INTERTEXTUALITY, INTERDISCURSIVITY AND HYBRID GENRES

Iegorova A. V.
Ph.D. in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation
National Transport University
Omelyanovycha-Pavlenka str., 1, Kyiv, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0003-4904-9123
anna_iegorova@ukr.net

Within the framework of cognitive-discursive paradigm present article attempts to define the categories of intertextuality and interdiscursivity and to investigate their relation to the phenomenon of genre hybridity. Both categories originate in Bakhtinian ideas about the dialogic nature of texts and heteroglossia. However, as the analysis of the literature showed, the notions of dialogicality, intertextuality and interdiscursivity bear significant differences. Dialogicality is seen as a general principle of language use, discourse, and cognition, as the inherent, innate ability to indulge in dialogue. Interdiscursivity, on the other hand, in most general terms, is understood as a socially significant linguistic phenomenon which focuses on dialogical relations between different language conventions related to social tendencies or ideological significances which are reflected in elements of genres, discourses, and styles, and signalled by specific linguistic forms, including certain lexical units, sentence structure and prosody. And intertextuality is the notion denoting overall property of texts, finding its expression in the presence of connections between them, through which texts can implicitly or explicitly refer to each other. Therefore, as can be seen from the definitions provided, these categories, albeit conceptually close, differ primarily on the level of abstraction.

It is also notable that due to increasing role of information technology and multi-media in all spheres of modern human life, interdiscursivity along with recontextualization of certain social practices in new social and cultural contexts often results in emergence of hybrid genres not only in writing but in live conversations as well. Moreover, genre hybridity can be often traced in art, advertising and cinematography, which allows analysts to to conduct multimodal discourse analysis.

ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНІСТЬ, ІНТЕРДИСКУРСИВНІСТЬ ТА ГІБРИДНІ ЖАНРИ

Єгорова А. В.
доктор філософії (філологія),
доцент кафедри іноземної філології та перекладу
Національний транспортний університет
вул. Омеляновича-Павленка, 1, Київ, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0003-4904-9123
anna_iegorova@ukr.net

У статті в рамках когнітивно-дискурсивної парадигми робиться спроба визначити категорії інтертекстуальності й інтердискурсивності й дослідити їх зв'язок із феноменом жанрової гібридизації. Обидві категорії беруть початок від ідей М. Бахтіна про діалогічність текстів і гетероглосію. Однак, як показав аналіз літератури, поняття

«діалогічність», «інтертекстуальність» і «інтердискурсивність» істотно розрізняються. З одного боку, діалогічність розглядається як загальний принцип використання мови, дискурсу й пізнання, як вроджена здатність брати участь в діалозі. З іншого боку, інтердискурсивність у найзагальніших рисах розуміється як соціально значуще мовне явище, що фокусується на діалогічних відносинах між різними лінгвістичними нормами, які пов'язані з певними соціальними тенденціями або ідеологією, відбиваються в елементах жанрів, дискурсів і стилів і виражаються зо допомогою певних мовних форм, включаючи лексичні одиниці, синтаксичну структуру речень і просодію. А інтертекстуальність – це поняття, яке означає загальну властивість текстів, що знаходить своє вираження в наявності між ними певних зв'язків, за допомогою яких тексти можуть імпліцитно або експліцитно посилатися один на одного. Таким чином, як видно з наведених визначень, ці категорії хоча й близькі в концептуальному плані, розрізняються насамперед на рівні абстракції. Також примітно, що через зростаючу роль інформаційних технологій і мультимедіа в усіх сферах сучасного людського життя інтердискурсивність і реконтекстуалізація певних соціальних практик у нових соціальних і культурних контекстах часто приводить до виникнення гібридних жанрів не тільки в писемному мовленні, а й у живому спілкуванні. Мало того, жанрова гібридизація часто простежується також у мистецтві, рекламі й кінематографі, що дозволяє аналітикам проводити мультимодальний аналіз дискурсу.

Problem statement. In contemporary linguistics the text is no longer seen as the highest level of communication hierarchy, as there is meta-textual level of discourse. Therefore, the usual text categories are reinterpreted in the light of cognitive-discursive paradigm. The study of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, therefore, is of great theoretical and practical value, and thus, may contribute to our understanding of the subtle mechanisms underlying verbal communication. Moreover, the notions of intertextuality and interdiscursivity are closely connected with the phenomenon of genre hybridity, and virtually are key phenomena to conduct multimodal discourse analysis.

The purpose of this article is twofold:

1) to perform literature review and set apart the notions of dialogicality, intertextuality and interdiscursivity;

2) to characterize the phenomenon of genre hybridity, as a result of recontextualization and genre chains mediation.

Presentation of the material. Both terms originate from the Bakhtinian ideas of dialogic heteroglossia, where all texts are understood as being dialogic, and therefore should be interpreted against the background of and with regard to other thematically related or co-related texts. The dialogic nature of texts lies within the phenomenon of heteroglossia, the co-existence of the texts' own voice and the voices of others [1, p. 291]. These "other voices" are explicit or implicit elements from other sources, including discourses, genres, and styles from other language conventions through which interdiscursivity can be formed.

The Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia is closely related to interdiscursivity and sometimes the two terms are used interchangeably in literature on discourse analysis. However, they should be differentiated. Dialogicality is a much more general property or principle of language use, discourse, and cognition, taken as the ability to indulge in dialogue. It is an inherent, innate ability and the need for us as social creatures to enter into dialogue. As Langacker puts it, "conversation is <…> canonical, providing a basic model that other uses of language mimic and adapt as needed. <…> our verbal thought takes the form of imagined dialog, if only with ourselves. A spoken monolog, as in giving a speech or telling a story, can be thought of as the limiting case of dialog <…> and when we write, we usually write with the reader in mind, imagining the reader's reaction" [2, p. 459].

Interdiscursivity, on the other hand, is a relatively specific socially significant linguistic phenomenon which focuses on the dialogical relations between different language conventions related to social tendencies or ideological significances. Thus, the concept of interdiscursivity inevitably goes back to Bakhtinian ideas about dialogized heteroglossia.

Having paraphrased the terms of dialogicality and heteroglossia in correlation with text, textuality, and their relation to society, J. Kristeva introduced the term "intertextuality" to describe the overall property of texts, that finds its expression in the presence of connections between them, through which texts can implicitly or explicitly refer to each other. Moreover, for Kristeva intertextuality implies "the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history" [3, p. 39]. Intertextuality reflects the "unpacking" of the textual whole through a special strategy of interrelating one text with other textual or meaningful systems and their dialogic interaction in terms of both content and expression. That is, intertextuality should be understood as dialogical relations of the texts.

G. Genette in his work "Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree" proposed a more inclusive term than intertextuality – "transtextuality" of which he listed five subtypes [4]:

– intertextuality – quotation, plagiarism, allusion;

– paratextuality – relation between a text and its "paratext" (text surrounding the main body of text, including titles, headings, prefaces, epigraphs, footnotes, etc.);

– metatextuality – explicit or implicit critical commentary on another text;

– hypertextuality – relation between a text and a preceding "hypotext", a text or genre on which it is based but which it transforms, modifies, elaborates or extends (for example parody, spoof, translation);

– architextuality – designation of a text as a part of a genre(s).

While the first three types in Genette's classification exhibit the overt cases of texts' relations, the last two – are about more covert relations, those of structural and general semantic level, as well as generic relations. Generally, intertextuality refers to the phenomenon that other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text, which is typically expressed through explicit superficial textual features such as quotations and citations [5, p. 97]. It is basically seen as "the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth" [6, p. 84]. The equivalents for the notions of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in works of N. Fairclough are "manifest" and "constitutive" intertextuality respectively. Manifest intertextuality refers to the explicit presence in another through the techniques of discourse representation, presupposition, negation, metadiscourse and irony [6, p. 85]. Constitutive intertextuality refers to the mixing configuration of discourse conventions such as genres, activity types, and styles associated with different types of discourse [6, p. 104]. In order to emphasize that the focus is on discourse conventions rather than other texts as constitutive, Fairclough introduces them under the term of "interdiscursivity" to replace "constitutive intertextuality", thereby, foregrounding various elements of "orders of discourse", such as genres, discourses, and styles.

In general terms Critical Discourse Analysis has brought the dynamics of communication back into the studies of interdiscursivity through analyzing relevant discoursive practices. This approach gave the possibility to apply both linguistic analysis and social research for scrutinizing social and critical significance of interdiscursivity. According to Fairclough [6; 7; 8], interdiscursivity is more than a stylistic phenomenon, because it has important implications for social practice. His research combines the constitutive view of discourse illustrated by Foucault, and the dynamic view of discursive practice along with its relationship to social practice. Thus, the constantly changing interdiscursive relations in texts become central to understanding of the process of social change. The scholar holds that the interdiscursive relations in texts can reflect three interrelated tendencies of contemporary public discourse: "democratization", "commodification" or "marketization", and "technologization" of discourse [6, p. 200–224]. All these changes in language use are part of broader processes of social changes affecting the development of postmodern society. These ideas originate in the works of Pêcheux, who explained interdiscourse as a "complex of ideological formations" closely connected with the notion of preconstruct – an array of previous discourses, which make up a scheme for a new discourse [9, p. 111–113].

According to Bhatia, who explores the cases of interdiscursivity in different kinds of institutional discourses [10; 11; 12; 13], the phenomenon of mixing "private intentions" with "socially recognized communicative purposes" is characteristic of and widely used in a number of professional domains, resulting in mixing of genres. The researcher explains that "this dynamic complexity of professional communication is the result of several factors, including the ever-increasing use of multi-media, explosion of information technology, multi-disciplinary contexts of the world of work, increasingly competitive professional (academic as well as business) environment <…>" [11, p. 1]. Bhatia sees interdiscursivity as a function of "appropriation of generic resources" across three kinds of contextual and other text-external resources: genres, professional practices, and professional cultures [13, p. 24]. The functioning of interdiscursivity as a special kind of linguistic phenomenon is closely related to cognitive, social, cultural and institutional factors of language use. Thus, an interdiscursive text, "is not individual and idiosyncratic but part of a shared cultural world" [5, p. 105].

One of the most important categories introduced by Critical Discourse Analysis, which is closely related to interdiscursivity is recontextualization. Recontextualization is understood as placement of one social practice within the boundaries of another with acquisition and transformation of its elements, a process which is referred to by Fairclough [6] and Chouliaraki and Fairclough [14] as "colonization and appropriation". Linell describes the process as "the extrication of some part or aspect from a text or discourse, or from a genre of texts or discourses, and the fitting of this part or aspect into another context" [15, p. 145]. The relationships and differences between such contexts (spatial and temporal) are reflected in specific nature of transformations of texts, discourses and genres [16, p. 22].

Recontextualization takes place through the mediation of genre chain, which operates as a regulatory tool for the selection of one discourse and the exclusion of the other. For instance, a narrative of personal experience, which has some specific characteristics, is "filtered" when moving to a different genre, for example to police interrogation in pre-trial investigation or testimony of a witness in

trial. Moreover, genre chains are able to engage in prospective and retrospective relations, which results in assimilation of their characteristics, and genre hybridization as manifestation of interdiscursivity.

The recontextualized genre, therefore, undergoes certain textual changes, such as simplification, condensation, elaboration or refocusing; shifts in self-presentation, role-relationships or legitimization of authority (including concepts and propositions, arguments and lines of argumentation, stories, assessments and evaluations, ideologies, etc.); transformation of meanings and meaning potentials (like reversals of figure-ground relations) [15, p. 175]. Textually it is realized in mixing such elements as particular words, expressions, arguments, topoi, rhetorical devices and styles, which gives the possibility for a researcher to identify them and analyze hybridity [14; 16].

Interdiscursivity makes any communication highly variable. As noted by Bhatia, "although generic forms are products of conventional knowledge embedded in disciplinary cultures, they are dynamic constructs" [12, p. 360].

This variability of interdiscursive texts derives from the constant need for making linguistic choices, both at formal, as well as at the strategic level [5, p. 106–109]. Speakers have to choose among elements of genres, discourses, styles, and specific linguistic forms associated with the selected element, including certain lexical units, sentence structure and prosody. Operating at different levels of linguistic structures, the selection process includes selection of communicative strategies to achieve the desired effects in accordance with communicative goals, which differ from context to context. These choices, however, are made with different levels of consciousness and awareness [5, p. 109], sometimes the choices can be highly motivated by communicative goals (for example, in the case of narratives told by witnesses in court), while others are made automatically with a lower level of awareness and consciousness (as in case of telling an anecdote at the dinner table). This largely depends on the speaker's overall communicative competence, individual psychological characteristics and other contextual parameters.

Conclusions. To sum up, genre hybridity as realized through interdiscursive movements can be interpreted as a means of linguistic adaptation to new social and cultural contexts, being the product of dynamic negotiation and the result of choice-making as dependent on communicative and pragmatic goals of the speakers in certain contexts. Given the overall tendency of scientific research to synergy, genre hybridity, along with its underlying concepts of intertextuality, interdiscursivity and recontextualization, may well be employed to conduct analysis in future research of such discourses, but not restricted to, as political, social media, mass-media, advertising discourse. Moreover, the theory of genre hybridity may be applicable outside purely linguistic science, for example in art and film criticism.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.; M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
2. Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
3. Kristeva, J. (1991). Word, dialogue and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (34–61). Oxford : Wiley-Blackwell.
4. Genette, G. (1997). Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree. (Ch. Newman & Cl. Doubinsky, Trans.]. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
5. Wu, J. (2011). Understanding Interdiscursivity: A Pragmatic Model. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 6 (2–3), pp. 95–115.
6. Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge : Polity Press.
7. Fairclough, N. (2003). Analyzing Discourse: Text Analysis for Social Research. London : Routledge.
8. Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language (2nd ed.). London : Pearson Education ESL.
9. Pêcheux, M. (1982). *Language, semantics and ideology*. New York : St. Martin's Press.
10. Bhatia, V.K. (1993). Analysing Genre. Language use in professional settings. London-New York : Longman.
11. Bhatia, V.K. (1995). Genre-mixing in professional communication: the case of "private intentions" v. "socially recognized purposes". In P. Bruthiaux, T. Boswood, B. Bertha (Eds.), Explorations in English for Professional Communication (pp. 1–19). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
12. Bhatia, V.K. (2008). Genre Analysis, ESP and Professional Practice. English for Specific Purposes, 27, pp. 161–174.
13. Bhatia, V.K. (2012). Critical Reflections on Genre Analysis. Ibérica, 24, pp. 17–28.
14. Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
15. Linell, P. (1998). Discourse across boundaries: On recontextualizations and the blending of voices in professional discourse. *Text & talk: an interdisciplinary journal of language*, discourse & communication studies, 18 (2), pp. 143–157.
16. Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (2010). Recontextualizing European higher education policies: the cases of Austria and Romania. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7: 1, pp. 19–40.