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ABSTRACT
This article discusses the problem of interpretation of the concepts “discourse”, “interdiscoursivity” and “discourse analysis” from a perspective of modern multidisciplinary research. The object of this article is a comprehensive description of discourse analysis as a method of study of the texts belonging to different types of discourse: artistic, poetic, historical, political - and considered by us as a product of interdiscursive formations. The material for analysis was the texts by Russian writers and poets I.I. Lazhechnikov, L.N. Andreev, I.A. Chernukhin, as well as the speeches by Russian politicians and diplomats - S.V. Lavrov and V.A. Nebenzi. We have analyzed the characteristic features of these types of discourse, the use of the method of discourse analysis in the process of study (using prosaic and poetic texts as an example). The necessity of using discourse analysis as the main method of studying the texts of different genre and discourse attribute has been revealed and substantiated. Based on the results of the study, the authors have given a comprehensive definition of the discourse analysis, presented a multidisciplinary characteristic of the concept “discourse”, made conclusions about the significance of the method of discourse analysis in the study of the texts that belong to different thematic groups of discourse.
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INTRODUCTION

1. Discourse Analysis: Target Setting
The use of correlative categories, concepts, terms in various areas of modern humanitarian knowledge is one of the characteristic features of world-wide thinking of the last decade. One of such concepts to characterize modern multidirectional multidisciplinary studies is discourse. When referring to discursive methods of research, a whole range of the problems in the field of social and humanitarian sciences are solved: in terms of communicative linguopragmatics, a discursive chain unfolds to the problems of modeling social reality. A consolidating concept of this type of studies is rightfully considered to be a discursive style of analysis - one of the new way of socio-humanitarian thinking. Today, the term “discourse analysis”, is widely introduced in science: it is used to name the scientific...
research centers and the schools of science, as a component of the titles of scientific serials, to designate the domain of scientific interest. At the same time, it becomes obviously needed to clarify the status of discourse analysis as a special phenomenon of the modern linguistic science, which is difficult to unambiguously evaluate due to the multiple interpretations of the concept “discourse”. In this regard, let us turn to a varyer of different definitions of the concept existing in modern scientific practices. This is due to the fact that meaningful constituents of the concept “discourse” are extremely diverse. As a consequence, a number of difficulties arise when determining the positions of a researcher working within the framework of the discursive line of text study.

2. The Role of the Concept “Discourse” in the Definition of Discourse Analysis

In our field of view of performing discourse analysis, the following definitions of the concept “discourse” are considered as the main ones: 1) the construction of object by force of a certain system of statements (Discourse Analysis, 1999, 276); 2) the communicative units of language - the sentences and their combining in more massive unities, that are in semantic relation and form the text perceived by the addressee as a whole formation (Duka, 1998, wwww); the important component of the sociocultural interaction with the features being characteristic of this phenomenon - the interests, goals and styles (Crawford, 1999, 263); 4) “the text, immersed in the context of language communication and interaction, not abstracted from the multitude of communicative-pragmatic factors, such as goal-setting, expectation, patterns of the companies in communication, place and time of a communicative event from the point of view of each of the communicants” (Lacan, 1997, 38); 5) “texts and conversations included into social practice” (Lacan, 1997, 38); 6) social dialogue, which is realized between individuals, social groups and public associations by means of social institutions, as well as the dialogue between various social institutions involved in the process of communication (Dijk, 1996).

Various interpretations of the concept “discourse” make it possible to conclude that discourse analysis can be viewed as a new analytical approach to linguistic different phenomena and practices. Openness, flexibility, adaptability as the distinctive features of discourse analysis in the light of interdisciplinary researches, on the one hand, characterize a dynamic potential of this method, on the other hand, are the main points of criticism, according to which the drawbacks of discourse analysis are the lack of a common methodological and conceptual base, continuity of schools and tendencies, inconsistency and so on. Therefore, today, a key task is only to develop an interdisciplinary methodology for discourse analysis.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Interpretation of the Concept of “Discourse Analysis” in the Works by Domestic and Foreign Linguists

Referring to the method of discourse analysis, the scholars rely on the notion of discourse that have today no clear and generally accepted definition in science. The Professor of the Amsterdam University, T.A. Van Dijk, who has devoted a number of his works to the problem of discourse and discourse analysis, characterizes this notion in the following way: “The concept of discourse is as vague as the concept of language, society, ideology. We know that the notions being most vague and difficult to define become often the most popular. “Discourse” is one of them” (Dijk, 1996).

The representatives of the American school (T. Givon, J. Grimes, R. Langacker, W. Chafe, Z. Harris) turned to discourse and discourse analysis in the mid 50s of the 20th century. The works by the scholars mentioned above covered for the first time the benefits of discourse analysis under the conditions of forming a new anthropocentric picture of the world. It is just then the term “discourse” entered the scientific thesaurus of linguistics. American scholars in the definition of discourse emphasized the syntactic substantiation of its existence. For example, Z. Harris, who was first to turn to the problem of studying discourse, defined this concept in the article “Discourse Analysis” (1952) as a sequence of utterances, a segment of the text to be longer than a sentence. A syntactic constituent in the analysis of discourse dominates in the works by domestic scholar V. A. Žvegintsev as well. According to his interpretation, discourse – “...is two or more sentences, being in semantic relation ...” (Zvegintsev, 1980, 17). Thus, in the first stage of discourse analysis, the problem areas in
drawing a distinction between text and discourse were determined. Accordingly, the main task of the scholars was reduced to the search for the answer to the question about the place of discourse in the traditional opposition Language – Speech.

French linguist E. Benveniste in his works was first to note a dynamic character of discourse. Considering discourse as the functioning of language in the process of communication, he gives the following definition to this concept: discourse – “the speech assigned to speakers” (Benveniste, 2009, 296). These studies laid the foundation of forming the dominant ideas to date of a static structure - text, as well as discourse as a procedural structure. However, the functioning of the term discourse in modern linguistics is not grounded only on the processual side of communication. Certainly, in a broad sense, discourse is understood as a communication between the speaker and the listener (observer) in the given spatial, temporary and other context. This communicative act can be speech, written, comprise verbal and non-verbal components. A conversation with a friend, a dialogue between the dean and the student, reading a note can be mentioned as the examples. But a narrow concrete sense of this term, in addition to a common global meaning, is also present in the theory of discourse. According to the definition given by T. A. Van Dijk, “the term discourse denotes a completed or continuous “product” of communicative action, its written or spoken result that is interpreted by the recipients” (Dijk, 1996). Such treatment makes it possible to define discourse in the strict sense, according to which discourse is a written or verbal product of communicative action. In the context of this investigation, the strict sense of discourse is the most relevant, however, in order to achieve the scientific goals it is necessarily to refer to the important discourse components such as spatial and temporal context.

The notion discourse came into scientific use of our national linguistics later. Despite the fact that leading Russian scholars (N. F. Alefirenko, O. V. Alexandrova, N. D. Arutyunova, V. I. Karasik, E. F. Kirov, E. S. Kubryakova etc.) managed to achieve significant results in their studies, the problems of public discourse (there were defined the conclusions made by foreign schools more precise, offered a detailed typology of discourse), in the study of this phenomenon there have remained many blind spots so far. In domestic linguistics, discourse is understood as a new component of the anthropocentric picture of the world, as a part of the traditional opposition “Language - Discourse – Speech”. The studies of this concept develop other scientific discourse investigations of the French and English-American schools. It becomes apparent the expediency of some discourse approach for most directions of linguistic research. Understanding of discourse as a complex interdisciplinary concept in the domestic linguistics is formed in several stages. In the work by Volgograd linguist V. I. Karasik “The Types of Discourse” discourse is defined as “the text being immersed in the situation of communication” (Karasik, 2000, 5).

N.D. Arutyunova also considers discourse as a object of interdisciplinary study. This approach is reflected in its famous, already classic definition of discourse. This multi-component concept is defined in the works of the scholar as “a coherent text together with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; the text, taken in respect of the eventual aspect while understanding; the speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in interactions of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)” (Arutyunova, 1990, 136).

V.E. Chernyavskaya, having summarized the different notions of discourse in the domestic and foreign linguistics, reduces them to two basic types: (a) “a concrete communicative event fixed in written texts and oral speech that is carried out in a certain cognitive and typological communicative space”; and also b) “a set of thematically correlated texts” (Chernyavskaya, 2009, 14-16).

Thus, the emergence of the notion of discourse as a complex unit representing a particular communicative action, as well as a verbally fixed result of this action is connected with the transition of social linguistic research into the new anthropocentric paradigm. We understand discourse as a linguistic unit of the highest level, that has a structural, functional specificity. According to Yu.S. Stepanov, discourse is “a new feature in the aspect of Language, which appeared by the end of the 20th century” (Stepanov, 1996, 71).

Since the consideration of the specific character of the communication act is possible only from the standpoint of a sociolinguistic, cognitive, linguocultural aspect, the notion of discourse becomes an extremely topical for social contemporary linguistic researches.
Most definitions of discourse are not at variance with each other, but only complement and structure it. In view of multidimensionality and ambiguity of the notion of discourse, we will adhere to the definition given by T. A. Van Dijk, according to which discourse is “a complex communicative phenomenon” (Dijk, 1996, 112), “communicative event” (Dijk, 1996, 122).

2. Typology of Discourse
Let us turn to the typology of discourse, which also requires some more precise definitions. The basis of any classification must have a clear definition of the basic concept. But in view of the multifacetedness of discourse, there are the complexities in determining the bases for types of discourse. To confirm the above, we will give several classifications:

– according to the character of the subject: institutional and personal (Karasik, 2002, 208-252);
– according to the channel of information communication: written and oral (Matveeva, 1990);
– according to genre characteristics (N. Fairclough, 2009);
– according to the sphere of communication: book, colloquial, mass-communicative (Kostomarov, 2005);
– according to time characteristic: Soviet, post-perestroika;
– according to thematic division (by content): political, advertising, religious, scientific, pedagogical, mass media, artistic, etc.;
– according to the national and cultural parameter: Russian discourse, American discourse, etc.

From our point of view, the most productive and terminologically accurate typology can be considered the typology of discourse on the basis of thematic division, since this classification allows to reveal the basic social features of each type of discourse, and also to identify the points of contact of different types of discourse. As E.I. Sheigal rightly notes, “as a result of the transparency of the boundaries of discourse there often happens the juxtaposition of the characteristics of different types of discourse in one text” (Sheigal, 2004, 24).

The field of our studies comprises artistic, poetic and political discourses.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A METHOD OF STUDYING TEXT

1. The Difficulties of Interdisciplinary Application of Discourse Analysis

The application of discourse analysis as a strategic research project, naturally, reveals a number of methodological difficulties connected with the study of discourse in general. This problem is covered in the work by American scholars Parker and Burman (Parker, Burman, 1993) “Thirty-Two Problems of Discourse Analysis” (1993). Despite the fact that this work substantially represents the critical judgments concerning the discourse analysis rather than the difficulties themselves, it can rightfully be considered as a successful attempt to systematize the main barriers the scholars meet with on the path to application of discourse analysis. Consider the study by Parker and Burman, by extending it with the observations from global experience of applying the discourse analysis in the various scientific fields: linguistics, culturology, philosophy, sociology, psychology - as well as from the experience of later studies of the phenomenon.

Firstly, as it has already been noted, the difficulties of interdisciplinary application of the method of discourse analysis are related, first of all, to the diversity of the discourse-analytical approaches. The choice of the appropriate treatment of discourse, the construction of the discursive model, the selection of the most significant parameters and indicators, the choice of a strategy of discourse research largely depend on the approach, the methodological basis, or are conditioned by the paradigm in context of which the investigation is developed. Based on the application of discourse analysis, the investigations are often criticized for using such vague notions that does not have an unambiguous terminological treatment, such as “discourse”, “text”, “narrative”, “topic”, in which they naturally exist. The meanings of these notions and the situations in which they are used need a clear substantiation and explanation in order not to allow misinterpretation and distortion of a meaning.

Second, the methodological level of the discourse-analytical approach reveals the difficulties related to the analysis of the text and the context. Contraversal in this aspect is the issue about “the depth” of
the development of the analysis of the actual text to form an interpretation that is adequate according to scientific norms. Such difficulties can be caused by the integration, for example, of linguistic and sociological methods.

Third, modern studies of discourse are criticized for a reference to the scientific schools within the framework of which they are carried out. The research that leaves the applied methodology behind the field of reflection of the scholar who is engaged in representing the theoretical positions and makes maximum efforts to verify the hypotheses drastically developed within the framework of a certain theory of hypotheses, suffers from a kind of “empirical insensitivity”.

We believe that the method of discourse analysis presupposes the development of new hypotheses and further construction of scientific thematic theories rather than verification of positions, the formulation of which is predetermined by a certain theory. In this connection, the studies in the field of discourse often deal with the text as a construct and a tool of modeling the reality, and the study of the very reality or its fragment is seen only as applied direction in research. The criticism of discourse analysis is often connected with the perception of it as a method devoid of specificity, a clear methodological framework within which the scholar could be sure of his having reached the only possible interpretation and understanding of the text. Nevertheless, the discourse analysis by definition is not aimed at achieving the only possible interpretation of the texts, since within its investigation there occur different representations of the reality in the discourses of different type and genre, with various ways of generating and interpreting texts in different contexts and under different circumstances.

2. Modern Approaches to Discourse Analysis

The modern approach to the problem of discourse analysis supposes the question about the qualitative and quantitative units of analysis to be obligatorily solved. We understand qualitative units as the informative elements that can be as single words, themes, whole messages, behavior acts. The quantitative units of the analysis suppose the frequency of occurrence of categories, the volume, duration of an action. The material is actually considered as a means of information transfer. It is that in which difference between the qualitative and quantitative methods lies. Discourse analysis takes note of non-transparency of the units being analyzed by “refusing at the same time from their projection on non-discursive reality” (Kalina, 1997, 17). According to the judgment of the representatives of the continental school, interpretation must take into account the ways of functioning of discourses, without distracting from an original point of view. It is here where the understanding that the discourse analysis is defined as a discipline of the text analysis arises. In fact, the method is a combination of cultural and didactic practices within a certain framework and intellectual situation. In this connection, it is impossible to leave the statement of one of the representatives of the school of modern discourse analysis Parker, according to which “discourse analysis can, in the end, seem to be a research with the examples and nothing more” (Parker, 1997, 293).

The concept “repertoire of interpretations”, introduced by Potter and Wetherell (Potter, Wetherell, 1990) means refusal of unambiguous interpretations of the objects, which leads to the emergence of opposition of behavioral and experimental psychology, as well as other humanities. This position is proved by a number of different views of psychology, person's psyche, the role of diverse phenomena in semantic space of a particular culture.

An ambiguous issue is the question of the weak points of the method of discourse analysis. An objective answer to the question put in this way suggests the existence of a single ground to be common to all schools of methodologies, but not refer to either from really existing one, since conscious or unconscious desire for adaptation of the database of criteria to its own characteristics is inherent in each branch of scientific cognition. For example, the methodological platform of positivism advances the principles of operationalism and verification as such criteria, which the methods of experimentation and observation work well with. At the same time, the methodological position, for example, of the intercultural psychology uses the descriptive methods, assuming that the direct comparison of the research material accumulated within different cultures is impossible. However, considering certain historical factors, in the domestic scientific tradition, a positivistic orientation occupies the leading position in the minds of scientists, that is why, we have presented the
comparative possibilities of discourse analysis from the point of view of the main methodological principles of positivism.

PRAMATIC POTENTIAL OF THE METHOD OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Interdiscourse as an Object of Discourse Analysis
French scholar M. Foucault, who is justly considered to be the founder of modern western school of discourse analysis, constructs a theory in the process of development of this issue, known today as “archeology of knowledge”. Within the framework of this theory, the concept of discourse is presented by the researcher as “a set of anonymous historical rules being always determined by time and space, which designate the conditions of utterance influence in this era and for this social, economic, geographic and language or environment” (Foucault, 1996, 74). The theory of discourse by M. Foucault presents the theory of historical reconstruction of conditions of knowledge and theories in general. Reconstruction of the history of thought is possible only through determining the interrelations between different types of discourses. Only being immersed into the context of interdiscourse, discoursivity is able to find its concrete historical form, called by M. Foucault as “the order of discourse”. Based on M. Foucault’s idea, the representatives of the French school of discourse analysis introduce the concept of interdiscourse to designate: non-verbal processes that are external to discursive practice, which work as sociocultural and linguistic contexts of discursive acts and determine their semantic-gestalt characteristics (in the broad sense of the word); discursive-linguistic phenomena, which are in relation to the discursive continuity (sequence) as external (in the strict sense of the word).

The representative of the French school of “automatic analysis of discourse” M. Pecheux continues to actively develop the notion of interdiscourse. The most important position of the theory of discourse analysis, according to the scholar is the concept of unconscious in discourse - is embodied in such theoretical definitions as interdiscourse and preconstruction. The representatives of this school argue that any discourse contains the traces of the preceding and surrounding discourses, in connection with which the subject of the discourse ceases being a source of sense and becomes the discourse being formed, disintegrating in the process of complex interactions between language and interdiscourse.

Scholars R. Scollon and S. Scollon characterize the phenomena of interdiscourse interactions: “each of us is a member at the same time of many different discursive systems, since only virtually any professional communication is the communication through the boundaries dividing us into different discursive groups” (Scollon, 2001, 86). This position allowed the scholars to introduce the notion of interdiscursive communication into scientific use, by which is understood as the whole spectrum of different discursive groups of communicative actions intersecting the boundaries.

German scholar Yu. Link gives the representation of the concept of interdiscursivity in narrower sense. On the basis of M. Foucault’s discourse analysis, the scholar suggests differentiating between the concepts “special discourse” and “interdiscourse”. Yu. Link treats special discourse as the language of different subcultures, interdiscourse helps to achieve mutual understanding between the members of social groups in the process of communication.

In the studies by Russian linguist Yu. Rudnev interdiscourse is regarded as similar to style. Discourse is understood by the scholar as “such text measuring taken as a chain / complex of utterances that presupposes within itself syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between formal elements that form the system and reveals the pragmatic ideological attitudes of the subject of the utterance limiting the potential inexhaustibility of the meanings of the text” (Rudnev, www).

However, it is pointless to limit the notion of interdiscourse by the stylistic characteristics. The poetic discourse, being in the center of attention of our research, is closely connected not only with the literary discourse, but also with many other discourses: historical, political, didactic, pedagogical, etc. Considering the interdiscursive space as “external environment, in which discourse is formed and produced; the space in which the senses are generated” (Alefirenko, 2002, 126), interdiscursivity is defined as the interaction of poetic, artistic, political discourses with historical, pedagogical, musical discourses, etc. in a certain text space.
Interdiscursivity as the evidence of the distinctness of discursive space of the text, integrating into the whole system of the complementary mastered and mastering by it general knowledge, is considered to be the ability of the basic discourse to relate to and interact with other types of discourse. V.E. Chernyavskaya understands interdiscursivity as “a change of discourse, as the play with discourses becomes visible only in the textual structure, i.e. through a variety of intertextual signals”, since the texts interact as a result of intersection of “cognitive modules” in the system of human knowledge (Chernyavskaya, 2009, 240). This enables to assert that the work of the interdiscursive mechanism of text formation is revealed in the intertextual communication that is realized as the possibility of the author to appeal to the external textual sources, semantic positions and their conceptual systems representing “the result of generalization of cognitive experience of man, stored in the form of special mental formations of different type” (Kubryakova, 1996, 95-97).

2. Characteristic Peculiarities of Interdiscursive Space of the Text
The establishment of interdiscursive links attributes aesthetic character to the text. Depending on the author’s chosen strategy, the created text correlates with the discursive systems of a certain type by reproducing their prototypical elements in the text. In the works of different genres the interdiscursive links in the structure of newly created text act as the semantic elements. For example, the fictional text undoubtedly demonstrates the quality of interdiscursiveness, which is revealed in the interaction and integration of the institutional (historical, political) and personal (artistic, poetic) types of discourse.

Let us pay attention to the forms of combination of different types of discourse and the ways of interdiscursive integration. The forms such as a prosaic fictional text based on the historical event (novels by I. I. Lazhechnikov), a poetic text based on the historical event (the work by I. A. Chernukhin), and the inclusion of interdiscursive elements into the texts of the artistic (the works by L.N. Andreev) and political (the speeches by S.V. Lavrov and V. A. Nebenzi) discourses appear to be in our view.

The plots of the novels by I.I. Lazhechnikov - «Последний Новик» / “The Last Young Nobleman”, «Ледяной дом» / “The Ice House” and «Басурман» / “Basurman” - have the historical basis. The prosaic text of fiction is created by the writer on the basis of historical events. Historical material is processed and reinterpreted by the author. The novelist narrates about the times of the reigning of Ivan III, Peter I and Anna Ioannovna. The basis of the factual plan of the narrative in the novels by I.I. Lazhechnikov is created by historical discourse, which is realized, first, by introducing into the text of the narrative of the actual participants of the historical events – С царствованием Карла XI самих черных для лифляндского двора; – великий ; Порог этого переступает Бирон; государыня Анна среди придворных; Царь Васильевич! (With the reign of Charles XI, the most black years have come for the Livonian nobility; Peter is a great sovereign; Biron is crossing the threshold of this temple; There appeared the sovereign Anna Ivanovna among the crowd of different courtiers; Tsar’ Ivan Vasilievich)! Second, the interaction of artistic and historical discourses in the texts of novels by I. Lazhechnikov is through the introduction of many historical realities: household – (the purple mantle), охабень (cloak), понушиа (bedroom), п (tradesman), etc., military – стрелец (strelets), (spearman), ретир (reiter), палаш (broadsword), (musquet), etc.

An element of historical discourse in the novels by I.I. Lazhechnikov is an interlacing of religious and mythological pictures of the world.

For example, the world of the text of the novel “Busurman” is real - it is the world of Moscow (Moscowia) of the 15th century, the epoch of the reign of Ivan III - and mythical at the same time – it embodies the pagan folk conceptions of the world, faith in spirits accompanying a man throughout his life. The one-way life of a Russian man is directly connected with thoughts about the kingdom of heaven: прибегнул с молитвой к небесной заступнице; не оружие и не мудрость человеческая спасла нас, а господь небесный; владыка небесный ведает / he resorted with a prayer to the heavenly intercessor; not the weapon or the wisdom of man have saved us, but the Lord of Heaven; the Lord of Heaven. The life of the earth and the life of the heaven merged in the minds of the Russian man: Хабар говорил ей о святости своих обязанностей перед оптом земным и оптом небесным, перед сестрою, уверяя ее клятвенно; / Khabar told her about the sacredness of his responsibilities to the father on the earth and the heavenly Father, to his sister, assured her on oath;
and also pagan and Christian principles were closely intertwined: кого не призывала она на помощь... и небесные силы, и старушек ведей. / she called for help all sorts of things... and heavenly forces, and old voodoo women. A strong faith in God permeates the life of the people: и мамка, и девушки, и прочие служители, все по своим углам, запевают перед иконами свечи, молились. / mother, girls, and other ministers, all in their corners, waxing candles in front of the icons, were praying, and simultaneously following a pagan ritual, connected, in particular, with the purification of the house of an Orthodox person after visiting his home by a non-believer, a basurman: курили и курили ладаном так, что можно было в нём задохнуться, пели молебны с окроплением боговенской водой двора, жилого и нежилого строения, водрузили над воротами и над всеми входами медные кресты с святыми изображениями. / they were fumigating and fumigating with incense so that one could suffocate in it, were singing prayers by sprinkling the courtyard, a residential and non-residential construction with the Epiphany water, they hoisted copper crosses with holy images over the gates and above all entrances. Thus, both mythological and religious pictures of the world, reflected in the language, are an integral component of the national and cultural picture of the world on the whole. The text of the novel “Basurman” by I.I. Lazhechnikov reflects the original worldview and world attitude of the novelist in the intertwining of mythological and religious pictures of the world. Interdiscursive links form a vertical context that starts up the mechanisms of sense formation that correspond to the conceptual-thematic attitudes of the author, expressed by linguistic means, enabling to present the aesthetically cognized reality, the formed conception and serve to express the aesthetic-philosophical position of the author. Their functions are defined by creative strategy of the author, since the inclusion of elements of other discourses into a certain discourse is always accompanied by an author’s individual interpretation. This phenomenon can be observed in the works by L. A. Andreev to whom, where the aesthetic-ideological position of the author is formed by including the elements related to the historical discourse into the artistic discourse: Тоже весть берутся , отечество спасают . ей надо, а не отечество. Нем, не мы. Лассаль, например, – вот это !; / They, too, start getting down to business, they save the fatherland. She needs a suck, but not the fatherland. No, we are not ripe. Lassalle, for example, - That’s a brain!; the religious discourse: Пришёл великий ; Иисус Христа раз предупреждали, что Нуда из – человек дурной славы и его остерегаться, / the Lent has begun; Jesus Christ has been repeatedly warned that Judas from Cariot is a man of ill fame and one is to beware of him; and also a special type of discourse, singled out by a number of scholars in the work of this writer - medical discourse: Вчера я : к нам пришёл сумасшедший ; Попадя головой, примерилась бежать и рвалась на платье. И так сильна в охватившем ей , что не могли с нею справиться о. и Настя...; ...безумие и . Рассказывают, что в нашей и армии много душевнобольных. У нас уже четыре психиатрических . / Yesterday I saw: a crazy soldier came to us; a priest’s wife was hitting a brick wall in her efforts to run somewhere and ripping her dress out. And she was so strong in her being distraught that neither Vasily nor Nasty could handle her...; ... madness and dread. They say that our army as well as the enemy’s one increased of many deranged people. We have had already four mental hospitals opened. Thus, one nominates a new knowledge that corresponds to the concept to be built up, in another expressive form, being distinctive from the analyzed one. This makes impossible to understand the discourse, without recognizing its being heterogeneous, its having a set of discursive hierarchically organized formations, the penetration of the interdiscourse into the intradiscourse. The inclusion of the elements of the various discourses into the poetic text based on the historical events, as a rule, has a rational-logical ground and is determined by the addressee’s purposes and tasks, the tendency to replenish the information blocks comprehended in other types of discourses. This is determined by the peculiarities of representation of a historical event in a poetic text, in the center of which there is the poet’s “self”, his personal attitude (or the contemporaries’ attitude) to the events depicted, a personality in history, but not the very event or a historical person. A vivid example is the discursive space of the works by Belgorod poet I. A. Chernukhin, where one can trace the functional interaction of the historical discourse in mere poetic artistic discourse: «Со , утверждают, , По пути на Полтаву Где-то здесь, за Ворсклей,
Срублен был дом.
С той поры по деревни
И пошли с царской руки
затерявшейся в реки»;
/ From Peter’s times, they say, On the way to Poltava tsar, Somewhere here, behind the gloomy Vorskla, built a house of logs. Thenceforth around the village, thanks to tsar’s good graces, they went along the river, lost in the willows, pensive, still and very old.

патриотичный:
«В тот год
Надрывно плакали
По уезжающим .
А мы, пострелы ,
Стесняясь чувств, слов,
Руками трогали
Шинели отцов»;
/ In that year women cried their leaving husbands a river. And we, barefoot mischievous children, Being Shy of feelings, shy of words, Touched our father’s new overcoats with our tiny hands;

политический:
«литой кремлёвский
На всех медалях, –
Он полубог – Иосиф
С кровавым в очах»;
/ The leader of a molded Kremlin profile
He is on all medals, red bunting-
He is a demigod - father Joseph
With a trace of blood in his eyes;

религиозный:
«Триедино Слово –
Богом когда-то оно.
Словом, как мальчик, .
Речь мою замыкают .
Надо спасительно веют
Три смиренных креста.
/ Triune is the great Word -
It was God at one time.
Like a boy, I quail at the Word.
My speech is bookended by the mouth.
Over me there is a redeeming blow of
Three unified lowly crosses.
Compare with the biblical text of the Gospel of John: В начале было Слово, и Слово было у Бога, и Слово было Бог, / In the beginning there was the Word, and the Word was at God, and the Word was God, – which is repeated almost word for word in the text of the poem by the Belgorod poet.
In the poetic discourse by I. A. Chernukhин a special place is occupied by “I-concept” as a central concept of poetic works in general. By means of it I. A. Chernukhin represents not only the author’s personal attitude to the creative thought, but also a self-acceptance of the writer:
«Я никогда не был и броским
Или ярким...
как цветы».
/ I have never been fashion-forward and flashy
Or bright ...  
As variegated flowers.
The peculiarity of the poetic discourse determines its interrelation with the other types of discourses, which is explained by the peculiarity of the discursive space of the poet. The determination of interdiscursive connections gives an aesthetic character to literary text. In the poetic works of different genres, interdiscursive links appear to be semantic elements in the structure of the newly created text.

In its turn, the inclusion of a diversity of figurative means, references to the artistic discourse, examples from the historical discourse into the political discourse becomes an integral part of the political speeches and texts affecting the target consciousness. Within the political discourse there is “any material in the media, which covers politics and the author of which is a political figure, or, on the contrary, addressed to a politician” (Sheigal, 2004, 26).

The inclusion of interdiscursive elements into the texts of political speeches is determined by the intersection of the political discourse with other types, in particular, with publicistic and mass media (the speeches by politicians are broadcast and printed in the media), literary (the quotations from literary texts, the use of figurative means, phraseological units), historical (the references to historical events and personalia).

Thus, in the speeches of contemporary politicians and diplomats, one can observe the inclusions of the elements of the literary discourse into the diplomatic and political discourses: “When I listen to some of my colleagues, it seems to me that this is no longer “Alice's Adventures in Wonderland”, this is “Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There” (V. Nebenzya). There is also a mutual interpenetration of political and folklore: “They do not listen to and do not hear, it is called in Russian «ты им про , а они – про Ерему» / you are mixing apples and oranges” (V. Nebenzya); historical discourse: “Does nobody here understand that that this is the theatre of absurdity?” (V. Nebenzya); and also the discourse of time: “We “have synchronized watches” about the JCPOFA on the Iranian nuclear program” (S. Lavrov).

At the same time, it should be noted that the link of a discourse and the mental processes, worldview of a particular subject reflected in the language is represented in his discursive space, where the extent of activities and interests of the author, of the poetic text in our case, expands the boundaries of the basic poetic discourse by means of interspersing it with the elements from the other discourses. So, the interdiscursivity of the texts of various types has an aesthetic character, which is manifested in the borrowing of motifs, plots and images to have been created earlier in the texts already existing, such as literary, historical, didactic, political, journalistic and others. The context of such works is formed by interdiscursive links being as a political mechanism of meaning-making, which gets in line with the aesthetic concepts of the author. Interdiscursiveness has a pragmatic nature, since it is conditioned by a tendency towards the search for new external cognitions and meanings to be inherent in creative process.

CONCLUSION

The existence of various approaches to the interpretation of discourse analysis has led to a quantitative extension of the studies that are ranked with this field of science, which, on the one hand, has definitively categorized it as an independent scientific school of thought, and, on the other hand, erases the boundaries between the treatments of the scientific concept under consideration, which is expressed in a number of representations of the term “discourse analysis”, each of which offers its own interpretation of discourse and the ways of working with it, as we have already mentioned earlier.

Turning to the indicated method, we do emphasize the consideration of interdiscursive links used by the authors to express their aesthetic and ideological viewpoints. Discursive space is full of cultural and historical realia, that, on the one hand, perform a cognitive function of reflection of the mental world of the subject of a discourse, a range of his interests and the objects to reflect on, on the other hand, are pragmatically oriented, as they are indicative of a high level of intertextual competence among the competences to activate the cultural memory of the target. In addition, thanks to their use, the author reveals the interdiscursive links being as a mechanism of meaning-making, which corresponds to a certain aesthetic concept.

Thus, each concrete discourse (artistic, poetic, political, historical, etc.) is represented by a variety of discourses to be realized via the text. The interdiscursiveness of authors has a pragmatic character, as
it is determined by the tendency that is inherent in creative process to search for new cognitions and meanings.
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