MEGATEXT IN ACADEMIC
AND ARTISTIC COMMUNICATION

Kolegaeva I. M.

INTRODUCTION

Prehistoric times are times of which no written manuscripts left. Thus, the emergence, formation and diversification of written communication marks civilization shifts in the history of mankind. Written communication since ancient times has been one of the most common and effective means of fixing, storing and transmitting information through time and space.

A written message, from a diary note up to a scientific treatise, unites people in a joint act of communication, transforming them, according to A. Papina, into "two active sources of heuristic activity. One participant implements a communicative plan (the message of certain information), the other decrypts it"[1]. At the same time, "responsibility" for the effective functioning of written communication falls on both participants. "The text is not autonomous, it does not exist by itself: responsibility is shared between writer and reader, " wrote Keith Oatley, suggesting a new designation for this collaborative activity – *writingandreading*[2]. Y. Sidorov stressed: "the essence of the text can only be established in interconnection of the text and the communicative activities of participants in the act of speech communication (namely, the author and recipient)"[3].

This scientific research is devoted to the **problem** of optimizing the *communicative functioning of the* text, the process that received the newly coined, and rather extravagant, name *writingandreading.* The optimization mentioned implies deepening the information potential of the text (the activity of the addresser) and improving its interpretations

---

[1] Папина А.Ф. Текст: его единицы и глобальные категории. Изд. 2-е. Москва: Едиториал УРСС, 2010. С. 8.

[2] Oatley K. Writingandreading. The future of cognitive poetics. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 161.

[3] Сидоров Е.В. Порядок текста: монография. Москва: Изд-во РГСУ, 2011. С. 82.

(the activity of the addressee) by expanding the volume and complexity of the structure within such a communicative phenomenon as **megatex**. The term *megatext* was proposed by us as long back as in 1991[4]. It was developed later in a series of publications[5].

In the current academic discourse there circulate a dozen of terms derived from the term *text:* makrotext, hypertext, paratext, metatext, hipotext, intertext, texton[6]. Each of them highlights different peculiarities of the multifaceted phenomenon of a verbal message structured as a whole text. Special attention to the *structure* of text is illustrated by the prominent name of one of the last publications, where the works of scientists from different countries are collected *Text and Language. Structures. Functions. Interrelations*[7]. Therefore, research in this area is definitely **relevant.**

The **aim** of the present paper is:

1) to elucidate the phenomenon of *megatext*,

2) to qualify communicative validity of each component of a *megatext*,

3) to expose peculiarities of each of them in appositive <u>academic</u> vs <u>artistic</u> communication.

---

[4]Колегаева И.М. Текст как единица научной и художественной коммуникации. Одесса: Одесобллолиграфиздат, 1991. С 76 and beyond

[5]Колегаєва І.М. Літературний твір й іншомовна читацька аудиторія. (Комунікативні аспекти текстових трансформацій). *Щорічні записки з українського мовознавства.* Одеса: Вид-во Одеського держ. унів. ім. І. Мечникова, 1996. Вип. 3. С. 9–22;

Колегаєва І.М. Мегатекст як вияв комунікативної гетерогенності цілого завершеного тексту. *Мовознавство.* 1996. № 1. С. 25–30;

Колегаева М.М., Голубенко Л.Н. Феномен коммуникативного посредничества. Его роль в становлений филолога. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Латстар, 2000. № 7. С. 141;

Колегаева И.М. Текстовая парадигма: микро-, макро-, мега-, гипер- и просто текст. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Фенікс, 2008. № 22. С. 70–80.

[6] Колегаева И.М. Текстовая парадигма: микро-, макро-, мега-, гипер- и просто текст. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Фенікс, 2008. № 22. С. 70–80;

Пьеге-Гро И. Введение в теорию интертекстуальности. Москва. Изд-во ЛКИ, 2008. С. 226–229;

Фатеева Н.А. Интертекст в мире текстов: Контрапункт интертекстуальности. Изд 3-е, стереотипное. Москва.: КомКнига, 2007. 280 с.;

Чернявская В.Е. Лингвистика текста: Поликодовосгь, интертекстуальность, интердискурсивность. Москва: Книжный дом "ЛИБРОКОМ", 2009. С. 25.

[7]Text and Language. Structures. Functions. Interrelations, Quantitative Perspectives / Advisory editor Eric S. Wheeler. Wienn: Praesens Verlag, 2010. 251 p.

To achieve this goal we solve several **problems:** we elucidate the meaning of the term *megatext*, describe its dichotomous division into *the main text* and *the auxiliary text*, and analyze the communicative potencies of each subsidiary component.

Methods of our research are rooted in pragmalinguistics, communicative linguistics, and hermeneutics; application of structural and megatextual analyses proved to be fruitful as well.

The **material** of our research is literary communication, limited by a written, complete, formally structured message, determined, among other things, by the parameter of a functional style. *Artistic communication* discussed further reveals itself in prosaic texts (novels, stories, fairy-tales, and essays of different genre attributions). *Academic communication* that is regarded in the paper is represented with different research publications (articles, monographs, scientific treatise, textbooks).

In other words, the **object** of the present research is twofold: text as a unit of communication in general, as well as in opposition of academic / artistic communication.

1. Academic vs Artistic Communication and Text Structure

The distinction between the goals and tasks facing the sender and the recipient of a message within the framework of academic and artistic communication leads to a significant difference in the algorithms for its encoding and decoding. The following two regularities attract specific attention. The first regularity covers declared or non-declared discourse activity of the addresser through his/her structuring the message which radically differentiates, respectively, academic and artistic communications.

In other words, the author of *an academic publication* is openly constructing his/her message, appealing to the readers' intellect, to their specified thesauri, to logically grounded discussion of the subject matter. The author invites the reader to share his/her theoretical standing explicitly marking his/her own position among other academic publications. Meanwhile the author of *an artistic work* appeals to the readers' imagination and emotionality and pretends exposing a fragment of "real world inhabited with real personalities". The conventionality of artistic communication implies that the readers are immerged into fictitious world of a novel, story or fairy-tale in some invisible "*gestalt*"

capsule of the text. The context of other artistic works in which the text exists is not anyhow explicated in the text *per se*.

Alongside with integrity and "transparency" of the external textual structure of *an artistic message* it is notable for complexity, fractionality, and multilayeredness of its internal communicative form due to numerous inclusions of quasi-communicative chains into it, for example, besides the author and the reader as real communicants it eagerly includes personages as fictitious communicants having all sorts of fictitious communication (entrusted narration, dialogues, correspondence, diaries etc.). *An academic message*, on the contrary, completely lacks any quasi-communicative (imagined) inclusions, having instead diversified layer of explicitly marked citations and references. A complicated, parceled and hierarchized external structure of the message is observed here.

Summing up the difference between communicative goals and tasks of artistic and academic communication we support the thesis that "the poetic text is fluid and continuous, but the academic one is discrete"[8]. The continuity, "fluidity" of *the artistic text* ensures optimal closure of the addressee within the framework of the represented quasi-reality. Readers' attention is not diverted to his/her awareness of the external formal organization of the message. The inner communicative structure of an artistic text (sometimes very complex) does not advertise itself through metacommunicative discourse of the *addresser* in remarks like "this will be discussed further on in chapter 5 of the book". Neither does it in the outer structure of the text through fractional parceling and logical hierarchical ordering of the fragmentary structure of the text.

Leading the *addressee* out of the boundaries of this communicative act and referring him/her to some outer, non-textual information is carried out in an erased, veiled form of allusions, hidden or transformed citations without an exact indication of their source and address, which results in smoothing and veiling the inclusion of this particular artistic text in a number of the like communicative formations. *The academic text*, on the contrary, explicates its appeal to extra-textual information through direct quotations, references, polemic commentaries etc., thus openly including the text into the paradigm of corresponding academic publications.

From the point of view of its pragmatic orientation and structural specificity, the whole complete text of more or less significant volume

---

[8] Степанов Г.В. Язык. Литература. Поэтика. Москва.: Наука, 1988. 383 с.

almost never represents a monolithic formation. On the contrary, it is often nothing more than an association of several components, carriers of different communicative functions, characteristics and purposes. In other words, the whole complete text is most often a communicatively heterogeneous phenomenon. In particular, structurally targeted heterogeneity is manifested in unequal pragmatic guidelines that different parts of the text perform in a general communicative task.

Various parts of text can function with different pragmatic goals (either information transfer or optimization of this process). One part is always focused on sending a message *per se*. The other aims at providing optimum conditions for the most effective transmission and perception of this message. The unity of the two parts makes up a new communicative formation which will be discussed further on.

Megatext, by our definition, is the unity of **the main text** and **the auxiliary text**. These parts are distinguished by the pragmatic orientation, communicative validity, and obligatory/optional nature of their presence in the megatext. *The main text* is completely obligatory; it is valuably dominant over the auxiliary one, pragmatically aimed at the transmission of the message *per se*. This is the text of a *story, an article, a novel, an essay, a monograph*, and so on. *The auxiliary text* is a number (from 1 to 8) of text messages, which optionally accompany the main text; which are valuably secondary and pragmatically auxiliary, *i.e.* which aim at optimizing the functioning of the main text. They are *preface/afterword, content, abstract, summary, footnote, commentary, glossary, bibliographic list, dedication, epigraph, appendix*. The set of *the main* and *the auxiliary* (at least one) *texts* forms a communicatively heterogeneous whole, which we call **megatext**.

The genetic affinity of text and megatext is quite obvious. Of course, the starting point is always a text. Sometimes it is initially accompanied by an auxiliary message(s), for example, a text and an *epigraph* to it, a text and a *dedication*. In this case, the text from the very beginning of its circulation enters the communicative space in the "***megatext*** package". But most often the appearance or expansion of the ***megatextual*** structure chronologically *follows* the appearance of *the main text*. In addition, the variability of the ***megatextual*** structure of one and the same basic text is also a common occurrence. Our assumption is that the longer a text circulates in the communicative space and the greater its information potential and/or artistic value is, the greater is the

probability of appearing new and new auxiliary messages added to the core message. Most often they are new *comments*, *glossaries*, and *prefaces* that differ from their predecessors (if any). Consequently, each time new configurations of the **megatextual** structure appear. For example, 5 editions of Nathaniel Hawthorne's novel *Red Letter*, the famous and popular work of the English classics, which were published over 40 years (1959-2000), never repeated their **megatextual** structure[9].

2. Megatext: Components, Functions

There is no doubt that the communicative value of *the main* and *the auxiliary components* of a single **megatext** is unequal, which affects even the order of their location in the literary work. *The main text* is always a complete graphical body, entirely or dominantly placed on the page. On the contrary, graphic bodies of *auxiliary messages* are always separated from the body of the main message and from each other. The font that the *auxiliary messages* are printed (usually petite) differs from the font of *the main text* and indicates the subordinate status of the corresponding fragments. The same applies to lay-out: an auxiliary fragment is placed either below the main text (*footnote*), or with an enlarged left or right field (*epigraph*), or separately (*dedication*, *annotation*). We hold that *the auxiliary text* is a group of discrete verbal entities, each of which is (semantically and formally) much more closely linked to *the main text* than to each other. Thus, within **megatext** as a whole, we observe the prevalence of vertical links (between the main and auxiliary components) over the horizontal (between the individual components of *the auxiliary text*).

The auxiliary text formations may be placed in the preposition to *the main text* (*preface, abstract, dedication, epigraph, content*), the interposition (*references*), the postposition (*afterword, commentary notes, content, resumé, summary, bibliographic list, appendix*) or in the parallel position (*page footnote*). The separate and subordinate location of *auxiliary messages* is a manifestation of their communicative minority (but not redundancy). It sometimes gives the reader the opportunity to read *the main text* and some of *the auxiliary components* of **the megatext** separately. For example, it is obvious that with fast, or

---

[9] Лукиянова Е.Ф. Мегатекст и образ читателя. *Записки з романо-германської філології*. Одеса: Фенікс, 2003. № 13. С. 117–128

rather hurried, superficial perception of *a megatext*, the reader often reads *the main message* and fully or partially neglects *the auxiliary messages*.

The question of autonomous functioning of auxiliary messages has several answers. Most of them are meaningless and are of no interest to the reader outside their links with the main text. *Dedication*, *footnote*, *commentary*, and *content* fulfill their communicative function exclusively within a *megatext*.

For example, *dedication* is nothing but a reflection of the author's respect and affection for a particular person, who is usually quite unknown to the reader. That is why it can be rather cryptic: only initials instead of the person's full name are frequently used in such auxiliary message. Nominations like *my parents, my wife* do not add much to such communicative units, leaving them almost completely void of informative content for the reader. In the framework of *the megatext dedications* just draw a certain "thread" into the outer world of literary publications.

To the components of *a megatext*, which do have the potential of independent communicative functioning, we include *preface/afterword*, *bibliographic list* and *epigraph*. Realizing the diversity of this chain, we still insist on the functional similarity of its components.

Preface / afterword, being focused on *the main text*, nonetheless is a self-completed text form, to which the reader refers with a specific communicative task: to obtain in abridged form an overview-digest information about the author and the basic themes of *the main text*, the general background (aesthetic, literary, socio-economic or scientific), on which *the main message* is constructed. No wonder *preface* and *afterword* alongside with *annotation* and *summary* are constructed in accordance with the rules of a semantically and formally complete message. Sometimes they can communicate in a very independent way, even separately from *the main text*.

Among all *the auxiliary messages* included into *a megatext*, the focus of many researchers was often upon *epigraph*. We will give Z. Turayeva's views on this "optional element of the text", which "has a dual orientation to the source text and the new text", into which it is integrated[10]. Reflecting on the independent status of *epigraph*, we

---

[10] Тураева З.Я. Лингвистика текста. Текст: Структура и семантика. Москва: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. С. 54.

emphasize the peculiarities of this status. *An epigraph*, before being included in **the megatext**, is a precedent textual phenomenon that functions in the communicative space on its own: a Biblical quotation, a stanza of some well-known poetry, a proverb, etc. Being attached to *the main message* as an *epigraph*, such text complicates the semantic structure of the target text by bringing to its semantic structure the emotional and thematic echoes of the "parental" text. The communicative activity of the addresser and the addressee of **the megatext** containing *an epigraph* presupposes the presence of a wide range of literary, ideological and cultural knowledge in the thesauri of both communicants.

Sometimes the reader may independently perceive *the content* and *the bibliographic list* accompanying this or that text. In case the headings are thematic (not simply numerical), *the content* is nothing else but the concentration of the most important semantic nodes of the main message. In addition, *the content* is *an auxiliary message* that facilitates the reader's initial acquaintance with *the main text* and his/her further orientation in its compositional-architectonic structure. The information obtained may either invite the reader for further reading of *the main text* or prompt him/her to stop reading at all.

In its turn, *the bibliographic list*, as an integral part of an *academic* text (in contrast to the *artistic* one) gives the reader the opportunity to grasp the cultural and professional basis on which the main message is formed. Such lists reflect (partially but rather vividly) the author's academic thesaurus. Besides, a list of bibliographic sources offers valuable additional information that can be used effectively regardless of *the main text* to which it is appended.

No doubt, full decoding of *a megatext* (as the author's intentions usually are) takes place in successive (without any gaps) readers' perception of all the components of the message that were included by the author into the **megatextually** structured message.

Let us consider the specifics of such communicatively heterogeneous formation on the example of *a megatext*, consisting of *the main text* and its *commentary*. *The commentary* is inextricably linked to the main text both with content and formal-language links. According to Gerard Genette's statement, expressed in his book "Palimpsesti: Literature in the Second Degree" (1982), *the comment* comes with its

pretext (the text that is commented) in metatextual relation[11] which is a manifestation of meaningful connections.

The comment usually has the form of foot-notes or post-text notes. A graphic signal that marks the functional link between *the main* and *the auxiliary messages* is a special asterisk or numeric sign located at the end of the segment of *the main text* that is subject to comment. A communicatively competent reader (that is, the one who knows the norms of adequate decoding of texts of a certain functional style) takes such a mark as a signal for switching from the main message to the auxiliary one.

It should be noted that in general, *comments* themselves, even if they are collected into a single post-text block, cannot function individually like a separate communicative unit, as opposed to, say, *afterword*, *bibliography*, and the like. The reason lies in very strong vertical ties between *a commentary note* and *the main text*. This circumstance is most clearly manifested through the specific text deicsis.

According to Michael Toolan, deictic words are "all those language elements that have the orientation function *here, there, now, then* and indicate, that discourse occurs in a particular place and at a specific time"[12]. Peter Stockwell argues that the deictic markers create a "zero point" of the deictic field. Change of these markers leads to a deictic shift and transition to another deictic field[13]. However, no deictic shift occurs on the boundary between *the main text* and *the commentary*, despite the fact that these two messages – *a comment* and its "pretext" (in G. Genette's sense) – are located in different visual fields. The lexical units having a deictic character, namely, *here*, *above*, *below*, *the following* in case they are used in *the commentary note*, indicate that *the note* as a message does not form its own deictic field; instead, it uses the system of deictic coordinates that exists in *the main message*.

Thus, for example, the phrase *the following text*, functioning in *a note*, implies next (after the asterisk) part of *the main message*. The deictic word *following* in this phrase does not imply the next *note* (in case there is any). Besides, the fact that *the note* itself is in postposition to *the*

---

[11] See: Фатеева Н.А. Интертекст в мире текстов: Контрапункт интертекстуальности.. Изд 3-е, стереотипное. Москва: КомКнига, 2007. С. 121–142.

[12] Toolan M. Narrative. A Critical Linguistic Introduction. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. P. 59.

[13] Stockwell P. Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. P. 79.

main text (thus, nothing may follow it) is completely ignored. Consequently, such a deictic phrase acquires its true meaning only in the coordinate system of *the main message* and exclusively at the point of its linear deployment, to which this *commentary note* is attached.

For example, in *the comments* to Oksana Zabuzhko's novel "Museum of Abandoned Secrets" we read: *"nous sommes les artistes* (hereinafter in the text "Nu somm les artist") – we are artists *(fr)"[14]*. Let us pay attention to the deictic reference "*hereinafter in the text*" – it refers to the text of the novel after page 241, where the commented French inclusion is first used. Between the center of the deictic field (p.241), upon which the deictic *hereinafter in the text* is oriented, and *the commentary* containing this statement (p.829), there are as many as 588 pages. But the real textual distance is irrelevant in the outlook of communicative dimension. We herewith stress that no other auxiliary message demonstrates such formal unity with the main text.

In our opinion, *the commentary note* and the corresponding part of *the main text* constitute a common discourse (albeit with hierarchical components), both of them are constituents of a common deictic field with the single center of shifter coordinates.

3. Pragmatics of Auxiliary Components in a Megatext

Functional and pragmatic differences of *the main* and *the auxiliary messages* are a constant parameter of any **megatext**. Their quantitative ratio is variable. Typically, *the main text* dominates. The minimum limit for *the auxiliary text* equals one verbal formation, say, *an epigraph*, *a footnote*. Zero representation of *auxiliary component* automatically eliminates the very concept of **megatext**. Such message, thus, has a purely **textual**, not a **megatextual** structure.

As to the contents of *commentary notes* (especially those added by an editor), the following should be highlighted. On the one hand, helping the reader to elucidate some vague, difficult moments of the main message, the commentator, no doubt, performs a certain educational mission. On the other hand, the commentator's *intrusion* into the communicative chain ("author–text–reader" transforms into "author–text–commentator–reader") leads to an imbalance of the communicative rights of the addresser (author)

---

[14] Забужко О. Музей покинутих секретів: роман. Вид 2-е, доп. К.: Факт, 2009. 832 с.

and the addressee (reader). The figure of a commentator as well as his activities, were not foreseen by the author and thus violate the author's fundamental right to be explicit in his work to the extent that he considers appropriate. As M. Bakhtin wrote, "the statement (the novel including – I.K.) ends with silent *dixi* ("I have said all that I had to say")"[15]. Yet, the commentator undertakes an unauthorized educational mission to *report* something that *has **not** been reported* by the author.

First of all, such intrusions affect artistic texts. Editor's/translator's/commentator's interpretation and elucidation of hints, clarification of allusions, attribution of hidden citations, as well as translation of foreign language inclusions in a belles-lettres text – all these eventually lead to alteration, even twisting of the reader's image. The expected (by the editor-commentator) image of the reader of ***a megatext*** (with unauthorized added commentary) turns out to be not identical (smaller) to that of the initial ***text*** (devoid of commentary).

Appealing to his initial model of the addressee (the so called *reader's image*), the addresser (the writer) leaves certain parcels of information in a nonverbalized, implied presentation. Having verbalized what used to be only implied, the commentator trespasses the communicative "territory" both of the author and of the reader. To the commentator's mind the scope of the reader's thesaurus looked insufficient and requiring some tips and elucidations to cover certain expected lacunae in the reader's communicative competence. Notwithstanding its educational impact such activity deprives the reader of the opportunity to exercise his right to "read between the lines", which, according to Catherine Emmott, gives the reader a pleasure if he can cope with the additional challenges of a literary work and realize his ability to guess what is not said directly (the pleasure that readers can get from the additional demands that such texts make is their inference-making abilities)[16].

O. Vorobyova investigates the phenomenon of ambiguity in literary text and insists that ambiguities are statements which are *designed* to be left nondeciphered, remaining for good "a thing-in-itself", the statements that are left for the readers to "infer, ascribe, or read into the text relevant

---

[15] Бахтин М.А. Эстетика словесного творчества. Москва: Искусство, 1979. С. 250.

[16] Emmott C. Reading for pleasure. A cognitive poetic analysis of "twists in the tale" and other plot reversals in narrative texts. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 145–159.

explanations"[17]. She resumes that "ambiguity may serve as an initial impulse of the author-reader dialogue as in-built in literary text or of its readers' potential dialogic response".

In academic publications, *commentaries* also fulfill educational mission, but with less destructive effect (if any at all) upon the addresser's communicative rights. For example, the work by Phillip Wheelwright *Metaphor and reality*, which was included into academic publication *Metaphor theory* (1990), is commented by the translator who explains that the term *T-language,* used in the text, means *tensive language,* or language which creates tension – the key notion of the general theory of metaphor, which was developed by Ph. Wheelwright. Then the commentator adds that characteristics of T-language are spoken about in one of the chapters in Wheelwright's *Metaphor and Reality*[18].

Yet certain trespassing of communicative powers can be traced in translated academic publications, where we sometimes encounter an *editorial comment* that is nothing less than an academic dispute with the author. A vivid example of such unauthorized expansion of the editor's communicative powers is the Russian edition of the "Semiotics of a Book" by the Polish researcher Zberskiy[19], where on the 67 pages of the author's text there are 16 footnotes of editorial comments, 5 of which are of polemic character. In our opinion, such phenomena lead to the neglect of the author's communicative rights and at the same time to the expansion of the communicative rights of the reader, giving him, so to speak, "the most favored regime".

4. Inner vs Outer Textual Structure
in Academic / Artistic Communication

Megatextual structure of a message that unites *the main text* and *the auxiliary messages* such as *references*, *footnotes*, *annotation*, *summary*, etc. into a single communicative whole, is minimal in the belles-lettres text. This once again confirms the thesis of the typical wholeness, non-

---

[17] Vorobyova O.P. 'Haunted by ambiguities' revisited: In search of a metamethod for literary text disambiguation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of university of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava.* Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2017, II (1), P. 428–496. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2017-0011.

[18] Теория метафоры: сборник. Москва: Прогресс, 1990. С. 82.

[19] Зберский Т.Семиотика книги. *Червинский М. Система книги.* Москва: Книга, 1981. С. 6–127.

discretion of the formal structure of the artistic text. The above-described form of *an artistic message*, like a whole capsule, envelopes the addressee, drawing him/her into a closed universe of quasi-reality. One more analogy seems to be permissible. N. Zhinkin holds the following: "Potebnia compared speech with a transparent glass, behind which the world around us is visible"[20]. In our opinion, artistic *speech* is not always suitable for this comparison. Its imagery, individuality, aesthetically justified deviations from general language standards can become the object of the addressee's attention on a par with the subject of speech and, therefore, deprive such speech of the properties of transparent glass. However, the image of the transparent substance, invented by Potebnia, seems to us fully applicable to the artistic *message*, if not to its *language*, to *its textual structure*, which can be likened to a transparent glass capsule through which the world of quasi-reality that surrounds the addressee is visible.

Especially it should be noted that the general trend towards the integrity and non-discretion of the *external* form of *the artistic message* is opposed to the complication and fragmentation of its *internal* communicative structure. This is due to the introduction of quasi-communicative chains, for example, entrusted narration on behalf of different characters (sometimes entering into each other narrations on the principle of "Chinese box"), imitating the dialogues and thoughts of characters, all sorts of written texts (diaries, letters, news-paper items etc.). The sender and recipient of such messages in the artistic literary work are not the addresser / addressee of the whole text (i.e. the author / reader), but most diverse quasi-communicative figures (from anthropomorphic, sometimes alien characters to otherworldly voices).

The paradox of *artistic communication* is that the absolute conventionality (often unreality) of such quasi-communicative interventions does not hinder, but, on the contrary, contributes to the fuller involvement of the addressee, into the fictional world of quasi-reality encapsulated in a single "transparent capsule" of textual form.

Unlike *artistic, academic communication* assumes an unhindered exit of the addressee outside the scope of this particular communicative unit in order to attract the widest possible information base, due to which

---

[20] Жинкин Н.И. Речь как проводник информации. Москва: Наука, 1982. 160 с.

the recipient can judge the completeness, consistency and credibility of the concept presented.

Megatextual structure of *academic communication* in every possible way promotes such a communicative activity of the addressee. This is evidenced by the apparatus of *bibliographic references*, obligatory for such texts, and following the rigorous rule of correct citation of sources with indication of their exact address. Such *auxiliary messages* of *the* ***megatextual*** *structure* of an *academic publication* imply the possibility of the reader's addressing the relevant publications outside the measures of this very communicative product.

The traditional system of *footnotes*, *cross references*, *annotations*, and *summaries* maximally explicates both the auxiliary communicative activity of the addresser and the message *per se* as a product of the addresser's communicative activity. This message consequently is perceived not only in itself, but also as a phenomenon standing in a series of ontologically homogeneous communicative phenomena. Various paradigmatic connections between the former and the latter are openly declared in any *academic publication*.

It is self-evident that quasi-communicative inclusions are completely alien to modern *academic texts*, although in the past scientific reports were often clothed in the form of dialogues, conversations with a friend, etc., which was probably a residual reflection of the general trend of communication from personal to transpersonal. As D. Price[21] notes: "All modern scientific literature begins with letters to very real people". Nowadays, quasi-communicative figures are readily introduced into *popular science literature* to increase its intelligibility and persuasiveness.

Whereas the power of persuasiveness of *academic texts* lies in another – in the logic and sequence of the presentation, the consistency of the facts reported, the reasoning of the author's conclusions, the breadth and correctness of the information base being drawn from outside. The most optimal form of such messages is not a "transparent one-piece capsule" that isolates the addressee within an art message, but a parceled, hierarchically ordered and explicitly marked text form. This form contributes to the unambiguous perception of the content structure of the

---

[21] Прайс Д. Тенденции в развитии научной коммуникации – прошлое, настоящее, будущее. *Коммуникация в современной науке*. Москва: Наука, 1976. С. 83–109.

message, to the unhindered exit of the addressee into the *academic text* paradigm. It adequately reflects the heterogeneity of the discourse activity of the addresser, namely his text and megatext activity, his creation of main and auxiliary messages within the framework of a single communicative whole (***megatext***).

Thus, we see that the information retrieved by the recipient from the *academic message* is of a dual nature. This is, above all, information about the reference space reflected through discourse, but it is also information about the discourse itself: about the varieties in which it is implemented and about the forms in which it is cast.

In *artistic communication*, the information retrieved by the recipient is deprived of such duality, it equals the information about the reference message space. Discourse as such remains outside the field of the addressee's view. The assertiveness of the addressee's non-presence in the *discursive* activity of the message fundamentally distinguishes artistic communication from academic one.

The process of reading literary texts is perceived by many researchers through the prism of metaphor. Joanna Gavins holds that most often reading is described in terms of the metaphor of *immersion* ("*sensation of being immersed in. .. ")"*[22].

Peter Stockwell operates a conceptual metaphor READING IS A JOURNEY[23]. Relying on the last metaphor, it is worth noting that reading a ***megatetext*** is a tacitly imagined journey with a travel-guide in hand. A traveler can use the services and tips of the guide-book, or he may neglect them and set to travel-reading *the main text*, bypassing all the tips of *the auxiliary texts*. Or in some cases he can choose to limit his journey to a guide-book only, without even going on a journey. It is clear that the choice remains for the reader. But it is also clear that the maximum of information potential is realized through the very ***megatextual*** whole.

In the end we conclude that either in *artistic* or in *academic communication* ***text*** and ***megatext*** are members of a single communicative family. Continuing the family metaphor, we shall

---

[22] Gavins J. "Too much blague?" An exploration of the text worlds of Donald Barthelme's 'Snow White'. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 129.

[23] Stockwell P. Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. 193 p.

emphasize, that "parents" of each of them are practically always different: the author of *the main text* may not be the author of *the auxiliary texts*: *comments*, *prefaces*, *afterwards, epigraphs* are traditionally the communicative products of others (editors, translators, other writers or poets). The combination of *the main* and *the auxiliary components* into a single **megatextual** *structure* is partly the implementation of the author's will (such are **megatexts** with *epigraph*, *dedication*, *content*, *appendix*, *bibliographic list*, *references*), partly it is not sanctioned by him at all (such are **megatexts** with *editorial comments, preface* or *afterward, abstract).* Important in either case is the synergetic effect generated by such communicative association.

CONCLUSIONS

Summing up all of the above mentioned, we state:

A whole complete text most often functions as a pragmatically heterogeneous phenomenon. Structural heterogeneity is correlated with unequal pragmatic guidelines that different parts of such text perform in a general communicative task. One part of a **megatext** is always focused on sending a message *per se*. The other aims at providing optimum conditions for the most effective transmission and perception of this message.

In the presence of such communicative heterogeneity, the corresponding complete message is split into two unequal components: *the main text* and *the auxiliary text components* such as *preface*, *afterword*, *content*, *abstract*, *footnotes*, *epigraph*, *dedication*, *bibliographic references* and *bibliographic list, appendix*. Conglomeration of such latter text formations is considered as *the auxiliary text*. The unity of *the main* and *the auxiliary texts* makes the formation of a higher order, which we propose to call **megatext**. *Megatextual* structure of *academic* and *artistic text* varies both in its nomenclature and its functions.

SUMMARY

The article puts forward the theory of **megatext** as a formal structure combining two communicatively heterogeneous components, different in their information validity and pragmatic aims. The two components are *the main* and *the auxiliary texts. The main text* is completely obligatory; it is valuably dominant over the *auxiliary* one, pragmatically aimed at the

transmission of the message *per se*. This is the text of a *story, an article, a novel, an essay, a monograph*, and so on. *The auxiliary text* is a number of text messages, which optionally accompany *the main text*; which are valuably secondary and pragmatically subordinate, *i.e.* aiming at optimizing the reader's perception of *the main text*. They are *preface/afterword, content, abstract, summary, footnote, commentary, glossary, bibliographic list, dedication, epigraph, appendix*. The set of *the main text* and at least one of the possible varieties of *auxiliary texts* forms a communicatively heterogeneous whole, which we call **megatext**. *Academic text* openly manifests its inclusion into a textual paradigm of other academic publications, suggesting clear references to works on the connected themes and problems (*bibliographic lists, commentaries, glossaries* explicate such connections). *Artistic texts* are evasive in this respect; they suggest thematic, emotive links with other works of art through *epigraphs*, hidden citations, tending to preserve certain information in an ambiguous, non-deciphered form. Such *auxiliary texts* as *prefaces* or *afterwords* as well as *commentaries* essentially expand the informative potential of *the main text,* though their perception is always up to the reader.

REFERENCES

1. Emmott C. Reading for pleasure. A cognitive poetic analysis of "twists in the tale" and other plot reversals in narrative texts. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 145–159.

2. Gavins J. "Too much blague?" An exploration of the text worlds of Donald Barthelme's 'Snow White'. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 129–144.

3. Oatley K Writingandreading. The future of cognitive poetics. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. P. 161–173.

4. Stockwell P. Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. 193 p.

5. Text and Language. Structures. Functions. Interrelations, Quantitative Perspectives / Advisory editor Eric S. Wheeler. Wienn: Praesens Verlag, 2010. 251 p.

6. Toolan M. Narrative. A Critical Linguistic Introduction. London, New York: Routledge, 2002. 260 p.

7. Vorobyova O.P. 'Haunted by ambiguities' revisited: In search of a metamethod for literary text disambiguation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of university of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava.* Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2017, II (1), P. 428–496. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2017-0011

8. Бахтин М.А. Эстетика словесного творчества. Москва: Искусство, 1979. 424 с.

9. Жинкин Н.И. Речь как проводник информации. Москва: Наука, 1982. 160 с.

10. Забужко О. Музей покинутих секретів: роман. Вид 2-е, доп. Київ: Факт, 2009. 832 с.

11. Зберский Т. Семиотика книги. *Червинский М. Система книги.* Москва: Книга, 1981. С. 6–127.

12. Колегаева И.М. Текст как единица научной и художественной коммуникации. Одесса: Одесобллолиграфиздат, 1991. 120 с.

13. Колегаева И.М. Текстовая парадигма: микро-, макро-, мега-, гипер- и просто текст. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Фенікс, 2008. № 22. С. 70–80.

14. Колегаева М.М., Голубенко Л.Н. Феномен коммуникативного посредничества. Его роль в становлении филолога. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Латстар, 2000. № 7. С. 136–143.

15. Колегаєва І.М. Літературний твір й іншомовна читацька аудиторія. (Комунікативні аспекти текстових трансформацій). *Щорічні записки з українського мовознавства.* Одеса: Вид-во Одеського держ. унів. ім. І.І.Мечникова, 1996. Вип. 3. С. 9–22.

16. Колегаєва І.М. Мегатекст як вияв комунікативної гетерогенності цілого завершеного тексту. *Мовознавство.* 1996. № 1. С. 25–30.

17. Лукиянова Е.Ф. Мегатекст и образ читателя. *Записки з романо-германської філології.* Одеса: Фенікс, 2003. № 13. С. 117–128.

18. Папина А.Ф. Текст: его единицы и глобальные категории. Изд. 2-е. Москва: Едиториал УРСС, 2010. 368 с.

19. Прайс Д. Тенденции в развитии научной коммуникации – прошлое, настоящее, будущее. *Коммуникация в современной науке.* Москва: Наука, 1976. С. 83–109.

20. Пьеге-Гро И. Введение в теорию интертекстуальности. Пер.с фр. Москва: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2008. 240 с.

21. Сидоров Е.В. Онтология дискурса. Изд. 2-е. Москва: Книжный дом "ЛИБРОКОМ", 2009. 232 с.

22. Сидоров Е.В. Порядок текста: монография. Москва: Изд-во РГСУ, 2011. 208 с.

23. Степанов Г.В. Язык. Литература. Поэтика. Москва: Наука, 1988. 383 с.

24. Теория метафоры: сборник. Москва: Прогресс, 1990. 512 с.

25. Тураева З.Я. Лингвистика текста. Текст: Структура и семантика. Москва: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. 144 с.

26. Фатеева Н.А. Интертекст в мире текстов: Контрапункт интертекстуальности. Изд 3-е, стереотипное. Москва: КомКнига, 2007. 280 с.

27. Чернявская В.Е. Лингвистика текста: Поликодовосгь, интертекстуальность, интердискурсивность. Москва: Книжный дом "ЛИБРОКОМ", 2009. 248 с.

Information about the author:
Kolegaeva I. M.
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Chair of Lexicology and Stylistics
of the English Language, Romance-Germanic Philology Department,
Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University
2, Dvoryanska str., Odesa, 65082, Ukraine