

## **LITERARY TEXT AS A MULTIDIMENSIONAL PHENOMENON: INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO LITERARY ANALYSIS**

Contemporary literary studies have undergone a profound transformation, influenced by philosophical reorientation, technological innovation (including AI, ChatGPT, and generative AI), globalisation, and interdisciplinary scholarship. Moreover, they no longer regard literary texts as self-contained aesthetic artefacts independent of their social, historical, psychological, or media contexts. Instead, literary text is more often understood as a multidimensional cultural construct [1, p. 23; 2; 7; 14, p.48-54], shaped by interpretation, ideology, memory, identity, digital environments, and intercultural communication.

The shift from structuralist and formalist paradigms towards post-structuralist, interdisciplinary (hermeneutic, cognitive, ecological, and digital) approaches has significantly broadened the methodological foundations of literary analysis. Therefore, modern literary approaches to literary analysis [1; 2; 3; 7; 10; 14, 15] foreground the dynamic interplay among literary text, the reader, culture, and media, emphasising that meaning is produced through interpretative processes conditioned by historical, political, and technological factors.

As Hans-Georg Gadamer argues, understanding a text's meaning is always historically mediated [9]. He introduced the concept of the "fusion of horizons," [9, p.25] in which interpretation is understood as a dialogue between past and present perspectives. Jacques Derrida [8] and Paul Ricoeur [15] focus on its instability and multiplicity. This hermeneutic approach considers literary text as an open, dialogical flux of meanings that requires constant interpretation. It states that meaning does not exist as a fixed entity embedded within the text itself; rather, it emerges through the interaction between the text and the reader's historical and cultural consciousness.

Recent hermeneutic studies [2; 3; 15] also incorporate the theory of intertextuality, which Julia Kristeva [12] further developed, arguing that every text exists within a network of prior texts, cultural codes, and symbolic systems. With the development of narratology, it became possible to conceptualise literary texts as polyphonic, with a cacophony of different narrators' voices [4, p.25], multiple ideological perspectives (often opposing) and competing discourses.

One of the defining features of contemporary literary studies is *interdisciplinarity*. Literary scholars increasingly integrate methods from philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, media studies, political science, and applied/corpus linguistics. This methodological expansion reflects the growing complexity of modern linguistic phenomena that are inevitably connected to cultural and societal roots and therefore require multifaceted analytical frameworks. Hence, the emergence of digital humanities has radically transformed literary analysis and linguistic research. Techniques drawn from corpus linguistics, computational stylistics, data visualisation, and distant reading enable scholars to analyse large textual corpora and identify large-scale literary patterns.

Franco Moretti, in his work "Conjectures on World Literature" [14, p.54-68], introduced the concept of "*distant reading*," which lies in using second-hand information about literary texts as a key, rather than expecting a literary researcher to read all pertinent texts themselves.

According to Franco Moretti, “distant reading” shifts literary analysis away from intensive “close reading” of a limited canon toward large-scale patterns, systems, genres, and textual networks observable across extensive corpora.

He has argued for supporting primary reading and interpretation of literary texts, for incorporating additional *quantitative data on literature*, and for using secondary criticism to build models of information about literature: “But the trouble with close reading (in all of its incarnations, from the new criticism to deconstruction) is that it necessarily depends on an extremely small canon. This may have become an unconscious and invisible premise by now, but it is an iron one nonetheless: you invest so much in individual texts only if you think that very few of them really matter. Otherwise, it doesn’t make sense. And if you want to look beyond the canon (and of course, world literature will do so: it would be absurd if it didn’t!). Close reading will not do it. It’s not designed to do it; it’s designed to do the opposite. At bottom, it’s a theological exercise -- a very solemn treatment of very few texts taken very seriously -- whereas what we really need is a little pact with the devil: we know how to read texts, now let’s learn how not to read them. Distant reading: where distance, let me repeat it, is a condition of knowledge: it allows you to focus on units that are much smaller or much larger than the text: devices, themes, tropes, or genres and systems. And if, between the very small and the very large, the text itself disappears, well, it is one of those cases when one can justifiably say, less is more. If we want to understand the system in its entirety, we must accept losing something” [14, p.48].

As we may see from the statements above, “distance reading” may be effective when applied to literary history and the evolution of genres (for example, the concept of CRIME in British/American crime fiction, the concept of Country in Aboriginal Australian fiction, the concept of WAR in Australian poetry).

Digital humanities scholars such as David Berry and Anders Fagerjord [5] emphasise that digital technologies fundamentally reshape cultural production, interpretation, and knowledge formation. Among them, digital archives, open-access publishing, algorithmic analysis, and network visualisation expand access and democratise literary scholarship in relation to trauma/memory studies, postcolonial history novels, and war literature.

In the context of automation, Big Data, artificial intelligence, and global digital communication, literary texts increasingly exist within technologically mediated environments that shape both textual production and reader reception.

Within this interdisciplinary methodological approach, literary text functions simultaneously as a complex linguistic construct, a repository of cultural memory, a psychological and trauma-informed archive, and an intermedial phenomenon operating across multiple semiotic systems. Furthermore, it foregrounds the capacity of literary texts to encode collective and individual experiences [6;11;12;13] shaped by historical catastrophes, migration, colonialism, technological transformation, ecological crisis, and globalisation.

Besides, literary texts increasingly operate in multimedia environments, where verbal language units interact with visual, digital, auditory, and performative elements, producing hybrid multimodal forms of meaning-making. From hermeneutic and post-structuralist perspectives, the text constitutes an open interpretative space characterised by semantic plurality, intertextuality, and discursive instability [3, p.168].

Current psychological and trauma-focused frameworks [10;11;12;13] view literature (literary texts) as a way to narrate, rebuild, and culturally pass on suppressed memories, emotional states, and intergenerational traumatic experiences.

Contemporary approaches to literary text reflect the broader intellectual transformations of the twenty-first century. Modern literary scholarship demonstrates that literary texts are dynamic cultural formations shaped by globalisation, technological change, ecological crisis, historical memory, and evolving social identities. Through interdisciplinary methodologies and innovative theoretical frameworks, contemporary literary studies continue to redefine the role of literary text in understanding human experience and the complexities of contemporary culture.

#### REFERENCES

1. Adami E., Kress G. Multimodality, meaning-making and the issue of “text”: An introduction. *Text & Talk*. 2014. Vol. 34, № 3. P. 231–237. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0007>
2. Babelyuk O. V., Koliassa O. V., Matsevko-Bekerska L. V., Matuzkova O., Pavlenko N. The Interaction of Possible Worlds through the Prism of Cognitive Narratology. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*. 2021. Vol. 12, № 2. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3892970>
3. Babelyuk O., Koliassa O., Smaglii V. Language Means of Revealing Postmodern Ludic Absurd in English Literary Text. *WISDOM*. 2021. Vol. 20, № 4. P. 166–179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v20i4.531>
4. Babelyuk O. Multimodal polyphonic narrative as amalgamation of hybrid graphic techniques and innovations. *Language. Literature. Folklore*. 2024. № 1. P. 23–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-9594-2024-1-2>
5. Berry D., Fagerjord A. *Digital Humanities: Knowledge and Critique in a Digital Age*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2017. 184 p.
6. Caruth C. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996. 111 p.
7. Damrosch D. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2003. 324 p.
8. Derrida J. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. 360 p.
9. Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and Method*. New York : Continuum, 1975. 601 p.
10. Herman D. *Story Logic: Problems and Possibilities of Narrative*. Lincoln : University of Nebraska Press, 2002. 450 p.
11. Hirsch M. *The Generation of Postmemory*. New York : Columbia University Press, 2012. 320 p.
12. Kristeva J. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York : Columbia University Press, 1980. 305 p.
13. LaCapra D. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. 216 p.
14. Moretti F. *Distant Reading*. London : Verso, 2013. 256 p.
15. Ricoeur P. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth : Texas Christian University Press, 1976. 112 p.