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Abstract: The article discusses the issues associated with representation of category of intertextuality in a scientific text. In this work, the actualization of the category of intertextuality is studied from the standpoint of the cognitive-discursive approach, which made it possible to determine both the composition of knowledge transmitted by intertextual inclusions and the functional purpose of these linguistic means in scientific texts. Intertextuality as one of the categories demonstrates itself in a scientific text with the maximum degree of intensity, which is due to the institutional nature of scientific knowledge and the dialogic nature of scientific communication, as well as the main purpose of the scientific text to be a means of storing, representing and transmitting scientific knowledge and opinions, taking into account the history of the development of science.
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INTRODUCTION

The study of the category of intertextuality in the scientific “text” began relatively recently; This category was subjected to detailed research on the linguistic material of literary texts in different sections of philological science, which gave rise to differences in the understanding of this linguistic phenomenon by researchers.

The term "intertextuality" was introduced into scientific circulation in 1967 by the French semioticist Y. Kristeva, who, starting from the idea of M.M. Bakhtin on the dialogic character of a literary text, defined intertextuality as a universal property of texts and textuality in general. As a category of text, intertextuality was studied from the point of view of the philosophy of language, all linguistic activity of a person and culture in general (R. Barth, I. Ilyin, V. Bazylev), as a common space in which texts are created and exist (J. Derrida), and also as "a network of constraints that keep the reader in the direction of correct interpretation" (M. Riffater). Intertextuality was considered at the level of borrowing language styles (D. B. Olkhovikov, D. Johnson), from the point of view of functioning and methods of 'introducing into the content of literary texts (I. V. Arnold, N. A. Fateeva, A. Ya. Klimovskaya and others), as an integral property of scientific communication (V.E. Chernyavskaya, M.V. Alekseeva, E. Mi Mikhailova, etc.).

A review of works devoted to intertextuality showed that most research in the field of this linguistic phenomenon was carried out within the framework and terms of stylistics and cultural linguistics, which, in our opinion, limits the description of the possible properties and characteristics of this phenomenon. The development of the cognitive paradigm of knowledge made it possible to look differently at the phenomenon of intertextuality. Proceeding from the basic provisions of cognitive linguistics, intertextuality was considered at the level of interaction of mental worlds and conceptual integration (M. Turner, J. Fauconnier, Yu.S. Stepanov, E.A. Rybina, S.G. Filippova) and as a way of presenting old knowledge (V. E. Chernyavskaya, E. A. Bazhenova, E. V. Mikhailova). However, a number of problems remain unresolved, including
the questions of what is the participation of intertextual inclusions (hereinafter referred to as IV) in the design and representation of scientific knowledge and opinions and what is the participation of intertextual inclusions in the disclosure of the content of concepts of a particular science and the concept sphere of science in the whole. The answer to the questions posed cannot be given without referring to the analysis of the relationship between cognitive mechanisms and language as a means of reflecting the results of cognitive activity. At the same time, it is also important to analyze the ways of presenting the knowledge gained in scientific discourse and text.

In this work, the actualization of the category of intertextuality is studied from the standpoint of the cognitive-discursive approach, which made it possible to determine both the composition of knowledge transmitted by intertextual inclusions and the functional purpose of these linguistic means in scientific texts (E.S.Kubryakova).

Currently, in the linguistics of the text, the text itself is beginning to be considered not only as the ultimate unit of verbal communication, but also as a component of supertext education. This is mainly due to the reorientation of some philosophical epistemological problems. Many scientists see communication as a component of the basic structure of consciousness; consciousness and cognition are understood as forms of interpersonal communication, direct or indirect social interaction, setting rational-discursive goals [8]. Proceeding from this, it is proposed to consider a complex of texts united by thematic unity as a super text formation. Indeed, examining the specifics of scientific prose, one cannot but agree that any scientific work is “a development, continuation or refutation of previously recognized positions, polemics with other directions or individual scientists” [2]. Each individual scientific text accumulates the results of previous research, opinions and views of other scientists; in other words, a scientific text is created on the basis of the general mental-conceptual space of the science, the means of fixing and developing which it is. It is not surprising, in this regard, that a scientific text is linked - retrospectively and prospectively - with other scientific texts and acts as a microtext in the macrotext of scientific communication both in the field of a certain branch of scientific knowledge and in global general scientific communication [1]. This, in turn, indicates a high degree of intertextual and interdiscursive interaction of scientific texts, which is born against the background of a certain extremely generalized conceptual form, theoretically synthesizing various ideas about the world order, consisting of sensory-figurative models, worldview structures and fundamental knowledge about reality, formed in the public (as well as group, individual) consciousness, which is commonly called the "picture of the world."

Numerous studies of intertextuality as a philosophical, literary and linguistic problem suggest that the study of this extremely complex multidimensional phenomenon is of great importance for the development of philology, literature and culture. This requires the attraction of new knowledge from cultural studies, sociology, psychology, psycholinguistics and cognitive linguistics. The most objective idea of intertextuality as a textual category, its content and the system of means of its linguistic realization can be obtained by conducting special studies of its specific features in texts of different functional styles. As the analysis of works devoted to the category of intertextuality shows, it is not necessary to speak of the existence of any generally recognized classification of intertextual inclusions at the present time. On the one hand, as indicated above, this is due to the fact that most authors do not distinguish between the methods of actualizing the category of intertextuality (by what action is the linking with other texts) and the means of objectification (with the help of which language units the “foreign” text is presented) of this category.

Some researchers have identified the types of intertextual relations [4], nevertheless, the special task of defining the methods of intertextual borrowings and identifying the means of objectification of the category of intertextuality in these works was not posed, and these issues in linguistics have not yet been resolved. On the other hand, the very definition of such a linguistic phenomenon as "intertextual inclusion" has not been derived, although scientists have become
interested in the problem of determining the unit of analysis of intertextual communication. So, N.V. Koroleva, studying this phenomenon in scientific texts, believes that the unit of analysis of intertextual communication in scientific discourse is “dialogical intertextual unity” [5]. Intertextual is such a semantic unity of sentences of scientific discourse, which contains at least one indication of a foreign fragment of discourse; intertextual unity is called dialogical because it presupposes communication of at least two authors on the same issue. It is assumed that the dialogical intertextual unity has a clearly expressed three-phase structure: the first phase is the concrete environment of the fragment being integrated, in which there is an understanding of what the actual inclusion is used for; the next phase - medial - is a borrowed fragment of scientific discourse; in the final phase, the author of a scientific discourse indicates the source used (author's name, year of publication, page, etc. [4]. Based on the analysis of the above-mentioned literature, it can be concluded that at the moment linguists have not identified the characteristic features, signs of intertextual addition. M.M. Bakhtin proposed to consider the change of the subject of speech as such a feature, but not all researchers agree with this: the opposition of intertextuality as a conscious method and intertextuality as an unconscious thought, do not allow to unconditionally accept this feature as a classifying one. If we consider such forms of intertextual communication as borrowing a style, plot, appeal to historical, everyday realities, then this feature must be eliminated altogether. Another reason for the undeveloped problem, as I.V. Arnold, is “the great complexity and variety of modalities of functions and implications - evaluative, characterological, compositional, ideological. Implications can be associated with the fact that each foreign word is saturated with echoes of other people's statements, to which the author relates both with reverence and irony” [1].

It should be noted that the above attempts to classify intertextual inclusions were carried out mainly in terms and from the standpoint of stylistic research, which to a certain extent limits the description of the properties and status of such formations. Apparently, there is a need to consider this linguistic phenomenon from the standpoint of a cognitive approach that characterizes the modern paradigm of linguistic knowledge, which is confirmed by already begun works in this direction.

Such a large number of definitions of intertextuality and interdiscursiveness, in our opinion, is due to the fact that the concepts of text and discourse underlying them also have many different interpretations. The text, as well as the discourse that has recently received wide scientific application, is one of the cornerstones on which a scientific theory is built. Since the text and discourse have an ontological status, the understanding of these terms directly depends on the scientific and worldview concept that the scientist adheres to.

In conclusion we can say that, the consideration of the prevailing concepts, it should be added that intertextuality as a form of secondary artistic convention contributes to the metaphorization of the text, creating a field of artistic-figurative depiction. In a literary text, it can act as the basis of a remake, all kinds of allusions, reminiscences, constructing additional meanings, varieties of textual and subtextual extension of meanings.
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