A.M. Zhakulayev[*], S.U. Takirov

Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: adil91kz@mail.ru, sarzhan68@mail.ru)

Features of literary and historical discourse

The article examines the emergence and study of the concept of discourse in modern science. The authors of the article propose their own approach to the phenomenon of artistic discourse. The relevance and significance of the study of literary discourse and historical discourse are aroused. The levels that distinguish artistic discourse and historical discourse from other humanitarian discourses are considered, and the main criteria in the artistic text are analyzed. The researcher emphasized that historical discourse is transmitted through the perception of a historian or writer, the influence of the category of time on events in it, and studied the specific features of the literary and historical discourse. It is emphasized that historical discourse is not a whole continuum, but its texts can be divided into several typological groups in the classification. The article is guided by the works of such scientists as R. Bart, A.V. Lubsky, A.P. Minyar-Belorucheva, A.S. Adilova. In historical works of art, it is stated that the preservation of historical value is an important factor and requires careful study.

Keywords: discourse, text, discourse analysis, institutional discourse, fiction, communication, linguistics, postmodernism, literary discourse, historical discourse.

Introduction

The history of the world is preserved not only in historical monuments but also in the "text". If one looks at the essence of the text, one will find a lot of negative comments. The solution of different points of view, which have developed over the centuries, is riddled with riddles through discourse. It originates from ancient Greek philosophy. For the first time, this concept was encountered in the works of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. The concept of "discourse analysis" was considered in 1928 by Leo Spitzer in "Stilstudien" [1], in 1952 by Zellig Harris in "Discourse Analysis" [2], only after M. Foucault's "Archaeology of knowledge" began to be comprehensively studied [3]. The emergence of new areas of linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century (cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc.), the rise of communication to a new level contributed to the development of "discourse".

When the word "discourse" is accompanied by a "text", our scientists offer different concepts. The relationship between text and discourse is complex and still considered an urgent problem in discursology. For the first time, T.A. Van Dyck and W. Kinch tried to determine the difference between text and discourse [4; 46].

Text and discourse are not opposite concepts, but their relationship with each other is discussed a lot. For example, F. De Saussure considers the correlation between text and discourse from the point of view of a defining position [5; 97, 98]. Scientists constantly justify the fact that it is unacceptable to replace the text with discourse, where there is no text, no thinking, or research. Thus, the discourse does not unfold without text. Michel Foucault considers discourse as a separate direction, saying that "discourse created by the sequence of signs that make up a sentence is a set of words that obey the same system of formation and depend on the same discursive formation".

Experimental

The article uses the method of comparing text and discourse. The study aims to identify similarities and differences between discourse and text. In relation to text and discourse, the British linguist G. Widdowson defines that "discourse is the sum of text and situation, and text is the subtraction of situation from discourse". V.I. Karasik divides the typology of discourse into three types: sociolinguistic (who speaks?), pragmalinguistic (as they say?), thematic (about what?) [6; 276, 277].

---

[*] Corresponding author's e-mail: *adil91kz@mail.ru*

In sociolinguistics, discourse focuses on personality and status. Personality-oriented discourse is divided into daily and everyday discourse, and status-oriented discourse is divided into institutional and non-institutional discourse [6; 319, 320].

Institutional discourse obliges the narrator to represent a particular social institution. Types of institutional discourse — political, military, medical, pedagogical, etc.

From the above, we can see that discourse is one of the most complex, multi-faceted and visible communities in various areas of human activity. J.R. Tolkien argues that the community itself is a discourse, and the discourse consists of a community ('community involved discourse and discussion involved community') [7; 21, 22].

Many Kazakh scientists are engaged in new research on the problem of discourse. For example, the scientist A.S. Adilova identifies the common features and differences between text and discourse [8; 16].

Doctor of philology, professor B.I. Nurdauletova and A.S. Nurzhanova in the article "Concepts of discourse and discursive analysis" emphasized the relationship of discourse with text, the concepts of addressant/message/addressee. Young researcher Meruert Bazarbayeva in her article "Artistic discourse in the works of bilingual writers" focuses on the history and cognition of discourse, discursology, categories of discourse of fiction: artistic text, author, reader, hyperbole.

A.S. Adilova clarified and proposed that because discourse is a multi-faceted complex phenomenon, three main directions of its study are currently found in scientific circulation: Pragmalinguistic, dialogic and cultural studies. Since the most basic component of discourse is communicants, researchers distinguish between personal discourse and institutional discourse, based on which personal discourse itself is divided into artistic discourse (artistic, expressive, figurative expression of a person's perception of his own game, the world) and simple discourse (compensation for the need for everyday communication). The types of institutional discourse involve the consideration of the purpose of communication and the main character, often the place, of the state of communication. For example, if there is a religious discourse, it should be considered that the conversation, discussion of the imam and the believer often take place in a mosque in as a sermon. There are several types of institutional discourse: journalistic, religious, pedagogical, administrative, medical, legal, political, military, advertising, scientific, etc. [8; 16].

Results and Discussion

Parameters of literary discourse

Discourse is a broad concept that covers a wide range of areas. Modern philosophy, not only in linguistics but also in literary criticism, arouses great interest in "discourse", "discourse approach". Scientists proposed to break down the differences between literary discourse and other discourses into several blocks in determining and explaining them: Worldview, software, ontological, and methodological/technical blocks [9].

A worldview block is a socio-cultural state, external factors of discourse. That is, the complexity of modern culture is focused on the new traditionalism, which seeks to find a postmodern form in the new classical worldview.

Software block defines the levels of discourse text. In literary studies, discourse refers to two levels of text: One "object/subject" (depending on the specifics of the object of research-artistic and literary discourse — can be attributed to the level of "hermeneutic" meta-discourse) and meta-pronunciation — "object/subject" statements (the level of logical and methodological meta-discourse). The logical and methodological meta-discourse is formed in connection with the definition of the relationship between philosophy, literary studies and fiction. When considering the problems of philosophy, literary studies and fiction, the following theoretical and methodological orientations are thematically developed to "ideal" discourses: 1) orientation to philosophical discourse, simultaneous revision of its ontology, i.e. inclusion in the system of "author–text–reader" (literary sub-discourses of hermeticism and deconstructivism); 2) orientation to the conceptual and methodological ideal of scientific and natural science and linguistic discourses, which led to the creation of structuralism and post-structuralism; 3) orientation to the main (previously established) discursive paradigms of literary criticism, which are clarified by defining the "author–text–reader" scheme and combinatorics when constructing the methodology of artistic text analysis (receptive aesthetics and narratology). These orientations contribute to the formation of teleology of discourse (the general and unifying goal of discourse paradigms — knowledge of the essence of artistic and literary discourse and clarification of the features of discursive practice of literary studies (the logical and methodological aspect of literary research) and general characteristics of subject methodology. However,

these blocks do little to determine the parameters of literary discourse without "ontological and technical" levels.

The ontological block is a form of discourse. The object of literary discourse is an artistic text. An artistic text is a rhetorical structure, the meaning of which is not unambiguous and clearly defined, but must be constantly formulated when interpreting different figurative structures and identifying different ("internal" and "external") contexts. Also, the peculiarity of fiction is that it can change its form and context in historical evolution. The variety of goals and features of fiction discourse is explained by sub-discourses of intertextual connections with other humanities. Based on this, literary discourse is divided into many conceptual models of an artistic text at the ontological level. From the proliferation of conceptual models, models can be divided into two main types: 1) models that fix and explain the "constants" of artistic and literary discourse (structuralism, receptive aesthetics, narratology); 2) models that fix the specifics of "dynamics" and the marginal elements of the artistic text (hermeneutics, deconstructivism, poststructuralism). These models allow us to form a comprehensive understanding of literary discourse.

The methodological/technical block is the cognitive structure of discourse, the value of which is directly related to the previous parameters. The issues of interpretation of scientific and artistic texts of literature are considered.

Through the above levels, the main parameters of literary discourse are clarified, and the space becomes much wider.

Thus, discourse has a close relationship with the text. It has its own characteristics. If the text is formed at a specific time, the discourse can constantly change at any time. For instance, journalists can say that there is a movement in the text, and we will not deny it. However, the thoughts and images contained in it are "discourse". The range of discourse is wider than the text and the same text may be the cause of the emergence of a new discourse.

The object of literary discourse is an artistic text. The main criteria of artistic discourse: Free-emotional and aesthetic influence on the reader; Discursive activity of the speaker; Discursive communication of the author and the reader; Activity between a literary work/artistic text/external factor; Discourse of the speaker and characters subordinated to aesthetic communication; Formative of the space of word art; Direct influence on the "spiritual space" of the reader; Connection of the world depicted in the artistic text with reality; Diversity of genre, thematic and ideological components (sub-discourses), etc.

Literary discourse is one of the most complex concepts in discourse theory. Every literary scholar and linguist interprets it in their own way. The information in the text created by language has created a discourse between the real world and the virtual world. This discourse not only destroyed the boundaries of the virtual world with reality life but also led to the creation of a world of ghosts in consciousness.

Types of historical discourse

Today is the story of tomorrow. Any work has a hint of the past. Therefore, the author interprets the past situation through an artistic text, linking it with the present. The transmission of history in an artistic text creates a "historical discourse".

Historical discourse is a complex concept. Eric Hobsbaum believes that history itself is a discourse. We agree with his view because the data is transmitted through the perception of the same situations by the persons transmitting the historical events. Naturally, the originals themselves are subject to such modifications, as many historical researchers are.

Many historians have adopted the concept of historical discourse only after F. De Sausseur's statement that "language works according to its internal laws". Eric Hobsbaum: "if you understand the language that people spoke, thought, and made decisions in each particular era, then you can understand history. But only a certain fact can give the solution to everything, and not a chain of words that constantly replace each other". However, historians do not have methods to study history other than interpreting the available data. Historians are better to consider the language units used in that society rather than interpreting past events in terms of their era.

Historical discourse was considered in the works of researchers as R. Bart [10], E.M. Musaeva [11], A.V. Lubsky [12], A.P. Minyar-Belorucheva [13], and others.

The concept of "historical discourse" was first scientifically studied by Roland Bart in his work "Fashion system", which comprises articles on the semiotics of culture.

R. Bart in 1966, in the section "Discourse of history" of the above work, analyzed the latest achievements of the science of linguistics of that period and stated that the emergence of "discourse of linguistics" is possible. Since it affects literary analysis it is one of the main tasks of semiology. Do we have

the right to further contrast poetic and novelistic discourses, fictional narratives, and historical narratives with each other? In the course of the meeting, the participants discussed the main directions of development of the Kazakh language in the context of historical narratives. It is on this question that the scientist expresses the following thoughts: Do assumptions about past events in relation to our culture (since the ancient Greeks) differ in certain originality under the rules of "truth" in historical science, which are unconditionally subject to "truth" and "effective" justification? Is there any structural system? How is it given in epic (novel), dramatic works? If there is such a specific or structural system, then where is it located in the discursive system, at what level of the speech process? To find answers to these questions, several great classics, such as Herodotus, Machiavelli, Bossuet, and Michel, have touched on the discourse of historians (note: not fully, but partially).

First of all, under what circumstances the classical historian has the right to say or not to say by action in his discourse. In this case, R. Bart suggests shifters.

Shifters ("words" in the sense of Jacobson) — a category that provides for the transition from self-narration to act-based narration or from act-based narration to self-narration at a certain (some) level of non-linguistic discourse (according to R. Bart's suggestion).

R. Bart: "There seem to be two stable types of shifters in historical discourse. The first type includes what can be called listening shifter. This category is described by the formula C'Ca'/Ca2, which Jacobson calls "testimoniala" in the language. The events described (Ce), the speech act of the informant (Ca1) and the word of the subject's statement (Ca2) referring to him are simultaneously mentioned in the discourse" [12]. That is, through such shifters, comments are made on any information heard by a historian who collects and narrates information sources, testimonies, and other things related to his discourse.

Referring directly to the information heard depends on the choice of the historian. There is no need to refer directly to the information one has heard. After all, it brings the historian closer to the ethnologist who informs him; accordingly, these shifters are more common in ethnologists-historians such as Herodotus.

It is clear that listening shifters are not shifters that fully reveal the concept of "historical discourse". It is often found in ordinary stories and in some elements of novel narratives (stories derived from fictional words found in the text of storytellers).

The type of second shifter proposed by the scientist includes all openly declared signs, with the help of which the subject of the statement (in this case, the historian) organizes his discourse, corrects and changes it, makes a clear mark on it. These shifters are important for the organizer of the discourse. This is because the historian can get different narratives related to his subject, differ in that he can temporarily and locatively adapt the data to the speech related to his subject.

The organizational charts put forward an important problem. It is the simultaneous transfer of two times, namely, the time in which events are told and the time in which information is told according to the act.

Such a connection gives rise to a number of important facts of discourse, R. Bart touched on three of them:

1. All the facts that make history easier. The fact that the number of pages on both sides is the same, but (the unit in which the time of the information reported by the act is measured) corresponds to different time intervals (the time in which the events are reported). For example, the text of Machiavelli's work "The history of Florence" sometimes covers several centuries, sometimes only twenty years. The closer the historian approaches the time of the narrative, the more the time of the narrative affects the information and slows down the field (flow) of the historical process.

2. Discourse, in all its possibilities, is obliged to delve deeply into historical time. This can be called an crooked or chain history.

3. Organizational charts play a significant role in relation to the genealogical time of history [10].

In the "Historical discourse", R. Bart draws attention to two permanent shifters. One of them is "listening shifters", the other is "organizational shifters". The first is related to the direct listening of the historian, and the second is related to the narrative of the historian by adapting information to his discourse. He also did not ignore the question of the timing of the narration.

E.M. Musayeva defines: "Historical discourse — the process of forming meaning, which is aimed at identifying the patterns of historical development of society in order to form a certain system of values in the national community of people and is based on the processing, interpretation and analysis of information obtained from primary sources" [11].

According to the researcher A.V. Lubsky, in the third quarter of the XX century, the intense influence of postmodernism on historical science led to the widespread spread of the concept of "historical discourse", in postmodernism, historical discourse is interpreted as having no relation to the "truth to the world" as a set of language experiences, since it tends to "float", therefore, in historical discourse, objective reality is not reflected in its integrity, but continues in a temporal articulated and semiotic articulated form. Postmodernists argue that historical reality is considered not for external recognition of the subject, but as a "linguistic reality", emphasizing the following features of historical discourse:

1. Verbal articulatory form of opposition to the content of consciousness, regulated by the dominant type of rationality in a particular socio-cultural tradition;

2. A complex set of language practices involved in the formation of ideas that have an external impact on discourse in the form of "power/knowledge", reflecting how people are trapped in the regulatory framework of specific discourses;

3. A hypothetical construction that does not correspond to reality, but expresses it [12].

Considering this statement by A.V. Lubsky, we assume that in historical discourse "language" is the main meaning-forming factor.

A.P. Minyar-Belorucheva is a scientist who conducted some basic research in determining the typology of historical discourse from the point of view of the present day. The researcher classifies historical discourse into two types: Primary historical discourse and Secondary historical discourse [13].

All the sources that make up the original historical discourse will be flexible to detail. The second historical discourse through the components of the primary discourse, texts (scientific-historical and artistic works) are created, in which the primary data is not only explicit and implicit, but also valuable.

Primary data is a historical discourse characterized by a complex, multifunctional, diverse nature. Each of them was discursive: oral relics, including chronicles, various documents: registers, acts, codes, rules, as well as newspaper and magazine articles, pamphlets, leaflets, works of art; circulation graphics: Visual monuments that include engravings, xylography, motion picture, video chronicle, feature films.

In the second historical discourse, the perception and interpretation of primary data, i.e. past events, is narrated through the participation of the historical consciousness of the researcher or writer. The second historical discourse is classified as scientific-historical and artistic-historical, divided into prototype and individual author.

The division of scientific-historical discourse into narrative and analytical refers to individual authorship. After all, it reflects the historian's attitude to previous events and thought processes. The second historical discourse is directly related to the historical knowledge and experience of the historian or writer.

Through the views and positions of historians who interpret the data, the texts of the second historical discourse are created, and the mental space formed in turn gives rise to the polyphony of the historical discourse.

J. Swales presents the following principles of typology of historical discourse:

1. The specific vocabulary of historical discourse includes discursive formulas specific to this discourse.

2. Discursive and substantive competent representatives of the historical community include certified specialists: scientists, teachers, history teachers [7].

As a rule, the main elements of historical discourse include:

– main events and participants;

– context;

– circumstances that accompany the events;

– background explaining events;

– evaluation of participants of the event;

– information that connects discourse with events [6].

At the same time, the actual features of historical discourse are the chronological accuracy of events, the content of the plot and dramatization of events.

Conclusions

In general, none of the discourses is found in its pure form alone, without any impurities. Therefore, for artistic discourse, the linguistic personality of the author and reader plays a significant role. However, since the components of discourse are constantly changing it is subject to the laws of synergy, that is, a particular text can be updated again after a long time, depending on the need [8].

In postmodernism, the text dominates (the world is within the text), the product of the spoken text. Well, in discourse, the text is a part of it. The world is comprises endless discourses, and the text wants to define its horizon and bring it to a certain state. In postmodernism, the space of the text goes beyond the human consciousness.

Discourse is a much more powerful channel than the semantic thought given by the text. When the text enters the discourse, it is not the result of a single original thinking system; it becomes social thought in different languages, in different spheres. The source of all dynamics is the original text.

Therefore, the text forms images, and discourse turns it into a thought. One is linguistic, one is social. The main feature of literary discourse is the result of a certain culture that dominates the development of society. Its typology is complicated because science and culture and literature are combined in the historical discourse. The peculiarity of historical discourse is that several types of conceptual texts related to each other participate in its formation. These are primary (original) sources and secondary texts based on them, i.e. scientific, historical or artistic works.

In literary discourse, it is possible to define the original text, and in historical discourse, the source itself is written through the perception and vision of a historian or writer. Historians give an interpretation of the recorded data, which is interpreted by the writer in the artistic text. We cannot claim that any historical event is original. If the world is within the text (in the understanding of postmodernists), if history consists of discourse, then all discourses are the result of copies (simulacra) without the original.

References

1 Spitzer L. Stilstudien / L. Spitzer. ― Moscow: Hueber, 1969.

2 Harris Z.S. Discourse Analysis / Z.S. Harris. ― New York: Linguistic Society of America, 1952.

3 Фуко М. Археология знания / М. Фуко; под общ. ред. Бр. Левченко; пер. с фр. С. Митина и Д. Стасова, ― СПб., 1996.

4 Дейк ван Т.А. Стратегии понимания связного текста / Т.А. ван Дейк, В. Кинч // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. ― Вып. 23. Когнитивные аспекты языка. ― М.: Прогресс, 1988. ― 318 с.

5 Fairclough F. Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language / F. Fairclough ― London: Longman Group Limited, 1995.

6 Карасик В.И. Языковые ключи / В.И. Карасик. ― М.: Гнозис, 2009.

7 Swales J.M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings / J.M. Swales. ―Glassgow: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

8 Адилова А.С. Көркем мәтіндегі цитация құбылысы / А.С. Адилова. ― Алматы: Эверо, 2015. ― 252 б.

9 Кротков Е. Научный дискурс: философско-методологический анализ / Е. Кротков // Credo New. ― 2014. ― № 3.

10 Барт Р. Дискурс истории / Р. Барт // Система моды. Статьи по семиотике культуры; пер. с фр. ― М.: Изд-во им. Сабашниковых, 2003. ― С. 438–440.

11 Мусаева Е.М. Когнитивный анализ способов метафорического представления концепта «американская нация» в историческом нарративном дискурсе (на материале английского языка): дис. … канд. филол. наук. Спец. 10.02.04 ― «Германские языки» / Елена Михайловна Мусаева. ― СПб., 1997.

12 Лубский А.В. Дискурс исторический / А.В. Лубский // Теория и методология исторической науки: терминол. словарь. ― М.: Аквилон, 2014. ― С. 93–95.

13 Миньяр-Белоручева А.П. Роль концептуальных метафор в историческом дискурсе / А.П. Миньяр-Белоручева // Герценовские чтения. Иностранные языки: материалы Всерос. межвуз. науч. конф. (14–15 мая 2015 г.). ― 2015. ― С. 11–13.

А.М. Жакулаев, С.У. Такиров

Әдеби және тарихи дискурс ерекшеліктері

Мақалада заманауи ғылымның ой шеңберіндегі дискурс ұғымының пайда болуы мен зерттелуі туралы айтылады. Дискурс пен мәтіннің айырмашылықтары мен өзіндік ерекшеліктері ескеріліп, көркем дискурс құбылысына авторлық көзқарас ұсынылған. Әдеби дискурс пен тарихи дискурсты зерттеудің өзектілігі мен маңыздылығы қозғалған. Көркем дискурс пен тарихи дискурсты өзге гуманитарлық саладағы дискурстардан ерекшелейтін деңгейлері қарастырылып, көркем мәтіндегі негізгі критерийлері сарапталған. Зерттеуші авторлар тарихи дискурсты тарихшы немесе жазушының қабылдауы арқылы берілетіндігіне, ондағы уақыт категориясының оқиғаларға тигізетін әсеріне тоқталып, әдеби және тарихи дискурс түрлерінің өзіндік ерекшеліктерін зерделеген. Тарихи дискурс тұтас континуум емес, оның мәтіндерін жіктеуде бірнеше типологиялық топтарға бөліп қарастыруға болатындығына назар аударылған. Мақалада дискурсқа қатысты Р. Барт, А.В. Лубский, А.П. Миньяр-

Белоручева, А.С. Адилова сынды ғалымдардың еңбектері басшылыққа алынған. Тарихи көркем шығармаларда тарихи құндылықтың сақталуы маңызды фактор болатындығы және мұқият зерттеуді қажет ететіндігі айтылған.

Кілт сөздер: дискурс, мәтін, дискурстық талдау, институциональды дискурс, көркем әдебиет, коммуникация, лингвистика, постмодернизм, әдеби дискурс, тарихи дискурс.

<div align="center">

А.М. Жакулаев, С.У. Такиров

Особенности литературного и исторического дискурса

</div>

В статье рассмотрен вопрос о происхождении и изучении концепции дискурса в современной науке. Предлагается авторский подход к изучению феномена художественного дискурса с учетом различий и особенностей дискурса и текста. Сохранение исторической ценности в исторических художественных произведениях является важным фактором и требует тщательного изучения. Рассматривается актуальность и значимость изучения литературного дискурса и исторического дискурса. Изучены уровни, отличающие художественный дискурс и исторический дискурс от дискурсов в других гуманитарных областях, анализируются основные критерии художественного текста. Исследователь обращает особое внимание на то, что исторический дискурс реализуется через восприятие историком или писателем, на него влияют категории времени и события; исследуются особенности типов литературно-исторического дискурса. Обращено внимание на то, что исторический дискурс не является целостным континуумом, в классификации его текстов его можно разделить на несколько типологических групп. Теоретическую основу исследования составляют труды таких ученых, как Р. Барт, А.В. Лубский, А.П. Миньяр-Белоручева, А.С. Адилова.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, текст, дискурсивный анализ, институциональный дискурс, художественная литература, коммуникация, лингвистика, постмодернизм, литературный дискурс, исторический дискурс.

<div align="center">

References

</div>

1 Spitzer, L. (1969). *Stilstudien* [Stilstudien]. Moscow: Hueber.

2 Harris, Z.S. (1952). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Linguistic Society of America.

3 Fuko, M. (1996). Arkheologiia znaniia [Archeology of knowledge]. (S. Mitina, D. Stasiva, Trans.), B. Levchenko (Ed.). Saint Petersburg [in Russian].

4 Deik, T.A. van, & Kinsh, B. (1988). Strategii ponimaniia sviaznogo teksta [Strategies for understanding coherent text]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoi lingvistike — New in foreign linguistics. Kognitivnye aspekty yazyka — Cognitive aspects of language.* Vol. 23. Moscow: Progress [in Russian].

5 Fairclough, F. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman Group Limited.

6 Karasik, B.I. (2009). Yazykovye kliuchi [Language Keys]. Moscow: Gnozis [in Russian].

7 Swales, J.M. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Glassgow: Cambridge University Press.

8 Adilova, A.S. (2015). *Korkem matindegi tsitatsiia qubylysy* [The phenomenon of citation in the literary text]. Almaty: Evero [in Kazakh].

9 Kratkov, E. (2014). *Nauchnyi diskurs: filosofsko-metodologicheskii analiz* [Scientific discourse: philosophical and methodological analysis]. Credo New, No. 3 [in Russian].

10 Bart, R. (2003). Diskurs istorii [History discourse]. *Sistema mody. Stati po semiotike kultury — Fashion system. Articles on the semiotics of culture*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo imeni Sabashnikovykh [in Russian].

11 Musaeva, E.M. (1997). Kognitivnyi analiz sposobov metaforicheskogo predstavleniia kontsepta Amerikanskaia natsiia v istoricheskom narrativnom diskurse (na materiale angliiskogo yazyka) [Cognitive analysis of the ways of metaphorical representation of the concept American nation in historical narrative discourse (based on the material of the English language)]. Candidate's thesis. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].

12 Lubskii, A.V. (2014). Diskurs istoricheskii [Historical discourse]. Teoriia i metodologiia istoricheskoi nauki — Theory and methodology of historical science. Moscow: Akvilon [in Russian].

13 Minyar-Belorucheva, A.P. (2015). Rol kontseptualnykh metafor v istoricheskom diskurse [The Role of Conceptual Metaphors in Historical Discourse]. *Herzen Readings. Foreign languages: Vserossiiskaia mezhvuzovskaia nauchnaia konferentsiia (14–15 maia) — All-Russian Interuniversity Scientific Conference (pp. 11–13).* Moscow [in Russian].