

## INTERDISCURSIVITY

The notion of interdiscourse was first introduced by M. Pecheaux, who understood it to be a complex of a discursive formation and of ideological formations to be revealed behind the transparency of a discourse. Thus *interdiscourse* appears to be closely related, almost interchangeable with another notion – that of the preconstructed, standing for the totality of preceding discourses being the raw material for the new discourse. Due to the preconstructed a discourse turns inevitably into interdiscourse [7, p. 266–270].

On the other hand, interdiscursivity is closely interwoven with intradiscursivity. Although the former focuses on the discourse being affected by outward factors and the latter – on the relations between utterances within discourse, the borderline between them is diffuse as, according to P. Seriot, it is impossible to utterly distinguish intradiscursivity from interdiscursivity, attitude to another being a variant of attitude to oneself, never absolutely isolated [8, p. 30].

Thus the preconstructed, intradiscourse and interdiscourse are the aspects of discourse essence, which cannot be perceived apart from the already said, not yet said, i.e. various dialogic relations, being part of them. This early broad perception of interdiscourse can be called radical, since it eliminates the border between discourse and interdiscourse, emptying the both notions at that.

In contrast to the radical approach there is a narrow conception of marked interdiscursivity materializing in texts in specific signals – elements belonging to various discourses [10; 12].

The recent decade witnessed popularization of the notion of interdiscursivity in linguistics, although there is as yet no fixed single understanding of it. Among the existing trends let us mention the attempt to bring interdiscursivity to some other linguistic category – discursivity [1; 4; 9], intersemioticity [2; 5; 6], intertextuality [3; 11].

In order to avoid such false identifications one can define interdiscursivity as introducing into a text belonging to a certain discourse and manifesting its peculiar features alien elements characteristic of other discourses. The seam between discourses can at that lie on either the surface (language) or the deep (cognitive) level of a discourse.

### References

1. Andreeva V. A. *Literary narrative: discourse and text* / V. A. Andreeva. – St. Petersburg. : Norma, 2006. – 182 p.
2. Gorbunova N. G. *Heterogeneity of James Joyce's text: the mechanisms of coherence in the "incoherent" text* / N. G. Gorbunov // *Linguistics of text and discourse analysis: traditions and prospects: fri. scientific. art.* – St. Petersburg : St. Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance, 2007. – P. 85–91.
3. Gordiyevsky A. A. *Category interdiskursivnosti in scientific and didactic text: thesis abstract ... PhD in philological sciences* : 10.02.20 / A. A. Gordiyevsky. – Tyumen, 2006. – 19 p.
4. Danilevskaya N. V. *Cognitive interdiskurs as a reflection of the dynamics of the scientific picture of the world [Electronic resource]* / N. V. Danilevskaya // *Herald MAPRYAL*. – 2006. – № 50. – Access mode: <http://www.mapryal.org/vestnik/vestnik50/index.shtml> (date accessed 30.09.2013).
5. Melnikova O. A. *Interdiskursivnost as a communicative phenomenon: thesis abstract ... PhD in philological sciences*. 10.02.19 / O. A. Melnikova. – Tver, 2004. – 15 p.
6. Olizko N. S. *Synergistic principles of artistic discourse of postmodernism* / N. S. Olizko // *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University. Vol. 30, Philology. Art history.* – 2009. – № 10 (148). – P. 84-87.
7. Pecheux M. *Common truths. Linguistics, semantics, philosophy* / M. Pecheux // *Quadrature sense. The French school of discourse analysis.* – Moscow : Progress, 1999. – P. 266–270.
8. Serio P. *How to read texts in France* / P. Serio // *Quadrature of meaning. French school of discourse analysis.* – Moscow : Progress, 1999. – P. 11–52.

9. Surgai Yu. V. *Interdiskursivity cinematic in cross-cultural perspective: thesis abstract ... PhD in philological sciences: 10.02.04 / Yu. V. Surgai.* – Tver, 2008. – 17 p.

10. Chernjavskaja V. E. *The plaintext and open discourse: intertextuality – discursivity – interdiskursivity / V. E. Chernjavskaja // Steele-6. - Beograd, 2007. – P. 11–26.*

11. Shevchenko V. D. *Interference of oratory and publicistic discourses / V. D. Shevchenko // The system of language and the discourse: intern. collect. of proceedings. – Samara: Samara University, 2007. – P. 91–103.*

12. Link J. *Diskurs/Interdiskurs und Literaturanalyse / J. Link, U. Link-Heer // Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik. – 1990. – N 20. – P. 88–99.*

Y. V. Beloglazova