

Intertextuality as an Integral Component of the Modern Ukrainian Discourse (on the Example of Literary and Journalistic Styles)

Nataliia TORCHYNSKA¹,
Viktoriiia SHYMANSKA²,
Iryna GONTSA³,
Olena DUDENKO⁴

¹ Khmelnytskyi National University, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, natatora@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6182-0027>

² Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Uman, Ukraine, vishuma@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1164-1041>

³ Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Uman, Ukraine, i.s.hontsa@udpu.edu.ua, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9848-045X>

⁴ Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Uman, Ukraine, nusik2009@meta.ua, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9168-6321>

Abstract: The article highlights the impact of globalization processes on formation of dominant worldviews and guidelines, as well as ways and means of representing the latter. The state and prospects of studying intertextuality as an important element of modern world discourses in the projection on the national cultural background are studied. Attention is drawn to the high degree of development of both theoretical and applied aspects of intertextuality of discourses by representatives of academic communities of different countries and fields of knowledge, which gave grounds to establish the polydiscursive and interdiscursive nature of the object of analysis. Orientation of domestic experts on parameterization of mainly specific manifestations of intertextuality within certain discourses at the level of isolated intertexts and presence of gaps in the theoretical description of the phenomenon in the context of national specificity is stated. Emphasis is placed on the definite variability of the terminology due to the interdisciplinary nature of discursiveness and, accordingly, intertextuality. A complementary link has been established between postmodernism as the dominant philosophical worldview and the intertextuality of discourses. The specifics of the intertextuality of contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse with regard to various scientific studies are clarified. The concept of “intertextual memory” is introduced and justification of its use is given. The need to apply the term “postmodern intertextuality” in relation to contemporary literary discourse is considered. The common and distinctive features of the manifestation of intertextuality in literary and journalistic discourses are traced. The specifics of intertextuality of Ukrainian journalistic discourse are described. It is established that the precedent character of the communicative act is of exceptional importance for realization of intertextuality in journalistic discourse.

Keywords: *Globalization, phenomenon of postmodernism, prototext, polydiscursivity of the text, interdiscursivity of the text, intertextual memory, precedent phenomenon.*

How to cite: Torchynska, N., Shymanska, V., Gontsa, I., & Dudenko, O. (2021). Intertextuality as an Integral Component of the Modern Ukrainian Discourse (on the Example of Literary and Journalistic Styles). *Postmodern Openings*, 12(4), 255-271. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.4/373>

1. Introduction

The dominant phenomenon in the spiritual, educational and scientific spaces of recent times is the unique phenomenon of globalization, which causes both active and passive interpenetration not only of new technologies, methods and means of communication, but also of original cultures, arts and types of thinking. In view of this, the statement of Shalayev (2008) that the spirit of globalization is most fully revealed in postmodernism with the latter's inherent mixing of concepts, value orientations, guidelines, comprehensive creative play, experiment (Shalayev, 2008) seems natural and justified. At the same time, it is impossible not to pay attention to the oxymoronic nature of the essence of the phenomenon of postmodernism, which, due to destruction and chaos, forms a special kind of order, the core of which is the text. Derrida (2000) concluded in a similar way at the time, pointing to the absence of non-textual reality as a conceptual space in which culture formalizes its discursiveness (Derrida, 2000). We must understand that it is not only and not so much about the linguistic context of understanding this concept, because from this point of view, any concept becomes a text, and any text, respectively – a concept (Derrida, 2000).

The outlined complementary binary of textual reality in one or another formulation suggests existence of a certain prototext, which is the basis of both the previous and following texts. From such positions, any text is actually or potentially a component of another text, so initially the latter will have intertextual status. This clearly demonstrates the process of creating new words in the language, as it involves existing and repeatedly reproduced components and patterns, which are then produced and reduplicated systematically, but in a random order.

The most comprehensive concept of prototextuality and, accordingly, the essence of intertextuality is set out in the works of Barthes (1973): “Any text is always already an intertext; other texts are available in it at different levels, in relatively well-known forms: texts of past cultures or texts of the modern one... Any text is a new fabric, woven from the existing primary quotations ... fragments of cultural codes, formulas, rhythmic structures, fragments of social idioms, etc., they are all absorbed by this text, involved in it ... As a prerequisite for any text, intertextuality cannot be reduced to problems of sources and influences, they are a common field of anonymous formulas, the etymology of which can rarely be established, unconscious or automatic citations, used even outside the quotation marks” (Barthes, 1973). From the above interpretation of the essence of intertextuality it becomes clear that the phenomenon itself has a long

history, although the term came into scientific circulation thanks to exploration of Kristeva (1967) “Bakhtin, word, dialogue and novel” only in 1967. It is absolutely assumed that the concept, laid down by the author in the definition initially, has undergone transformations to our time due to rethinking of the essence of the phenomenon by representatives of different industries, areas, approaches and scientific schools. Today, depending on the object of research and the field of knowledge, intertextuality is interpreted differently, but in general it is a broad and narrow definition of the term. From the standpoint of Barthes (1973), Derrida (2000), Nerubasska, Palshkov, & Maksymchuk (2020), Nerubasska, Maksymchuk (2020) and Riffaterre (1987) (broad understanding), this is a special philosophy according to which each sign system is a text that is constantly in a state of intertextual communication with other sign systems, and from the point of view of linguists and literary critics (narrow understanding), a special quality of individual texts, a special way of creating and reading texts (Bogovin, 2017).

The problem of intertextuality in its various manifestations and contexts can be considered to be thoroughly developed by the world scientific community. The outlined range of issues at different times interested literary critics, linguists, philosophers, art critics of broad geographical affiliation: Barthes (1973), Bloom (1973), Derrida (2000), Mitosek (2005), Khant, 2019, Piegay-Gros (1996), Riffaterre (1987) and many others. Some aspects of intertextuality were not overlooked by Ukrainianists, in particular Vivat (2011), Bilozub (2011), Halych (2015), Golovinsky (2008), Zavgorodnya (2009), Shystovska (2017) and others. At the same time, we should state that recently there has been a decrease in the scientific interest of domestic researchers in the theoretical foundations of intertextuality and refocusing on the practical study and description of samples of specific manifestations of intertextuality of separate discourses and their fragments. In this regard, today in the Ukrainian theory of intertextuality we observe gaps that need to be filled by analysing and systematizing the achievements of predecessors, taking into account the general vector of discursiveness inherent in domestic academic practice.

Thus, the aim of the article is to establish and describe the specifics of the phenomenon of intertextuality in the context of modern polydiscursive and interdiscursive concepts on the Ukrainian basis. Accordingly, the objects of the work were manifestations of intertextuality in modern Ukrainian discourse, which has a clear postmodern vector. The subject of research is the literary and journalistic styles of modern Ukrainian discourse as a manifestation and at the same time the basis of intertextuality.

2. The phenomenon of intertextuality as a discursive dominant of postmodernism

The postmodernist model of the world with the “death of the author” postulated by Barthes (1973) presumes not only creation and functioning of a metatext in which many prototexts and their fragments coexist, but above all the conceptual interaction of meanings and connections between them, formed on a pluralistic polycode and multicultural background by active interaction of intro- and extralingual factors. In this sense, the axial dominant of postmodernism is absolutely reasonably becoming the discourse, which “essentially symbolizes postmodernism: heterogeneity, diversity, variability, but at the same time regularity and unpredictability of the choice in search of meaning on the line between the possible and the impossible” (Barasheva & Petrenko, 2017).

In view of the above, it seems natural to say that discourse is a unit of knowledge of the postmodernist concept, which allows not only unsealing or decoding to the maximum extent the meanings of the text, but primarily unconstructively and constructively approaching to the reality made by the author. Postulating discourse as a central category of postmodernism, it should be noted that the definition itself, despite the high degree of interdisciplinary study and parameterization by philosophers, sociologists, linguists, literary critics, psycholinguists, political scientists, etc., remains debatable, actually polysemous, and open to many new interpretations.

The vast majority of scientists, studying the issue of discursiveness in various aspects of its manifestation, point as the author of the term the American linguist Harris (1952), who in the article “Discourse Analysis” noted that “the language is realized not in confusing words and sentences, but in a coherent discourse, from one word to a ten-volume novel, from a monologue to a debate on the Square of Unity”, so the discourse is “a sequence of sentences expressed (or written) by one (or more) people in a given situation” (Harris, 1952). We assume that the definition has a somewhat older etymology, given the formal presence of the word *discursus* in Latin, relevant to such units as “speech”, “type of speech”, “text”, “type of text”. The point is that discourse as a phenomenon is not terminologically defined and not established, the need for parameterization and introduction into scientific circulation of which was paid attention only in the second half of the twentieth century, it potentially exists for hundreds of years, i.e., it is older than is commonly believed.

The most comprehensive evolution of the term, in our opinion, was traced and described by Naumenko (2005), who pointed out that depending on the approach, discourse can be understood as speech, functional style,

perception of the addressee, and a question and answer act with a computer, and sociolect, and idiolect, but in fact it is about “the ability of any text to be constructed so as to provoke the addressee to pose questions to the addresser and their own answers to them” (Naumenko, 2005). At the same time, the most cited by scholars - researchers of discourse, is the definition of Arutyunova (1990), according to which the discourse is a speech “immersed in life” (Arutyunova, 1990). We assume that such an approach is a pragmatic attempt to remove a number of contradictions and uncertainties related, in particular, to the fact that postmodern discourse exists and the renaissance discourse remains in question. In a sense, it is an attempt to formalize the theoretical basis in order to facilitate the empirical study of discourse as a scientific object, because extralingual factors become specific to understanding the course of intralingual processes.

Within the framework of stated above, it is logical to conclude that discourse as a basis and at the same time a reflection of the postmodernist model of the world has a mosaic-hierarchical structure generated and mediated by the text in the form of synchronous existence in it of an infinite number of prototexts, decoded or unencoded, explicitly or latently present at the fragmentary level, with a minimal component in the form of utterances.

Intertextuality is a characteristic feature of discourse, on the one hand, and on the other – a key condition of its existence. As Bezrukov (2018) rightly noted at the time, “intertextuality not only creates an atmosphere of general context, which generates new / other meanings of the work, but also forms a manipulative stylistic unity of the text, turning the latter into polystylistic. It seems to replace the typed structure of the language with an infinite text mosaic, which reflects not only the integrity of the individual idiosyncratic system, but also forms the discursiveness of the new, author’s text” (Bezrukov, 2018). Taking into account these features of intertextual contamination of meanings within a certain discourse, we can assume that the latter will be of varying degrees of polydiscursive nature. The point is that within one communicative space-time coordinate, several discourses can be synchronously actualized due to objective “involvement” of a person in several communicative situations at the same time. We mean that when considering the specifics of discourse in general and the peculiarities of literary and journalistic discourses in particular, within this scientific article we operate with at least three discourses at the same time, given the citations and references to the above, in addition to the two mentioned, we involve fragments of scientific discourse.

It is also interesting to note that intertextuality often causes interdiscursiveness, which arises at the intersection of discourses in a

complex of both explicit-implicit features and in the synthesis of lingual and extralingual factors. Orlandi (1999) concluded in a similar way, pointing out that interdiscourse is “the sphere of knowledge, memory of discursive formations” (Orlandi, 1999). Thus, interdiscursivity as a reflection of permanent complementary attraction and repulsion of different discourses due to intersection of intertextual inclusions is not a new phenomenon, although theoretically it has been described and empirically parameterized not so long ago.

In this regard, it is reasonable to assume that isolation and decoding of intertextual elements within a single discourse directly depend not only on the so-called background knowledge, the level of general erudition of the recipient or the depth of his “immersion” in the global cultural context, but also on intertextual memory of the creator or scriptor. We believe that the term “intertextual memory” should be used to consider descriptions of intertextuality within discourse or discourses which at the thesis or conclusion levels is actively used by scientists for more than a decade Schank & Abelson (1977), Karpenko-Seccombe (2016), Chernyavska (2009), Shystovska (2017), et al., but has not acquired a well-established definition. By intertextual memory, in a broad sense, we mean genetic, mechanical, cultural, historical, and linguistic memory, certain mechanisms of which are activated and work with maximum productivity, while others remain inactive depending on the subject, which is its carrier. It is important to emphasize that actualization of fragments of donor texts in such case can occur at both subconscious and conscious levels, but in any case, the whole body of prototexts in the complex may remain undecoded due to features, firstly, perception and reproduction by intertextual memory of fragments of reality, and secondly, the previous experience of participants in the discourse.

Thus, intertextuality is justifiably qualified as an integral part of any discourse, that it is one of the central concepts of postmodernism, which, in turn, loses its essence outside the intertextual boundaries as a complex worldview. On the one hand, intertextuality in this case should be considered as part of metacognition, given the globalized nature of its manifestation in the text. On the other hand, it becomes a concrete realization (conscious or subconscious) of the body of acquired and inherited knowledge and experiences of a single author or scriptor. Given this, any discourse or discourses, Ukrainian as well, due to primary intertextuality are inextricably linked with the globalized cultural background and at the same time contain elements of the national conceptospheres.

We emphasize that some thorough and multi-vector theoretical works on the specifics of Ukrainian discursiveness, including the

intertextuality of national discourse, are not observed in academic practice today. At the same time, national-cultural concepts as components and contributors of the intertextual level in modern Ukrainian discourses are increasingly being developed by scientists in various scientific fields. Researchers currently focus mainly on literary and journalistic discourses as markers of modern national culture, which seems justified from the standpoint of their representation of poly- and interdiscursivity and, accordingly, manifestations of intertextuality of different etymologies and character.

3. The specifics of intertext in the contemporary literary discourse

Postmodernism as a form of self-consciousness of the globalized world at the present stage models a special heterogeneous picture of reality, which is most fully revealed through multi-vector and semantic interactions in literary texts, which, according to Gurbanska (2014), “function in a special linguistic-culture space in the semiosphere of national and world culture” (Gurbanska, 2014). In this regard, the interest of domestic semiotics, cognitologists, comparativists, culturologists, linguists and other specialists (Bacevych, 2004, Zubritskaya, 1996, Kolegaeva, 1991, Perelomova, 2008, Sologub, 2015) to the problems of literary discourse in general and Ukrainian in particular seems clear. At the same time, experts are not able to reach unambiguity in the definitions, among other things, regarding the concept of “literary discourse”.

In the work of Perelomova (2008) “Linguocultural codes of intertextuality of Ukrainian literary discourse: diachronic aspect”, unfortunately, without indicating the relevant source, in the context of consideration of scientists’ approaches to intertextuality of the literary discourse, stated the idea that, “a literary text as a specific creative piece of work has no discourse, because creation of a literary text and its perception cannot be imagined as direct components of a communicative act, a new actualization of the text occurs at each reading, but the text is not created again” (Perelomova, 2008). It is difficult to agree with this approach in general, although we must admit that the thesis that the text is not created anew with each reading seems reasonable, but at the same time the transaction-interaction complex based on the message does not anticipate a compulsory transformation in a clearly defined temporal-locative coordinate of communicators. In view of this, a literary text, however, is an integral part of structurally and semantically different communicative acts and the latter by their nature introduce the text into the discourse. In this case, the most concise and capacious is the interpretation of the literary discourse by

Voronovskaya (2015), from the standpoint of which we are talking about the process of interaction between the text (in a broad sense) and the recipient: “A literary text is one of the components of the act of literary communication, presenting a special literary reality, which, combining with the discourses of the author and the reader, creates a new type of discourse – a literary one” (Voronovska, 2015). Thus, we should state the groundlessness of the denial of the concept of “a literary discourse”, as samples of contemporary Ukrainian literary texts, especially with elements of augmented reality such as “the mirror-world”, as well as an active interaction of the author with the reader like “The Plays” by Les Poderevyansky, the body of meanings of which is realized to the maximum extent exclusively in the process of reading by the author, are representatives of individual communicative acts, regardless of the breadth and completeness of the interpretation of this term, and are of discursive nature. At the same time, this specificity reflects the key feature that it is both the basis and the marker of contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse, active involvement in the global cultural process, manifested at the level of specific intertexts.

We assume that originality of the literary discourse as a cultural phenomenon and its special polyphony on Ukrainian ground contributed to the emergence of scientific dissertation and monographs on the specifics, including manifestations of intertextuality, of the postmodern Ukrainian literary discourse (Voronovska, 2015, Gurbanska, 2014, Perelomova, 2008, Tykha & Kuravska 2020). Taking into account these parameters, Bilozub (2011) sees the need to introduce into scientific circulation the term “postmodern intertextuality” in relation to contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse, as it refers to deeper additional meanings and interpretations compared to the intertextuality of previous periods, and most importantly – consciousness and the scale of postmodernists’ use of techniques to create intertextuality (Belozub, 2011). The immediate confirmation of the validity of such conclusions of the author is literary and journalistic works of Ukrainian postmodernists Andrukhovych, Vynnychuk, Zabuzhko, Irvanets, Izdryk and many others, because the creators of these texts postulate and stress intertextuality as central semantic and text-generating category.

In similar formulations, the above idea can be traced in the work of Zavorodnia (2009) “Tektology”, in which the researcher, parameterizing the postmodern intertextuality of contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse, traces manifestations of the intertext at the level of specific intertexts of Ukrainian writers from Shevchenko to the present. The expert notes that intertextuality at the textual level is manifested by the following techniques: citation – conditionally verbatim excerpt from the pretext, which may be a

statement of another speaker or a previous statement of the author of the same text; allusion – a hint at a well-known historical or literary fact, a premeditated reference of the reader to a particular plot or image; reminiscence – an unconscious echo of the works of other authors, which is manifested in borrowed themes, images, individual expressions, details, etc.; paraphrase – retelling of someone else's thoughts in one's own words; imitation of a specific work; variations – use of someone else's text by processing it while preserving certain structural features of the original; travesty – transfer of characters and plots in an unusual situation for them to create a comic effect; parody – distortion by means of satire and humour of the original source; editing is the selection and consolidation of individual scenes and episodes that retain their fragmentation; collage – a work composed of disparate fragments of other texts, real or imitated documents, as well as illusions, quotations, etc. (Zavgorodnya, 2009). It should be added that these techniques do not exhaust manifestations of intertextuality in general and postmodernism in particular, because, as Matsko (2010) once noted, the defining mode of modern writing can be tentatively called *pluralia tantum* an explanation borrowed from the grammar (Matsko, 2010) therefore, involvement of the recipient in the discourse is an essential prerequisite for creation and existence of the text, and hence – implementation of a full-fledged communicative act.

Analysing intertextuality of contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse, it is worth emphasizing the diversity of its expression in the structure of the text, which, as mentioned earlier, is often multidiscourse by nature. We mean, first of all, the possibility of realizing intertextuality not only at the textual level in the form of intertextemes, but also at the genre, narrative, plot-compositional, positional, etc. It is no coincidence that Shistovska (2017), developing the opinion of Golovinsky, notes that “intertextuality is manifested by the very position of the author, the narrator, who can move freely from motif to motif and above all – from style to style, and not so much tells, but telling makes an argument. From this point of view, intertextuality is interpreted more broadly than just a sign of an artistic, literary work, i.e., it can be a feature of speech of a certain social group, epoch, culture” (Shistovska, 2017). As Tykha and Kuravska (2020) aptly noted, the prototext manifested in postmodern discourse is layered, mixed, allowing to reconstruct the meaning of the new through parody of the previous one, and chaotic introduction of fragments of previous cultures “creates a unique eclectic structure of postmodern literary text (Tykha & Kuravskaya, 2020). We consider the thesis of introducing contemporary Ukrainian discourse due to intertextual diversity to the metadiscussion level,

which is indirectly traced in the above-mentioned works, well-argued, but at the same time we add that it is about intertextual “inclusion” of national discourse both from a retrospective and perspective and in terms of perspective in the global communicative and cultural space with simultaneous national labelling. With such understanding specifics of intertextuality as a mandatory component of modern Ukrainian literary discourse, its levelling for some reason or ignoring in the cultural environment will mean, on the one hand, a gradual loss of identity of the national multicultural environment, and on the other – an isolation from integration into the global communicative space.

4. Intertextual markers of journalistic style

Intertextuality as a basis and at the same time a leading feature of a literary discourse has the same specific significance for journalistic discourse. The connection of these discourses seems obvious not only at the level of individual means and methods of text creation, but also in the communicative-semantic aspect. Despite having a communicative component in common with a literary discourse, journalistic discourse aims primarily to exert a pragmatic influence on the addressee and it is society-oriented to “express and shape public opinion, determine the standards of status of the individual in society, to conduct indirect inter-societal dialogue” (Fedorova, 2007). Some aspects of journalistic discourse, including intertextuality as an integral part of it, have long been the object of scientific interest of scientists from different countries, as evidenced by the works of Bell (1996), Kornetzki (2013), Matheson (2011), Meinhof & Smith (2000) and many other experts. Ukrainian scientists Bogdanova (2016), Halych (2015), Ilchenko (2013), Kalenych (2020), Moseychuk (2012) and others did not miss this problem. A variety of approaches and scientific schools determine the branch specificity of the definition of the term “journalistic discourse” and its uncertainty. If we generalize an array of definitions, it will be in the general sense of “the environment of systematic distribution of messages among numerous scattered audiences in order to influence formation and change of assessments, opinions, beliefs and behaviour of people in the form of pragmatic information” (Moseychuk, 2012). From this definition it becomes clear that journalistic discourse, in particular national, actively turns to intertextuality in order to intensify logical-associative comparisons and oppositions, adjusts the flow of thought according to pre-set parameters, increase the effectiveness of communicative acts and, consequently, their reflection.

It should be noted that intertextuality in Ukrainian journalistic discourse has become widespread, as well as conscious actualization and parameterization, over the past two decades, while in the literary it has been directly or indirectly manifested and is qualified for almost half a century. Probably, this can explain the fact that scientists did not immediately identify prototext markers as manifestations of intertextual discourse, calling this phenomenon the transformation of quotations (Shalimova, 1996), the unravelling of expressions (Solganyk, 2000) and so on. A similar opinion, reflecting on the intertextuality of journalistic works from the standpoint of retrospect and features of the modern stage, followed by Zrazhevskaya (2010) is held by Halych (2015): “Traditionally, intertextuality in the media is understood as a violation of the style of journalistic text. But journalism is a scientific and literary activity, and therefore journalism cannot avoid these general cultural postmodernist tendencies. <...>... when citation and parody are a common phenomenon in journalism, then other means of intertextuality, such as pastiche (violation of stylistic unity), use of profanity, shift of the semantic centre, etc. came to it not so long ago” (Halych, 2015). Thus, the polydiscursiveness of journalism is both in the global, and therefore at the present stage – postmodern, and in the national information and cultural contexts. National intertextuality markers, however, will be a priority due to the functional specificity of the discourse.

It is worth emphasizing that when studying the nature of the intertextuality of modern journalistic discourse and its manifestation in specific communicative fragments, scientists often resort to direct and indirect analogies with the literary discourse. Thus, analysing the features and sources of intertextuality in postmodern journalistic materials, Ilchenko (2013), Kalenich (2020), Ryabinina (2008) name the previously mentioned quotations, allusions and paraphrases among the categories of expression of intertextuality and add frame representants (fragments endowed with a stable associative-contextual connection with extralinguistic factors) and centonic texts (placement of large amounts of information in a concise volume, simultaneous reference to several prototexts) (Ilchenko, 2013). A similar unanimity of scientists’ opinions is observed in the issue of precedent phenomena as a source base for the intertextuality of modern Ukrainian journalistic discourse. Ryabinina (2008), summarizing the theoretical achievements of predecessors, somewhat clarifies the classification and distinguishes folklore, socio-political, literary, cinematic and song intertexts. The researcher tries to trace correlations of the variety of prototext with their functions within the discourse: “Intertextuality is a universal feature of the discourse of the modern Ukrainian press and manifests itself at all levels

of journalistic work, causing by this a variety of functional colouring of the discourse of periodicals (information, evaluation, appeal, entertainment, decoration, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality)” (Ryabinina, 2008). From this we can conclude that the nature of intertextuality makes it possible to activate the associative-logical and intellectual potentials of the recipient for the maximum disclosure of the multiplicity of meanings within the discourse. In addition, there is a paradoxical trend: intertextuality, on the one hand, directs the cognitive-thought processes of communication participants for the appropriate decoding of authorial intentions, and on the other – veils both the personality of the creator and his subjectivity, bringing closer due to operating the precedent phenomena the presentation to an unbiased and objectified statement of facts. Elements of intertextuality in journalistic discourse through a verbal sign refer to nonverbal realities.

5. Conclusions

Summarizing ideas stated in the article, it is necessary to emphasize the complexity and polyvectorness of the phenomenon of discourse intertextuality due to the interdisciplinary nature of the latter, which causes terminological variability. On the one hand, this state of affairs somewhat slows down scientific progress in this direction, as the academic community of a particular field develops its own theoretical and methodological basis for further analysis. On the other hand, the specificity of the object itself provides a variety of approaches and concepts, the choice of which directly depends on subjective factors, including the range of scientific interests of the researcher. Despite this, domestic science lacks thorough investigations of the monographic or dissertation level, which parameterize postmodern discursive intertextuality with maximum completeness, filling gaps in the terminology and removing a number of uncertainties.

We state that globalization transformations promote active interaction of cultures, technologies, knowledge, etc., so intertextuality, which has long been present in texts in a latent or undecoded state, is now gaining a larger scale, special expression and transparency. In addition, intertextuality and discursiveness are elements of the postmodernist model of the world, which, on the one hand, form its basis, and on the other – a specific feature, without which the essence of the philosophical system is neutralized. Intertextuality is a manifestation of the identity of the national multicultural environment and at the same time an element of integration into the global communicative space, which in a verbalized form through precedent phenomena appeal to non-textual reality.

The postmodern intertextuality of literary and journalistic discourses, which has a large number of common features, is meaning-making, but the array of decoded meanings correlates with the amount of intertextual memory of both the author and the scripter. The texts in them, having their own thematic and semantic field, accumulate in a direct or indirect form a corpus of meanings due to interaction of prototexts, but necessarily constitute a holistic communicative unity at the intersection of polycoding. Intertextuality significantly expands the boundaries of discourse, facilitating reaching the meta-semantic level of knowledge.

In this regard, our attempt to explore intertextuality as an integral part of modern Ukrainian discourse (on the example of literary and journalistic styles) is a separate attempt to generalize the views available in academic practice on this issue and does not exhaust its problems, opening prospects for further research of the phenomenon of postmodern discursive intertextuality.

References

- Arutyunova, N. (1990). *Diskurs [Discourse]. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]*, 136–137. Sovetskaya entsiklopediya. <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/136g.html>
- Bacevych, F. (2004). *Osnovy komunikativnoyi linghivistyky [Fundamentals of communicative linguistics]*. Akademija.
- Barasheva, D., & Petrenko, N. (2017). Diskurs kak edinita poznaniya postmodernizma [Discourse as a unit of knowledge of postmodernism]. *Sciences of Europe*, 3(13), 47–52. <http://www.europe-science.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/VOL-3-No-13-13-2017.pdf>
- Barthes, R. (1973). Texte théorie du [Theory of text]. *Encyclopaedia universalis*, 15, 78. <https://www.universalis.fr/encyclopedie/theorie-du-texte/>
- Bell, A. (1996). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Bezrukov, A. (2018). Funktsii intertekstualnosti v predelakh diskursivnoy praktiki [Functions of intertextuality within discursive practice]. *Intertekstualnost hudozhestvennogo diskursa: sbornik materialov konferentsii [Intertextuality of artistic discourse: collection of conference materials]*. Astrakhan.
- Bilozub, A. (2011). Intertekstualnist u khudozhnomu postmodernomu dyskursi [Intertextuality in artistic postmodern discourse]. *Linhvistychni studii [Linguistic studies]*, 23, 120–124. <http://litmisto.org.ua/?p=9124>
- Bloom, H. (1973). *The anxiety of influence: A theory of poetry*. New York. Oxford University Press.

- Bohdanova, I. (2016). Suhestyvnii potentsial pretsedentnykh odynyt v ukrainskomu mediinomu dyskursi pochatku XXI stolittia [Suggestive potential of precedent units in the Ukrainian media discourse of the beginning of the XXI century] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ukraine Donetsk National University Vinnitsa.
<https://abstracts.donnu.edu.ua/article/view/2173>
- Bohovin, O. (2017). Kurtuaznyi kod v aspekti teorii intertekstu yak zasib interpretatsii khudozhnogo tvoriv [Courtly code in the aspect of intertext theory as a means of interpretation of a work of art]. *Visnyk Khar'kivskoho natsionalnogo universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Filolohiia* [Bulletin of VN Karazin Kharkiv National University. Philology], 76, 214–217.
<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/philology/article/view/9221>
- Chernyavskaya, V. (2009). Lingvistika teksta: Polikodovost, intertekstualnost, interdyskursivnost [Linguistics of the text: Polycode, intertextuality, interdiscursiveness]. Librom. https://www.studmed.ru/chernyavskaya-v-e-lingvistika-teksta-polikodovost-intertekstualnost-interdyskursivnost_69a8058992e.html
- Derrida, Zh. (2000). *O grammatologii* [About grammar]. Ad Marginem.
- Fedorova, O. (2007). Hendernyi ta kohnityvnyi aspekty doslidzhennia anhlo-movnoho hazetnoho dyskursiv [Gender and cognitive aspects of the study of English-language newspaper discourses]. *Naukovyi chasopys NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Serii 9. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov* [Scientific journal of NPU named after M.P. Drahomanov. Series 9. Current trends in language development], 2, 147–150.
<http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/3498/1/fedorova.pdf>
- Golovynskiy, M. (2008). Intertekstualnist. *Teoriia literatury v Polshchi. Antolohiia tekstiv. Druha polovyna 20 – pochatok 21 stolittia* [Theory of literature in Poland. Anthology of texts. The second half of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century], 284–309. Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.
- Halych, V. (2015). Semiotyka intertekstualnosti publitsystychnogo tvoriv: sotsialno-komunikatyvna retseptsiia: monohrafiia [Semiotics of intertextuality of a journalistic work: socio-communicative reception: monograph]. Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University.
<http://dspace.luguniv.edu.ua/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/436/Galuch%20semiotika.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30.
<https://studylib.net/doc/25193085/discourse-analysis>
- Gurbanska, S. (2014). Postmodernistska model svitu v khudozhnomu dyskursi [Postmodern model of the world in artistic discourse]. *Studia linguistica*, 8, 350–353. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Stling_2014_8_57

- Ilchenko, O. (2013). Intertekstualnist i pretsedentnist v ukrainomovnykh ZMI pochatku XXI stolittia (na materiali metaforychnykh slovospoluchen) [Intertextuality and precedent in the Ukrainian-language media of the early XXI century (on the material of metaphorical phrases)]. *Linhvistychni doslidzhennia* [Linguistic research], 35, 155–160.
<http://journals.hnpu.edu.ua/index.php/lingvistics/article/view/2452/2483>
- Kalenysh, V. (2020). Intertekstualnist u suchasnomu mediadyskursi [Intertextuality in modern media discourse]. <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-37-2/7>
- Karpenko-Seccombe, T. (2016). Intertextuality as cognitive modelling. *English Text Construction*, 9 (2), 244–267. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.9.2.02kar>
- Khant, H., & Razumna, K. (2019). Leksychni ta stylistychni osoblyvosti suchasnoho anhliiskoho ta nimetskomovnoho publitsystychnoho dyskursu [Lexical and stylistic features of modern English and German-language journalistic discourse]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Filolohiia* [Scientific Bulletin of Uzhhorod University. Philology], 1(41), 174–180.
[https://doi.org/10.24144/2663-6840.2019.1.\(41\)](https://doi.org/10.24144/2663-6840.2019.1.(41))
- Kolegaeva, I. (1991). *Tekst kak edinitsa nauchnoy i hudozhestvennoy kommunikatsii* [Text as a unit of scientific and artistic communication]. Twirpx.
<http://www.twirpx.com/file/2453799/>
- Kornetzki, A. (2013) *Contrastive Analysis of News Text Types in Russian, British and American Business Online and Print Media*. Frank & Timme.
- Kristeva, J. (1967) Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman. *Critique*, 23, 239, 438–465. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41557377>
- Matheson, D. (2011). *Media Discourses: Analysing Media Texts (UK Higher Education OUP Humanities & Social Sciences Media, Film & Cultural Studies)*. Milton Keynes.
- Matsko, V. (2010). Intertekstualnist poetychnykh struktur [Intertextuality of poetic structures]. *Aktualni problemy ukrainskoi literaturi i folkloru* [Current issues of Ukrainian literature and folklore], 15, 45–52.
http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apulf_2010_15_8
- Meinhof, U., & Smith, J. (2000). *Intertextuality and the Media. From Genre to Everyday Life*. Manchester University Press.
- Mitosek, Z. (2005). *Theories of literary research* [Theories of literary research]. Tavria.
- Moseichuk, O. (2012). Publitsystychnyi dyskurs yak kontekst realizatsii komunikatyvnoho vplyvu na masovoho adresata [Journalistic discourse as a context of realization of communicative influence on the mass addressee]. *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnogo universytetu. Filolobichni nauky* [Bulletin of Zhytomyr State University. Philological sciences], 65, 174–177.
<http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/9237/1/34.pdf>

- Naumenko, A. (2005). *Filolohichnyi analiz tekstu (Osnovy linhvopoetyky): navchalnyi posibnyk* [Philological analysis of the text (Fundamentals of Linguopoetics): a textbook]. Nova Knyha.
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Orlandi, E. P. (1999). K voprosu o metode i ob'ekte analiza diskursa [On the question of the method and object of discourse analysis]. In *Kvadratura smysla* [Squaring of Meaning] (pp. 197–225). Progress.
- Perelomova, O. (2008). Intertekstualnist – strukturna oznaka tekstiv ukrainskoho postmodernoho khudozhnoho dyskursu [Intertextuality is a structural feature of texts of Ukrainian postmodern artistic discourse]. *Visnyk Sumskoho derzhavnogo universytetu. Filolohiia* [Bulletin of Sumy State University. Philology], 1, 174–180. <https://ukrlit.net/article1/1709.html>
- Perelomova, O. (2008). Linhvokulturni kody intertekstualnosti ukrainskoho khudozhnoho dyskursu: diakhronichniy aspekt: monohrafiia [Linguocultural codes of intertextuality of Ukrainian artistic discourse: diachronic aspect: monograph]. SumDU Publishing House.
- Piegay-Gros, N. (1996). Introduction à L'intertextualité. *Lettres Sup, Collection Lettres superieures*. Dunod. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278779810_Introduction_a_l'intertextualit
- Riabinina, O. (2008). Intertekstualnist u dyskursi suchasnoi ukrainskoi presy: linhvistychnyi aspekt [Intertextuality in the discourse of the modern Ukrainian press: linguistic aspect] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Kharkiv National University.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978). The Intertextual Unconscious. *Critical Inquiry*, 13(2), *The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis*, 13(2), 371-385. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1343499>
- Schank, R., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: an inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Erlbaum.
- Shalaev, V. (2008). Globalizaciya, postmodern, bifurkacionnyj chelovek – markery perekhodnoj istorii [Globalization, postmodernity, bifurcation man are markers of a transitional history]. *Servis PLUS. Sociologicheskie teorii obschestva* [Service PLUS. Sociological Theories of Society], 2, 96–105. <https://readera.org/140209785>

- Shalimova, G. S. (1996). Forma novaya – problemy staryye (Ob odnoy modeli gazetnogo zaglaviya) [The form is new – the problems are old (On one model of a newspaper title)]. *Zhurnalistika i kultura russkoy rechi* [Journalism and the culture of Russian speech], 1, 81.
- Shystovska, A. (2017). Poniattia intertekstualnosti ta pidkhody do noho [Shistovskaya, A. (2017). The concept of intertextuality and approaches to it]. *Problemy teorii literatury ta literaturnoi krytyky* [Problems of literary theory and literary criticism], 24, 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.18524/2312-6809.2017.24.127980>
- Solganik, G. (2000). *Stilistika teksta* [Stylistics of the text.]. Flinta; Nauka.
- Sologub, L. (2015). Nauchno-didakticheskiy diskurs: konstitutivnyie parametryi [Scientific and didactic discourse: constitutive parameters]. *Filologiya i literaturovedenie* [Philology and Literary Studies], 5. <https://philology.snauka.ru/2015/05/1436>
- Tykha, U., & Kuravska, N. (2020). Aliuzyvno-tsyatnyi vymir intertekstualnosti postmodernistskoho khudozhnogo tekstu [Allusive-quoted dimension of intertextuality of postmodernist artistic text]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk* [Current issues of the humanities], 2(31), 271–277. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.2/31.213993>
- Vivat, H. (2011). Folklornyi intertekst u tvorchomu dorobku I. Kalyntsia ta I. Svitlychnoho [Folklore intertext in the creative work of I. Kalynets and I. Svitlychny]. *Filolohichni traktaty* [Philological treatises], 3(4), 10–14. <https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/27826>
- Voronovska, L. (2015). Universalni ta spetsyfichni osoblyvosti vyznachennia oznak khudozhnogo dyskursu [Universal and specific features of determining the features of artistic discourse]. *Teoretychna i dydaktychna filolohiia* [Theoretical and didactic philology], 20, 155–166. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Tidf_2015_20_17
- Zavhorodnia, L. (2009). Tekstoznavstvo: navchalno-metodychni rekomendatsii do kursu [Textology: educational and methodical recommendations for the course]. Brama-Ukraina.
- Zrazhevska, N. (2010). *Komunikatsiini tekhnolohii* [Communication technologies]. Brama-Ukraina.
- Zubrytska, M. (1996). Slovo. Znak. Dyskurs. Antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky XX stolittia [Word. Sign. Discourse. Anthology of world literary and critical thought of the XX century]. Lviv: Litopys. Retrieved from https://www.studmed.ru/zubricka-m-red-slovo-znak-diskurs-antolog-ya-sv-tovo-l-teraturno-kritichno-dumki-xx-st_2cbb4e2a329.html