# A Study of Publicity Discourse from the Perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics

## Du Zhijuan

Xi'an Fanyi University Xi'an, 710105, China

**Keywords:** Systemic Functional Language; Publicity; Discourse

**Abstract:** This paper focuses on the relationship between systemic functional linguistics and discourse analysis, and explores why the theory is called "applicable linguistics". The author first discusses the contribution of systemic functional linguists to the Institute of Propaganda and Discourse, and then discusses the differences between the individual genetics in Systemic Functional Linguistics and that in Transformational Generative Linguistics. From the research content and research methods, this paper can sort out and comment on the current situation of discourse research from the perspective of pragmatics, analyze the problems existing in this field and look forward to the research development direction. Studies have shown that "discourse markers" is one of the hot issues in the study of pragmatics and sociolinguistics in recent years.

## 1. Introduction

The so-called "discourse" refers to the language in use, and is also called "discourse" from the perspective of linguistic research, as opposed to the abstract language system [1]. In the past 10 years, many scholars have also done a lot of research on the dialectical mark of Chinese scholars, including the study of English discourse markers and the study of Chinese discourse markers [2]. At present, although there is no unified understanding of the connotation of academic dialogue, that is, "what is discourse", the definition of metadiscourse by researchers can be roughly divided into narrow and broad sense [3]. At the same time, foreign sociologists also began to pay attention to the language conversation description in the real environment [4]. The study of dialogue can be traced back to classical rhetoric two thousand years ago, but it did not enter the field of linguistics until the late 1960s. Different research perspectives will have different results and give people different inspirations [5]. Narrow sense discourse, also known as "reflexive discourse", focuses on the textual organization function of discourse. But within the narrative sequence, the termination is structural [6]. This shows that "discourse analysts are only committed to creating descriptive categories on the basis of specific corpus, and discourse analysis lacks a unified overall description framework" [7][8][9].

## 2. Methodology

Since the birth of the concept of discourse, scholars have studied discourse from the perspectives of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, rhetoric, systemic functional linguistics and social constructivism [10]. However, from the perspective of pragmatics or sociolinguistics, most of the articles on discourse markers published by Chinese scholars are from the perspective of pragmatics or sociolinguistics. They use only two levels of sound and meaning, without the intermediate level of vocabulary and grammar. There is a one-to-one correspondence between sound and meaning. By the 1980s, artificial intelligence, cognitive science and information processing were among the disciplines. During the period of 3 to 5 years of age, the language that children are exposed to is the natural spoken language used by adults everyday, and the "inductive" behavior of "from proper to common" in the transitional phase continues. Therefore, scholars from different disciplines begin to explain discourse analysis (discourse analysis) and conduct analysis from their respective theoretical guidance. Some foreign scholars believe that discourse refers to a set of mechanisms that reflect the various characteristics of the text, such as the organization of the discourse, the views of

the author's discourse content, and the attitude of the reader.

The concept of discourse was first proposed by Harris in 1959. They use the concept of turn-taking and adjacent-language equivalence to analyze natural conversations. They think that in a conversation, the relationship between some talks is very close, and the two closely related words are called For adjacent language pairs. Under such a background, we cannot expect a completely unified understanding of the concepts in scholarly discourse analysis (discourse analysis). But by the age of 5 to 6 years old, the situation will change dramatically. After the 1990s, with the high attention paid to society and culture, the "critical discourse analysis" with the relationship between discourse and power or ideology came into being. In addition, in the prototype language stage, the number of micro-functions decreases, but the functions become more complex. As mentioned above, there are many pragmatic perspectives on discourse markers, but even if discourse markers are discussed in the theoretical framework of pragmatics, scholars have different definitions of "pragmatic (discourse) markers". Chinese scholars mainly study discourse markers from the perspective of pragmatics and sociolinguistics (including interactive sociolinguistics and variation analysis).

## 3. Result Analysis and Discussion

If we interpret the discourse markers (connectives) in the above three examples from the perspective of the three "pure functions" of systemic functional linguistics, the situation may be more complicated. In addition, with the development of social construction theory, Hyland and other scholars also regard metadiscourse as an important source of "author-reader" interaction resources, and believe that discourse expresses the interpersonal level of the text. That is how the author uses interactive resources and discourse resources to construct and maintain the interactive relationship with readers. At the same time, with its sociological and American tradition of descriptive linguistics, discourse analysts' analysis of conversation is only a static description, lacking the dynamic and functional analysis of conversation. But if you must analyze it from the perspective of interpersonal function, you can understand that the speaker uses "incidentally" to ease his tone, and to some extent, buffers the directness of the previous sentence, so that it does not straightforward. Some people have lost their ability to speak after they have fallen asleep or have had a disease, which is a powerful proof. At the same time, other disciplines have achieved a lot after turning to discourse.

In the early days of turning to discourse, linguists did not have new methods available to analyze discourse. So inheriting the original structuralist approach, trying to establish "discourse grammar", hoping to establish a set of rules for generating discourse, but soon found that this does not explain the discourse features in the specific context. With the rapid development of medicine and other sciences, scientists can determine that a part of the nerves in the human brain are specifically responsible for the language. The existing review of discourse studies basically focuses on the definition, classification and applied research of metadiscourse, and lacks reflection and comment on discourse studies from the perspective of pragmatics. Each level unit has many genera and a series of structures, and the components of which are composed of the next level units. From a pragmatic point of view, in the process of language use, the speaker's communicative awareness plays a significant role, which is a metapragmatic awareness of language use. The case of Jenny, a 13-year-old "artificial wild boy" discovered in California in 1970, shows that once the critical period of language acquisition is missed, human individuals can learn a certain number of words, but they can not learn grammar rules. This shows that even with such a device in the human brain, language acquisition can not be guaranteed. The innate mechanism also needs to be supplemented by the innate language stimulation, and innate and acquired interaction.

## 4. Conclusions

To sum up, discourse analysis has been expanding its research field and increasing its theoretical perspectives since its emergence. From the perspective of another less noticed systemic functional

linguistics, this paper makes a purely functional analysis of several discourse markers in systemic functional linguistics. It shows that the analysis of functional linguistics has its own characteristics, which also reveals the characteristics, characteristics and multifunction of discourse markers. This disharmony arises first between the negotiation system and the speech function, and then between the speech function and the mood. But we should also see that due to the functional and semantic features of systemic functional linguistics, this model may face more difficulties in dealing with large-scale corpora. Thirdly, the use of metadiscourse in academic writing reflects the author's ability to use terminology to a certain extent. That is to say, the author can use the metadiscourse in the verbal communication activities of academic writing to achieve the three discourse purposes of organizing discourse, expressing evaluation and initiating interaction, and the dynamic selection process based on pragmatic identity.

## References

[1] Choi J Y, Hwang E H, Rha D, et al. Reliability and validity of the Korean-language version of the Communication Function Classification System in children with cerebral palsy. Child: Care, Health and Development, 2018, 44(1):140-146.

[2] Mcnamara P, Durso R. The dopamine system, Parkinson\"s disease and language function. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 2018, 21:1-5.

[3] Weiland C, Yoshikawa H. Impacts of a Prekindergarten Program on Children's Mathematics, Language, Literacy, Executive Function, and Emotional Skills. Child Development, 2013, 84(6):2112-2130.

[4] Wu Y J, Thierry G. Fast Modulation of Executive Function by Language Context in Bilinguals. Journal of Neuroscience, 2013, 33(33):13533-13537.

[5] Diaz M T, Rizio A A, Zhuang J. The Neural Language Systems That Support Healthy Aging: Integrating Function, Structure, and Behavior. Language and Linguistics Compass, 2016, 10(7):314-334.

[6] Husaini H, Krisciunas G P, Langmore S, et al. A Survey of Variables Used by Speech-Language Pathologists to Assess Function and Predict Functional Recovery in Oral Cancer Patients. Dysphagia, 2014, 29(3):376-386.

[7] Po?czyńska, Monika, Curtiss S, Walshaw P, et al. Grammar tests increase the ability to lateralize language function in the Wada test. Epilepsy Research, 2014, 108(10):1864-1873.

[8] Sollmann N, Ille S, Boeckh-Behrens T, et al. Mapping of cortical language function by functional magnetic resonance imaging and repetitive navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation in 40 healthy subjects. Acta Neurochirurgica, 2016, 158(7):1303-1316.

[9] Żebrowska A, Zwierzchowska A, Manowska B, et al. Respiratory Function and Language Abilities of Profoundly Deaf Adolescents with and without Cochlear Implants.. Oxygen Transport to Tissue XXXIII, 2016, 912:73-81.

[10] Aguilera-Tello S A, Gutiérrez-Farfán, Ileana, Chamlati-Aguirre L E, et al. Otoacoustic Emissions as Cochlear Function Analyser in Children With Language Disorders. Acta Otorrinolaringologica (English Edition), 2015, 66(2):87-91.