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ABSTRACT

The article presents the theoretical fundamentals for the study of fictional discourse and text, as well as fictional interdiscourse and intertext in Cognitive Linguistics, from the standpoint of view of determining the relationship and status of concepts in two dyads and tracing them on the example of a work of art. The definitions to the following notions have been outlined: (a) fictional discourse is mental-communicative interaction between the addressee (author of a fictional work) and the addressee (potential reader), which takes place in a certain historical and cultural and social context, is based on ideas, beliefs, worldview orientations of the author-addresssee, aims to regulate the ideas, beliefs, worldview orientations of the reader-addressee and materializes in the form of texts of fictional works, the open set of which forms the verbal plan of fictional discourse; (b) fictional text is one of the components of the act of fictional communication, which represents a special fictional reality, which, combined with the discourses of the author and the reader, creates a new type of discourse – fictional. Besides, it has been proved that the fictional interdiscourse and intertext combine the speech of the author and the character and, therefore, have two communicative situations: (a) external communicative situation: addressee-author – addressee-reader, and (b) internal communicative situation: character – character.
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1. Introduction.

In modern cognitive-oriented studies (Bekhta, 2010; Kondratenko, 2012; Sanford, 2008), the issues of revising and understanding the concept of discourse and text in general and fictional discourse and text in particular to determine and justify their status. It is about the transition, or transformation, of the dyad ‘discourse – text’ (Koval et al., 2019, p. 96) to the dyad ‘interdiscourse – intertext’ (Selivanova, 2008, p. 712), and in the context of this article – the transformation of the dyad ‘fictional discourse – fictional text’ (Voronovska et al., 2018, pp. 52–61) to the dyad "fictional interdiscourse – fictional intertext" (see Stasyuk, 2017, pp. 149–154). Of course, the mentioned terms within the last dyad are not too standard because most scientists use the following concepts, which are also tangential and, in some cases, identical to them: "intertextuality of a fictional work" (Korablyova, 1999, p. 20), "intertextuality of a fictional discourse" (Perelomova, 2008, p. 208).

It becomes clear that discourse/interdiscourse and text/intertext, as well as fictional discourse/interdiscourse and fictional text/intertext, as a rule, are in constant contact; they are not simply interconnected, but mutually complementary, which corresponds to a greater extent the concept of "dyad" – "unity formed by two separate parts". At the same time, if we consider these concepts separately, we are already talking about the concept of "dichotomy" – "consecutive division of the whole into two parts, then each part again into two, etc." (SUM, Vol. 2, 1973, p. 292).

Representatives of various scientific schools of discourse analysis have repeatedly proven that the concepts of "discourse" and "text", as well as "interdiscourse" and "intertext", complement each other, depend on each other, etc., i.e., they are not independent, even though individual researchers sometimes consider, for example, only "interdiscourse" (Demydyak, 2017, pp. 15–21) or "intertext" (Makarova, 2005, pp. 7–11). Acquaintance with these and other works proves that researchers, when talking about interdiscursive connections, unconsciously refer to the intertext or vice versa.

The previous conclusion makes it possible to talk about both "discourse" and "text", as well as "interdiscourse" and "intertext" as a dyad – a single whole formed from two separate parts.
2. Literature Review.

The questions and problems outlined above are the objects of research of various schools of discourse analysis, which were formed before the end of the 20th century: English Logical-Analytical (Austin, 1961; Searle, 1969), English sociolinguistic (Gilbert & Mulkey, 1984), Dutch Cognitive-Pragmatic (Van Dijk, 2014), German linguistic (Meringer, 1908), French structural-semiological (Barthes, 2001; Todorov, 1981; Greimas, 1983; Pêcheux 1988), as well as Ukrainian (Artemenko, Bezugla & Belozyorova, 2020 p. 368, Shevchenko & Morozova, 2005, p. 233, Serazhim, 2002, p. 392, etc.) schools.

3. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of the article is to present the theoretical fundamentals for the study of fictional discourse and text, as well as fictional interdiscourse and intertext in Cognitive Linguistics, from the standpoint of view of determining the relationship and status of concepts in two dyads and tracing them on the example of a work of art.

Objectives:

– to present the relationship and status of concepts in the dyads ‘discourse – text’ and ‘interdiscourse – Intertext’, ‘fictional discourse - fictional text’ and ‘fictional interdiscourse – fictional intertext’ in cognitive linguistics;

– to characterize a fragment of fictional intertext with fixation of discursive-textual markers belonging to different discourses.


4.1. Dyads ‘discourse – text’ and ‘interdiscourse – intertext’. The traditional understanding of the dyad ‘discourse – text’ and its two concepts can be found in the writings of many representatives (Selivanova, 2011, p. 350). For example, Sekerina calling discourse a process and text a product of one or another discourse, explain: "Discourse is a broader concept than the text itself. Discourse is both the process of language activity and its result (=text)" (Sekerina, 1997, p. 307). According to Makarov, this interpretation leads to contrasting discourse and text.

Kondratenko tries to distinguish between the two concepts of "discourse" and "text": "[...] discourse is an oral form of a text, and a text is a written form, that is, a graphic fixation of speech; discourse is monological speech, and text is dialogic (polylogical) speech. Currently, text linguistics has developed an almost unanimous opinion regarding this distinction, and therefore the text is interpreted as either one of the components of the discourse or as its unit". (Kondratenko, 2012, p. 39).

An exciting and worthy of attention is the concept of the Eastern linguistic school of discourse analysis, proposed by Chang Kim Bao (2000), who tried to compare discourse and text with two opposite sides of the same entity – yin and yang, where text is potential (yin). Discourse is realizing this potential in language activity (yang) (Chan Kim Bao, 2000, p. 180). As we can see, the researcher first talks about the text and then the discourse. The researcher adds that "all linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (our italics – D. Zh.) involved in the organization and functioning of the text as a means of linguistic communication are taken into account, and it is also argued that both text and discourse have such characteristics as linearity and volume" (Ibid.).

Somewhat later, in particular in 1967, when Kristeva gave impetus to the introduction into scientific circulation of the concept of "intertext" as one of the central concepts of poststructuralist criticism (see her works (Kristeva, 1980, etc.), A change in research orientations took place, which led to the actual transition/transformation from discourse to interdiscourse and text to intertext (which the researcher noted) and, more precisely, from the dyad ‘discourse – text’ to the dyad ‘interdiscourse – Intertext’, which are much broader. Let us recall, for example, the opinion of Pulcinelli Orlandi, who writes that "it (interdiscourse) is a field of knowledge, a memory of discursive formations" (Pulchinelli Orlandi, 1999, p. 211).

Thus, the linguistic tradition of studying the two concepts "interdiscourse" and "intertext" begins to form, which today can be found in the works of Americans (McHale, 1987; Riffaterre, 1978), British (Bennett, 1991), German (Gumbrecht, 2004; Iser, 1978), French (Barthes, 1974), Ukrainian (Makarova, 2005; Stasyuk, 2015) researchers. Moreover, when defining the concept...
of "interdiscourse", researchers refer to text fragments as markers of discursive situations, fragments.

McHale (1987), the American linguist, believes that "interdiscourse refers to the interaction between different genres or modes of representation in one work or a set of related works (our italics – D. Zh.)" (p. 5). Iser (1978), the German linguist, interprets interdiscourse as "interaction between different textual contexts or horizons of expectation in the interpretation of a literary work" (p. 33). Gumbrecht (2004), the German linguist, also held a similar opinion: "Interdiscourse (our italics – D. Zh.) contains how different modes of representation or "presence" interact with each other within the limits of a literary work or in a wider cultural context" (p. 138).

Along with the concept of "interdiscourse" appears the concept of "intertext" in its close interaction.

Today, some researchers (Lebedyeva-Guley, Levytska, 2009, p. 160; Kosinova, 2018, p. 26) continue to rely on the interpretation of the concept of "intertext" proposed by Barthes: "Each text is an intertext; other texts are present at different levels in more or less well-known forms: the texts of the previous culture and the texts of the surrounding culture. Each text is a new fabric woven from old quotes. Excerpts of cultural codes, formulas, rhythmic structures, fragments of social idioms, etc. – all of them are absorbed by the text and mixed in it since there is always a language before the text and around it" (Barthes, 2001, p. 1470). A similar position regarding the concept of "intertext" can also be found in the American Researcher Riffaterre: "the network of linguistic relations that presupposes a text and that combines it with other texts" (Riffaterre, 1978, p. 33).

For example, Kristeva claims that any text is an intertext and, therefore, the result of other discourses (Kristeva, 1980a, pp. 165–167.).

At the same time, representatives of the communicative-discursive approach, when interpreting the intertext, also refer to discursive fragments and explain it as "the interaction of different types of intertextual discourses – the author's discourse about the characters' discourse, the discourse of one character about the discourse of another" (Bakhtin, 1979, p. 234).
Even though the main focus of the study is on the two dyads, ‘fictional discourse – fictional text’ and ‘fictional interdiscourse – fictional intertext’, it is worth determining their status and interdependence.

4.2. Dyads ‘Fictional Discourse – Fictional Text’ and ‘Fictional Interdiscourse – Fictional Intertext’. In modern linguistic research, considerable attention of scientists is focused on the dyad ‘fictional discourse – fictional text’ (Bekhta, 2010; Kolegaeva, 2010; Nikonova, 2007, etc.).

In the work "Specifics of fictional discourse and its aspects," Ometsynska et al. (2018) interprets fictional discourse as "mental-communicative interaction between the addressee (author of a fictional work) and the addressee (potential reader), which takes place in a certain historical and cultural and social context, is based on ideas, beliefs, worldview orientations of the author-addressee, aims to regulate the ideas, beliefs, worldview orientations of the reader-addressee and materializes in the form of texts of fictional works, the open set of which forms the verbal plan of fictional discourse" (p. 54). At the same time, the fictional text, according to the definition of Prybluda (2013), is "one of the components of the act of fictional communication, which represents a special fictional reality, which, combined with the discourses of the author and the reader, creates a new type of discourse – fictional" (p. 5).

Let us recall the work "Syntaksis ukraiinskoho modernistskoho i postmodernistskoho khudozhnoho dyskursu" (lit. The Syntax of Ukrainian Modernist and Postmodernist Fictional Discourse), in whichh Kondratenko (2012), the Ukrainian researcher, mentions the following six approaches to the study of fictional discourse and fictional text at the same time: (a) anthropocentric approach – situations when a human-being (his thoughts, feelings, experiences, relationships with other characters) are at the centre of the space of fictional discourse; (b) cognitive approach, conditioned by the perception of fictional discourse and text as a complex phenomenon that expresses the writer's knowledge of reality in the form of an author's picture of the world; (c) communicative approach, which represents the concept of discourse as a communicative situation together with its components, where the communicative situation is a three-part act: ‘author (speaker) – literary text – reader (recipient)’; (d) pragmatic – when the fictional text is able to act as one of the components of the act of fictional communication, representing an extraordinary fictional reality, which,
combined with the discourses of the author and the reader, creates a new type of discourse – fictional; (e) traditional approach involves the study of text units, grammatical categories, connections and stylistic devices; (f) functional-linguistic approach – when fictional discourse performs aesthetic, cognitive and communicative functions (pp. 41–45). It is worth paying attention to the last approach when the researcher draws attention to the importance of levels of communication in fictional discourse and text: vertical (author-reader) and horizontal (between characters) (Kondratenko, 2012, p. 156).

The idea of "paratext" proposed by Genette (1997a) is necessary for any space of fictional discourse: "Fictional discourse is not limited to the text itself, but also includes paratextual elements that surround this text, such as the title, preface, and footnotes" (p. 3). The researcher is convinced that "these paratextual elements play a decisive role in shaping the reader's interpretation of the text and contribute to its overall meaning" (Genette, 1997b, p. 3).

In work "Zobrazhennia personazhnoho dyskursu yak zhanrovo determinovanyi vplyv komunikatyvnoi vtorinnosti v khudozhnomu teksti" (lit. Image of Character Discourse as a Genre-Determined Influence of Communicative Secondariness in a Fictional Text) Kolegaeva (2010) notes that "within the framework of fictional discourse, it is usually customary to distinguish two primary subtypes of it: (a) poetic discourse, which is characterized by a high degree of saturation of metaphors, measured rhythmic and syntactic segmentation of speech and use of phonetic means; (b) the prose type of fictional discourse, which is characteristic of short stories, novellas, novels" (p. 103). These subtypes combine the speech of the author and the character and, therefore, have two communicative situations: (a) external communicative situation: addressee-author – addressee-reader, and (b) internal communicative situation: character – character.

Taking into account the fact that the prose type of fictional discourse was chosen in the study because the analysis will include works (novels by American authors of the 20th century: "Flowers for Algernon" (Daniel Keyes), "The Catcher in the Rye" (Jerome Salinger), "All the King's Men" (Robert Warren), "The Old Man and the Sea" and "A Farewell to Arms" (Ernest Hemingway); English authors of the 20th century: "Sherlock Holmes" (Conan Doyle), "1984"
and "Animal Farm" (George Orwell), "A History of the World in 10½ Chapters" (Julian Barnes), "The Black Prince" (Iris Murdoch), so it is necessary to focus on its definition.

Today, the prose type of fictional discourse (PTFD) has a complex multi-layered structure in which meanings and the regulation function are constructed at different levels. This approach to understanding enabled us. Kolegaeva (2010) divides PTFD into "author's discourse and character discourse" (p. 103).

We assume that Kondratenko's (2012) opinion regarding the levels of communication, i.e., vertical and horizontal within the fictional discourse, correspond to the author's discourse and the character discourse: if the vertical communicative situation is the presentation of the author's discourse – when the embodiment of the author's own moral and aesthetic position in work is aimed at creating a situation of active interaction between the "I" of the author and the "you" of the reader, then horizontal communicative situation – character discourse, when it is a linguistic, general-linguistic phenomenon that forms a single system of language means for the transmission of information, inner thoughts, state, feelings (Bekhta, 2002, p. 25–26). Let us try to focus on these two discourses.

Kristeva (2000) notes that "the author's discourse (italics is our – D. Zh.) is about another discourse; it is a word that speaks with another word but not a word about a word (not a real metadiscourse). In this unpredictable world, a character is nothing more than a discursive position of an "I" that writes across another "I"; it is a discourse ("word") that conducts a dialogue not only with the discourse of the writing "I," but also with oneself" (469).

In the work "Kohnityvno-prahmatychna kontseptsiya khudozhnoho dyskursu (na materiali movotvorchosti Olhy Kobylanskoi)" (lit. Cognitive-pragmatic concept of fictional discourse ((based on the language works of Olha Kobylanska)) Rusnak (2020) interprets the author's discourse (discourse of the author-narrator) (from now on – author's discourse) as "a part of the cultural space where semiotic units function according to the laws of certain genres, in which the knowledge, information, assessments, and mentality of the author as a representative of a certain socio-cultural community are creatively reproduced by verbal means and which have a pragmatic load" (p. 86). The researcher mentions the following five features of the author's discourse: (1) realization of the discourse in the fictional text of a particular genre;
(2) author, time, and place of writing fictional texts; (3) style; (4) cognitive aspect; (5) pragmatic aspect (ibid.). In this context, it is worth paying attention to two prominent figures – the author and the reader, about whom Rusnak (2020) says, stressing that "the author and the reader are separated in time and space, but the fictional text functions as a result of their co-creation, which leads an imaginary dialogue between themselves (the author always counts on the fact that his fictional text will be perceived)" (p. 86).

The study of the character discourse, which is on the horizontal line of the communicative situation, is determined primarily by its cognitive potential and structural-semantic and communicative status. Voloshynov (1973) wrote about it that it is "speech within speech, statements about statements" (Voloshynov, 1973, p. 115).

Bekhta (2002), explaining the essence of character discourse, admits that "all characters and their speech are objects of the author's attitude" (p. 26). He draws attention to the speech of the characters, which, in his opinion, "takes part in textual communication, it is the speech of persons of the depicted, virtual world, and it is devoid of the influence of the real situation in which the fictional text is interpreted in its entirety" (Bekhta, 2002, p. 26). The character discourse is a linguistic, general-linguistic phenomenon that forms (along with other types and modifications of speech) a single language system for transmitting information, inner thoughts, expression of will, states, feelings, sounds. The type of character speech is a consequence of the opposition relationship, firstly, "author's" / "own", and, secondly, "other's" / "character" (Ibid.).

The tendency to actualize "discourse within discourse" (Demydiak, 2017, p. 15) and "text within text" (Lotman, 1996, p. 70) makes it possible to trace the transitions of fictional discourse to fictional interdiscourse, from the prose type of fictional discourse to the prose type of fictional interdiscourse, within which the transition of the author's and character's discourse to the author's and character's interdiscourse takes place. In addition, the transition will also be traced at the level of the text: from the fictional text to the fictional intertext, the prose type of the fictional text to the prose type of the fictional intertext, within which the transition of the author's and character's text to the author's and character's intertext takes place.
In the work "Interdykursyvnyi kharacter khudozhnoho tekstu (na materiali nimetskoji movy)" (lit. Interdiscursive character of the fictional text (based on the material of the German language)), Zastrovska et al. (2018) try to explain the fixation of interdiscursivity in the fictional space: "A work of art as a medium of the interconnection of various types of discourse is in itself interdiscourse, which is determined by the author's concept of the work of art. The author directs the "game" of discourses in the work of art to the solution of the problem set by him. At the same time, the author uses linguistic (primary q secondary) means, as well as non-linguistic means (verbalizes behavioural reactions, emotional state of the characters)" (p. 97).

5. Practical Application of Different Types of Discourses in Fictional Interdiscourse.

The fragment of the text from The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes by Doyle taken for analysis, which belongs to the fictional interdiscourse, allows us to see the manifestation of various types of discourse, in particular medical, scientific, and legal, each of which we will try to consider.

In the presented fragment of the intertext of the fictional interdiscourse (see Appendix A), linguistic markers belonging to the medical discourse can be traced:

(a) the noun blood—The fluid that contains cells; circulates through the heart, arteries, veins, and capillaries; carries nourishment, electrolytes, hormones, vitamins, antibodies, heat, and oxygen to the tissues; and takes away waste matter and carbon dioxide—in different phrases: a drop of blood in a chemical pipette, fresh blood, microscopic examination for blood corpuscles, the proportion of blood, quantity of blood, test for blood stains;

(b) the noun hemoglobin—ABBR: Hb, Hbg, Hgb The iron-containing pigment of red blood cells (RBCs) that carries oxygen from the lungs to the tissues.

According to the context, it becomes evident that blood and hemoglobin as a component of blood have a decisive role in conducting medical examinations to solve crimes of various severity. In the fragment, we also observe how the doctor focuses on hemoglobin (for example,
"The question now is about hemoglobin. No doubt you see the significance of this discovery of mine?"), which makes it possible to determine how old the blood stain is.

Even though the activities of the main characters, Sherlock Holmes (detective) and Dr. Watson (doctor), were aimed at solving crimes of various degrees of severity, in their work, they repeatedly turned to the achievements of science, as evidenced by the noun discovery—the process of finding information, a place, or an object, especially for the first time, or the thing that is found3, which is observed in different collocations: significance of this discovery, medico-legal discovery. Science helped Dr. Watson to invent a way to determine the age of blood. Therefore, we can talk about the presence of linguistic markers of scientific discourse in the text of fictional interdiscourse.

In addition, we can also observe linguistic markers of legal discourse:

(a) noun crime – n. a violation of a law in which there is an injury to the public or a member of the public and a term in jail or prison, and/or a fine as possible penalties4

(b) verb commit – v. to send a person to prison by virtue of a warrant or other lawful writ for the commission of a crime, offense, or misdemeanor, or for contempt or non-payment of a debt5


In Cognitive Linguistics, the following two dyads are to be determined: ‘discourse – text’ and ‘interdiscourse – Intertext’, ‘fictional discourse – fictional text’, and ‘fictional interdiscourse – fictional intertext’, which continue to attract the attention of discursologists. Thus, the preliminary interpretation of dyads, firstly, made it possible to trace the natural transition of the dyad ‘discourse – text’ into the dyad ‘interdiscourse – intertext’, which is caused by the nature of discourse and text: discourse as a process acquired additional features due to the integration of resources of other discourses to achieve the author’s intention. Therefore, there was a need for such a transformation.

3 Retrieved from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/discovery
5 Retrieved from https://www.upcounsel.com/legal-def-commit-commitment
The concept of the dyad ‘fictional discourse – fictional text’ and its transition to the dyad ‘fictional interdiscourse – fictional intertext’ in fictional works also demonstrates the manifestation of interdiscursiveness and intertextuality through the interaction of the addressee (author) and the addressee (reader) through an act of fictional communication in which discourses have combined the author and the reader's discourse. Such a tendency was recorded in the examples taken from the text *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* by Doyle, which belongs to fictional interdiscourse and made it possible to see the manifestation of various types of discourses, particularly *medical, scientific, and legal*.
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Illustrative Data Material

Appendix A

“Dr. Watson, Mr. Sherlock Holmes,” said Stamford, introducing us.
“How are you?” he said cordially, gripping my hand with a strength for which I should hardly have given him credit. “You have been in Afghanistan, I perceive.”
“How on earth did you know that?” I asked in astonishment.
“Never mind,” said he, chuckling to himself. “The question now is about haemoglobin. No doubt you see the significance of this discovery of mine?”
“It is interesting, chemically, no doubt,” I answered, “but practically – – “
“Why, man, it is the most practical medico-legal discovery for years. Don’t you see that it gives us an infallible test for blood stains. Come over here now!” He seized me by the coat-sleeve in his eagerness, and drew me over to the table at which he had been working. “Let us have some fresh blood,” he said, digging a long bodkin into his finger, and drawing off the resulting drop of blood in a chemical pipette. “Now, I add this small quantity of blood to a litre of water. You perceive that the resulting mixture has the appearance of pure water. The proportion of blood cannot be more than one in a million. I have no doubt, however, that we shall be able to obtain the characteristic reaction.” As he spoke, he threw into the vessel a few white crystals, and then added some drops of a transparent fluid. In an instant the contents assumed a dull mahogany colour, and a brownish dust was precipitated to the bottom of the glass jar.
“Ha! ha!” he cried, clapping his hands, and looking as delighted as a child with a new toy. “What do you think of that?”
“It seems to be a very delicate test,” I remarked.
“Beautiful! beautiful! The old Guiacum test was very clumsy and uncertain. So is the microscopic examination for blood corpuscles. The latter is valueless if the stains are a few hours old. Now, this appears to act as well whether the blood is old or new. Had this test been invented, there are hundreds of men now walking the earth who would long ago have paid the penalty of their crimes.”
“Indeed!” I murmured.
“Criminal cases are continually hinging upon that one point. A man is suspected of a crime months perhaps after it has been committed. His linen or clothes are examined, and brownish stains discovered upon them. Are they blood stains, or mud stains, or rust stains, or fruit stains, or what are they? That is a question which has puzzled many an expert, and why? Because there was no reliable test. Now we have the Sherlock Holmes’ test, and there will no longer be any difficulty.”