Intermediality and Literary Modernism Research: Becoming, Justification, Perspectives[1]

Mykyta Isagulov

This paper is an attempt to answer the question of *why* intermediality and its 'toolbox' are important for literary research, in particular, the study of modernist texts. The discussion covers the theoretical matters of the intermediality theory as a logical continuation of intertextuality studies, intermediality's key foci. It also focuses on the concept's popularity reflected in the unique binary of terminological and methodological inconsistency and intermediality's serving as an umbrella term for multiple notions and phenomena. It also attempts to find definitions acceptable for a literature-based intermediality analysis, as well as to demonstrate the uniqueness and importance of a literary medium through an overview of the historic development of media, the growth of literature's importance since the eighteenth century, as well as the current postmodernist and post-structuralist vision. It draws upon possible results of the application of intermediality to modernist literature studies and applicable methodology, and concludes by stressing the importance of a literary medium and the need for an interpretative approach to the phenomena under the intermedial umbrella.

Key words: art studies, cultural studies, medium, media, intermediality, text, intertextuality, interart, modernism.

Introduction

The choice of this topic was mandated by the perception of intermediality among literary scholarship and the didactic problems surrounding the notion of intermediality, as well as a mere wish to place intermediality and its components in a stronger position in comparative studies and literary analysis. The intention is not to provide the reader with a deep theoretical critique but to highlight certain examples showing the value of intermedial analysis of literary texts.

First and foremost, multiple theoretical matters on intermediality remain unresolved, in particular regarding literary studies and the definition of key terms, such as 'medium', 'media', 'medial', 'intermedia', 'intermediality', and 'mediality'. The 'fight' over terminology leads to academic debates, yet the key terms cannot be agreed upon by the highly reputed scholars working in the field of intermediality from the very coinage of the term back in the 1980s: this tends to slow down or entirely prevent a fruitful and meaningful research of intermediality in literature.

Second, there remains a strong need to continue narrowing down and transforming the umbrella of intermediality, which includes over four dozen related (and often interchangeable) terms and notions, which are seen and interpreted differently by scholars.

---

[1] This the first literature review on intermediality I prepared for my PhD thesis in 2022; as it is not common to publish such papers in humanities, I decided to share it here as an unpublished paper.

Third, intermediality is seen differently by Western scholarship and the researchers from Central and Eastern Europe's semiotics- and poststructuralism-based research schools.

Fourth, most intermediality research tends to the study of plurimedial forms, mostly in the context of new media or digital media, whereas the study of literature-based intermedial forms and the study of modernism from the position of intermediality is, in fact, out of focus.

Fifth, consequent to such a lack of attention to literature, there is no universally accepted and acknowledged research methodology, even though the intermedial toolbox provides multiple options and opportunities for researchers.

Sixth, there is a generic need to show that the medium "really is the master of modern culture" (Murphet 2009, 2), although this paper aims at a radical opinion that it is a literary medium that should be seen as the key medium due to its documenting, parodying, and archiving functionality.

The vision of the entire world as a textual medium is combated by some key scholars; this paper attempts to prove that they might not be entirely right. The goal is to demonstrate that literary texts often "include significant amounts of what appears to be extraliterary material – formally and in content – and that we too often ignore this dimension of literature" (Bruhn 2016, 1). The pragmatic thesis is that by focusing on intermediality components in the works of literature, researchers may detect new meanings and see a larger picture of each literary work in question, as intermediality can be a tool that "communicates action inside and outside the arts" (id.). Written narrative literature that is traditionally considered to be the most "natural and uncomplicated literary form" is, in fact, the opposite – "an artistic form consisting of a complex and highly engrossing system of medialities" (ibid., 123).

Even though mixed media, synthesis of arts, interart,[2] medialities have always been about a combination and transformation of mostly visual arts or musical forms, whereas the role of literature was always a point of debate and discussion, there is a need to challenge this approach by supporting the role of the literary medium and synthetic literature-based forms in the (post)modernist world.

The main hypothesis is that any modernistic work should have traceable intermedial components, whereas the major intermedial forms are not necessarily present. Given that, the scholarly goal should be to see *what* is used, *why* it is used, and with *what result* – rather than attempt to perfect the theory of intermediality and related concepts and phenomena. Hopefully, this paper can help readers with any background to get insights into the life around them and their own research works and see intermediality as (a) a universal phenomenon around humanity, (b) an aspect of research, and (c) toolbox that deserves attention and could apply to other fields and topics, both within literary scholarship and interdisciplinary studies.

The following discussion moves from an overview of intermediality theory and its role in the twenty-first century to the overarching role of literature as a medium, whilst also discussing actual intermedial heritage, and ends up with intermediality's impact on literary research and possible results of an intermediality-based literary studies.

---

[2] For instance, traditional research on specific types of media-synthesis – 'word and image', 'music and image' studies. Some of them, specifically 'word and music' studies have transgressed into intermedial studies of 'musicalisation of fiction' but did not leave entirely the methodology and approaches typical to pre-intermediality era.

Intermediality Now: Three Conflicts

Following a forty-year span of intermediality-related research and discussion,[3] it is possible to say that intermediality is an umbrella term and hypernym for a range of phenomena happening between media. Thus, the intermediality theory was built by generations of researchers from various fields of study and countries, which adds to the complexity of the ongoing discussion through what could be defined as three 'conflicts' or dichotomies – historical, terminological, and geographical.

First, there is a *historical conflict*. The scholarship sees the origin of intermediality and the rise of its topicality differently.[4] Consequently, they work on the theory from two different theoretical perspectives. The first strand of theoretical works, which is more traditional in the West, relates to the fact that the term 'intermedium' was used by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in 1812 in the meaning of the narrative function of an allegory, whereas in 1965 Dick Higgins, one of the key representatives of the Fluxus movement, developed it in his essay as 'intermedia' to define the conceptual fusion of several media, i.e., various types of arts (Higgins 2001). In 1983, Hansen-Löve coined the term 'intermediality' to distinguish it from 'intermedia', which attracted the attention of various scholars. Further key development of the theory of intermediality was done by Werner Wolf, who studies it in the context of the fusion of literature and music. The Wolf's interpretations have been accepted, challenged, or re-worked by other generations of scholars, mostly German-speaking researchers.

In parallel, the other strand developed. As Hansen-Löve's initial article related to the investigation of the cultural problem of 'mutual illumination of arts', he tried to separate the newly coined term 'intermediality' from the intertextual layer, basing his research on semiotics, relations between literature and pictorial arts, and Russian modernism. In 2007,[5] he continued to develop the theory on intermediality, based on intertextuality and the works of Kristeva, Derrida, and Barthes that in their turn are based on the works of Bakhtin, and even the works of Ferdinand de Saussure (Allen 2022).

The ultimate majority of the academic works on intermediality seem to be based either on *Coleridge–Higgins–Wolf* paradigm, or *Bakhtin–Kristeva–Hansen-Löve* strand, both of them being valid theories and concepts; although the former dominates the Western research, rejects semiotic components, and hardly touched British literature, focusing mostly on the synthesis of specific media and creation of new media forms, whereas the latter gained academic popularity in Eastern Europe, concentrates on semiotics and poetics, is closely linked to intertextuality, and is not limited to a specific language or literature.

Both strands promote different methodologies, different understandings of a medium, mediality, and intermedial references; they both, however, refer to the critically important 1766

---

[3] The term 'intermediality' (Intermedialität) was coined by A.A. Hansen-Löve in 1983 - see: Hansen-Löve, A.A. 1983. "Intermedialität und Intertextualität. Probleme der Korrelation von Wort- und Bildkunst - Am Beispiel der russischen Moderne [Intermediality and Intertextuality. Problems of Correlation of Verbal and Pictorial Art – Using the Example of Russian Modernism]." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, no. 11, 291-360.

[4] See in-depth discussion on the history of the term and its revival by Fluxus in Schröter, Jens. 2012. "Four Models of Intermediality." In *Travels in Intermedia[lity]: Reblurring the Boundaries*, 15-36. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press.

[5] See Hansen-Löve, A.A. 2007. *Intermedialität der Moderne zwischen linguistik und pictorial turn. Zum medialen Ort des Verbalen – mit Rückblicken auf russischen Medienlandschaften [Intermediality of Modernity Between Linguistics and Pictorial Turn. On the Media Location of the Verbal – With a Look Back at Russian Media Landscapes]*. München: n.p.

essay of G. E. Lessing about Laocoon.[6] Both directions of the theoretical search are also united by the fact that they have been to an equal extent (in)directly impacted by the Western research on media in the twentieth century, which stimulated the search for new terms and concepts to differentiate between the processes and subjects of study.

The binary of strands gives birth to a *geographical conflict* of intermediality research. The key research trends come from German-speaking countries (Austria and Germany), Canada, Sweden, the BeNeLux, and post-Soviet countries, thus making several clusters with different methodologies, approaches, and foci. This geographic division results in the development of key intermedial research centres in Austria,[7] Sweden,[8] and Canada.[9] Consequently, the key research products come in different languages, which does not lead to easy exchange of ideas and research results between the clusters.

The third matter is the most complicated and is about content and *terminological conflict*. It is well-known that clear definitions of the basic terms are crucial for an objective and resultful study. Unfortunately, the definition of the content of the terms 'medium', 'media', 'medial', 'mediality', 'intermedia', 'intermedial', 'intermediality' is the key battlefield: most research papers on intermediality start with the definition of terms acceptable for that research.

Within this conflict, there is a contradiction linked to the above-mentioned historical conflict. On the one hand, the term 'intermediality' is based on the theoretical works of Bakhtin, reworked by Kristeva, Derrida, Barthes, Foucault, and Lacan, who were all (post)structuralists. They speak of meta-text and intertextuality as a sense of art and culture of the postmodernism epoch, as postmodernism re-evaluated the previous epochs and started treating the world as a text and a unified system of signs. Having named the world a text, postmodernism started differentiating between homogeneous[10] and heterogeneous texts, which can be otherwise seen as single-coded and intermedial ones.

This vision of the world as a text (or canvas, tissue, fabric) was crucial for developing the new terminology and understanding the role of the literature; on the other hand, the current Western scholarship prefers to see intermediality as opposition to or continuation of Higgins's 'intermedia', which is explained by the fact that the focus on media shifts to mediality as a "rewriting of the (continental) European concept of intermedia into Anglo-Saxon media theory" (Krtilova 2012, 38). Such a change aimed at establishing a difference between media as an object of intermedial analysis and previously (and still) widely used terms of 'mass

---

[6] Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. 2022. *Laokoon oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerei und Poesie. 1766. [Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry. 1766]*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
This essay caused a wave of discussions by writers, philosophers, and artists about the role of media, borders between them, the role of the artists - it still goes on, being mentioned, praised, or criticised in almost any intermediality-related essay or book.
[7] University of Graz (CIMIG, the Centre for Intermediality Studies in Graz).
[8] Linnaeus University (IMS, Centre for Intermedial and Multimodal Studies) and ISIS (International Society for Intermedial Studies).
[9] University of Montreal and University of Quebec (CRI, Centre de recherche sur l'intermédialité).
[10] Homogeneous texts belong to one art/medium (a work of literature, a painting, a musical piece, etc.), i.e., any musical, choreographic, pictorial, and other works are seen as texts by postmodernists, although written in different artistic codes.

media', 'new media', 'old media', 'public media', which are believed by some scholars to fall outside of the umbrella of intermediality.[11]

Even though there is a problem of visions, Higgins's argument prevails among modern scholars. Thus, medium-specific art forms can be perceived as "signs of old-fashioned authoritarian societies", whereas 'intermedia' is "the only artistic answer to the … culture of contemporary Western societies" (Higgins 2001; Bruhn 2016, 3).

Intermediality as a Fashionable Term

As Wolf puts it, intermediality "may appear as yet another fashionable term"; its scope is significantly larger, though, and "the increased emphasis on this concept can be accounted for by a number of more substantial reasons" (Wolf 1999, 1). First, focus on intermediality is the logical continuation of the interest in intertextuality and related concepts; second, intermediality-related research opens new horizons as they are interdisciplinary; third, intermediality research is used to "(re)affirm the flexibility, openness and adaptability of a verbal medium" (id.); fourth, historical development of media and the arts stimulates the application of intermedial concepts to academic projects. Intermediality thus becomes a trend "both as a theoretical discourse that seeks to account for the cultural changes … and as a practice itself" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 2).

Speaking of the new term, Wolf defines intermediality as "the participation of more than one medium of expression in the signification of a human artefact" (Wolf 1999, 1) and claims that 'intermedial' and 'intermediality' as terms have been constructed as an analogy to 'intertextual' and 'intertextuality' in the intersemiotic context. The terms relate to inter-media relations in analogy to "certain relations between (verbal) texts" (ibid., 35). While discussing Wolf's vision, Emden and Rippl state that the appearance of the term 'intermediality' "highlights … a fundamental break, a rupture, in … conceptual arsenal" and that it can be seen as a "response to changing cultural contexts and material conditions" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 1). The trend for intermediality in cultural and literary studies is set by the "considerable transformation" of the role of media in the twentieth century, "culminating, for the time being, in an increasingly digital life world characterized by the confluence of different media, both visual and textual" (id.). The transition to the 'age of intermediality' "is marked by the move from a monocentric to a polycentric type of logic", i.e., the logic of the network, when there is no common centre (Pennacchia Punzi 2007, 11).

Speaking of the applicability of the new terminology, intermedial phenomena have always been part of our life and culture; the intermedial analysis, however, can be performed only from a perspective of theories and terminology used/developed during the last four decades, which creates an ambiguity about the subject matter, which is old and new at the same time. Consequently, all intermedial research is based on poststructuralism, deconstruction, Foucauldian archaeology and systems theory (Krtilova 2012, 37).

As a notion describing a massive range of cultural phenomena, intermediality cannot (and will not) have one definition due to its use in various fields of study – art history,

---

[11] Speaking of this second vision of intermediality, Bruhn refers to German media theorist and film scholar Jens Schröter, who "frames the current situation via the well-known dichotomy of a Laocoonism or medium specificity position … versus a Gesamtkunstwerk tradition" (Bruhn 2016, 3).

philology, musicology, sociology, philosophy, film studies, and media studies. These disciplines deal with different "intermedial constellations" requiring individual approaches and definitions (Rippl 2015, 10).

Schröter, for instance, speaks about four key strands of perception of intermediality: synthetic intermediality as an attempt to close the gap between art and life through new synthetic forms; formal or trans-medial intermediality; transformational intermediality as re-presentation of displacement of media; and ontological intermediality. He claims that the definition of the term varies depending on the discourse and the four above strands/types aim at "different phenomena with different methods" (Schröter 2012, 31). This leads to a different understanding of a medium. For the literary research, it seems more applicable to use the ontological vision of intermediality and use the appropriate understanding of medium, which, in this case, might be wider than in 'transformational intermediality'.

Given these matters, intermediality can be defined as "a particular relation … between conventionally distinct media of expression or communication: this relation consists in a verifiable, or at least convincingly identifiable, direct or indirect participation of two or more media in the signification of a human artefact" (Wolf 1999, 37). Wolf suggests to base classification and analysis of intermediality on media involved, formation of medial 'dominants', quantity of intermedial parts (total vs. partial intermediality), genesis of intermediality – authorised (primary) and non-authorised (secondary), quality of intermedial involvement – overt (direct) and covert (indirect) – based in analogy to narratology (ibid., 37-39). Wolf also agrees with Peter Wagner's claim that "[i]f one accepts the broad sense of the term 'text' as a synonym of 'semiotic system' … intermediality can be called a 'subdivision of intertextuality'" (ibid., 46), however, he specifies that "not all intermediality is at the same time also intertextuality" (ibid., 48). Even though this approach is challenged by Rajewsky, and other scholars do not agree with this entirely or have even developed other definitions for intermediality and medium, Wolf's definition of intermediality remains fully acceptable for literary research.

Speaking of alternative definitions of the term, some scholars prefer to use Henk Oosterling's explanation of "*inter-mediality* as a 'differing' movement of the message through a system of interrelated but different media" (Pennacchia Punzi 2007, 10). Bruhn states that "the term seems to apply to a relationship between (inter) texts or medialities, rather than emphasizing that the merging of media occurs within a single medium or a single artefact" (Bruhn 2016, 14). While the conventional idea is that intermediality is a mixture/combination of autonomous media(lities), it seems reasonable to agree with Bruhn that all texts (artefacts, works of art – in other terms) "reflect a mixed constellation" (ibid., 15), and intermedial forms are wider and more varying than a simple media-combination or media-exchange, as described in the initial theories.

A safe way to summarise a theoretical vision of intermediality's umbrella is by saying that "all media are mixed, but in infinitely differentiated ways" (Bruhn 2016, 15). Additionally, media do not "exist disconnected from one another"; they rather exist "in complex media configurations and have therefore always been based on other media" (Schröter 2012, 15). Rippl also quotes W. J. T. Mitchell to claim that 'pure' media do not exist and all arts are composite and mixed, i.e., all "art forms are interconnected" and "intermedial qualities always inhere in cultural phenomena" (Rippl 2015, 10). Thus, intermediality can be seen as a

combination of "the links (and cross-breeds) between various art forms, and the various disciplines" (Herzogenrath 2012, 2) and, based on Higgins's position, is something 'between the between' (id.).

To conclude, for literary research, one may use the following definition: "intermediality is (the study of) specific relations among dissimilar media products and general relations among different media types" (Elleström 2017), as it is generic and covers all the other definitions.

Ill-Defined and Tangible Medium

Despite the popularity of media research, "the concept of medium remains strangely ill-defined" (Grishakova and Ryan 2010, 2). Up to eight key definitions are offered by major dictionaries. Thus, a medium is either a "channel for long-distance communication" or "the material or form used by an artist, composer or writer" (id.). Both definitions can be acceptable, especially in the view that if a "medium is to acquire narratological relevance, it is as a 'language' with a specific storytelling power" (id.).

In general, understanding of media cannot be reduced to forms of representation, technologies, or symbolic systems. "The medium and the concept of medium are not fixed ideal entities", and they emerge "in processes of perception, creation, and reflexion" and are always under "becoming and transforming" (Krtilova 2012, 39). Krtilova stresses that a medium becomes fluid, and that an artefact is constituted by all kinds of aspects, including space, the tool, the product, everything around and within it (ibid., 42).

Instead of defining medium or mediality Bruhn argues that each media product has three media dimensions: basic (e.g., written words or moving images); qualified (e.g., a novel/a newspaper, a commercial/a film, depending on whether the medium is within arts or beyond them, or literature, cinematography); and technical (i.e., material-technological projection surface – e.g., a piece of paper, TV screen) (Bruhn 2016, 19-20). Even though this division is broad and makes almost anything a medium, this also gives research flexibility and allows investigating anything through the prism of intermediality. In this regard, Krtilova adds that "[media] provide tools to handle, perceive, and reflect the world and at the same time, act as mediations": media can be seen as "formations of the real which is always already "informed" …, accessible only in certain forms of representation, "culture," in language, "facts," symbols, institutions, discourses, regimes of the sensible". She adds that media "are not mere (passive) objects – they are rather reflective structures, ... providing perspectives, techniques of signification, agencies by which they can be analyzed" (Krtilova 2012, 38).

By 'media', people usually refer to "the production and distribution as well as the storing and reception of signs" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 8); media are not mere tools of communication, though, they "are themselves signs, both in their symbolic and their material dimension" (id.). Kolker refers to McLuhan's naming media as "extensions of men" (Kolker 2008, 4) and physical engagements with the world; McLuhan himself launches a provocative definition that "the medium is the message" (ibid., 7), having borrowed it from Cubism and justified it in his 1964 book *Understanding Media*. Similarly, Houwen calls the medium 'a master' and says that media are sociological concepts and that they produce social relationships and co-produce social bonds (Houwen 2017, 155). Referring to Raymond Williams, she says

that the "medium is socially shared" and functions between people, enabling social relations, depending on them, though, in terms of its existence (ibid., 158).

Neutrally, a medium can be defined as a "tangible means of communication or realisation, a conduit ... that enables ideas and/or ... types of energy to transform or transfer from one state to another" (Crossley 2019, 2). Although one of the most acceptable definitions of medium is provided by Elleström, who calls media "communicative tools constituted by related features" (Elleström 2014, 2). He adds that all media are intermedial and multimodal, i.e., they are "composed of multiple basic features and are understood only in relation to other types of media" (id.). Consequently, during a literary study, one may speak of literary medium, musical medium, pictorial medium, etc. to avoid confusion.

To better understand and analyse media, Elleström also proposes to use a fourfold system of medium modality and to think of material modality (i.e., "interface of the medium"), sensorial aspects of media perception, spatiotemporal modality, and semiotic modality (Elleström 2010, 17-21). He also stresses the need to consider two 'qualifying' aspects of media – contextual (mode of blend) and operational (i.e., "aesthetic and communicative characteristics") (ibid., 24-25).[12]

Two-and-a-Half Typologies

Intermediality as a theory is also being complicated by the understanding of the same phenomena differently by different aesthetics (e.g., Antiquity vs. Romanticism); by study of the same processes by intertextuality scholars, (post)structuralists, cultural studies, media studies, intermediality studies, who all attempt to see it through different prisms; and by the fear of applying intertextuality ideas to intermediality-based studies.

Even though there exist several dozen terms and notions that describe, refer to intermediality and can be included under its umbrella, it is always possible (and sometimes reasonably required) to treat the terminology (and intermediality in general) according to five criteria:

- understanding of a medium;
- compositional links;
- number of media involved;
- types of media inter-relations; and
- historical inter-relation of media (Isagulov 2019a).

For instance, intermediality can be subdivided into mono-medial, plurimedial, poli/multi-medial forms, while intertextuality in this case is a form of horizontal and vertical canvas/tissue, which, due to its global and holistic nature, 'devours' all intermedial elements. Often it is impossible to detect a pure intermedial form, as diverse types of intermediality interlink and mingle to support the 'text' through activation of various intermedial relations at all levels: technological and semiotic understanding, intra-compositional and outer-compositional, broadly and narrowly, horizontally and vertically.

---

[12] Besides, in the context of literature-based intermediality studies, one can also speak of literary vs. "non-literary" form of writing (Williams 1977, 144) and mediation as an active relationship or "specific transformation of material" (ibid., 158).

To make it simpler and applicable to literature-based studies, two key typologies of intermediality should be mentioned. Wolf's typology, which is considered the most renowned, is centred around four key intermedial phenomena:

- Extracompositional:
    - transmediality as elements that are not specific to individual media and that appear across a variety of them;
    - intermedial transposition as the transfer of the content/form from one medium to another medium;
- Intracompositional:
    - intermedial relations/references as explicit (direct) or covert (indirect) involvement of other media; and
    - pluri-mediality (multi-mediality or combination of media) (Wolf 2005, 253-255).

As the key focus of Wolf's research is the musicalisation of fiction, this is one of many intermedial cases. Rajewsky's approach to classification and typology of intermediality seems to be stricter and less focused on specific media and media forms. She does not specify between extra- and intra-compositional character of intermediality, 'throws off' transmediality and suggests three sub-types:

- media-combination (multi-media, pluri-media, mixed media) – opera, theatre, cinematography, etc. – when there exists a "communicative-semiotic concept, based on the combination of at least two medial forms of articulation" (Rajewsky 2005, 52). In Wolf's terms, this is 'pluri-mediality';
- medial transposition – film adaptations, novelisation, etc. – relates to the "way in which media product comes into being" through "transformation of a given media product (a text, a film, etc.) or of its substratum into another media" (ibid., 51). Wolf calls this 'intermedial transposition';
- intermedial references (musicalisation of fiction, film techniques in literature, ekphrasis, etc.) – involve only one medium (ibid., 52). Wolf's typology names it 'intermedial relations/references'.

Rajewsky (ibid., 54-55) and later Rippl (Rippl 2015, 18) state that mentioning one or another medium does not justify the use of the term 'intermediality' and that only evoking or imitation of formal and structural features with their own media-specific means can be deemed under the intermedial label. This supports a deconstructive trend of intermediality studies through imposing limitations on references (which are literary elements perceived as fragments of a larger canvas) and limiting the field of intermediality to cross-medial adaptations or mixed media only. Moreover, this contradicts the arguments on the need for flexible intermediality-based literary studies.

Most probably such limitation would not be supported by Weisstein either, who called similar form of intermediality as 'intermedial intertextuality' (Weisstein 1993), or Hallet, who states that literature as a medium is a general term encompassing a large variety of genres and texts "that can be expected to incorporate other media in very specific ways", whilst the range of media to be represented or referenced in a "literary text may range from a TV set and a film camera to a newspaper article or a pop song and its composer" (Hallet 2015, 436), which may all be considered instances of intermediality. Elleström says that "distinctions are valuable as

long as one does not force them" (Elleström 2010, 34). As the borders of media are not always clear and sometimes there is no possibility to draw a distinct media border in terms of media transformations, he suggests being guided by hermeneutics so that to analyse these fragile connections: "[t]he only method of deciding whether it is a case of 'strong' transformation of 'weak' reference is to interpret" (ibid., 35).

The concept of text dominating the world allows us to consider mere mentioning of other artefacts as meaningful and valuable intermedial elements with a strong supportive function. Therefore, taking into account the complexity of the phenomenon and the need to apply it to the literary research, as well as the fact that "a single methodology of intermedial analysis can probably not do justice to all ... forms of medial interrelations" (Hallet 2015, 437), it is possible to use slightly different classification of three key types of intermediality. These types are aligned with typologies of Wolf and Rajewsky, but the proposed naming and grouping rather reflect the type of intermedial relation between a literary artefact under study and other media. Thus, they are:

- conventional intermediality;
- normative intermediality; and
- referential intermediality.

Conventional intermediality would mean the medial variety of forms of the work of art (e.g., musicalisation of literature, plasticity of music) and will include forms that have an integral, key medium, as well as non-traditional forms, inter-work relation of artistic codes. It will cover complex arts, media-fusion, media-combination, media-hybrids, media-exchange, synthesis of arts, recoding, medial variety, and medial heteromorphy. These would be pure forms of what Wolf and Rajewsky call 'intermedial references'. This type also covers ekphrasis, media-combination/pluri-mediality and Wolf's transmediality.

Normative intermediality would mean the development of a single fable by various media, when a medium of the original work becomes a norm (an ideal) for all other works and artists. This can be seen as intermediality in its broad form – linking of a holistic multi-artistic space within a culture (i.e., setting up the meta-language of culture). Such intermediality appears when a new epoch re-evaluates the arts and achievements of the preceding epochs, creating new forms and feelings based on old fables. It brings out new methods and forms of artistic reflection of the world around. This type corresponds to (inter)medial transposition in typologies of Wolf and Rajewsky.

The *referential intermediality* is brought to light due to the intertextual character of the literary research; it will refer to the referencing of works from other media in the given medium, when one of the media serves as a referent. This type of intermediality contributes to specific dialogue of cultures by quotes, reminiscence, self-quoting, citing, and referencing. It can also include media-incorporation, media-projection, media-links, and all types of intertextual linkages. This category is an addendum to typologies of Wolf and Rajewsky and fits the peculiarities of literary texts.

Literary Medium as a Subject of Research

In his works, Bakhtin speaks of the content of literature reflecting the externity, i.e., the refraction of reality in literature. Through reflection of these external elements, literature creates new forms, new signs that are works of art that become "a real part of the social reality"

(Bakhtin and Medvedev 1991, 18). In addition, "literary history is concerned with the concrete life of the literary work in the unity of the generating literary environment" (ibid., 27). The explanation for this is as follows: the study of literature in "living interaction with other domains and in the concrete unity" of life does not lead to the loss of literature's individuality (ibid., 28). Besides, each element of the work of art is part of a "closed-off unity", and the meaning is received only within the structure of the whole, i.e., "each element of the artistic work has primarily a purely constructive significance" (ibid., 45). This can be interpreted as the need to see all intermedial components in the 'polyphonic' artistic work as purposeful, specific, conscious, intentional, i.e., requiring deciphering or analysis in the context of the whole work.

Following the logic of Bakhtin's essay *Epic and Novel*,[13] at certain stages of working on the literary piece, the author may be 'forced' by characters to go in a specific direction, use specific links, or employ specific intermedial tools. The logic of artistic work is sometimes (or maybe always) stronger than the logic of the writer; otherwise, the plot may become too artificial and will not interest the reader, as the genre will be unfinished and unresolved (Bakhtin and Medvedev 1991, 129). As "plot is completely contained within the framework" (ibid., 106) of the artistic work, the plot and framework may change significantly with the integration of polyphonic elements, i.e., intermediality.

Moreover, a topic and a theme may dictate the genre and form of the artistic work, i.e., making a painter the main character would require the application of a pictorial medium into a literary form. According to Bakhtin, novels do not 'get along' with other genres; hence, there is no harmony, limitations or complementarity; the novel as a genre 'parodies' other genres and exposes their forms and their language (i.e., arts and media). It "squeezes out some genres and incorporates others into its own peculiar structure" (Bakhtin 1981, 5).

While intermediality has been in the focus of media studies and cultural studies for over forty years, "literary studies have acknowledged the importance of intermediality only with much delay" (Rippl 2010, 64). This delay is explained by the fact that the resistance to exploring mediality and intermediality in literature is rooted in literary studies' "fear of losing one's identity as an independent philology" (id.). There seems to be now a turnaround tendency, as intermediality helped to make a 'leap' from the past theories to "contemporary medial age" (Eilittä, Louvel, and Kim 2012, vii), when literature became understood as a medium. This "contributed to liberation of literature ... from an isolated position in an established scholarly landscape with its clear-cut borderlines between disciplines" (ibid., vii).

Thanks to Barthes and his opinion that every artefact is a text, as well as Kristeva's belief that text is a dynamic mosaic of quotations that includes absorptions and transformations of other texts (built on Bakhtin's idea of dialogicity), literature started playing a more significant role in the intermediality studies. However, the current focus is still shifted to medial transformations and fusions, cinematography, which is a bias, given the fact that the 'text' approach gave birth to the term and phenomena, while scholars turned it down and moved towards the study of non-textual (non-verbal) forms and concepts.

---

[13] See Bakhtin, M. M. 1975. "Эпос и роман [Epic and Novel]." In *Вопросы литературы и эстетики. Исследования разных лет. [Matters of Literature and Aesthetics. Researches of Different Years.* Moscow: Fiction Literature.

A literary work "is continually translated from one medium into another, thus acquiring a plurality of identities, generated as a trace of the movement itself" (Pennacchia Punzi 2007, 10). At the same time, the "debate on the relationship between old and new media is ever more asserting the idea that new media do not replace the old ones but establish a symbiosis with them". Hence, old media "while maintaining their own specific traits, generate new features in the presence of new media" (ibid., 12-13). In this regard, the beneficial side of literary research on intermediality is that it will be of an interdisciplinary character, will open new horizons and will be a "collaboration between art and science" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 78).

Intermediality study based on literature may also support Dupré's concept of "metaphysics of radical ontological pluralism" (Dupré 1993, 18), as it is not only the science but the humanities as well that can be "the search for fundamental kinds defined by real essences" (ibid., 60). Bruhn states that even though the key research focuses on such creative pairs as word and music, word and image, the literary theory and comparative literature investigated the importance of matters of inter-relationship between medialities and literature, which "resulted in a number of interdisciplinary fora". Eventually, "[l]iterary theory and comparative literature … have described at least parts of the relation between literature and the other arts … and they have discussed the appropriate analytical and theoretical tools" (Bruhn 2016, 5).

The importance of mass media in the twenty-first century also adds much to the popularity of intermedial research, as "[i]ntermedial borrowings seem peculiarly obvious in current mass media at both the textual and generic levels" (Young 2008, 244). The alignments of cinematography and literature, the interplays between these two media around the turn of the century were "among the most crucial factors that shaped what came to be called modernist literature and culture" (Marcus 2015, 179). These led to a significant increase in intermedial studies of cinema,[14] despite the literature still having large lacunas untouched by intermedial research. At the same time, literature has long been a major source of inspiration and "the main authority to challenge the younger medium of film" (Schmid 2019, 12).

Whereas it is acknowledged that intertextuality as a "theory and interpretive practice has played a significant role in the recent development of adaptation studies" (Allen 2022, 204), intermediality can also play a significant role in such studies as well, whereas, in its turn, the intertextual vision can be applied to study of literature-based intermedial forms. To conclude, the most radical opinion would be adapting the point that intermediality can be treated as the origin of cinematography, and, given the most significant role of cinema in the development and progress of modernism, to say that, in a mediated manner, intermediality can be considered as a phenomenon that facilitated the birth of modernism as an epoch (see Wiseman 2021).

Intermedial Heritage: Antiquity to Modernity
Research of the intermedial components in literary artefacts is based on millennia-long traditions of art synthesis and the existence of multimedial forms since Antiquity. Multiple researchers[15] state that as soon as Homer put a description of the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad*,

---

[14] Most books on intermediality published in 2020-22 are studies of cinema.
[15] See, for instance, Eilittä, Leena, and Catherine Riccio-Berry, eds. 2016. *Afterlives of Romantic Intermediality: The Intersection of Visual, Aural, and Verbal Frontiers*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

which is the first documented case of ekphrasis, the concept of intermediality was born and set free into aesthetic theory and artistic practices close to intermediality.

Each artistic epoch tried to unite all the arts around certain syncretic dominants. Thus, for instance, Antiquity praised sculpture and theatre, the Middle Ages architecture, while the Renaissance was fascinated by paintings, the Enlightenment by theatre, and Romanticism brought up music. Then, Realism crowned the literature, *fin de siècle* and Modernism – visual arts and literary forms, while Postmodernism focused on literature and text.[16]

One of the reasons literature (and a literary medium) is crucial for understanding of the other arts and media is behind the fact that the art of Antiquity, which originated from mythology, did not manage to preserve initial integrity, and split into several artistic streams and types: verbal arts, decorative arts, theatre, music, sculpture, and architecture. As mythology lies at the crossroads of human development, it is always accompanied by two opposite processes, separation and unification, that push the development process of the arts and cause artistic changes and experiments. Even though sculpture became the dominant art of Antiquity, as it conveyed all aesthetic beliefs of the epoch, theatre, being a synthetic art, united several literary forms and other arts to form a *de facto* integral medium of the epoch. Antiquity, as an epoch, also documented and recorded most of the basic fables and plots that later fed generations of artists. Here, one could mention the thirty-six basic dramatic situations described by Georges Polti in 1895[17] and later developed by the postmodernists or even discussed by contemporary media researchers.[18]

Even though the dominating art of the Middle Ages was the architecture of sacral buildings ('music in stone'), scholiasts praised music as the art striving for eternal harmony and put it on equal grounds with literature (holy writings). The similarity between the dominant medium of architecture and the construction of literary works also allowed discussion on the 'stone Bible' – a mediaeval synthesis of Christian literature and architecture.

Fragmentation became the specific feature of the aesthetic thoughts of the Renaissance: through a fragment, artists tried to convey literary, musical, or pictorial artistic components as a whole. "The fragment was no longer perceived as a deformed piece or 'chunk', but the organic part of the currently destroyed and once ideal and holistic art piece" (Isagulov 2017, 177). The Renaissance also started the process of rediscovery and reassessment of the arts of earlier epochs as both a conscious and subconscious search for traditions that would be close to the epoch's spirit and correlate with its own experience. Ultimately, Renaissance artists "worshipped Christian saints and praised the beauty of ancient gods" equally (Lubimov 1976).

Whereas Mannerism, Baroque, Rococo, and Classicism praised different media, the former presented to the world a new synthetic literature-based form – play for reading (closet drama, Lesedrama) – characterised as the first synthetic form of modernity (Kagan 1972, 219). Baroque gave musical-verbal synthesis of opera and oratorio, musical drama. Rococo revived ancient pastoral forms with a specific erotic component, which promoted further rebirth of

---

[16] For a detailed analysis of the dominant media see Isagulov, Mykyta. 2017. "Интермедиальные доминанты: от Античности к современности [Intermedial Dominants: from Antiquity to Modernity]." *Античность - Современность (вопросы филологии) [Antiquity - Modernity (Matters of Philology)]*, no. 5, 2017, pp. 172-184.
[17] See Polti, Georges. 1895. *Les trente-six situations dramatiques [36 Dramatic Situations]*. Paris: Mercure de France.
[18] See Figgis, Mike. 2017. *The Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations*. London: Faber & Faber.

spiritual subtlety and sensual feelings, which fed Sentimentalism and Romanticism. Classicism crowned theatre and tried to re-create the syncretic art of Antiquity.

While Romanticism declared music as an integral medium, the epoch's most significant genres have been formed in literature and music (e.g., musical dramas of Richard Wagner based exclusively on mediaeval literary epics). Romanticists worshipped artistic activities as a basis of life and art that is aimed at transformation and creation of the world, which allowed them to formulate and objectivise the new intermedial paradigm *architecture/sculpture – painting – music – poetry*, where the intermedial search of the history of arts was reflected (Kagan 1972, 66).[19] Romantic intermediality aimed to "cross the borders between classical and Romantic styles, between Christianity and pantheism, or between literary fiction and natural sciences" (Nivala 2016, 80), building the concept around oppositions. Similarly to a later period of modernism, "art was a medium of reflexion" (ibid., 87). Noteworthy, Romanticism also distinguished the category of mixed/complex arts, which included architectural-depictive art synthesis, music-choreographic and music-dramatic art, theatrical art, music-poetry synthesis, and pictorial-poetic synthesis (Kagan 1972, 94).

While realism is remarkable for literature's becoming a dominant medium due to mass publishing in the nineteenth century, the *fin de siècle*, transition between the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, is characterised by a critical perception of art synthesis. Two arts come to the foreground: literature and painting. Special roles are played by new arts, photography (1839) and cinematography (1878). One could argue that this epoch is remote from modernist aesthetics; however, a "distinction has to be drawn between the *fin-de-siècle* as a chronological period, and *fin-de-siècle* as a unique attitude or response to this period" (Nottingham 2015, 351). The response was in principle to various crises and changes faced by the turn-of-the-century generations, which echoed in the modernist era that also faced wars and various crises related to the economy, society, culture, and politics.

The *fin de siècle* became a logical pre-modern period and encompassed "a wide range of practices with regards to the body", which resolved in the fact that "modernity as such became both a descriptive and a normative term laden with a host of assumptions concerning efficiency, productivity and health" (Killen 2015, 47). In addition to that, Jervis adds that the culture "becomes modern when it manifests a degree of understanding of how its own processes intervene in the world, exhibiting the cultural power of the means of classification and control", which resulted in modernity's revealing "itself as not just contingently, but inherently, reflexive" (Jervis 2015, 59).

Whereas literature of *decadence* adopted an anarchistic style "in which everything was sacrificed to the development of the individual parts" (Gagnier 2010, 2), "[m]any *fin-de-siècle* figures opposed narrow egoism, domesticity, and nationalism" (ibid., 3), which leads to the conclusion that self-reflexion at the turn of the centuries and later on within modernism was a significantly wider process. This may be proved by the fact that "increasing individuation led to the disintegration of the whole" (ibid., 11), which was required for artistic re-evaluation and re-assessment of processes and, consequently, finding a new self.

---

[19] Antiquity and Middle Ages correspond to architecture and sculpture, painting represents Renaissance, music is of a paramount importance for Romanticism, and poetry (literature) corresponds to post-Romanticism, Realism, Modernism, and Postmodernism (Kagan 1972, 66).

Except for the search of new creative forms that would reflect the interior world of artists, who faced certain extremely dramatic historical events and rapid changes, they needed new synthesis and dialogues at all levels – there were borders between cultures (e.g., England vs. Italy), civilisations (e.g., European metropoles vs. African colonies), arts (e.g., integration of literature into paintings), borders within the society. Hence, art becomes the voice of change. As "humankind does not fall blindly in any particular spot and does not lie blind in it, it learns to stand free, to find for itself a sphere of self-reflexion" (Gagnier 2018, 63), intermediality became a modernistic tool of a search for self-reflexion and self-realisation.

Modernism followed the *fin de siècle* epoch and built upon its traditions through acceptance and/or rejection. Building on the *fin the siècle* vision of the world and the role of arts, modernism can be also seen as an epoch when "every art … is refined twice and is born two times – through the work of the artist-creator and through the spectator's own subjective and artistic reflective prism as shaped by their worldviews, educational background, or personal philosophy" (Isagulov 2015). This can be interpreted as a unique modernistic approach to add more to the narrative/descriptive texts through linking multiple additional cultural and medial layers, which are not always 'visible' or traceable or decipherable with ease.

Modernism is also a period when art (which is always conscious and critical of previous epochs and its own development) becomes the period when "artist's exploration of his or her medium and the problems and possibilities of representation" becomes a characteristic feature of the whole generation (Lehtimäki 2010, 183). Any work of art (verbal, visual, etc.) "opens new perspectives, more extensive than the work's immediate communicative content, and provides access to new meanings beyond the immediately available" (Grishakova 2010, 329). Intermedial metarepresentation becomes a "tool of human navigation in the surrounding world and a bridge between perception and knowledge" (id.). As Nivala states, "our knowledge of the absolute is always media-specific" and presentation of the "whole universe in one artwork" would embark techniques using a "combination of different media" (Nivala 2016, 88), which can be considered a logical evolution of fragmentation approaches to arts developed in the Renaissance epoch. Cross-exposure (of the universe from various and even opposing angles) would be the best way to "pinpoint negatively the borders that delimit the absolute" (id.), which is a logical continuation of Romanticism's exploration of the role of absoluteness in life and the arts.

These are some of the factors that allow us to speak of modernism as a turnaround epoch, when there took place the medial recognition of literature, self-awareness of modernist artists, reassessment of the role of media in general and literature. To reveal and present a mixture of intermediality means both to read the literature closely and be aware of the histories and conventions around the authors.

The rise of technical media (specifically cinematography and photography), which "marks the beginning of a historical transformation that continues to rearrange the relationship between texts and images" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 4), facilitated the reassessment of literature's role in the global context. Modernism becomes that specific epoch, when the artists had enough experience (cf. two world wars), knowledge (cf. literacy levels and the spread of printed media), and practice (cf. *fin de siècle* legacy) to turn around all existing processes and (re-)invent the arts as new media forms basing them on the concept of everything around being

texts (in its widest meaning of a comprehensive system of signs). However, as Murphet puts it, within a network of media associated with modernism, literature was served poorly (Murphet 2009, 4). He argues that "literature's sudden self-recognition as a medium … had more to do with its metaphoric ability to absorb material qualities from the more substantial media around it" (ibid., 4-5), which makes modernism a self-aware epoch in medial terms. Using Emden and Rippl's wording, it was "merely the latest manifestation of changes in the cultural perception of modernity" (Emden and Rippl 2010, 4).

Modernism and its treatment of media (subconsciously and through self-aware reflexion) remain the "modern literary subject" due to the "mixture of introspective self-reflectivity, middle-class familiarism and genderization, and liberal autonomy" (Gagnier 1991, 31). Modernism, as the follow-up epoch to decadent *fin de siècle,* continued the attempts "to 'commodify' literary talent" (ibid., 32). Modernism eventually chose literature and painting as its dominants, having popularised collage techniques both in the visual arts and literature. Modernists believed that the masterpieces of many painters would not exist without the painter's ability to see the pictorial in a literary way and literature in a pictorial way.

Ultimately, Modernism becomes an epoch when it is critically important for the artists to explain their role, position in the context of human development, including the development of the arts and media, to discover and voice their self-identification in the world. Many modernist writers dedicated special non-creative works to musing on the role of an artist, the role of language in documenting society.[20] Intermediality, yet not known to them under this term, became a deliberately used tool that helped them to break with previous traditions and build the new ones through reassessing the classic media combinations and developing the new ones.

Postmodernists, in their turn, tried to finalise the century-long search for an integral medium. First, they objectivised the historic-cultural necessity of certain syntheses, such as *prose – poetry – music*; *painting – décor – architectonics*; *theatre – pantomime – dance* (Kagan 1972, 292, 303, 313). Secondly, they selected literature (as the most holistic realisation of text and word) as their integral medium that expressed and characterised other arts. In addition, they developed an understanding of mechanisms of synthesis and parallel ties between arts horizontally (synchronically) and vertically (i.e., intertextual canvas).

According to Bakhtin, the novel's becoming a 'high' literature genre made other genres stubbornly conventional, which later led to their parodising and, consequently, becoming "more free and flexible", when their language was renewed by "incorporating extraliterary heteroglosia" and they became dialogised (Bakhtin 1981, 7). Such a phenomenon can be explained by the openness of the genres to a new zone "for structuring artistic models", i.e., a zone of contact with the present life around the literature (id.). This leads to the conclusion that openness of a medium to other media, in particular of literature since Romanticism, facilitated the media contacts and development of new forms ('more free genres'), which manifests the role of literature, among others, in intermediality studies.

In conclusion, the choice of modernist works for literary research on intermediality is defined by the fact that modernism re-evaluated and re-assessed the heritage of previous epochs

---

[20] See, for instance, critical essays and manifests presented by Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, Mina Loy, E. M. Forster, Virginia Woolf, and T. S. Eliot.

and, in parallel, faced the development of new media and had to 're-invent' the literature. Besides, the modernist texts are mature enough to be considered conventional; one may prefer to avoid contemporary examples of new narratives (including digital ones), which are struggling to find their form.

Towards Intermedial Methodology/Vision
Given the above 'wandering' of intermedial processes through centuries and epochs and the 'bumpy' road of the scholarship towards the acceptance of the phenomenon, there exist certain positive outcomes. The research of literature-based intermediality helps understand the role of literature within the arts and the role of a literary medium within other media; the role of intermedial references and their role in modernist writings. It helps detect the specific media, see the purpose of their integration, trace the historical impact of the epoch, and link the work to the holistic cultural canvas. Intermediality helps see the literary artefact as a fragment of this canvas, and the references are the threads linking all fragments together.

Such results can be achieved through an analysis of literary works, a detection of all elements that fit the umbrella of intermediality, a study of intermedial elements involved, and assessing them through the prism of conscious and subconscious application. If several works of one author are studied (or the works of several writers from the same epoch), the analysis may benefit from a summary of the purpose of intermedial components to detect the overall tendency for a specific artist or time.

The research of modernistic works benefits from the critical role of intermediality that manifested itself in this period, the rapid transition from the nineteenth century to the world wars tragedies and multiple drastic changes in society and culture, constant acceleration of the economic and other processes impacting both artists and people around them. The study of such artefacts allows seeing clear parallels with ancient myths and/or biblical stories, as well as the peculiarities of intermedial ties between modernist literature and other arts from contemporary and previous epochs.

The possible applicable research methodology may be of a complex character, so as to investigate multiple sides of the intermediality as a specific and wide phenomenon. Thus, a researcher may apply comparative-historical and hermeneutic methods with the elements of cultural-historical, comparative, psychological, and receptive methods. The comparative-historical methodology with elements of cultural-historical study may help analyse the evolution of intermediality and detect the peculiarities of intermedial relations typical of specific periods in literary modernism. The hermeneutic method supports complex analysis and interpretation of the intermedial ties that arise on the pages of literary works under study. Given the historical-literary specifics of the phenomenon of intermediality, certain poststructuralist and deconstructive approaches, as well as the 'close reading' technique, could be considered to help detect the veiled and subconscious references between novels and other works of art.

Probable results may include the revealing of certain oppositions supported by intermedial references, e.g., 'own' versus 'strange', 'outdated' versus 'new'. Such binaries are often built by artists with the help of other media and serve the purpose of enlarging the contextual fields of their works, similarly to above mentioned fragmentation. The division of everything into 'mine' and 'not mine' helps writers 'complicate' their stories with the veiled (backstage) topics of the conflict of national mentalities, perception of life and reality by

pushing together the unlimited number of worlds and setting conflicts between art and life, *genii* and filisters, ecstatic Dionysian and harmonic Apollonian beginnings (Isagulov 2019b).

The multitude of conflict levels is brought up by writers through specific techniques: references in the titles of the novels, deep (conscious) quoting of other works of arts, referencing other works and cultural processes, building plot parallels, opposing arts and media, pushing together the old and new, or forcing the characters to travel to lands where there dominate other cultures and arts. Various artistic layers, added through these opposition techniques to the overall 'tissue' of the context, add new senses to novels and broaden their plots through additional meaningful fragments.

The conflicts related to the plots transform into the conflicts of world perception and view (e.g., reality vs. history, real world vs. theatre, traditions vs. madness), conflicts of aesthetic beginnings (e.g., chaotic vs. harmonised, Apollonian vs. Dionysian), and arts (e.g., visual arts vs. theatre, paintings vs. literary works). The use of oppositions based on references, quotes, parallelisation of plots, opposition of times and arts, geographic transposition of characters to other cultural settings helps to link national and international layers to the stories, allowing conflict of cultures, which may be considered critical for writers to investigate due to the historic period when these literary artefacts have been created. Comparable results of oppositions based on intermedial components are expected to be seen in many other modernist works.

Similarly to real life, "media relations enable us to grasp the complexity of reality and culture, to observe various tensional" states (Pethő 2020, 4); therefore, "[l]iterary theory cannot be separated from cultural theory, though it may be distinguished within it" (Williams 1977, 145). In this regard, attention to cultural context is critical to seeing the whole picture built by intermedial ties. Besides, intermediality allows the revival of description research. The transmedial "perspective opens a rich mine of medial comparisons both from a systematic and a historical perspective" (Wolf 2007, vii).

Whilst there has been a scholarly neglect of description studies (in contrast to wide narrativity studies) due to their seemingly monomedial and monogenetic nature, "description also constitutes a major 'semiotic macro-mode' or 'macro-frame' which by far transcends the boundaries of narrative texts, or even of literature in general" (Wolf 2007, vii). Greater attention to description is required, as this phenomenon is relevant to literary works as well as other arts. Wolf argues that descriptions "have escaped scholars engaged in the field of intermediality studies so far, and even within literary studies description does not appear to be a key concept" (ibid., 4). The reason for description's importance is that it has "obviously a referential function, but employs reference in a special way". The "descriptive differs from narrative, which is also referential or at least suggests referentiality" (ibid., 13).

To conclude, the transition to intermediality studies leads to modernisation of the research and a methodological toolkit, without the need to draw strict borderlines between literary studies or media studies. This adds to the interdisciplinary nature of such a project.

Conclusion

Intermediality is popular; the focus is mostly on media studies, cultural studies, new media and digital media, cinema and 'classic' problems (e.g., musicalisation of fiction), though. The

intermediality-based *literary* studies add to the general picture of the arts, literature, and modernism, as well as a revision of approaches and methodologies.

The lack of complex studies of intermediality poetics and intermedial elements on the material of modernist literature, both in Western and non-Western academia, adds much to the novelty of such research. The scientific and theoretical importance lies in the fact that it helps go deeper into the literary vision and perception of the works of the modernist writers.

The practical value of such research is defined by the application of complex methodology of studying intermediality in literature, as well as the artistic techniques of creating intermedial ties and linking additional contexts within the single artistic 'tissue'.

Conducting research from a perspective that literature remains an integral, dominating medium in the twentieth century, as well as nowadays, supports the application of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of media and relations between literature and non-verbal media.

Each study contributes to the theoretical field on intermediality, as the phenomenon of intermediality and its constituent components are still not well developed and require further development through specific case studies. It would also contribute to the research on specific authors due to the re-evaluation of their artistic heritage and creative practices.

Intermediality-based case studies also support the development of a larger field of the study of modernism, postmodernism in general, and literary modernism in particular, whereas the topicality of the research questions is defined by its belonging to contemporary cultural and literary studies in general.

Application of complex methodology and intermedial toolbox allows defining a holistic system of intermedial ties within modernism, both horizontally and vertically, which also strengthens the field of research.

2022

Works Cited

Allen, Graham. 2022. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1975. "Эпос и роман [Epic and Novel]." In *Вопросы литературы и эстетики. Исследования разных лет. [Matters of Literature and Aesthetics. Researches of Different Years.* Moscow: Fiction Literature.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, T.X.: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., and N. P. Medvedev. 1991. *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Translated by Albert J. Wehrle. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bruhn, Jørgen. 2016. *The Intermediality of Narrative Literature: Medialities Matter*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crossley, Mark, ed. 2019. *Intermedial Theatre: Principles and Practice*. London: Red Globe Press.

Dupré, John. 1993. *The Disorder of Things: Metaphysical Foundations of the Disunity of Science*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Eilittä, Leena, Liliane Louvel, and Sabine Kim, eds. 2012. *Intermedial Arts: Disrupting, Remembering, and Transforming Media*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Eilittä, Leena, and Catherine Riccio-Berry, eds. 2016. *Afterlives of Romantic Intermediality: The Intersection of Visual, Aural, and Verbal Frontiers*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Elleström, Lars, ed. 2010. *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elleström, Lars. 2014. *Media Transformation: The Transfer of Media Characteristics Among Media*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elleström, Lars. 2017. "Adaptation and Intermediality." In *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, 509-526. New York: Oxford University Press.

Emden, Christian J., and Gabriele Rippl, eds. 2010. *ImageScapes: Studies in Intermediality*. New York: Peter Lang.

Figgis, Mike. 2017. *The Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations*. London: Faber & Faber.

Gagnier, Regenia. 1991. *Subjectivities: a History of Self-Representation in Britain, 1832-1920*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gagnier, Regenia. 2010. *Individualism, Decadence and Globalization: On the Relationship of Part to Whole, 1859-1920*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gagnier, Regenia. 2018. *Literatures of Liberalization: Global Circulation and the Long Nineteenth Century*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grishakova, Marina. 2010. "Intermedial Metarepresentations." In *Intermediality and Storytelling*, 312-331. New York: De Gruyter.

Grishakova, Marina, and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds. 2010. *Intermediality and Storytelling*. New York: De Gruyter.

Hallet, Wolfgang. 2015. "Methodology of Intermediality in Literary Studies." In *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music*, 436-445. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hansen-Löve, A.A. 1983. "Intermedialität und Intertextualität. Probleme der Korrelation von Wort- und Bildkunst - Am Beispiel der russischen Moderne [Intermediality and Intertextuality. Problems of Correlation of Verbal and Pictorial Art - Using the Example of Russian Modernism]." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, no. 11, 291-360.

Hansen-Löve, A.A. 2007. *Intermedialität der Moderne zwischen linguistik und pictorial turn. Zum medialen Ort des Verbalen – mit Rückblicken auf russischen Medienlandschaften [Intermediality of Modernity Between Linguistics and Pictorial Turn. On the Media Location of the Verbal - With a Look Back at Russian Media Landscapes]*. München: n.p.

Herzogenrath, Bernd, ed. 2012. *Travels in Intermedia[lity]: Reblurring the Boundaries*. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press.

Higgins, Dick. 2001. "Intermedia. 1965." *Leonardo* 34 (1): 49-54.

Houwen, Janna. 2017. *Film and Video Intermediality: The Question of Medium Specificity in Contemporary Moving Images*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Isagulov, Mykyta. 2015. "Art, Mirrors and the Divine." *Maple Tree Literary Supplement* May-August 2015 (19). http://www.mtls.ca/issue19/writings/essay/mykyta-isagulov/.

Isagulov, Mykyta. 2017. "Интермедиальные доминанты: от Античности к современности [Intermedial Dominants: from Antiquity to Modernity]." *Античность - Современность (вопросы филологии) [Antiquity - Modernity (Matters of Philology)]*, no. 5, 172-184.

Isagulov, Mykyta. 2019a. "Интермедиальность как зонтичный термин: попытка классификации [Intermediality as an Umbrella Term: Approach to Classification]." *Культура слова [Word Culture]*, no. 1(2), 28-39.

Isagulov, Mykyta. 2019b. "Оппозиция "свой - чужой": расширение художественного контекста английских романов [Own - Strange" Opposition: Extending the Artistic Context of the English Novels]." *Античность - Современность (вопросы филологии) [Antiquity - Modernity (Matters of Philology)]*, no. 6, 82-88.

Jervis, John. 2015. "The Modernity of the fin de siècle." In *The Fin-de-siècle World*, 59-73. London; New York: Routledge.

Kagan, M.S. 1972. *Морфология искусства: Историко-теоретическое исследование внутреннего строения мира искусств: [монография, части I, II, III] [Morphology of Art: Historical and Theoretical Study of the Internal Structure of the World of Art: [monograph, parts I, II, III]]*. Leningrad: Искусство [Art].

Killen, Andreas. 2015. "The Second Industrial Revolution." In *The Fin-de-siècle World*, 45-58. London; New York: Routledge.

Kolker, Robert, ed. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Film and Media Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krtilova, Katerina. 2012. "Intermediality in Media Philosophy." In *Travels in Intermedia[lity]: Reblurring the Boundaries*, 37-45. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press.

Lehtimäki, Markku. 2010. "The Failure of Art: Problems of Verbal and Visual Representation in Let Us Now Praise Famous Men." In *Intermediality and Storytelling*, 183-207. New York: De Gruyter.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. 2022. *Laokoon oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerei und Poesie. 1766. [Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry. 1766]*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

Lubimov, L.D. 1976. *Искусство Западной Европы. Средние века. Возрождение в Италии [Art of Western Europe. Middle Ages. Renaissance in Italy]*. Moscow: Просвещение [Enlightenment].

Marcus, Laura. 2015. "Film and Modernist Literature." In *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music*, 179-184. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Murphet, Julian. 2009. *Multimedia Modernism: Literature and the Anglo-American Avant-garde*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nivala, Asko. 2016. "Mediality and Intermediality in Friedrich Schlegel's Early Romantic Thought." In *Afterlives of Romantic Intermediality: The Intersection of Visual, Aural, and Verbal Frontiers*, 75-94. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Nottingham, Chris. 2015. "The New Politics of 'Higher Individualism.'" In *The Fin-de-siècle World*, 351-364. London; New York: Routledge.

Pennacchia Punzi, Maddalena, ed. 2007. *Literary Intermediality: The Transit of Literature through the Media Circuit*. Bern; New York: Peter Lang.

Pethő, Ágnes, ed. 2020. *Caught In-Between: Intermediality in Contemporary Eastern European and Russian Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Polti, Georges. 1895. *Les trente-six situations dramatiques [36 Dramatic Situations]*. Paris: Mercure de France.

Rajewsky, Irina O. 2005. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality." *Intermédialités*, no. 6, 43-64.

Rippl, Gabriele. 2010. "English Literature and Its Other: Towards a Poetics of Intermediality." In *ImageScapes: Studies in Intermediality*, 39-65. New York: Peter Lang.

Rippl, Gabriele, ed. 2015. *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Schmid, Marion. 2019. *Intermedial Dialogues: The French New Wave and the Other Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Schröter, Jens. 2012. "Four Models of Intermediality." In *Travels in Intermedia[lity]: Reblurring the Boundaries*, 15-36. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press.

Weisstein, Ulrich. 1993. "Literature and the (Visual) Arts: Intertextuality and Mutual Illumination." In *Intertextuality: German Literature and Visual Art from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Ingeborg Hoesterey and Ulrich Weisstein, 1-17. Columbia, S.C.: Camden House.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiseman, Boris. 2021. "Intermediality and the Origins of Cinema." In *Cinematic Intermediality: Theory and Practice*, 121-135. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wolf, Werner. 1999. *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wolf, Werner. 2005. "Intermediality." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan, 252-256. London: Routledge.

Wolf, Werner. 2007. "Description as a Transmedial Mode of representation: General Features and Possibilities of Realization in Painting, Fiction and Music." In *Description in Literature and Other Media*, 1-87. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.

Young, Paul. 2008. "Film Genre Theory and Contemporary Media: Description, Interpretation, Intermediality." In *The Oxford Handbook of Film and Media Studies*, 224-259. New York: Oxford University Press.