

REVIEWS, SCIENTIFIC LIFE CHRONICLES

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ, ХРОНІКИ НАУКОВОГО ЖИТТЯ

UDC 81+82.0+81'25/02

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-23>

Sonia ZYNGIER

Doctor in Applied Linguistics, Adjunct Professor,
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6355-6407>

EXPERIENCING THE IN-BETWEEN: A GATEWAY INTO INTERMEDIALITY

For citation: Zyngier, S. (2025). Experiencing the In-Between: A Gateway into Intermediality. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 1, issue 29, pp. 388-396, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-23>



Introduction

My first reaction when I was invited to review *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies*, edited by Olga Vorobyova, Ruslana Savchuk, and Larysa Taranenko [2024], was to decline the task, as nine chapters from the total of 16 are written in Ukrainian. However, the seven remaining ones, the list of chapter titles, the accompanying abstracts, and the summary on pages 345–355 are in English and seemed to be quite challenging. Yielding to curiosity, I took the invitation as an opportunity to reflect on current and relevant issues in linguistics, semiotics, translation and literary studies. The interactions between various media and arts have by now become quite central especially to these fields. Could this collection indicate that intermediality reflects a change of paradigm or can it be considered just another trend? This was one of the reasons that made me decide to review it.

A paradigm shift?

The question posed by the editors in the foreword of the volume: “Intermediality in philological studies: a fashion trend or a new paradigm?” does not have an easy answer. Changes in thought in the Humanities are constant and gradual. They do not occur overnight, and it is hard

to determine when a paradigm shift occurs. The concept of “paradigm” in scientific thought was initially described and systematized by Thomas Kuhn [1962/1991]. Anikó Kálmán [2016, p. 96] points out that “[a]lthough critics chided him for his imprecise use of the expression, Kuhn was responsible for popularizing the term *paradigm*, which he described as essentially a collection of beliefs shared by scientists, a set of agreements about how problems are to be understood.” And she adds: “Indeed, a paradigm guides the research efforts of scientific communities, and it is this criterion that most clearly identifies a field as a science. A fundamental theme of Kuhn’s argument is that the typical developmental pattern of a mature science is the successive transition from one paradigm to another through a process of revolution” [Ibid., p. 96]. Before the transition occurs, however, many marginal theories grow until they destabilize and replace the centre. From Werner Wolf’s perspective, “[f]or some time the humanities and the study of literature in particular have witnessed yet another ‘turn’: the intermedial turn” [Wolf, 2011, p. 2]. Additionally, Bill Louw [2011, p. 174] observes that “New methods are born as a result of paradigm shifts and scientific revolutions. They are the *paths* that we adopt *after* they have been dictated by momentous discoveries in science.” Due to the new perspectives the studies presented in the collection bring, the question posed is whether this paradigm shift has occurred and whether the chapters in the volume reflect it.

Lost in lexis

The main keyword of the volume is “intermediality.” As explained by Olga Vorobyova [2021, p. 294], quoting after Irina Rajewsky, “Current use of the term *intermediality* is associated with the works of Aage A. Hansen-Löve, an Austrian scholar who in 1983 dwelt upon the correlation between intermediality and intertextuality, defining the former as phenomena in which individual media or their material manifestations – such as word and image – become inextricably bound to, or even ‘merged’ with one another and as such ‘are simultaneously and oscillatingly present’” [Rajewsky, 2005, p. 52].

However, according to Ágnes Pethö [2011, p. 1], this term is rather controversial as it depends on “the assumptions regarding the nature of mediality itself, with no shortage of various taxonomies and definitions concerning the types and categories of intermediality.”

Another complicating factor is that the terms “modality” and “mediality” seem at times to be used interchangeably. Even if we accept the current definition of “mediality,” in logic, semantics, and grammar, modality has traditionally been used in a quite different sense: it “is concerned with speakers’ attitudes and perspectives towards the propositions they express” [Wales, 1991, p. 302], or “*modality* refers broadly to a speaker’s attitude towards, or opinion about, the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence” [Simpson, 1993, p. 47].

Moreover, both “modality” and “mediality” are preceded by the prefixes multi-, pluri-, inter-, trans-, which add to the Babel of concepts and definitions. Hence, updating definitions are always welcome to prevent a less seasoned scholar from becoming lost in the forest of semantics.

In their seminal book and building on Halliday’s functional linguistics, Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen expand the notion of modality to visual communication. They explain: “The term ‘modality’ comes from linguistics and refers to the truth value or credibility of (linguistically realized) statements about the world [...] But modality is not only conveyed through these fairly clear-cut linguistic systems” [Kress, van Leeuwen, 1996, p. 160]. They add: “A spoken text is not just verbal but also visual, combining with ‘non-verbal’ modes of communication such as facial expression, gesture, posture and other forms of self-presentation. A written text, similarly, involves more than language: it is written *with* something (gold, ink, (en)gravings, dots of ink, etc.); with letters formed in systems influenced by aesthetic, psychological, pragmatic and other considerations, and with a layout imposed on the material substance, whether on the page, the computer screen or a polished brass plaque. The multimodality of written texts has, by and large, been ignored [...]. Today, in the age of ‘multimedia,’ it can suddenly be perceived again” [Ibid., p. 39]. Thus, from a social semiotic perspective, the authors pave the way towards a multimodal approach to artistic artefacts.

To provide a way out of the lexical maze, the image of a symbiotic relationship, where different parties benefit from the interaction, may be useful. More specifically, multimodality tends to be concerned with the tactics and strategies needed for the interplay of one or various

modes (hypertexts, photography, painting, architecture, film and theatre, etc.) when constructing a fictional narrative. According to Marie-Laure Ryan and Jan-Nöel Thon “Through *multimediality* [...] different types of signs combine within the same media object – for example, moving image, spoken language, music, and sometimes text in film – while through *intermediality*, texts of a given medium send tendrils toward other media” [Ryan, Thon, 2014, p. 10]. In this way, intermediality considers two or more media in a symbiotic relationship. In doing so, it shapes and changes the parties involved, creating a new fictionality. According to Werner Wolf “(inter)mediality can also be conceived of in both a narrow and a broad way: the narrow sense focuses on the participation of more than one medium within a human artefact,” and a broader one which “applies to any transgression of boundaries between conventionally distinct media and thus comprises both ‘intra-’ and ‘extra-compositional’ relations between different media” [Wolf, 2011, p. 252].

Objectives and methodology

One of the reasons that make *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* a timely publication is the fact that, being grounded in a multidisciplinary methodology, it offers various applications by means of analysing a range of works of art from the perspective of linguists, literary and translation scholars. This multiplicity stands as evidence that a paradigm shift may be in progress. A close observation of the keywords in English that accompany all the chapters will reveal the wealth of different media involved and consequently the distinct methodological approaches. The reader is thus introduced to multiple intermedial interactions between literary texts and architecture, cinematic discourse, music (jazz, song, literary musicalization, or music-driven eroticism), photography, drama and theatrical production, visual arts, and translations. Through the numerous analyses and illustrations, the reader is thus able to realize what the notions of intermediality and all the different prefixes that modify the term “modality” imply.

Given the above, *the aim* of this review is, at least, a double one. First, to verify, by way of *comparative analysis*, the validity of the authors’ assumption that the current research centrality of intermediality as well as adjacent phenomena might be regarded as a marker of paradigm shift in philological studies. Second, to outline the scope of pedagogical implications related to the issues, both theoretical and applied, brought up in the volume, when the latter are scrutinised through the lens of language and literature classroom.

Seven chapters discussed

As mentioned above, the volume brings together 16 chapters, seven of which are in English. Four of these belong to Part 1, one to Part 2 and two are the only ones in Part 3. In Part 1, “Linguopoetics of Intermediality,” Chrzanowska-Kluczevska (Chapter 1) presents an original contribution to the poetics of architecture. She argues that within this concept one must distinguish between the *language of architecture* (i.e. non-verbal medium perceived as analogical to verbal poetic text) and *the language about architecture* (i.e. verbal description of architectural structures). She explains how the first instance is realized by figurative representation whereas ekphrasis prevails in the latter. The material the author uses comes from guidebooks and travel literature describing Buddhist religious monuments in Tibet and Nepal. Quoting Siglind Bruhn [2000, p. 8], she explains ekphrasis as “a representation in one medium of a text composed in another medium” [Chrzanowska-Kluczevska, 2024, p. 34] and points out that “[i]ntermedial and transmedial relationships between the verbal and architectural media are as if axiomatically assumed” [ibid., p. 27]. A more detailed definition of ekphrasis can be found in Peter Verdonk: “Literary ekphrasis, as it ultimately evolved from rhetoric, can be taken in a wider and a narrower sense. In the wider sense, it is a detailed description of any real or imagined object or scene, or of an abstract idea, mental image or state of emotion. In the more restricted sense, ekphrasis is associated with poetry addressing not only works of visual art, such as paintings, tapestries and sculpture, but also architectural art, and functional artefacts such as goblets, vases, and weaponry like swords, shields and suits of armour. In this case too, all these objects may be real or fictional” [Verdonk, 2005, p. 233]. A pleasure to read, this chapter shows how buildings and other

physical phenomena can be experienced by means of verbal descriptions, using various kinds of tropes besides metaphors.

Also, in Part 1 and from a communicative pragmatic and experimental phonetic perspective, Tetyana Sayenko (Chapter 5) analyses two WWII resistance public speeches, one by King George in 1939 and the other one by Winston Churchill in 1940, comparing them to their respective cinematographic and musical renderings, also including the reference to two duelling songs in the film *Casablanca*. Her results indicate that certain rhythmic, temporal and intonation patterns constitute what she calls a rhetoric of resistance and that the mode of speech delivery and the speaker's voice reveal the true nature of the speaker and may affect the audience's response. Like Chapter 1, Chapter 5 makes a delightful reading. Tetyana Sayenko justifies her alignment with intermediality by saying that "[t]he multimodal nature of inspirational speeches makes them unique verbal art forms that can create new spaces of meaning, thus transforming political and cultural realities" [Sayenko, 2024, p. 123]. The chapter concludes that "the emotional transformation of both the speaker and his audience is the result of the multimodal (and intermedial) interaction of the tools affecting the perception" [Ibid., p. 143].

Like Chapter 5, Chapter 7 examines the rhetoric of war in public speeches, also in Winston Churchill's 1940 address and in the film *The Darkest Hour*. A detailed analysis of verbal and non-verbal rhetorical devices in three video media leads Yaroslava Fedoriv to hold that anti- and pro-war messages are genre-dependent in the sense that logical arguments characterize documentary whereas feature films tend to be more emotional. She concludes that "[f]rom the intermediality perspective, a message can be amplified if accompanied with supporting channels that impact the audience's senses: colour, sound, size, movement, and the like, with contrasts playing a crucial role in the message perception" [Fedoriv, 2024, p. 181].

These chapters (1, 5 and 7), however rich, unique, varied and detailed in their analyses, do not seem to draw a clear boundary between intermediality, transmediality and multimodality. This is one of the reasons I believe an opening theoretical chapter spelling out the differences between the working terminologies would be opportune.

Also, in line with the previous chapters in Part 1, Chapter 9 looks into multimodal representation of the image of "pillars" as a metaphor in English-language political discourse on Europe. It examines how long the metaphor remains a novelty before its use becomes conventional. In terms of methodology, the study relies on corpus analysis. The data derived mainly from two online text corpora: Europarl 3: English Corpus, composed from the proceedings of the European Parliament dated 1996 and 2006, and the British National Corpus. For the online visual corpus, VisMet 1.0, online corpus of about 350 images from political cartoons, advertising, artworks, or other categories was used. Other sources were also used, such as entries for the word "pillar" in three well-known dictionaries (The Oxford English Dictionary, Macmillan and Merriam Webster). Anna Kryvenko concludes that the degree of conventionality or novelty of monomodal and multimodal expressions must be placed in a continuum, **depending on the genre and the aims of various social actors**. The cline of novelty / conventionality depends on the communicative purposes of different social actors as well as specific genres, which can be modified within individual situational contexts. The author also shows that there are semantic differences between verbal and visual metaphors that must be taken into account. Here, the word "intermediality" is not used. Instead, the focus is on mono-multi-modality. Anna Kryvenko defines multimodality as "the co-occurrence and interplay of different semiotic resources for making meaning" [Kryvenko, 2024, p. 211], adding to the definitions presented above.

In Part 2 ("Intermediality in Literary Studies"), Chapter 12 contributes to research in intermediality by examining the works of Boris Mikhailov, who belongs to the Kharkiv School of Photography. Here, Michele Vangi offers an analysis of the photographer's work *Unfinished Dissertation*, which presents an interplay between text and personal pictures. The material selected allows the author to define the term "iconotext: a work that combines text and image in a multiform fusion, linking two apparently irreducible objects to create a new one" [Vangi, 2024 p. 273], and shows how Mikhailov's art is an instance of political dissidence, opposing the narrative of Soviet realism.

Many artists have combined texts and photography, or what is called "photographic poetics" to create narratives, or iconotexts. At the exhibition in the J. Paul Getty Museum, *In Focus: Writing for the Camera*, on view from February 22 through May 29, 2022, the connection between writing

and photography was displayed. As announced, the “exhibition showcases imaginative, conceptual approaches to the practice of combining written words and photographic images during the last 50 years [...]. ‘Modern and contemporary artists have often employed a variety of media to create their work, and many incorporated photography into their practices,’ says Timothy Potts, Maria Hummer-Tuttle and Robert Tuttle Director of the J. Paul Getty Museum. This exhibition celebrates the fruitful conversations that such different media can spark when brought together” [Tate, 2022].

Having read the chapter, experiencing the artwork in the exhibition does indeed prove the “Vitality of a photographic iconotext,” which is the subtitle of the chapter’s Section 6. More collected publications on the subject would definitely be welcome.

The two chapters that close the book belong to Part 3, “Intermediality from the Translation Studies Perspective.” In Chapter 15, Tetiana Nekriach and Ruslana Dovhanchyna probe the similarities and differences between interlingual and intersemiotic translation of fiction. They make a distinction between the strategies and the tactics used in transposing literary texts into different media, such as theatre or cinema. The strategies involve domestication and foreignization whereas the tactics are seen as a specific way of solving a particular problem by means of different practices, such as omission, generalization, concretisation, replacement, compensation and transposition. Their main concern is how far intersemiotic translation can go beyond linguistic constraints. The authors conclude that literary texts and intersemiotic translations often clash regarding their stage or screen transposition, distancing the representation from the primary source. The reason, they argue, is that “interpretations are multiple, subjective, highly dependent on various social, ideological and artistic factors” [Nekriach, Dovhanchyna, 2024, p. 335].

In the final chapter, Oleksandr Rebrii addresses the intersemiotic translation of verbal descriptions and their corresponding illustrations in children’s literature and points out the difficulty of the transposition due to various social and cultural differences. He details four strategies used: (1) the translation of the verbal component only; (2) the translation of both visual and verbal components requiring two professionals (an interlingual and an intersemiotic translator); (3) a choice between translating either the verbal or the visual component (or a partial and/or altered adaptation); (4) translating only the verbal while omitting the illustration altogether [Rebrii, 2024]. Numerous examples are provided, but especially interesting is the difficulty of translating Rudyard Kipling’s short story *How the Alphabet was Made*, illustrated in the original work with Latin letters to Ukrainian Cyrillic, or transposing Anatole Bilenko’s East Slavic hero in *Kolobok* to the Anglo-Saxon world. The author holds that deciding on how to translate both text and illustration is a complex issue, having to take into account the culture, the context and the market.

The structure

The point I would like to raise here refers to the way the chapters were organized. All the abstracts and the chapters discussed above indicate that the first part of the volume offers nine quite varied studies under the umbrella title of “Linguopoetics of Intermediality.” However, four of them (Chapter 5, 7, 8, 9) address the interrelations between political issues and the different mediatic manifestations. Perhaps they could have deserved a separate section, since they seem to be in line in terms of their focus. The other chapters in Part 1, the language of architecture (Chapter 1), musicalization of literary prose (Chapter 2), an essay on visual arts (Chapter 3), a linguistic narrative of French artistic discourse of the 18th to 21st century (Chapter 4), and the construction of emotion in film discourse based on Halliday’s social semiotics (Chapter 6), these could remain under the umbrella title of Part 1. Instead of three parts, the book would have displayed more unity and balance if Part 1 had been broken into two. This would have allowed the reader to perceive more clearly the wide scope of intermedial studies. Besides, the Résumé at the end provides a brief account of the overall purpose of the book. However, due to the relevance of the publication, perhaps a more expanded opening chapter in English situating and defining intermediality would have been quite welcome to an international audience.

Pedagogical applications

The collected chapters in *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* systematize and update the theory, applying it to many different contexts. They are thought-provoking and may provide a springboard for pedagogical applications.

In the teaching of language and literature, earlier trends in this direction can be felt. One of them is parts of the programme in Literary Awareness [Zyngier, 1994], which can benefit from the theoretical support the book provides. For example, aiming at intermediate (A2/B1 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) English as a foreign language (EFL) teens at a government-sponsored high school, Viana and Zyngier [2022] describe a unit adopting a four-phase model: (1) sensitizing students to the role of dialogues in context; (2) verbalizing their understanding of the main concepts; (3) identifying stylistic features; and, especially, (4) applying the recently acquired knowledge to new contexts and media, including, for instance, documenting all the decisions for the staging of a scene that students have read and deciding on: the venue (e.g., the kind of playhouse it will be performed at, the maximum number of seats, location, etc.); the target audience (e.g., age group); the critics to be invited to write reviews (e.g., the types of publications where they want the reviews to be published); the merchandise to be sold before/after the performance (e.g., programs, CDs / DVDs, T-shirts); the sponsors who would like to be associated with this play; the setting where the scene takes place (e.g., time of day, lighting, objects on stage); the music (e.g., song, live or recorded performance, volume); the actors (e.g., age, costume, make-up, manner of speaking, body movement, position on stage, relationship between the characters, the intention implied in their speeches).

Another possibility is providing more theoretical support for Unit 12 in *Developing Awareness in Literature* [Zyngier, 2002], where students are asked to act as mediators in the LITERATURE system [Schmidt, 1982]. Here literary works are placed in the field of social interactions, and students are asked to discuss cover designs (colours, layout, pictures, paperback / hardback), price range, location of sale etc. for some of the literary texts presented. Their decisions must be based on their textual interpretation.

In addition, a multimodal semiosis of different book covers of a novel could be enlightening for students of both literature and language [see, for example, Nørgaard, 2023, p. 510]. The study of advertising could also help students see the relationship between language and culture through the fictions it creates its “verbal play, compressed story-telling, stylized acting, photography, cartoons, puns and rhythms” [Cook, 1992, p. xv]. In a more recent coursebook, Ronald Carter and Angela Goddard [2016] **open new vistas into a wide variety of language aspects by building from students’ actual experience and working with many different kinds of media and settings.**

Contributing to the experimental data on pedagogical applications, Chesnokova [2016] selected a poem by Emily Dickinson (*A Slash of Blue*) to see if the medium of presentation affected students’ responses. Participants (135 graduate and undergraduate students majoring in English Philology or Translation Studies from a Ukrainian Humanities Department) were separated into five groups: Groups 1 and 3 read the poem in a conventional classroom environment, Group 4 in a survey on Facebook, and Group 5 listened to the poem on YouTube. The results Chesnokova obtained from a questionnaire provided enough empirical evidence to conclude that medium by means of which students are presented to a text does indeed affect the response. Interestingly enough, the authentic version used in the classroom contributed mostly to the negative assessment data. As one can see, the pedagogical applications of multimodality and intermediality are manifold.

Conclusion

All in all, that *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* provides a metalanguage, methodological strategies and applications that help the teacher, the scholar, the translator, and the reader in general understand what can by now be considered a paradigmatic change in the studies of Humanities. That said, one cannot review a book on intermediality without considering its cover and how it reflects its content. Ingeniously, the design features a large “I,” standing for “intermediality,” at the center of a Venn diagram, which represents the logical relationships between the intersecting modes. Each circle stands for one of the key topics explored in the chapters.

Having experienced the wealth of diverse intermedial interactions that the chapters provide, one closes the book with a much more enriched and expanded vision of the innovations resulting from the melding of arts and various media. I feel definitely rewarded for having accepted the challenge.

References

- Bruhn, S. (2000). *Musical Ekphrasis: Composers Responding to Poetry and Painting*. Hillsdale: Pendragon.
- Carter, R., Goddard, A. (2016). *How to Analyse Texts: A toolkit for students of English*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Chesnokova, A. (2016). Empirical stylistics in an EFL teaching context: comparing virtual and face-to-face reader responses. In M. Burke, O. Fialho, S. Zyngier (Eds.), *Scientific Approaches to Literature in Learning Environments* (pp. 105-124). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chrzanowska-Kluczevska, E. (2024). Poetics of architecture – Architectural ekphrasis and architectural topology. Buddhist religious monuments of art in Tibet and Nepal in the 20th-century travel writing. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 25-52). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.
- Cook, G. (1992). *The Discourse of Advertising*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Fediriv, Ya. (2024). War discourse in film: A triple perspective of intermediality. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 166-182). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.
- Kálmán, A. (2016). The meaning and importance of Thomas Kuhn's concept of 'Paradigm Shift.' How does it apply in Education? *Opus et Educatio*, 3 (2), 96-107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3311/ope.85>
- Kress, G., van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- Kryvenko, A. (2024). A multimodal perspective on representations of pillars in European political discourse. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 209-230). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962/1991). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (Portuguese transl.: *A Estrutura das Revoluções Científicas*. SP: Editora Perspectiva).
- Louw, B. (2011). Philosophical and literary concerns in Corpus Linguistics. In V. Viana, S. Zyngier, G. Barnbrook (Eds.), *Perspectives on Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 171-196). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sci.48.11lou>
- Nekriach, T., Dovhanchyna, R. (2024). Interlingual and intersemiotic translation of fiction: Similarities and dissimilarities. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 323-337). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.
- Nørgaard, N. (2023). Multimodality and stylistics. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics* (pp. 506-520). London, New York: Routledge.
- Pethö, Á. (2011). *Cinema and Intermediality: The Passion for the In-Between*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rajewsky, I.O. (2005). Intermediality, Intertextuality and 'Remediation': A literary perspective on Intermediality. *Intermedialités / Intermediality*, 6, 43-64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1005505ar>
- Rebrii, O. (2024). Translating children's literature. Intersemiotic perspectives. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 338-353). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.
- Ryan, M.L., Thon, J.N. (2014). Storyworlds across Media: Introduction. In M.L. Ryan, J.N. Thon (Eds.), *Storyworlds across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology* (pp. 1-21). Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sayenko, T. (2024). The rhetoric of resistance: Multimodality and intermediality. In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 122-145). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.

Schmidt, S.J. (1982). *Foundation for the Empirical Study Literature. The Components of a Basic Theory* (Transl. by R. de Beaugrande). Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London, New York: Routledge.

Tate, V. (Ed.). (2022). Exploring the Connection between Writing and Photography (*In Focus: Writing for the Camera*). Getty. Retrieved from <https://www.getty.edu/news/exploring-the-connection-between-writing-and-photography/>

Vangi, M. (2024). Challenging the borders of intermediality studies: Boris Mikhailov's "Unfinished Dissertation". In O. Vorobyova, R. Savchuk, L. Taranenko, (Eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies* (pp. 272-284). Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.

Verdonk, P. (2005). Painting, poetry, parallelism: ekphrasis, stylistics and cognitive poetics. *Language and Literature*, 14 (3), 231-244. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947005054479>

Viana, V., Zygier, S. (2022). Dialogue and drama in high-school contexts: Using literary awareness in English as a foreign language education. In H. Hansen-Thomas, L. Lopriore (Eds.), *Transforming Practices for the English as a Foreign Language Classroom* (pp. 73-90). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.

Vorobyova, O. (2021). Verbal holography, music, and emotions in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Nocturnes*. In A. Pawelec, A. Shaw, G. Szpila (Eds.), *Text – Image – Music: Crossing the Borders. Intermedial Conversations on the Poetics of Verbal, Visual and Musical Texts. In Honour of Prof. Elżbieta Chrzanowska-Kluczevska* (pp. 293-320). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Vorobyova, O., Savchuk, R., Taranenko, L. (Eds.). (2024). *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies*. Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House.

Wales, K. (1991). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman.

Wolf, W. (2011). (Inter)mediality and the Study of Literature. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 13 (3), 2-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1789>

Zygier, S. (1994). *At the Crossroads of Language and Literature: Literary Awareness, Stylistics, and the Acquisition of Literary Skills in a EFL Context*. PhD thesis. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Zygier, S. (2002). *Developing Awareness in Literature*. Rio de Janeiro: Faculdade de Letras / UFRJ.

ДОСВІД ПОГРАНИЧЧЯ: ШЛЯХ ДО РОЗУМІННЯ ІНТЕРМЕДІАЛЬНОСТІ

Рецензію присвячено обговоренню змісту та обсягу проблематики, розглянутої у колективній монографії «Міждисциплінарні обрії інтермедіальності: лінгвістика – літературознавство – перекладознавство» (під редакцією О.П. Воробйової, Р.І. Савчук та Л.І. Тараненко) (Київ, 2024), де зібрано праці двадцяти відомих вчених з України, Польщі, Японії, Італії та Нової Зеландії. У рецензії аналізується у зіставному ключі, на тлі звернення до суміжних за термінологією явищ, припущення, висловлене у монографії, стосовно того, що розбудова студій інтермедіальності може маркувати певне парадигмальне зміщення у гуманітаристиці. Доведення цієї гіпотези з опертям на міждисциплінарний методологічний підхід є і метою викладених у монографії студій. На тлі розрізнення медіальності й модальності в рецензії висвітлено симбіотичні зв'язки між ними, які ґрунтуються на взаємодії різних медіа (літературно-художнього, кінематографічного, театрального, музичного, політичного, полемічного) і мистецтв (архітектури, художньої літератури, образотворчого мистецтва, художньої кінематографії, документаристики, риторики, політичної карикатуристики, книжкових ілюстрацій, драматургії, фотографії), а також на мультимодальному підході до мистецьких артефактів. У детальному огляді розділів, написаних англійською мовою і присвячених мові архітектури та стосовно архітектури, публічним промовам супротиву у їхньому кінематографічному та музичному поданні, особливо тим, що спираються на воєнну риторичку, використанню образу колон (стовпів) у дискурсі Євросоюзу, а також поетиці фотографії та проблематиці інтерсеміотичного перекладу, окреслюються, у межах супровідної мети огляду, деякі можливості дидактичного застосування засадничих положень та дослідницьких здобутків, репрезентованих у монографії, у різних сферах навчання, включаючи ті, які спрямовано на розвиток літературної обізнаності студентів. Таке застосування може торкатися розбудови стилістичної чутливості читачів до звичних чи новітніх контекстів та середовищ на тлі розміщення мистецьких творів у полі соціальної взаємодії і встановлення зв'язків між мовою та

культурою крізь призму створених ними уявних світів. Коментуючи особливості структури монографії, авторка зазначає, що книга, обкладинка якої відзеркалює злиття мистецтва і різноманітних поняттєвих та дискурсивних середовищ, що складає зміст її розділів, є дуже очікуваним виданням, у якому інтермедіальність позиціоновано як феномен, що концентрує у собі естетичні, політичні та соціальні роздуми сьогодення.

Ключові слова: інтермедіальність, мультимодальність, мова художньої літератури, екфразис, інтерсеміотичний переклад, парадигмальні зміни, симбіотичні зв'язки, педагогічне застосування, літературна обізнаність

EXPERIENCING THE IN-BETWEEN: A GATEWAY INTO INTERMEDIALITY

Sonia Zyngier, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)

e-mail: sonia.zyngier@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-23>

Key words: *intermediality, multimodality, language of literature, language of art, ekphrasis, intersemiotic translation, paradigm shift, symbiotic relationship, pedagogical applications, literary awareness*

This review discusses the scope and extent of the volume *Cross-Disciplinary Horizons of Intermediality: Linguistics – Literary Studies – Translation Studies*, edited by Olga Vorobyova, Ruslana Savchuk, and Larysa Taranenko (Kyiv, 2024), which brings together the contribution of twenty prominent scholars from Ukraine, Poland, Japan, Italy, and New Zealand. *The review aims to examine, while applying a comparative analysis, the argument postulated in the volume as its objective that intermedial studies tend to mark a paradigm shift in the Humanities while addressing related terminological issues in the area, relying upon a multidisciplinary methodology.* Discriminating between mediality and modality, the review highlights their symbiotic relationship grounded in the interaction of various media (literary, cinematic, theatrical, musical, political, polemic) and arts (architecture, fiction, music, visual arts, feature movies, documentaries, rhetoric, political cartoons, book illustrations, drama, photography) as well as a multimodal approach to artistic artefacts. **Suggesting a detailed overview of the chapters written in English, which focus on the language of and about architecture, resistant public speeches in cinematographic and musical rendering, particularly addressing the rhetoric of war, the image of pillars in EU related discourse as well as poetics of photography and the issues of intersemiotic translation,** the reviewer outlines some pedagogical applications linked to a few relevant studies in the field, including those that are aimed to cultivate the university students' literary awareness. **Such applications, the outlining of which is an additional objective of the review, may concern developing stylistic sensitivity to traditional and innovative contexts and media, while approaching artistic works placed in the field of social interactions and establishing links between language and culture through fictional worlds they create.** Commenting upon the structure of the monographic study, the review indicates that the volume, whose cover vividly mirrors the melding of arts and media represented in its chapters, is a much welcome publication which situates intermediality as a phenomenon involving aesthetic, political, and social reflections of our times.

Дата надходження до редакції / Submitted: 31.05.2024

Дата прийняття до публікації / Accepted: 14.01.2025

Дата публікації / Published: 03.06.2025