



Fazilat KODIROVA,
Advisor to the Director of the Agency of innovative development
E-mail: fazilatkodirova@gmail.com

Based on the review of Professor M. Kurbanova of UzMU

THE LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE FUNCTIONING OF ART DISCOURSE

Annotation

The article analyzes the features that set verbal art discourse apart include the variety of genres found in art history texts and the way in which these texts connect to different discursive spaces through the representation of elements that are connected to other discourse types. Examining communication tactics enables us to investigate the writers of art texts' communication objectives. The communicative-pragmatic model of art discourse allows one to examine an art historian's writing from the perspectives of informational, interpretive, and evaluative strategies-all of which are unified by the persuasive strategy.

ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ФУНКЦИОНИРОВАНИЯ ИСКУССТВОВЕДЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

Аннотация

В статье анализируются особенности, отличающие вербальный художественный дискурс, в том числе разнообразие жанров, встречающихся в искусствоведческих текстах, и то, как эти тексты соединяются с различными дискурсивными пространствами через репрезентацию элементов, связанных с другими типами дискурса. Изучение коммуникативной тактики позволяет нам изучить коммуникативные цели авторов художественных текстов. Коммуникативно-прагматическая модель арт-дискурса позволяет рассматривать творчество историка искусства с точки зрения информационной, интерпретационной и оценочной стратегий, которые объединяет стратегия убеждения.

SAN'ATSHUNOSLIK DISKURSI VAZIFALARINING LINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI

Аннотация

Maqolada og'zaki san'atshunoslik diskursni ajratib turadigan xususiyatlar, jumladan, san'atshunoslikka oid matnlarda uchraydigan janrlarning xilma-xilligi va bu matnlarning boshqa diskurs turlari bilan bog'liq elementlarni ifodalash orqali turli xil diskursiv makonlarga qanday bog'lanishi tahlil qilinadi. Muloqot taktikasini o'rganish san'atshunoslik diskursi mualliflarining kommunikativ maqsadlarini o'rganish imkonini beradi. San'atshunoslik diskursning kommunikativ-pragmatik modeli san'atshunos asarini ishonirish strategiyasi bilan birlashtirilgan axborot, talqin va baholash strategiyalari nuqtai nazaridan ko'rib chiqish imkonini beradi.

Discourse is commonly regarded as an "open system", the essence of which allows for the identification of new varieties of discourse. Along with dynamically developing social institutions, foundations are laid for the formation of discursive diversity, creating a vast body of materials for researchers to study [4].

The study of the characteristics of various types of discourse is one of the main scientific interests of modern linguists. Most often, dissertations examine types of discourse such as political, legal, medical, and advertising discourse. It is worth noting the increasing attention of scholars over the past two decades to the study of art discourse, which is of particular interest for this research.

The concept of "art discourse" essentially implies a direct relation to art and the institution of art history. However, as noted by U.A. Jarkova, "scientific texts from the specified subject area form only one of the microfields of art discourse" [7]. M.V. Kozlovskaya also speaks of the wide variability in the characteristics of texts belonging to art discourse, noting that they do not necessarily belong exclusively "to the class of scientific texts" [9]. Texts of art discourse can be both general and abstract, contain detailed descriptions, and vary in lexical and terminological content [9]. In this context, it seems especially important to consider the existing approaches to the study of art discourse to define this concept and its peculiarities within the context of discourse studies.

Thus, essentially, we can speak of art discourse when "works of art become the subject of verbal works" [7]. Today, the concept of works of art encompasses a wide range of artistic forms. Among them, visual arts, particularly painting, are typically the focus of special attention from linguist researchers. This direction is characterized by a broad genre diversity and a significant amount of material for research. Although inherently non-verbal, this type of art takes on a verbalized form within art discourse.

The study of art discourse from a pragmatic aspect deserves significant attention. A.P. Bulatova defines the term as follows: art discourse is "the verbalized experience of thinking about objects existing as works of art, organized within the framework of perception strategies, authority, evaluativeness, and other art strategies" [3]. Thus, A.P. Bulatova considers art discourse from the perspective of the necessary linguistic knowledge and strategies for communication. Among the distinctive features of art discourse is the importance of perception strategies, with a flexible and non-linear superstructure noted in the organization of this type of discourse [3].

L.G. Pavlenko and A.E. Maik emphasize that various informational triggers can be used to create an art text, "from an exhibition review to influencing a typical social interaction situation" [15]. They highlight the impact of the art text on the recipient: "Art discourse is an oral or written text reflecting such language activity that is associated with the development of art in society, regardless of the time of the work's creation, and oriented towards the motives of the addressees, who use specific pragmatic strategies to achieve their goals" [15]. In addition, attention is paid to such features of art discourse as a wide range of recipients and structural similarity to other types of discourse.

Linguists' interest in art discourse is largely driven by the interpretative nature of the art text. On one hand, language fulfills an interpretative function alongside its communicative and cognitive functions [2]. At the same time, a work of art can be viewed as a semiotic system with its unique visual code, the message of which can potentially be decoded. The secondary verbal representation of such a message in an art text becomes possible through the mechanism of interpretation. E.A. Elina adheres to this position: "Any written representation of a depicted object is already its interpretation" [5]. In interacting with the non-verbal aesthetic message within the framework of art discourse, the subject perceives, evaluates, verbalizes, and interprets it. This

interpretation depends not only on the objective characteristics of the object but also on the "worldview" of the interpreter (their cultural level, life experience, socio-cultural factors, etc.) [5], which means there can be a fundamentally possible multiplicity of verbal interpretations for a single work of art.

E.V. Miletova, in our opinion, provides a comprehensive definition of art discourse: "a purposeful communicative activity associated with the interpretation of a work (or works) of art, carried out by its participants in the form of oral and written speech, in accordance with the rules, norms, and standards accepted in society." Art discourse itself is subdivided into verbal (Type I) and non-verbal (Type II) discourse, representing two stages of communication: (I) visual perception of non-verbal information and (II) its verbal interpretation [13]. Thus, linguists are primarily interested in the verbal art discourse of Type II.

The information conveyed to the recipient at the stage of verbal communication will have a subjective nature. After the direct visual perception of the information "encoded" in the work of art, the viewer or critic attempts to understand and then interpret the artist's message. Essentially rational and deliberate, the conveyed information will inevitably be accompanied by additional meaning formulated by the subject during interpretation to influence the reader in a specific way.

A.P. Minyar-Beloruicheva also speaks about the complex nature of the processes occurring during verbalization, describing their essence as follows: "the material is transformed into a linear model, creating nonlinear images in the mental space." The main factor and distinctive characteristic of art discourse is its nature as a "polycode formation," the comprehensive study of which requires an integral approach [14].

It is emphasized that in the process of verbalization, the art historian not only describes and analyzes the work of art but also acquaints the reader with "the main concepts of the paradigm that existed at the time the work was created." Moreover, it is not the real reality that is recreated, but the perceptions of it. Highlighting the mediated nature of communication in art discourse, A.P. Minyar-Beloruicheva sees the art historian as the connecting link in this communicative system [14]. Thus, the subjective nature of art interpretation is indicated, being determined by external factors such as individual experience and the existing paradigm.

A.P. Salienco also pays attention to these factors when considering the issue of the identity of proletarian art based on materials from the Soviet press of the 1920s. When analyzing art texts, it is essential to consider possible differences in the worldviews of art historians, their perception characteristics, generational, value, and national-cultural differences [18]. M.O. Belmesova also asserts that "linguistic analysis of the components of art discourse allows us to study its value component and the image of the national culture of English speakers" [1].

M.O. Belmesova characterizes art discourse as a "specific linguistic space" within a special communication situation, possessing its own concept sphere expressed through hypertextuality, a thematic set of emotionally charged and specialized vocabulary, as well as a clear structure. The researcher proposes a refined system for organizing verbal art discourse, consisting of three levels: mega-level, macro-level, and micro-level. The criterion for classifying an art text into a specific level of the studied discourse is the genre volume. For instance, the author would classify a monograph at the macro-level, while smaller texts belong to the micro-level [1].

Thus, the study of art discourse represents an important direction in modern linguistics, examined from various perspectives. When considering this type of discourse, researchers pay attention to its structural features, lexical content, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics. The subjective nature of art interpretation is highlighted, determined by external factors such as individual experience and the prevailing paradigm. Concurrently, the linguocultural factor is also emphasized as having a decisive impact on the nature of interpretation across the entire spectrum of art genres.

As previously noted, art discourse can be divided into non-verbal and verbal types. In verbal communication, the art historian interprets the work of art through linguistic signs in the

form of text, thereby verbally influencing the recipient [13]. This type of discourse can be verbalized in a wide variety of texts using different linguistic units, making it important to consider the specifics of art discourse in this context.

E.V. Miletova notes that "within the framework of verbal art discourse, there are certain genres of thematic texts," which can be understood as established forms for the interaction of discourse participants [13]. The researcher proposes a classification of genres based on two criteria: the field of application (i.e., functional criterion) and the lexical content and linguistic diversity of the texts (content criterion). Key genres for art history are identified, including newspaper articles, reviews, overviews, and announcements.

M.G. Smolina presents another system for classifying art genres: (1) artistic and journalistic genres, (2) informational genres, and (3) analytical and critical genres [19]. The first category corresponds to artistic texts such as essays, sketches, letters, feuilletons, parodies, legends, confessions, or artistic notes. The second category includes texts that provide information without a critical component, such as news notes, reports in newspapers or magazines, surveys, reports, question-and-answer formats, and informational interviews. Critical genres, considered fundamental to art discourse, include reviews and articles.

A.P. Bulatova offers a typology of genres grouped into scientific, journalistic, and artistic categories [3]. Scientific genres include articles, overviews, monographs, dissertations, textbooks, and exhibition catalogs. Journalistic genres encompass texts published in periodicals, including articles, reviews, overviews, sketches, notes, announcements, interviews, letters, and brochures. Artistic genres are typically realized in prose texts such as essays, memoirs, short stories, novellas, novels, biographies, and travel notes. The researcher also notes the presence of linguistic phenomena characteristic of specific styles in art texts, such as "headlines and leads" typical of journalism [3]. This functional-stylistic typology indicates the complex nature of art texts and the representation of features from different directions at the linguistic level.

A.B. Erokhina also pays significant attention to the feature of structural similarity in art discourse with other types of discourse, considering it a product of merging several discursive spaces [6]. When examining written art discourse, the researcher places it at the intersection of scientific, artistic, journalistic, and advertising discourses [6].

Since art history is considered a science, the art discourse will undoubtedly exhibit a significant number of features inherent in scientific discourse. Among these is the high degree of terminology in art texts, where different types of terms may be encountered. At the lexical level, E.V. Miletova suggests identifying three groups of specialized lexical units characteristic of verbal art discourse: a) terms; b) professional jargon; c) specialized borrowings [13]. The particular role of borrowed lexicon in English-language art texts is also noted, both at the terminological and other levels.

Another categorization highlights the high frequency of specialized art terms, which are often difficult for a recipient without a deep understanding of art to comprehend, thus bringing these texts closer to the discourse of the humanities. M.V. Kozlovskaya identifies three categories of art terms:

Specific low-frequency vocabulary (e.g., Cubism, stiletto, Vorticism);

Common words and phrases from the art sphere (e.g., composition, line, plane, pattern);

Composite combined terms (e.g., verve of the line, secure geometry, rough-stroked portrait);

Terms from other fields of knowledge [9].

Scientific discourse is characterized by a distinctive set of discursive formulas and a high level of intertextuality, meaning the incorporation of other texts [8]. In art discourse, these features are present and are actualized through quotations, footnotes, and references. However, while the incorporation of another text in scientific discourse typically includes citing the source and author, this is not always obligatory in art discourse, which aligns texts about art more closely with literary works.

Researchers highlight several features that link literary prose discourse with art discourse: the manifestation of the author as an individual in the text, elements of verbal creativity, emotionality and imagery, and the suggestiveness of the text, expressed in tropes and rhetorical figures [6]. Since visual objects cannot be fully expressed verbally, art historians use a variety of artistic means with sufficient imagery. At the linguistic level, art texts often feature metaphors, parallelisms, metonymies, antitheses, puns, antiphrasis, and other means of artistic expression used by experts when interpreting works of art.

Regarding elements of advertising discourse and media discourse, factors such as the importance of the impact component on the recipient and the subjectivity of the evaluation are noted to bring them closer together [6]. Experts observe that with the development of information technology, art criticism has significantly expanded its audience, resulting in changes to art texts to remain understandable and engaging to their new audience [16,17]. These substantial changes have led to the emergence of media discourse traits in art discourse, such as dialogicity, imagery, expressiveness, mythologization, stereotyping, and humor [24].

One of the key ways to actualize the characteristics of advertising and mass media discourse can be considered linguistic creativity or linguistic creativeness. E.S. Shmeleva interprets linguistic creativeness as "the ability of deep (conceptual) foundations, representing the result of understanding the world, to systematically generate diverse language signs, contributing to the development or evolution of the latter and ensuring the process of their communicative adaptation to the construction of a pragmatically oriented discourse" [23]. The definition emphasizes the pragmatic potential of this mechanism, built on modification, thereby achieving the goals of attracting reader attention and influencing the recipient's opinion, which partially corresponds to the goals of media and advertising discourse as well as the goals of art historical discourse.

Examining the linguistic creativity of advertising discourse, O.V. Sokolova suggests considering language play as a result of the linguistic creativity of the subject, aimed at "creating new, unique language units and modifying the relationships between them" [20]. The researcher identifies the following ways of linguistic representation of creativity: (1) the actualization of figurative meaning based on metaphorical or metonymic transfer; (2) the actualization of polysemy to create semantic diffusion (similar to puns); (3) polysemy as a result of modifying phraseological units; (4) as a result of interlevel interaction; (5) using derivational means [20]. However, according to O.V. Sokolova, linguistic creativity should be distinguished from discursive creativity, which involves appropriating linguistic techniques from other types of discourse.

The complex nature of human activity in the field of art history and the dynamic development of the art criticism institution justify the possibility of representing elements of other types of discourse in art historical discourse. Examining the essence of this process, V.E. Chernyavskaya speaks of "integrated into a holistic system of human knowledge, scattered in many discursive formations" [4]. The expert as a subject of discourse will also articulate various aspects of their own knowledge in art historical texts. Thus, it is possible to identify components of knowledge in art historical discourse that correlate with other discursive spaces.

The analysis of communicative strategies is one of the most common approaches in contemporary linguistic science for studying aspects of language representation in various types of discourse. To determine the specificity of implementing communicative strategies in art historical discourse, it is important not only to define this term but also to address the essence of the approach under consideration, as well as to describe the existing practice of pragma-discursive analysis of art historical texts.

At the core of the notion that discourse participants adhere to communicative strategies to achieve the goal of their utterance lies the pragma-linguistic approach to communication. According to this approach, every utterance is based on a communicative goal, and pragmatics is considered the field of knowledge that deals with "questions of choosing linguistic means

from the available repertoire for the best expression of thoughts, feelings; for the best impact on the listener or reader" [21]. Such an approach allows studying the principles guiding the author of the text in choosing certain language units and corresponding communicative strategies to achieve a specific effect on the recipient.

In contemporary science, the concept of communicative strategy can be interpreted differently. This fact was emphasized by M.L. Makarov: "Sometimes, a strategy is understood as a chain of decisions made by the speaker, communicative choices of various speech acts and language means. Another point of view links strategy with the implementation of a set of goals in the structure of communication" [10]. The first definition focuses on the speaker's decisions made during linguistic communication, while the second perspective revolves around the goal pursued by the speaker. However, the compatibility of these two approaches to understanding strategy is noted; on the contrary, the ability to combine these approaches is emphasized to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the communication process that interests the researcher.

G.G. Matveeva elucidates the definition of strategy through an analysis of its internal components: "A set of pre-planned and implemented moves during a speech act is defined as a communicative strategy; it is a complex of well-thought-out and motivated speech actions aimed at achieving a communicative goal" [12]. In this interpretation, a strategy emerges as a hierarchical category encompassing several subcategories (tactical moves), which are specific speech actions determining its content and driven by the communicative goal, which is considered an integral part of the speech (communicative) act.

E.V. Troshchenkova interprets communicative strategies from the perspective of their dependence on the overall discursive space: thus, strategies represent "flexible planning and phased implementation of communication in accordance with the subject's overall goal to influence the addressee and the conditions of communication, the relationship between communicants, which implies (mostly conscious) selection of linguistic and non-linguistic means and constant monitoring of their use" [22]. At the center of attention are the principles guiding the selection of language means by the communicant as a member of a particular community. From E.V. Troshchenkova's standpoint, intragroup identification of individuals as representatives of certain communities supporting specific viewpoints contributes to solidarity within the group based on shared perceptions of significance [22].

Based on this, special attention within this approach is paid to the factor of the mutual correlation of speakers' utterances within expressions, i.e., the linguistic realization not only of individual goals but also of group ones. In connection with this, in the context of examining socio-political discourse, in addition to "local" communicative strategies, a concept of "global communicative strategies" is proposed, arising from the activities of individual speakers belonging to a certain group. Thus, E.V. Troshchenkova suggests defining the concept of a global communicative strategy as follows: it is a strategy, "consciously or unconsciously implemented by the efforts of various speakers belonging to a certain group; it represents a significant factor in shaping group identity and maintaining existing sociocultural knowledge as shared by the group or its modification" [22].

The implementation features of communicative strategy analysis largely depend on the specificity of the particular type of discourse. E.V. Markova notes that discourse is an important factor in "coordinating and subordinating relationships in society" [11]. As previously noted, a significant characteristic of art discourse is its realization on two levels and within two differentiable models, verbal and non-verbal, which determine the specificity of its communicative structure implementation. According to E.V. Miletova, the components of the non-verbal type of art discourse will be the artist (sender), viewer (recipient), author's technique (code), and visual perception (channel) [13]. The verbal type of art discourse, representing the subject of primary interest in this study, consists, from the scholar's perspective, of the following elements: critic (sender), reader (recipient), mental perception (channel), and text (code).

Typically, among the variety of possible components of the speech act structure, the following elements are consistently distinguished: 1) sender; 2) recipient; 3) message goal; 4) discourse material; 5) communication situation. Thus, the specificity of actualizing these components will depend not only on the type of discourse but also, applicable to art discourse, on the chosen subtype of art discourse. This work focuses on the participants of communication within verbal written art discourse.

The art critic, who creates the text, acts as the sender of the message, while the recipient, the addressee of the message, can be considered the reader of this art historical text. For verbal art discourse, "various art historical publications become platforms for communication, where texts of various genres can be placed" [6, 60]. Such a mode of communication provides the opportunity for interaction between the addressee and the sender beyond a single temporal and spatial context. Mediated communication in art discourse allows for the analysis of the language representation features of art in texts united by a common theme but compiled at different times by experts from different countries around the world.

To analyze the communicative strategies inherent in this type of discourse, A.B. Erokhina proposed a communicative-pragmatic model of art discourse, described in her work "Pragmalinguistic Aspects of Contemporary Art Discourse (based on English-language texts devoted to visual art)." This approach is based on the authors' goals in critical art historical texts [6]. Thus, the researcher identifies interpretation and description of the art object, its evaluation, as well as influencing the recipient's behavior by changing their opinion about the art object, convincing them to visit a particular exhibition, etc., as the main goals of the art discourse participants [ibid.: 60]. From the author's perspective, it is these goals that determine the art historian's speech behavior in the discursive space, the analysis of which can be conducted by studying the ways of language representation of discursive strategies in speech.

Thus, the primary units of analysis in A.B. Erokhina's model of art discourse are communicative strategies, consisting of tactics and communicative moves: "for the examined type of discourse, it is most appropriate to highlight strategies that correlate with the main goal settings of critical art discourse – informing, interpreting, evaluating, and the 'global' persuasion strategy, which manifests itself within all the other listed strategies" [6]. In art historical texts, these strategies may be combined with each other, but each strategy is associated with a specific set of corresponding tactics and linguistic means, ensuring the realization of the strategy at the linguistic level.

Particular attention within this concept is devoted to the persuasion strategy, viewed as a "meta-strategy" permeating the entire structure of art discourse: "critics need not only to evaluate the work of art but also to make the reader believe in the legitimacy of this evaluation" [6]. Tactics through which the influencing function is realized include: tactics of establishing authority, appeals to authority, identification with the addressee, and increasing the level of suggestiveness of the text. In language, these tactics can be implemented through terminological precision, quoting, rhetorical figures, and other expressive means. It is important to note that the persuasion strategy can be

implemented both through the corresponding tactics and through other strategies of art discourse.

The communicative strategy of informing in art discourse aims to convey factual information about artworks, exhibitions, achievements, details of the artist's biography, and other relevant information. This strategy can be represented in the text through tactics such as description, illustration, immersion, and the transmission of factual information [6]. Typically, this strategy interacts with the strategy of art historical interpretation by providing the facts upon which the text is built. The strategy of interpretation includes tactics such as describing the artist's intentions, metaphorization, and constructing intertextual connections, which are actualized in language through modal constructions, quotations, and allusive references.

The communicative strategy of evaluation involves conducting a kind of axiological examination of the artwork. The evaluation strategy correlates with tactics of presenting the artwork positively or negatively, represented in language through evaluatively marked linguistic units and other means of representing evaluative meaning. Evaluation plays a crucial role in art discourse because it relates to the fundamental task of art historical practice: to expertly assess the value of various art objects.

Thus, investigating the specificity of implementing communicative strategies in discourse allows us to focus on the goals of art historical text authors and analyze the linguistic means through which these goals are achieved. Despite the various interpretations of the concept of communicative strategy, most researchers emphasize the significance of the decision-making factor by the communicator in the communication process, as well as the choice of specific linguistic means, the study of which constitutes an important stage in analyzing the ways of linguistic representation of art. In this study, the communicative-pragmatic model of art discourse by A.B. Erokhina was chosen for the pragmatic-discursive analysis of communicative strategies employed by art historians regarding English art, encompassing the strategies of informing, interpretation, and evaluation unified by the meta-strategy of persuasion.

In conclusion, Art discourse is a type of discourse related to the interpretation of works of art, which has a complex multi-level structure and a number of features, which include the subjectivity of art history interpretation and its determination by such factors as individual experience, the existing paradigm and linguacultural specificity.

At the linguistic level, art discourse will be distinguished by terminology, intertextuality, suggestiveness, evaluativeness and linguacreativity. For verbal art discourse, such characteristics as genre diversity of art history texts and connection with various discursive spaces, expressed in the representation of components related to other types of discourse, are distinguished.

The study of communicative strategies allows us to explore the communicative goals of the authors of art history texts. The communicative-pragmatic model of art history discourse makes it possible to analyze the text of an art historian from the position of strategies of information, interpretation and evaluation, united by the metastrategy of persuasion.

REFERENCES

1. Belmesova M.O. Kluchevye osobennosti iskusstvovedcheskogo diskursa v ramkakh tekstovoi aktualizatsii angliiskogo lingvokulturnogo kontsepta "Painting" (na materiale monografii g. Reinoldsa "Turner. World of art") // Vestnik YUUrGU. Seriya: Lingvistika, 2016. №1.
2. Boldyrev N.N. Interpretiruyushchaya funktsiya yazyka // Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gos. universiteta. 2011. №33.
3. Bulatova A.P. Lingvo-kognitivnyi analiz iskusstvovedcheskogo diskursa (muzyka, arkhitektura): diss. ... kand. filol. nauk. M., 1999. 276 s.
4. Chernyavskaya V.E. Lingvistika teksta: Polikodovost, intertekstualnost, interdiskursivnost: uchebnoe posobie. M.: Knizhnyi dom "LIBROKOM", 2009. 248 s.
5. Elina E.A. Verbalnye interpretatsii proizvedenii izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva. Nominativno-kommunikativnyi aspekt. Volgograd; Saratov: Izd. tsentr. SGSEU, 2002. 256 s.
6. Erokhina A.B. Pragmalingvisticheskie aspekty sovremennogo iskusstvovedcheskogo diskursa: dis. kand. fil. nauk. Mosk. gos. un-t im. M.V. Lomonosova. M., 2018.
7. Jarkova U.A. Voploshchenie znakovoi prirody izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva v iskusstvovedcheskom diskurse (na materiale nemetskoyazychnykh muzeinykh katalogov) // Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gos. universiteta. Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie. 2011. №33 (248). S. 49–52.

8. Karasik V.I. Yazykovoi krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs. Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. 477 s.
9. Kozlovskaya M.V. Osobennosti iskusstvovedcheskogo diskursa na angliiskom yazyke v XX veke i na sovremennom etape: dis. kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04. M., 2003. 130 s.
10. Makarov M.L. Osnovy teorii diskursa. M.: ITDGK "Gnozis", 2003. 280 s.
11. Markova E.V. Ponyatie mentalnoi reprezentatsii v sotsialnoi epistemologii. // Aspekty: Sbornik statei po filosofskim problemam istorii i sovremenosti. M.: Sovremennye tetradi, 2002. S. 37-43.
12. Matveeva G.G., Samarina I.V., Seliverstova L.I. Dva napravleniya v sovremennoi pragmalingvistike // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya 12. Sotsiologiya. 2009. №1-2. S. 50-57.
13. Miletova E.V. Angliiskoyazychnyi iskusstvovedcheskii diskurs: priroda i leksicheskoe napolnenie // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. 2013. №4. Ch.2. S. 114-119.
14. Minyar-Beloruicheva A.P. Polikodovost iskusstvovedcheskogo diskursa // Vestnik YUUrGU. Seriya: Lingvistika. 2017. №4.
15. Pavlenko L.G., Maik A.E. Strategii pragmaticheskogo vozdeistviya na tipizirovannuyu situatsiyu sotsialnogo vzaimodeistviya v angloyazychnom iskusstvovedcheskom diskurse // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. 2018. №6-1 (84).
16. Rubinstein R. Where Is the Audience for Art Criticism Now? [Elektronnyi resurs]. Rezhim dostupa: <https://www.artnews.com/art-in-america/features/where-is-the-audience-for-art-criticism-now-636661/>
17. Saltz, J. Seeing Out Loud: The Village Voice Art Columns, Fall 1998 Winter 2003, Great Barrington, Mass., The Figures, 2003, p. 14.
18. Salienko A.P. Proletarskoe iskusstvo v poiskakh identichnosti. Po materialam sovetsoi pressy 1920-kh gg // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 8. Istoriya. 2018. №3.
19. Smolina M.G. Teoriya i istoriya khudozhestvennoi kritiki: ucheb. posobie. Krasnoyarsk: IPK SFU, 2009. 128 s.
20. Sokolova O.V. Lingvokreativen li reklamnyi diskurs? Osobennosti polisemii v kommercheskoi i sotsialnoi reklame // Lingvistika i metodika prepodavaniya inostrannykh yazykov. M.: Institut yazykoznaniya RAN, №2(13), 2020. S. 134-157.
21. Stepanov Yu.S. V poiskakh pragmatiki (problema subyekta) // Izv. AN SSSR. Ser. lit-ry i yazyka. 1981. T. 40. №4. S. 325-326.
22. Troshchenkova E.V. Tsennostnyi aspekt koordinatsii mneniya vnutri partiinoy gruppy v obshchestvenno-politicheskikh diskussiyakh (Gl.5) // Tsennostnaya kartina mira angloyazychnogo sotsiuma. SPb.: Izd-vo SPbGU, 2019. 204 s. S.84-100.
23. Shmeleva E.S. Kognitivnye mekhanizmy i pragmaticheskii potentsial lingvokreativnosti (na materiale The Economist) // Vestnik NGU. Seriya: Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya. 18(3), 2020. S. 78-86.
24. Zheltukhina M.R. Tropologicheskaya suggestivnost mass-medialnogo diskursa: o probleme rechevogo vozdeistviya tropov v yazyke SMI: Monografiya. M.: IYa RAN; Volgograd: Izd-vo VF MUPK, 2004. 654 s.