



УДК 811.111'38'42:659.3  
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-3426/2026-1-6>

## MEDIATEXT IN THE PARADIGM OF INTERTEXTUALITY

**Prihodko Ganna Illivna,**  
Doctor of o Philological Sciences, Professor,  
Professor at the Department of English Philology and Linguodidactics  
*Zaporizhzhia National University*  
anna.prihodko.55@gmail.com  
orcid.org/0000-0001-6220-5333

*This article offers a comprehensive analysis of media texts within the paradigm of intertextuality, viewed as one of the core categories of contemporary linguistics, media linguistics, and mass communication theory. Intertextuality is interpreted as a multidimensional phenomenon integrating linguistic, cultural-semiotic, cognitive-communicative, and discourse-oriented approaches to the text analysis. The study outlines the principal theoretical perspectives on intertextuality, distinguishing between broad (cultural and literary) and narrow (linguistic and applied) interpretations, and demonstrates their relevance for the investigation of mass mediatexts. Special attention is given to the classification and modelling of intertextuality, including intertextuality proper, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality, as applied to media discourse. The article examines the specific role of a quotation in journalistic texts and differentiates between its fact-oriented informational function and its evaluative, image-forming function based on precedent texts and cultural references. The intertextual dimension is shown to contribute significantly to the meaning construction, textual playfulness, and interpretative strategies in media communication. The study also addresses genre hybridity and contamination in modern media, highlighting the interaction between journalism, advertising, and public relations, which raises important professional and ethical concerns. Emphasis is placed on the multimodal, polycode, and creolized nature of contemporary media texts, shaped by the technological development and the diversity of media platforms and communication channels. The paper concludes that intertextuality constitutes an ontological property of media texts and functions as a flexible and productive analytical framework. It enables a systematic understanding of media texts at semantic, structural, and semiotic levels and provides valuable insights into the mechanisms of meaning production in mass communication.*

**Key words:** mediatext, intertextuality, mass communication, mediadiscourse, genre hybridity, multimodality.

## МЕДІАТЕКСТ У ПАРАДИГМІ ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТІ

**Приходько Ганна Іллівна,**  
доктор філологічних наук, професор  
професор кафедри англійської філології та лінгводидактики  
*Запорізький національний університет*  
anna.prihodko.55@gmail.com  
orcid.org/0000-0001-6220-5333

*У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз медіатексту в парадигмі інтертекстуальності як однієї з базових категорій сучасної лінгвістики, медіалінгвістики та теорії масової комунікації. Інтертекстуальність розглядається як багатовимірний феномен, що поєднує лінгвістичні, культурно-семіотичні, когнітивно-комунікативні та дискурсивні підходи до аналізу тексту. Окреслено основні теоретичні напрями осмислення інтертекстуальності. У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз медіатексту в парадигмі інтертекстуальності як однієї з базових категорій сучасної лінгвістики, медіалінгвістики та теорії масової комунікації. Інтертекстуальність розглядається як багатовимірний феномен, що поєднує лінгвістичні, культурно-семіотичні, когнітивно-комунікативні та дискурсивні підходи до аналізу тексту. Окреслено основні теоретичні напрями осмислення інтертекстуальності. У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз медіатексту в парадигмі інтертекстуальності як однієї з базових категорій сучасної лінгвістики, медіалінгвістики та теорії масової комунікації. Інтертекстуальність розглядається як багатовимірний феномен, що поєднує лінгвістичні, культурно-семіотичні, когнітивно-комунікативні та дискурсивні підходи до аналізу тексту. Окреслено основні теоретичні напрями осмислення інтертекстуальності – широкий (культурологічний, літературознавчий) та вузький (власне лінгвістичний), а також показано їхню продуктивність у дослідженні текстів масової комунікації. Особливу увагу приділено класифікаціям і моделям інтертекстуальності, зокрема інтертекстуальності власне, паратекстуальності, метатекстуальності, гіпертекстуальності та архітекстуальності, у проекції на*



медіадискурс. Проаналізовано специфіку цитатності в журналістських текстах, виокремлено її інформативно-фактологічний та оцінно-образний рівні, пов'язані з функціонуванням прецедентних текстів і феноменів. Показано роль інтертекстів у формуванні смислової структури медіатексту, його ігрового потенціалу та стратегій інтерпретації. Окремо розглянуто процеси жанрової контамінації, гетерогенності та інтеграції журналістики з іншими комунікативними практиками, зокрема рекламою та PR, що актуалізує професійно-етичні проблеми сучасних медіа. Наголошено на мультимодальній, полікодовій та креолізованій природі сучасних медіатекстів, зумовленій розвитком цифрових технологій і різноманіттям каналів масової комунікації.

Зроблено висновок, що інтертекстуальність є онтологічною властивістю медіатексту та універсальним аналітичним інструментом, який дає змогу виявити його специфіку на змістовому, структурному й семіотичному рівнях.

**Ключові слова:** медіатекст, інтертекстуальність, масова комунікація, медіадискурс, жанрова гетерогенність, мультимодальність.

**Introduction.** Modern theory of intertextuality, which occupies a leading position in the interpretation of linguistic phenomena, is closely connected with traditional notions of functional styles based on the social nature of language, the concepts of connotation and context, as well as with discourse theory and cognitive-communicative and cultural-semiotic paradigms.

The word **intertextuality** has become a kind of magic word with which scholars attempt to open all doors leading into the “textual universe” (Allen, 2000). Relying on the ideas of intertextuality, new oppositions have entered scholarly usage: text – intertext, supertext, supercontext, hypertext, precedent text, polycode text, etc., which testify to the identification of new or relatively new types of texts or aspects of textual functioning.

The global divergence in approaches to intertextuality as textual openness is based on the understanding of the phenomenon itself in a broad sense (largely literary and cultural-semiotic) and a narrow sense (linguistic and applied).

Within the radical model (transtextuality, pan-textuality), which connects a text with the cultural-historical experience of humanity and the general literary process, mass communication texts constitute part of the global communicative process. The “mosaic” information of newspapers, magazines, radio, and television collectively reconstructs a modified picture of the world.

**Connection between Media and Culture.** Researchers note that media texts exist in our consciousness “rather as hypertexts that include myriads of associative links, a web of cross-references, the ‘sensory fabric of consciousness’ woven from a multitude of images and fleeting moods” (Rajewsky, 2005: 43–64). The media organize and structure the dynamically changing picture of the world through regularly reproduced themes. In the formation of “stable media topics,” linguocultural factors and national-cultural specificity play a crucial role.

Researchers consider the relationship between the media and culture differently. Since mass communication texts are characterized by one-time use and non-reproducibility (“one-day texts”). Newspaper texts (and even more so television and radio broadcasts) are indeed ephemeral and not reprinted. However, with the spread of the Internet, the modes of information storage and dissemination have changed: websites of many periodicals and electronic media provide open access to archives of all issues and collections of radio and television programs.

As products of mass culture, the media serve the formation of mass culture as a social environment, act as a source of cultural information, and function as a model of national-cultural specificity in verbal communication. Therefore, mass communication materials can and should be viewed as a fragment of national culture that offers a fairly complete picture of political, economic, and sociocultural processes (Struzziero, 2019: 91–104). The author and the audience are separated in time but not in the semiotic space.

Within the narrow model of intertextuality, textual openness appears as a specific property of certain types of texts containing explicit references to preceding texts. Such textual interactions are established at the semantic level (a ‘dialogue’ of texts marked by specific linguistic signals, the material level (text as a polycode sign), and the structural-compositional level.

**Concept of intertextuality.** The phenomenon of intertextuality is represented in various classifications and terminologies. Intertextual phenomena are grouped into two major classes: typological intertextuality as a textual category and thematic intertextuality, which arises when “the author intentionally thematizes the interaction between texts, making it visible to the reader through special formal means” (Juvan, 2008). Some scholars speak about intertextuality proper (“text within a text”), paratextuality, metatextuality (“text about a text”), hypertextuality, archi-textuality, intertext as a trope or stylistic figure,



poetic paradigm, and others (McQuail, Deuze, 2020; Sullivan, 2003: 194–197).

Some approaches clearly distinguish between intertextuality and intertextual relations (Hutcheon, 1989). Intertextual relations are viewed as one component of a broader system of intertextual links formed by paradigmatic, syntagmatic, intertextual, hypertextual, and derivational relations. Derivational relations appear in the “source text – derivative text” correlation and involve three main processes:

- 1) expansion (e.g., short story – screenplay – film);
- 2) reduction (e.g., annotation, theses);
- 3) complication, involving functional transformation (e.g., advertising texts embedded in a literary work).

**Types of intertextuality.** Let us consider the proposed content-based and structural models of intertextuality as applied to mass communication texts. Intertextuality proper, understood as the direct coexistence of two or more texts within one (in the form of quotation, hint, or image), is a specific feature of media texts.

Quotation material in media texts falls into two qualitatively different groups. The first is related to the media’s orientation toward representing (or rather transforming) reality, where journalistic information is based on social facts. Journalists draw information from contemporary life, quoting speeches of politicians and public figures, referring to expert opinions, and citing information sources. Reality itself becomes an object of quotation, serving to enhance objectivity, credibility, and verifiability.

The second intertextual layer consists of quotations with linguocultural value that shape imagery and evaluation. This quotation fund is described through such terms as precedent text, precedent phenomenon, intertexteme, cultural sign, logoevisteme, textual reminiscences, allusions, and speech clichés.

In mass communication, sources of intertexts include the “classical” cultural canon (literature, myths, folklore) and mass communication itself, which disseminates expressions from various contemporary discourses (political, youth, conversational, advertising). Such precedents are culturally connoted, expressive, and figurative, intensifying the playful aspect of the text and guiding interpretation.

At the same time, scholars note the negative effects of excessive cliché usage, leading to semantic dispersion and the absence of coherent logic (Bezemer, Kress, 2015).

Paratextuality, or intratextual openness, is manifested in media through relationships between the main text and its headline complex (headlines, subheadings, leads, captions, inserts). This aspect structures meaning development and spatial organization on the page.

Metatextuality, understood as commentary or critical evaluation of one text by another, is a key feature of media texts, which are often “secondary texts” that systematize and reinterpret primary texts.

Hypertextuality, in its literary sense, refers to parody or mockery and is limited in media to specific genres of artistic journalism. Today, however, the term **hypertext** is firmly associated with Internet communication as a system of non-linear references.

Typological intertextuality (architextuality) implies the reproducibility of textual models and is considered a universal textual feature. This approach accounts for openness at the level of structural models and genre prototypes.

**Conclusions.** Modern media texts exhibit genre contamination, hybridity, and multimodality. They integrate verbal, visual, auditory, and audiovisual components, forming a “new communicative product” capable of functioning across various media platforms.

Thus, intertextuality explains textual interaction at semantic, structural, and semiotic levels. For mass communication texts, intertextuality is an ontological property and a flexible analytical construct revealing the specificity of media texts. Consequently, interpreting media texts through the prism of intertextuality has become a key analytical approach in media studies.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Allen G. Intertextuality. New York: Routledge, 2000. 238 p.
2. Bezemer J., & Kress G. Multimodality, learning and communication. London: Routledge, 2015. 170 p.
3. Hutcheon L. Historiographic Metafiction Parody and the Intertextuality of History. *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Ed. by P. O'Donnell, R. Con Davis. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989. P. 3–32.
4. McQuail D. & Deuze M. McQuail's media and mass communication theory. London: SAGE, 2020. 688 p.
5. Rajewsky I. O. Intermediality, intertextuality, and remediation: A literary perspective on intermediality. *Intermedialités / Intermediality*, 2005. 6, P. 43–64.
6. Struzziero M. A. «Make it new» to return as rupture and difference: a study of Jeanette Winterson's *The Gap of Time*. *The Poetics of Fragmentation in Contemporary British and American Fiction*. Ed. by V. Guignery, W. Drag. Malaga: Vernon Press, 2019. P. 91–104.
7. Sullivan, G. (2003). Seeing visual culture. *Studies in art education*, 2003. 44 (3). P. 194–197.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Allen G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. New York: Routledge, 238 p.
2. Bezemer J., & Kress G. (2015). *Multimodality, learning and communication*. London: Routledge, 170 p.
3. Hutcheon L. (1989). Historiographic Metafiction Parody and the Intertextuality of History. *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Ed. by P. O'Donnell, R. Con Davis. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, P. 3–32.
4. McQuail D. & Deuze M. (2020). *McQuail's media and mass communication theory*. London: SAGE, 688 p.
5. Rajewsky I. O. (2005). Intermediality, intertextuality, and remediation: A literary perspective on intermediality. *Intermedialités / Intermediality*, 6, P. 43–64.
6. Struzziero M. A. (2019). «Make it new» to return as rupture and difference: a study of Jeanette Winterson's *The Gap of Time*. *The Poetics of Fragmentation in Contemporary British and American Fiction*. Ed. by V. Guignery, W. Drag. Malaga: Vernon Press, P. 91–104.
7. Sullivan, G. (2003). Seeing visual culture. *Studies in art education*, 44 (3), P. 194–197.

*Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 29.04.2026*  
*Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 22.05.2026*  
*Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.05.2026*