

Methodology for Identifying Models of Marking Relationships of Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in the Artistic Dimension

Dina Zhalko^{1*}

¹Kyiv National Linguistic University (Kyiv, Ukraine), dina.zhalko@knl.u.edu.ua

*Corresponding author: dina.zhalko@knl.u.edu.ua

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5913-7579>

ABSTRACT

This article presents a comprehensive methodology for identifying models of marking intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the artistic dimension, focusing on their interrelationships in contemporary literary and linguistic analysis. The study explores how texts interact through quotations, allusions, and reminiscences, creating complex networks of meanings and interpretations. It integrates Julia Kristeva's concept of intertextuality, which emphasizes the interaction of texts, and Michel Foucault's concept of interdiscursivity, highlighting the intersections of different discourses within a single text. The methodology employs intertextual and interdisciplinary analysis, using a fragment from J. Barnes's "A History of the World in 10½ Chapters" as a case study. This approach reveals the layered narrative structures formed through historical and literary allusions and various discourses, such as religion, politics, and culture. By examining these interactions, the study uncovers how texts and discourses influence readers and speakers, enriching the understanding of literary and linguistic creativity in contemporary cultural contexts. The methodology also introduces a hierarchical framework—artistic mega-intertext/mega-interdiscourse, macro-intertext/macro-interdiscourse, micro-intertext/micro-interdiscourse, and media-intertext/media-interdiscourse—to accurately define models of marking intertextuality and interdiscursivity. This framework serves as a crucial tool for researchers, facilitating the identification of direct and indirect markers within texts and discourses. The study's findings highlight the importance of recognizing intertextual and interdiscursive connections for a deeper comprehension of the nature of artistic and linguistic processes.

Copyright © 2024, Zhalko, D.

This open-access article is distributed and licensed under **the Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) license**.



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received	01 st February 2024
Revised	29 th April 2024
Accepted	31 st May 2024
Published	28 th June 2024

KEYWORDS

intertextuality, interdiscursivity, literary analysis, methodology, textual analysis

HOW TO CITE?

Zhalko, D. (2024). Methodology for Identifying Models of Marking Relationships of Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in the Artistic Dimension. *Acta Humanitatis*, 2(1), 58–73. <https://doi.org/10.5709/ah-02.01.2024-04>

1. Introduction.

The methodology of identifying models to mark the interrelationships of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the artistic dimension is a highly relevant and significant area of contemporary humanities research in an era marked by globalization and the rapid development of information technologies, where the exchange of ideas and texts is increasingly pervasive, recognizing and analyzing these interrelationships is crucial for understanding literary and linguistic processes. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity, foundational components of modern literary and linguistic theory, offer essential tools for such analysis.

Intertextuality is a concept developed by Yu. Kristeva (1967) examines how texts interact through quotations, allusions, and reminiscences, creating a network of meanings and interpretations. Such an approach enhances the understanding of individual literary works. It illuminates the intertwining of scholarly traditions and innovative ideas over time, a critical aspect of linguistic studies, as language as a system reflects these interrelationships. *Interdiscursivity*, a concept introduced by M. Foucault (1972), highlights the intersections between different discourses within a single text. This approach considers the cultural, social, and historical contexts that shape both the work of art and the linguistic structures it reflects. For instance, analyzing discourse practices can reveal how societal and ideological shifts influence language norms and their usage.

A methodology that integrates these two approaches is becoming an indispensable tool for contemporary researchers. It facilitates identifying deep connections between texts and discourses and elucidates the mechanisms of their interaction and influence on readers and speakers. This is particularly significant in postmodernism, where texts often employ irony, parody, and playful meanings, making their analysis both challenging and fascinating.

The relevance of this methodology is substantiated by numerous studies demonstrating its effectiveness in uncovering the complex structures of literary and linguistic works (Barthes, 1977; Bakhtin, 1981). In particular, R. Barthes (1977) underscores the importance of recognizing multilayered meanings formed through intertextual connections. On the other hand, M. Bakhtin (1981) emphasizes the dialogic nature of texts emerging through interdiscursive interactions. Additionally, linguistic research, such as the work of N. Fairclough



(1989), underscores the significance of discourse analysis in understanding social processes and power dynamics. Employing the methodology of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in linguistics enables researchers to uncover hidden meanings and ideologies that shape language and communication.

The methodology for identifying models for marking the relationships of intertextuality and interdiscursivity enriches the repertoire of modern linguistics and literary criticism. It allows scholars to view literature and language as dynamic processes of interaction involving ideas, images, and meanings that evolve and space. This approach is crucial for a deeper understanding of the nature of artistic and linguistic creativity and their roles in contemporary cultural contexts.

2. Literature Review.

A review of the scientific literature reveals that a standard feature across many studies is the recognition of the importance of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in shaping the meanings and structures of texts. Scholars consistently emphasize the interrelationship between texts and discourses and their influence on social and cultural contexts. However, differences arise in the research's methodological approaches and focal points.

In *linguistics* (Bazerman, 2004; Foucault, 1972; Johnstone, 2008; Kristeva, 1980), the focus is on analyzing language structures and their interactions. Yu. Kristeva (1980) emphasizes intertextuality as a process of interaction between texts, including quotations, allusions, and reminiscences. She describes the text as a "mosaic of quotations" and highlights the importance of cultural and historical contexts in shaping meanings. Her concept became the foundation for further research, particularly in analyzing how different texts interact to create a complex network of meanings (Kristeva, 1980).

M. Foucault (1972), introducing the concept of interdiscursivity, draws attention to the intersections between different discourses. He analyzes how discourses are shaped by social institutions and power, exploring their role in knowledge structure. M. Foucault (1972) emphasizes that discourses do not exist in isolation but interact and influence each other— additionally, Ch. Bazerman (2004) explores how textual practices influence the formation of professional discourses. His work highlights how intertextual relations create and maintain

professional communities, using examples from scientific communication (Bazerman, 2004). B. Johnstone (2008) focuses on intertextuality within routine language practices, showing how everyday language practices reproduce and transform discourse structures, influencing communication situations.

Cognitive linguistics (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Langacker, 1987; Turner, 1996) focuses on the cognitive processes underlying the understanding of intertextual relations. G. Fauconnier and M. Turner (2002) consider the concept of *mental spaces* as a basis for understanding intertextual relations. Such an approach helps us comprehend how information transmitted through different texts interacts in the reader's mind, creating new meanings (Fauconnier, 2002). R. Langacker (1987), developing the theory of cognitive grammar, explores how language structures reflect conceptual connections between texts, emphasizing the importance of cognitive processes in forming intertextual relations.

In "Metaphors We Live By", G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980) analyze how metaphors shape our conceptual systems, including intertextual connections. They demonstrate how metaphors help integrate different texts into a single cognitive network (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). M. Turner examines the processes of "blending" or mental mixing that underlie the understanding of intertextuality, explaining how readers combine elements from different texts to create new interpretations (Turner, 1996).

Discursive studies (Bhatia, 2010; Chilton, 2004; Dijk van, 2008; Fairclough, 1992; Wodak & Meyer, 2001) examine discourses' social and ideological aspects, focusing on their impact on social relations.

V. Bhatia (2010) explores genre analysis, showing how interdiscursivity affects the structure and function of different genres, especially in professional and academic contexts. P. Chilton (2004) analyzes political discourse, illustrating how intertextual relations shape ideological narratives and how political texts interact to create coherent ideological structures. T. van Dijk (2008) examines the cognitive aspects of discourse, demonstrating how intertextual connections help structure knowledge and shape social perceptions. N. Fairclough (1992) explores the relationship between language and power through critical discourse analysis,

focusing on interdiscursive connections manifested in texts and their impact on social structures and relations. R. Wodak and M. Meyer (2001) emphasize the importance of historical and social context in shaping discourses, analyzing how different discourses interact and influence social practices.

In *literary studies* (Eagleton, 1983; Genette, 1997; Riffaterre, 1980), scholars analyze literary texts, focusing on their aesthetic and cultural interrelationships. T. Eagleton (1983) examines intertextuality's political and ideological aspects, showing how literary texts interact with social and cultural contexts, influencing readers and society. G. Genette (1997) introduces the concept of "transtextuality" and analyzes various types of textual interactions, such as paratextuality and metatextuality, providing a systematic approach to studying intertextual relations in literary works. M. Riffaterre (1980) focuses on the semiotic analysis of intertextuality, exploring how textual structures and codes interact to create a multilayered network of meanings.

3. Material Studied.

The comprehensive research methodology was exemplified using a fragment from J. Barnes' "A History of the World in 10½ Chapters" (see Appendix A). The chosen fragment serves as an illustrative case of how intertextual and interdiscursive connections are employed to create a multilayered narrative structure. In this passage, J. Barnes integrates various historical and literary allusions intricately woven with discourses of religion, politics, and culture. This approach showcases how intertextual and interdiscursive analysis methodology can uncover deeper meanings and interconnections between texts and their impact on the reader.

4. Aim and Objectives.

This article presents a comprehensive methodology for constructing models of direct, indirect, and mixed marking of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the artistic dimension.

Objectives:

– to consider the chain 'artistic mega-intertext / mega-interdiscourse – artistic macro-intertext / macro-interdiscourse – artistic micro-intertext / micro-interdiscourse – artistic

media-intertext / media-interdiscourse' as an auxiliary tool for the correct definition of models of marking interdiscursivity and intertextuality in the artistic dimension;

– to present a comprehensive methodology for identifying models of direct, indirect, and mixed marking of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the artistic dimension, focusing on the horizontal (intertextual) and vertical (interdiscursive) artistic dimensions.

5. Method.

Marking interdiscursivity and intertextuality in the artistic dimension requires researchers to define the boundaries within the artistic microintertext / microinterdiscourse and select an effective methodology. This study employs two primary methods: intertextual analysis and interdisciplinary analysis.

Intertextual analysis involves identifying and examining textual connections, quotations, allusions, and reminiscences within a specific fragment. For this study, a passage from J. Barnes' "A History of the World in 10½ Chapters" is the subject of analysis. The objective is to determine how these elements shape the meanings and narrative structure of the work. This method focuses on how J. Barnes integrates historical and literary allusions to create a multilayered narrative, adhering to principles developed by Yu. Kristeva (1980).

Interdisciplinary analysis explores the interaction of various religious, political, and cultural discourses within the text and their impact on its perception. Utilizing the frameworks established by M. Foucault (1972) and N. Fairclough (1992), this approach examines the roles of power, ideology, and social contexts in shaping discourse. Interdisciplinary analysis aims to reveal how these discourses coexist and interact within a single fragment, forming a complex network of meanings.

These methodologies collectively facilitate a comprehensive understanding of how intertextuality and interdiscursivity operate within the artistic dimension, enriching our interpretation of literary works through a detailed examination of their textual and discursive dimensions.

6. The chain 'artistic mega-intertext / mega-interdiscourse – artistic macro-intertext / macro-interdiscourse – artistic micro-intertext / micro-interdiscourse – artistic media-intertext / media-interdiscourse' serves as an extra tool for

accurately defining models for marking interdiscursivity and intertextuality in the artistic dimension.

Analyzing intertextual and interdiscursive relations in literary texts is crucial to contemporary humanities research. To effectively understand these connections, we propose utilizing a chain of terms: "artistic mega-intertext / mega-interdiscourse", "artistic macro-intertext / macro-interdiscourse", "artistic micro-intertext / micro-interdiscourse", and "artistic media-intertext / media-interdiscourse". This hierarchical framework is an auxiliary and reliable tool for accurately defining models of marking interdiscursivity and intertextuality in the artistic dimension.

At the highest level, "mega-intertext" and "mega-interdiscourse" concepts encompass global intertextual and interdiscursive connections. These include significant texts and discourses characteristic of a culture or historical era. For example, common thematic, stylistic, and ideological trends that permeate different literary works of the same period fall under this category (Semkiv, 2023).

The next level, "macro-intertext" and "macro-interdiscourse", covers specific groups of texts and discourses united by common themes, genres, or styles. This level analyzes well-known literary movements or styles that interact, creating particular literary traditions or trends (Ukrainian literature, n.d.). An example is the interaction of romanticism and realism in nineteenth-century literature.

"Micro-intertext" and "micro-interdiscourse" refer to individual texts or small groups of texts containing explicit references, allusions, or quotations from other texts. This is the lowest level of analysis, examining specific examples of intertextuality and interdiscursivity within one or more closely related texts (Symbolopedia, n.d.).

"Medio-intertext" and "medio-interdiscourse" cover intertextual and interdiscursive connections that span different media, including literature, cinema, art, and music. This level reveals how artistic texts and discourses interact and influence each other across various media platforms (Semkiv, 2023; Krytyka).

7. A Comprehensive Methodology for Identifying Models of Marking Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality.

The methodology for identifying the marking of interdiscursivity and intertextuality involves two parallel steps: the horizontal trajectory focuses on identifying *direct and indirect intertextual markers* in the literary microintertext in the works of American and English writers of the twentieth century. In contrast, the vertical trajectory focuses on identifying *direct and indirect interdiscursive markers* in the artistic interdiscourse in the works of American and English writers of the twentieth century. This is followed by identifying models of marking interdiscursivity and intertextuality.

The preliminary stage of work with the works of American and English writers of the twentieth century involves the method of close reading (Fish, 1980; Leitch, 1983; A. Nünning, 2004; V. Nünning, 2004; Pennycook, 1994) in the context of the chain 'artistic mega-intertext / mega-interdiscourse – artistic macro-intertext / macro-interdiscourse – artistic micro-intertext / micro-interdiscourse – artistic media-intertext / media-interdiscourse', focusing on the link 'artistic micro-intertext / micro-interdiscourse'.

The proposed methodology will be discussed using a fragment from J. Barnes' "A History of the World in 10½ Chapters" (see Appendix A).

7.1. The Horizontal Trajectory of Identifying Intertextual Markers in the Literary Microintertexts of Twentieth-Century American and English Writers.

At this stage, intertextual analysis involves two successive steps: identifying intertextual markers and determining their status as direct or indirect.

The first stage is called *identification of intertextual markers*: (a) **binary opposition**: "the Devil and thereby put himself beyond the protection and shelter of the Lord" where the opposition between "devil" and "Lord" demonstrates the classic dichotomy of good versus evil, a central theme in many religious and philosophical discourses; (b) **religious metaphors**: "the Lord by his own hand smote down one of the Bishops of his own Holy Church" where the phrase "by his own hand smote down" reinforces the idea of direct divine intervention, viewed as an act of God's will or judgment; (c) **cultural allusions**: "even as Hercules did cleanse the stables of Augeas" where the allusion to the myth of Hercules cleaning the stables of Augeas uses cultural and mythological imagery to enhance the understanding of biblical and moral concepts, reflecting religious relativism and how different cultures interpret similar moral



dilemmas; (d) legal lexicon: "Is this not a vile blasphemy which the court must extirpate" where the terms "court" and "extirpate" reference legal discourse, emphasizing themes of litigation and justice, where moral and ethical decisions are discussed and implemented at the official level.

The second stage is called *the classification of intertextual markers*. At this stage we can observe the **direct intertextuality**: (a) well-known events or figures: "He smote down Belshazzar, as He smote down Amalek, as He smote down the Midianites, as He smote down the Canaanites, as He smote down Sihon the Amorite" where the references to biblical figures and events are direct quotations from the Old Testament, referring to specific biblical stories about divine punishment; (b) **citations**: "even as Hercules did cleanse the stables of Augeas" is a direct allusion to the myth of Hercules, who cleaned the stables of Augeas, one of his 12 feats; as well as the **indirect intertextuality**: (a) **allusions**: "Is this not a vile blasphemy which the court must extirpate" where the style and terminology are associated with biblical or mythological stories, but without direct quotation or specific references; (b) **symbolism**: discussing the activities of the Devil, who "proceeds thus in darkness and secrecy for many years, and then makes triumph of his evil purpose" where the motifs do not directly quote specific texts but use the general theme of the struggle between good and evil, which is typical of many religious and philosophical treatises.

7.2. The Vertical Trajectory of Identifying Interdiscursive Markers in the Artistic Micro-Interdiscourses of Twentieth-Century American and English Writers.

At this stage, interdiscursive analysis involves two successive steps: identifying interdiscursive markers and determining their status as direct or indirect.

The first stage is called *identification of interdiscursive markers*: (a) **purpose**: consideration and discussion of divine judgment and intervention in the historical context; raising questions about the legality and morality of actions, discussing the correctness of their assessment and punishment; involvement in the understanding and interpretation of cultural symbols through mythological references; encouragement to reflect on the nature of good and evil and their manifestations in the world; (b) **participants**: religious leaders, believers,



theologians; the court, the accused, society at large; readers, critics, cultural experts; philosophers, ethicists, public figures; (c) **themes**: *theme of Good and Evil*: The actions of the Devil (evil) are contrasted with the blessings of God (good), emphasizing the eternal struggle between virtue and sin; *theme of Divine Intervention and Punishment*: discussions of the actions of God who "overthrew" various historical and biblical figures, and references to the "blessing of the Lord" for the actions of the worms that ate the leg of the Bishop's throne, raise questions about the role of divine intervention in people's lives; *theme of Court and Justice*: the question of court and justice becomes central in the conversation about "obscene blasphemy" that the court must "eradicate," highlighting the role of the court in determining moral standards and punishing the guilty; *theme of Religious and Cultural Relativism*: Through references to various biblical and mythological stories (such as Hercules cleaning the Augean stables), the text raises questions about how different cultures and religions interpret similar moral and ethical dilemmas.

The second stage is called *the classification of interdiscursive markers*. At this stage we can observe the **direct interdiscursivity**: (a) **religious discourse**: "He smote down Belshazzar, as He smote down Amalek..." where the following discursive parameters are outlined: purpose: consideration and discussion of divine judgment and intervention in the historical context; participants: religious leaders, believers, theologians; themes: divine punishment, religious stories, moral lessons; (b) **legal discourse**: "Is this not a vile blasphemy which the court must extirpate" where the following discursive parameters are outlined: purpose: raising questions about the legality and morality of actions, discussing the correctness of their assessment and punishment; participants: the court, the accused, society at large; themes: blasphemy, justice, ethics, and morality; as well as the **indirect interdiscursivity**: (a) **cultural discourse**: "even as Hercules did cleanse the stables of Augeas" where the following discursive parameters are outlined: purpose: involvement in understanding and interpretation of cultural symbols through mythological references; participants: readers, critics, cultural experts; themes: Mythology, cultural symbols, universal moral lessons; (b) **philosophical discourse**: "Was this not the work of the Devil, to proceed thus in darkness and secrecy for many years..." where the following discursive parameters are outlined: purpose:

prompting reflection on the nature of good and evil and their manifestations in the world; participants: philosophers, ethicists, public figures, general society; themes: morality, ethics, nature of evil, philosophy of religion.

7.3. Models of Marking in the Dyad 'Horizontal (Intertextual) – Vertical (Interdiscursive) Artistic dimension'.

At this final stage, the methodology involves two stages to register the models of marking intertextual and interdiscursive connections through direct and indirect intertextuality and interdiscursivity. The combination and relationship of horizontal (intertextual) and vertical (interdiscursive) trajectories require careful observation.

The first stage is called *registering points of contact*. In this stage, we register the points of contact between direct intertextuality and direct interdiscursivity and indirect intertextuality and indirect interdiscursivity.

The model ***direct intertextuality – direct interdiscursivity*** is registered through the intertextual level: "He smote down Belshazzar, as He smote down Amalek, as He smote down the Midianites, as He smote down the Canaanites, as He smote down Sihon the Amorite" where there are direct references to biblical stories of divine punishment, specific events in the Old Testament, in connection with the interdiscursive level, i.e., religious discourse aimed at the quotations reflect religious discourse, discussing divine judgment and intervention in the historical context, mainly participants: religious leaders, believers, theologians; themes: divine punishment, spiritual stories, moral lessons.

The model ***indirect intertextuality – indirect interdiscursivity*** is registered through the intertextual level: "Was this not the work of the Devil, to proceed thus in darkness and secrecy for many years, and then make triumph of his foul purpose?" where it indicates biblical or mythological stories about the activities of the Devil, without direct citation or specific references, in connection with the interdiscursive level, i.e., philosophical discourse aimed at the discussion of the activities of the Devil and the struggle between good and evil creates a philosophical discourse; participants: philosophers, ethicists, public figures; themes: morality, ethics, nature of evil, philosophy of religion.

In the fragment from J. Barnes's work, connections between *direct intertextuality* and *direct interdiscursivity* and *indirect intertextuality* and *indirect interdiscursivity* are traceable. Direct quotations from the Old Testament and allusions to mythological events shape religious and cultural discourses. Indirect allusions and symbolism used to discuss the themes of good and evil create philosophical discourse.

The second stage is called *registering further points of contact*. In this stage, we register the points of contact between direct intertextuality and indirect interdiscursiveness and indirect intertextuality and direct interdiscursiveness.

The model ***direct intertextuality – indirect interdiscursivity*** is registered through the intertextual level: "He smote down Belshazzar, as He smote down Amalek, as He smote down the Midianites, as He smote down the Canaanites, as He smote down Sihon the Amorite" where there are direct references to biblical stories of divine punishment, specific events in the Old Testament, in connection to the interdiscursive level, i.e., cultural discourse aimed at the discussion of historical biblical events without explicitly religious or legal aspects but through the cultural context; participants: readers, critics, cultural experts; themes: Biblical history as part of cultural heritage.

The model ***indirect intertextuality – direct interdiscursivity*** is registered through the intertextual level: "Was this not the work of the Devil, to proceed thus in darkness and secrecy for many years, and then make triumph of his foul purpose?" where it indicates biblical or mythological stories about the activities of the Devil, without direct citation or specific references, in connection with the interdiscursive level, i.e., religious discourse aimed at the discussion of the activities of the Devil and the struggle between good and evil in a spiritual context; participants: religious leaders, believers, theologians; themes: Morality, ethics, religious stories about good and evil.

8. Concluding Remarks.

The chain of terms "artistic megaintertext / megainterdiscourse – artistic macrointertext / macrointerdiscourse – artistic microintertext / microinterdiscourse – artistic mediantertext / mediantertext / mediantertext" is an essential tool for comprehensively analyzing intertextual and interdiscursive connections in literature. Determining the boundaries of each level and



selecting an adequate methodology enables researchers to better understand the complex relationships between texts and discourses.

A comprehensive research methodology consists of three successive stages, which facilitate the registration of points of contact between direct intertextuality and direct interdiscursivity, indirect intertextuality and indirect interdiscursivity, and direct intertextuality and indirect interdiscursivity, or indirect intertextuality and direct interdiscursivity.

The first stage involves identifying intertextual markers. This is followed by determining their status as either direct or indirect. This stage focuses on the artistic intertexts of American and English writers of the 20th century. Similar to the horizontal trajectory, the first stage involves identifying interdiscursive markers. The second stage requires determining their status as direct or indirect. At this final stage, researchers must register the points of contact between direct intertextuality and direct interdiscursivity or indirect intertextuality and indirect interdiscursivity. Subsequently, they should register the contact points between direct intertextuality and indirect interdiscursivity or indirect intertextuality and direct interdiscursivity.

Intertextuality is evident through the use of quotations, allusions, and reminiscences. J. Barnes references many historical events and literary works, creating a "mosaic of quotations" that enriches the text with layers of meaning. By invoking well-known texts and events, J. Barnes not only situates his narrative within a broader cultural and historical context but also invites readers to draw connections and interpret the interplay between these references. For instance, J. Barnes might allude to biblical stories, classical literature, or historical speeches, prompting readers to consider how these elements interact within the narrative. This intertextual engagement encourages readers to actively participate in constructing meaning, as they must recognize and interpret the significance of these allusions about the text as a whole.

Interdiscursivity in J. Barnes' fragment is demonstrated through the intersection of multiple discourses, such as those of religion, politics, and culture. Analyzing these interdiscursive elements, we can discern how J. Barnes critiques or reflects upon societal norms and ideologies. For example, integrating religious discourse may highlight themes of morality



and existential questioning, while political discourse might address issues of power and governance. Cultural references can serve to critique or celebrate particular societal values or historical moments. By weaving these discourses together, Barnes creates a complex narrative that mirrors the multifaceted nature of reality.

The intertextual and interdiscursive analysis methodology reveals the text's intricate construction and underscores its impact on the reader. Recognizing intertextual references and the interplay of various discourses engages readers in a more profound, reflective reading experience. This engagement fosters a greater appreciation of the text's thematic richness and encourages readers to consider the broader implications of the narrative. By uncovering the layers of meaning embedded in the text, this analytical approach demonstrates how literature can serve as a lens to explore and critique societal, cultural, and historical phenomena. It highlights the dynamic interplay between texts and discourses, showing how they collectively shape our world understanding.

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments:

The authors thank all academic peers for the research findings and article writing.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer Statement:

The information, opinions, and views presented in the research article are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Acta Humanitatis, the Editorial Board, or its publishers. Acta Humanitatis and the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Author Bionote:

Dina Zhalko is a postgraduate student in the Department of Germanic and Finno-Hungarian Philology at Kyiv National Linguistic University (Kyiv, Ukraine).

The sphere of interest: Cognitive Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Fictional Discourse.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5913-7579>



Authorship and Level of Contribution:

Dina Zhalko contributed to the design and implementation of the research article, the analysis of the results, and the writing of the manuscript.

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text* (S. Heath, Trans.). Hill and Wang.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextualities: Volumes of influence. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2010). Interdiscursivity in professional communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 4(1), 32-50.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Dijk, T. A. van (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
- Fish, S. E. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969).
- Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Kristeva, J. (1967). Word, dialogue, and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader* (p. 37). Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. Columbia University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume I, Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford University Press.
- Leitch, V. B. (1983). *Deconstructive criticism: An advanced introduction*. Columbia University Press.
- Nünning, A. (2004). Towards a cultural and historical narratology: A survey of diachronic approaches, concepts, and research projects. In J. C. Meister (Ed.), *Narratology beyond literary criticism: Mediality, disciplinarity* (pp. 345-375). Walter de Gruyter.
- Nünning, V. (2004). On the perspective structure of narrative texts: Steps toward a constructivist narratology. In J. C. Meister (Ed.), *Narratology beyond literary criticism: Mediality, disciplinarity* (pp. 375-403). Walter de Gruyter.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.
- Riffaterre, M. (1980). *Semiotics of poetry*. Indiana University Press.
- Semkiv, R. (2023). The irony of a recalcitrant structure. *Krytyka*. Retrieved from <http://krytyka.com>
- Symbolopedia. (n.d.). What is symbolism in literature: Definitions and examples. Retrieved from <http://symbolopedia.com>
- Turner, M. (1996). *The literary mind: The origins of thought and language*. Oxford University Press.
- Ukrainian literature. (n.d.). Oxymoron – oxymoron. Retrieved from <http://ukrlit.net>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (p. 89). SAGE Publications.

Illustrative Data Material

“A History of the World in 10½ Chapters” https://archive.org/details/historyofworldinoobarn_o



Appendix A

Devil and thereby put itself beyond the protection and shelter of the Lord. What greater proof could there be but the manner of its desecrations, the cunning odiousness with which it hurled Hugo, Bishop of Besançon, into imbecility? Was this not the work of the Devil, to proceed thus in darkness and secrecy for many years, and then make triumph of his foul purpose? Yet the procurator for the bestioles argues that the woodworm have the blessing of the Lord in all that they do and all that they eat. He contends, therefore, that what they did in devouring the leg of the Bishop's throne had the blessing of the Lord. He contends further that the Lord by his own hand smote down one of the Bishops of his own Holy Church just as He smote down Belshazzar, as He smote down Amalek, as He smote down the Midianites, as He smote down the Canaanites, as He smote down Sihon the Amorite. Is this not a vile blasphemy which the court must extirpate even as Hercules did cleanse the stables of Augeas? [...].” (“A History of the World in 10½ Chapters”, p. 76).

“A History of the World in 10½ Chapters” https://archive.org/details/historyofworldinoobarn_o