенниковими, предикативними з референцією до учасників подій, а також дискурсивними конструкціями. Колективна авторизація реалізується взаємодією виокремлених конструкцій на позначення індивідуальної і інституційної авторизації у статтях з двома та більше зазначеними авторами.

Ключові слова: авторизація, диспозиція, журнальний дискурс, конструкція, пафос, риторика.

С. И. Потапенко, К. И. Андриишина. Лингвальные средства авторизации в современном англоязычном журнальном дискурсе: конструкционно-риторический подход. Статья посвящена изучению языковых средств авторизации в англоязычном журнальном дискурсе. Предложено определение авторизации, установлена подчинённость её дискурсивной реализации риторическим канонами и способам влияния, дифференцированы индивидуальный и институционный виды, эксплицированные языковыми средствами, включающими дейктические и безличные конструкции соответственно, раскрыта последовательность и частотность использования дейктических и безличных конструкций в различных текстовых блоках статей современного англоязычного журнального дискурса. С учётом семантики составляющих элементов дейктические конструкции классифицированы на четыре подгруппы, указывающие на ориентирование автора, его деятельность, общественные отношения и апеллирующие к пафосу. Конструкции, указывающие на ориентирование автора, фиксируют его взаимодействие с окружающей средой. Конструкции, обозначающие деятельность, расслаиваются на три подгруппы, которые отражают различные аспекты активности автора: когнитивные, коммуникативные, профессиональные. Конструкции, представляющие общественные отношения, раскрывают социальные роли автора в двух сферах: непосредственного окружения, т. е. семьи, друзей и быта, и широкого общественного пространства, охватывающего политику и экономику. К пафосу конструкции апеллируют через оценки, эмоции и потребности автора или читателей. Конструкции для обозначения институционной авторизации отражают отстраненность автора от сообщаемой информации тремя видами субъектных конструкций – именных, местоименных, предикатных с референцией к участникам событий, а также дискурсивными конструкциями. Коллективная авторизация реализуется взаимодействием конструкций, указывающих на индивидуальную и институционную авторизацию, в статьях с двумя и более авторами.

Ключевые слова: авторизация, диспозиция, журнальный дискурс, конструкция, пафос, риторика.

1. Introduction

Authorization as a category of the author's manifestation in Modern English magazine discourse is represented by constructions which due to fusion of form and meaning or form and function create an effect of authorship – individual, institutional or collective – in terms of ethos as an author's self-representation and pathos associated with the audience's evaluations, emotions or needs. Individual authorization is represented by a single author. Institutional one is manifested by a group of anonymous writers. Collective authorization is based on cooperation of a group of authors.

Authorization as a degree of manifestation of authorship of magazine text was formed as a result of transformation of the category of author under the influence of genre specificity of texts. In this research paper the author is distinguished as a creator of texts (Barthes, 1993) and the authorship as the addressee status in relation to the work (Schönert, 2009).

The gradual stratification of the author's characteristics made it necessary to highlight the category, which would cover all the characteristics of the manifestation of the authorship of the text: the performer (Antiquity), the anonymous, the pseudo-author, the collective authorship (Middle Ages), the creator (Renaissance), the author's image, his legitimization (18th century), the immanent author (Classical Realism), the displacement of the author, the narrator (20th century). All mentioned types of authors are reflected in the following classification of authorization – individual, institutional and collective.

Modern understanding of individual authorization is most closely connected with the concepts of the performer, the creator, the author's image, narrator with his own worldview, principles, judgments, biography and creativity (Bohnenkamp, 2002; Scholz, 1999; Schönert, 2009). Author's anonymity and pseudo-authorship are early manifestations of institutional authorization. Their spread was as a result of replacement of form "I" with "he". To be accepted by the public, the writer did not have to show his individuality, the most important thing was the information itself not its presenter. The formation of the collective authorship marked by the coexistence of several authors who work on one text together, forming a corporate letter (Haynes, 2005; Selbmann, 1994; Woodmansee, 1994), began in medieval manuscripts with much more difficult dynamics than in individually written texts (Minnis, 1993).

The development of mass media has led to the formation of a category of media authorization, which reflects the extent of the lingual reveal of authors of media texts, exercising a certain influence on the audience. Most noticeable media authorization as the integration category is represented in English magazines that publish informative articles with different types of authorization depending on how many people participate in the creation of the media texts as well as the way the authorship at the end of the information product is indicated.

Authorization in magazine discourse forms a continuum, which covers three main kinds of authorship: individual, represented by a single author in the American news magazine *Time*; institutional, which transmits the position to the publication as a whole, and therefore the editorial office deliberately does not indicate the authors of the published materials: this is accepted, for example, in the famous British magazine *The Economist*; collective, when multiple authors work and cooperate in a certain social group (Fairclough 1995; Renkema, 2004). Articles with collective authorization, which can have two to eight authors working in collaboration with one responsible author, are widely spread in American news magazine *Time*.

In **Section 1** of this paper, we address different kinds of authorization – individual, institutional and collective. **Section 2** presents the constructionist and rhetorical facet of authorization. **Section 3** gives the classification of the English magazine discourse linguistic means of authorization, that are represented by constructions entrenched in speakers' memory as unities of form and meaning or form and function. The paper distinguishes two types of constructions, namely deictic indicating individual authorization and impersonal pointing to the institutional authorship. **Section 4** provides the distinctive features of dispositional arrangement of English magazine articles and functioning of individual and institutional constructions in different sections of the articles. In **Conclusions,** we summarize the results obtained and give some tentative perspectives for further studies in this field.

2. Method

Studies of the ways of verbalizing different types of authorization in magazine discourse rely on the ideas of construction grammar (Goldberg, 2003; Thomasello, 2000) claiming that language is a repertoire of constructions, i. e. more or less complex patterns that integrate form and meaning in conventionalized or non-compositional ways (Goldberg, 2005; Potapenko, 2017; Thomasello, 2000) and canons of rhetoric (Aristotle, 1991, 2010; Burke, 2014).

In the authorization aspect, the construction has authorship indication values wider than the meaning of the words that form it. The rhetorical aspect of the research provides an account of canons of text structure, which covers invention, the point which the author establishes bona fides, grabs the audience's attention hoping to keep it; elocution, verbalization of ideas with the help of linguistic means, represented by constructions; disposition, linear arrangement of selected linguistic means (Burke, 2016; Enos, 2006, 2011; Leith, 2012).

Thus, the constructionist and rhetorical facet of authorization is represented at two textual planes: In particular, an inventive-elocutionary, or nominative, plane with the contents named by

constructions as unities of two or more elements functioning as a whole and a dispositional plane providing for the constructions' linear patterning in texts.

On the first, inventive-elocutionary plane we reveal the main idea and topic of the articles supported by the key words in headings and texts. Thus, the topic of the murder of the main Russian opposition figure in the article under the title *"Boris Nemtsov's murder reveals Russian weakness – not strength"* (Time 16.03.2015) is revealed, based on such key words of the article: famous person *Boris Nemtsov* and a common noun *murder,* which indicates bloodshed; toponym *Russia*, which names a specific country.

Dispositional plane of the study is aimed at identifying the properties of the arrangement and functioning of deictic and impersonal constructions in the sections of the articles (Dijk, 1985; 1986, 1991) with individual, institutional, or collective authorization.

On the dispositional plane of research, we differentiate formal sections of headline, introduction and conclusion and four semantic sections, namely informative, background, argumentative and commentary. The difference between the dispositions of individual and institutional articles is manifested in the following sections: argumentative one in the articles with individual authorization and background section in the texts with institutional authorship.

The application of a cognitive rhetorical technique has made it possible to identify and classify constructions indicating individual and institutional authorization and establish peculiarities of their usage in the sections of the articles with different types of authorization.

3. Linguistic means of authorization

In the English magazine discourse linguistic means of authorization are represented by constructions entrenched in speakers' memory as unities of form and meaning or form and function.

The paper distinguishes two types of constructions, namely deictic indicating individual authorization and impersonal pointing to the institutional authorship. Individual authorization is represented by deictic constructions implementing three types of author's self-identification: personal, indicated by combination of the first person singular pronoun with verbs or the corresponding possessive pronoun with a noun; inclusive, reflected by interaction of the first person plural pronoun with verbs or of the corresponding possessive pronoun with nouns; empathic, transmitted by the interaction of the second person pronouns with verbs or corresponding possessive pronouns with nouns.

3.1. Deictic constructions

Among 300 deictic constructions presented in the research according to their lexico-grammatical status we differentiate: nominal constructions *(my girls)*, for example, *Grief seemed to reshape my girls at a molecular level* (Time 25.05.2015, 58); verbal constructions *(I think)*, for example, *I think the initiative to adopt such a resolution should come from Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin* (Time 13.02.2017, 22).

With respect to referential meaning of its constituents, deictic constructions fall into several types: *orientational* (64 constructions), *denoting activity* (68 constructions), *social relations* (87 constructions) and *appealing to pathos* (81 constructions).

Orientational constructions, fixing the author's place in the environment, include somatic, perceptual and local.

Somatic constructions are related to the author's body or its parts:

(1)   *Paula Pell stops short and grabs my shoulder* (Time 30.11.2015, 118-119)

In example above (1), the somatic construction *my shoulder,* correlating with the verb *grab,* describes the author's acquaintance with a famous person *(Paula Pell).*

Perceptual constructions render visual, auditory or tactile modalities:

(2)   *I saw crosses that the Klan had put up, an announcement about a Klan meeting* (Time 15.01.2018, 32)

(3)   *I heard Dr. King speak when I was 15* (Time 15.01.2018, 32)

(4)   *LG has a new smart refrigerator with a door that turns transparent when I touch it* (Time 10.04.2017, 55)

In examples (2, 3, 4), various kinds of perception are indicated by constructions *I saw, I heard, I touch.*

Local constructions refer to the author's whereabouts:

(5)   *When I finally sat down to dinner with one Paris resident I had seen almost nothing of since the Nov. 13 assault on our city* (Time 30.11.2015, 136)

In example (5), the construction *our city* transmits the author's affiliation with the residents of the capital of France.

Constructions denoting author's activity pertain to different spheres, namely cognitive conveying his / her thinking; communicative reflecting his / her interaction with the characters of the article; professional emphasizing the common occupation of the author and readers. Thus, constructions denoting the author's enterprise refer to their cognitive, communicative or professional activities:

(6)   *I knew Boris very well* (Time 16.03.2015, 16)

(7)   *Without a word, they sum up what we talk about when we talk about love* (Time 23.05.2016, 55)

(8)   *I've been writing about politics longer than I played sports* (30.11.2015, 35-36)

In examples (6, 7, 8), various activities of the author are marked by deictic constructions *I knew, we talk, I've been writing, I played sports* respectively.

Constructions referring to social relations reveal the addressor's roles in two domains. They are immediate surroundings, covering family, friends, household and wide public life encompassing politics and economics. Thus, social constructions reveal author's roles of interaction with family, friends, household, society, politics, and economics:

(9)   *I'll eventually end up, just some place where my family will never find me* (Time 10.04.2017, 55)

(10)   *I worry about what this is doing to my marriage* (Time 7.11.2016, 63)

(11)   *In the meantime, I will continue to explore my relationship with Roomba* (Time 10.04.2017, 55)

In examples (9, 10, 11), the author demonstrates his relations with other people. The construction *my family* denotes the author's family, the construction *my marriage* indicates his marital status, the construction *my relationship* demonstrates the use of a household item represented by a robot named Roomba.

Author's household activity can be reflected by the construction *I've done vacuuming* like in the next example (12):

(12)   *I've done so much vacuuming in my life* (Time 10.04.2017, 55)

In the wide public sphere, the deictic constructions reproduce such varieties of activities: social *(our private lives),* economic *(our economy),* and political *(our next President):*

(13) *Although social media makes <u>our private lives </u>more public, it also makes us more self-absorbed and isolated from fellow citizens* (Time 10.04.2017, 18)

(14) *Greenspan, central bankers themselves have become the major player in global markets – something that has introduced huge, unknown risks into <u>our economy</u>* (Time 31.10.2016, 24)

(15) *We are about to experience a radical change in American politics: a woman may well be <u>our next President </u>*(Time 7.11.2016, 24)

In example (13), the author comments on the impact of social media on people's privacy. In example (14), he points to the economy at the level of the state (USA), and in example (15) the construction *our next President* reveals the author's connection to the US population around a figure of the following American president.

Constructions appealing to pathos evoke evaluation, emotions, and human needs uniting author and readers. Constructions appealing to evaluation characterize the author's attitude to the described events by linguistic means, which reflect reality in the aspect of assessment:

(16) *And by imitation, he (my son) became <u>my little dictator</u>* (Time 23.05.2016, 22)

In example (16), the construction *my little dictator* negatively assesses the author's son.

An appeal to emotions, that motivate, organize, and redirect human perception, thinking, and action, is carried out through emotive constructions, like in the following examples (17, 18):

(17) *I will just have to guess at the logic behind <u>my devotion</u> to Roomba* (Time 10.04.2017, 55)

(18) *And Paul, <u>I love you</u> too* (Time 25.05.2015, 53)

Magazine texts with individual authorization appeal to the basic needs of a person: safety, love, respect, self-realization (Maslow, 1970). In the following example (19), the deictic construction *I need to know* conveys the author's need for self-realization in line with promoting trends in women's fashion:

(19) *When <u>I need to know </u>how to#dresslikeoman, I call my friend Brenda, who is a professor at the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City* (Time 20.02.2017, 55)

3.2. Impersonal constructions
Constructions rendering institutional authorization represent authors' distance from the contents embodied by subtypes of subjective constructions: nominal, pronominal, and predicative subjective constructions referring to event participants, as well as discursive ones. In the research we distinguish 154 impersonal constructions: among them there are 62 subjective nominal constructions, 35 subjective pronominal constructions, 33 subjective predicative constructions, and 24 discursive constructions (14 appealing to evaluation and 10 – emotions).

Subjective nominal constructions fall into collective, plural, and indefinite referring to anonymous sources.

Subjective collective noun-verbal constructions combine collective nouns with verbs of perception *(government sees)* and physical activity *(Economist went to press)*:

(20) *Because the <u>government sees</u> what it calls "web cleansing" as necessary to prevent access to terrorist information, everyone in Xinjiang is suppressed to have a spy-wear app on their mobile phone* (The Economist 2.06.2018. 19-22)

In the example above (20), the government's activity is conveyed by the construction with the collective noun *government* and verb of perceptual semantics *see.*

Subjective plural noun-verbal constructions consist of nouns in the plural referring to sets of social actors at different levels of ethnic, professional, and universal generalization being combined with verbs of cognitive *(politicians know)* and communicative *(Germans tell)* semantics:

(21) *Politicians and users want to know more about how Facebook will adequately safeguard people's privacy and offer enough transparency about how it operates* (The Economist 14.04.2018, 21-22)

(22) *Some experts believe setting the young on a better financial path would also shorten recessions and help mitigate income inequality* (The Economist 30.11.2015, 42)

In examples (21, 22), subjective plural noun-verbal constructions name the average degree of unity of politicians and Internet users *(politicians and users)* and experts *(some experts).*

The greatest degree of unity is reflected by ethnonyms in the plural:

(23) *Germans tell pollsters they mostly agree with these measures* (The Economist 4.04.2015, 47)

In example (23), subjective plural noun-verbal construction *Germans tell* with ethnonym *Germans* and the verb of communicative semantics *tell* demonstrates unity of the whole nation.

Subjective pronoun-verbal constructions split into impersonal and negative types. Subjective impersonal pronoun-verbal constructions with indefinite pronouns and nouns or verbs of cognitive, perceptual, physical semantics expand the circle of participants:

(24) *He wraps his power in legal procedure, but everyone knows that the prosecutors and courts answer to him* (The Economist 28.10.2017, 9)

In example above (24), the subjective pronominal construction *everyone knows* points out the general awareness of people.

Subjective negative pronoun-verbal constructions combining indefinite pronouns with verbs referring to cognitive and physical activity eliminate an action performer:

(25) *While nobody knows what will follow, few people in Russia's elite expect the succession to happen constitutionally or peacefully* (The Economist 28.10.2017, 19-21)

In example (25), the subjective negative pronoun-verbal construction *nobody knows* transmits the general ignorance of people regarding further development of events.

Subjective predicative constructions with verbs of attitude and comparison *(it seems; it looks as if)* reflect an impersonal view of event participants:

(26) *The House of Lords is more effective than it seems* (The Economist 2.06.2018, 73 74)

(27) *It looks as if the creators may now call Greece 's bluff* (The Economist 13.06.2015, 50 51)

In the given examples (26, 27), the subjective predicative construction *it seems* conveys uncertainty about the activities of *the House of Lords* of the British Parliament and the subjective predicative construction *it looks as if* gives an impersonal evaluation of events described in the article events.

Discursive constructions structuring texts consist of the pronoun *it* in the subject position and the compound nominal predicate with emotive and evaluative units characterizing the information given in the previous or following utterance, concealing either the subject or object of evaluation:

(28) *The danger is that, with inflation falling and India enjoying a boost from cheaper energy, the country 's leaders duck the tough reforms needed for lasting success. <u>That would be a huge mistake</u>* (The Economist 21.02.2015)

In example above (28), the demonstrative pronoun *that* guides the reader to the previous text, informing about the actions of Indian leaders, which are characterized by the language unit *huge mistake* with negative meaning.

Thus, in modern English magazine discourse the individual authorization is presented by the deictic constructions and the institutional authorization – impersonal ones.

4. Dispositional arrangement of linguistic means of authorization

Arrangement and functioning of deictic and impersonal constructions as authorization devices is subordinated to disposition. In English magazine articles with individual and institutional authorization disposition has both common and distinctive features. Its similarity is represented by formal sections of headline, introduction and conclusion, as well as two semantic parts, namely informative one and commentary (Dijk, 1985). The biggest difference between the dispositions of individual and institutional articles is manifested in the following sections:

- an argumentative one in the articles with individual authorization and
- a background section in the texts with institutional authorship.

With respect to the number of dispositional sections, articles with individual and institutional authorization follow two models. They are extended, with six sections, and non-extended, with three, four or five sections. Individual authorization is reflected by constructions with differing frequency. In the headline, introduction and conclusion sections the dominant constructions are orientational and social indicating the author's place in the described events. The most construction-rich sections are informative and argumentative ones reflecting the place and activity of the addressor in the described events. The smallest number of constructions occurs in commentary sections since they are filled with other people's opinions.

The articles with institutional authorization are characterized by the dominance of subjective nominal constructions representing author's views from distance. Subjective collective and plural noun-verbal constructions referring to groups are common in headlines, introductions, conclusion sections. Subjective impersonal pronoun-verbal constructions expanding the circle of participants and concealing the information source, as well as subjective predicative constructions, indicating the position of a magazine as a whole are common in the informative and background sections. Commentary textual sections widely employ subjective indefinite nominal constructions referring to anonymous information sources.

Collective authorship, which can be bi- and multiple, results from the interaction of constructions rendering individual and institutional authorization.

5. Conclusions

There are three types of authorization in modern English magazine discourse: individual, which is represented by a single author; the institutional one is manifested by a group of anonymous writers; the collective one is based on the cooperation of a group of authors.

The cognitive rhetorical aspect of authorization is represented on two textual planes: an inventive-elocutionary, or nominative, plane with the contents named by constructions as unities of two or more elements functioning as a whole and a dispositional plane providing for the constructions' linear patterning in texts. On the inventive-elocutionary plane of the English

magazine discourse, linguistic means are represented by constructions entrenched in speakers' memory as the unities of form and meaning or form and function.

The paper distinguishes two types of constructions: deictic indicating individual authorization and impersonal pointing to the institutional authorship.

With respect to the referential meaning of its constituents, deictic constructions fall into orientational fixing the author's place in the environment: somatic relating to the author's body; perceptual rendering visual, auditory or tactile modalities; local referring to the author's whereabouts.

Constructions rendering institutional authorization represent the authors' distance from the contents by four subtypes of subjective constructions: nominal, pronominal, predicative referring to event participants as well as discursive.

The functioning of deictic and impersonal constructions as authorization devices is subordinated to disposition. With respect to the number of dispositional sections, magazine articles with individual and institutional authorization follow two models: extended, with six sections, and non-extended, with three, four or five sections.

Individual authorization is reflected by constructions with differing frequency. The most construction-rich sections are informative and argumentative reflecting the place and activity of the addressor in the described events. The articles with the institutional authorization are characterized by the dominance of subjective nominal constructions representing the author's views from distance in the informative and background texual sections.

The collective authorship, which can be bi- and multiple, results from the interaction of constructions rendering individual and institutional authorization.

Further linguistic studies in this domain can focus on the cognitive rhetorical analysis of individual, institutional, collective authorization in other types of media discourse: newspaper, Internet, radio and television.

REFERENCES

Andriishyna, K. I. (2019). *Linhvalni zasoby avtoryzatsii v suchasnomu anhlomovnomu zhurnalnomu dyskursi: kohnityvno-rytorychnyi aspekt.* [*Linguistic Means of Authorization in Modern English Magazine Discourse: Cognitive Rhetorical Aspect].* Unpublished candidate dissertation, Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine. (in Ukrainian).

Aristotle. (1991). *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aristotle. (2010). *Rhetoric.* New York: Cosimoclassics.

Barthes, R. (1993). The death of the author. In D. Graddol, & O. Boyd-Barrett (Eds.). *Media texts, authors and readers: a reader* (pp. 166-171). Clevedon, England; Philadelphia: Multilingual matters Ltd, The Open University.

Bohnenkamp, A. (2002). Autorschaft und Textgenese. In H. Detering (Ed.). *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen* (pp. 62-79). Stuttgart: Metzler.

Burke, M. (2014). Rhetoric and poetics: the classical heritage of stylistics. In M. Burke (Ed.). *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 11-31). New York: Routledge.

Burke, M. (2016). Discourse implicature, Quintilian and the Lucidity Principle: rhetorical phenomena in pragmatics. *Topics in Linguistics, 17*(1), 1-16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2016-0001

Dijk, T. A. van. (1985b). Structures of news in the press. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse and Communication* (pp. 69-93). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dijk, van T. A. (1986). News schemata. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Studying Writing. Linguistic Approaches* (pp. 155-186). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Dijk, van T. A. (1991). The interdisciplinary study of news as discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Mass Communication* (pp. 108-120). London: Routledge.

Enos, R. L. (2006). Arrangement. In Th. O. Sloane (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric* (pp. 49-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enos, T. (2011). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: communication from ancient times to the information age.* New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse.* London: Arnold Publishers.

Goldberg, A. E. (2003). Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *TRENDS in cognitive sciences, 7*(5), 219-224.

Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haynes, C. (2005). Reassessing "genius" in studies of authorship. *Book History, 8*, 287-320.

Leith, S. (2012). *You Talkin' to me? Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama.* London: Profile Books.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Minnis, A. J. (1993). The Medieval concept of the author. In D. Graddol, & O. Boyd-Barrett (Eds.). *Media texts, authors and readers: a reader* (pp. 161-166). Clevedon, England; Philadelphia: Multilingual matters Ltd, The Open University.

Potapenko, S. I. (2017). Constructions in English: from paradigmatic to syntagmatic relations. *Literatura ta kultura Polissia. Seriia: Filolohichni nauky, 89*, 172-180.

Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schönert, J. (2009). Author. In P. Hühn, J. Pier, W. Schmid, & J. Schönert (Ed.). *Handbook of Narratology* (pp. 1-13). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Selbmann, R. (1994). *Dichterberuf: zum Selbstverständnis des Schriftstellers von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart.* Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.

Scholz, B. F. (1999). Al ciato alsemble matum pater et princeps. Zur Rekonstruktion des früh modernen Autorbegriffs. In F. Jannidis (Ed.). *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs* (pp. 321-351). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Tomasello, M. (2000). First steps toward a usage-based theory of language acquisition. *Cognitive Linguistics, 11*(1/2), 61-82.

Vorozhbitova, A. A. (2010). Lingual rhetoric paradigm as integrative research prism in philological science. *European Researcher, 2*(1), 183-190.

Woodmansee, M. (1994). *The construction of authorship: textual appropriation in law and literature*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

DATA SOURCES
The Economist 21.02.2015
The Economist 4.04.2015
The Economist 13.06.2015
The Economist 28.10.2017
The Economist 14.04.2018
The Economist 2.06.2018
Time 16.03.2015
Time 25.05.2015
Time 30.11.2015
Time 23.05.2016
Time 31.10.2016
Time 7.11.2016
Time 13.02.2017
Time 20.02.2017
Time 10.04.2017
Time 15.01.2018

Potapenko Serhiy Ivanovych – Doctor of Linguistics, Professor, Kyiv National Linguistic University (73, Velyka Vasylkivska Street, Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine); e-mail: serhiy.potapenko@ndu.edu.ua

Потапенко Сергій Іванович – доктор філологічних наук, професор, Київський національний лінгвістичний університет (73, вул. Велика Васильківська, Київ, 03680, Україна); e-mail: serhiy.potapenko@ndu.edu.ua

Потапенко Сергей Иванович – доктор филологических наук, профессор, Киевский национальный лингвистический университет (73, ул. Большая Васильковская, Киев, 03680, Украина); e-mail: serhiy.potapenko@ndu.edu.ua

Andriishyna Kateryna Ivanivna – PhD in Linguistics, Lecturer, O. Dovzhenko Hlukhiv National Pedagogical University (24, Kievo-Moscowska Street, Hlukhiv, 41400, Ukraine); e-mail: katandrii@gmail.com

Андрійшина Катерина Іванівна – кандидат філологічних наук, викладач, Глухівський національний педагогічний університет ім. О. Довженко (24, вул. Києво-Московська, Глухів, 41400, Україна); e-mail: katandrii@gmail.com

Андриишина Катерина Ивановна – кандидат филологических наук, преподаватель, Глуховский национальный педагогический университет им. А. Довженко (24, ул. Киево-Московская, Глухов, 41400, Украина); e-mail: katandrii@gmail.com