

Philosophy of Postmodernism as a Marker of Modern Linguistic Methodology of Research on Interlinguistic Communication

YURII STEZHKO

Department of English, National Aviation University, 1 Gusara Avenue, 03058 Kyiv, Ukraine
Email: istezhko@ukr.net

The paper highlights the problems of the methodology of linguistics in the light of modern cultural transformations. The research object is the methodology of linguistic studies in the paradigm of postmodernism. The purpose is to substantiate the need for parity between rational and irrational approaches in the methodology of linguistic research. A point of the problem is the state inconsistency of the linguistic methodology with modern requests of global communication. In the process of research, a brief analysis of postmodernism in its relationship with linguistics is given; the causes of methodological disagreements of linguistic practices are determined; the parity of rationalism and irrationalism in the interpretation of the text is declared; a philosophical substantiation of the position on the correspondence of the narrative form of linguistic methodology to the humanistic potential of postmodernism is given. The conclusion is that the requirements of the philosophy of postmodernism should become an imminent part of research in linguistic methodology. The significance is improving the efficiency of the practical implementation of linguistic research.

Keywords: irrationalism, linguistics, methodology, narrative, philosophy, postmodernism, rationalism, reference

INTRODUCTION

It would not be an exaggeration to say that we live in the time of the information chaos. The natural diversity of spiritual life is changing into a spectrum of significant differences and irreconcilable positions – in the cultural and historical, philosophical, scientific and religious spheres and in the field of ‘common sense’. The differences range between philosophy and science also reaches the opposite – from the need for philosophy as methodology for scientific research to the complete rejection of such a need. And within the framework of the methodology opposite approaches to the cognition of reality are offered – or the ‘horizontal’ (irrational) principle of deconstruction, or the principle of rationality, and it means a deep ‘vertical’ philosophical conceptualisation of scientific knowledge. These discussions have a negative impact on linguistic research – primarily through losses in the field of protecting the national

language in the process of interlingual, intercultural communication. It is well known that a language is the foundation of national identity, without a servility to imperial oppression in global communication. 'Language is the key to a lasting identity of a nation, a basis for its ethnic cultural integrity', reads the preface to the newly approved Ukrainian orthography. Therefore, thanks to philosophy as the methodology, we should save linguistics as a science providing interlingual communication from losses caused by an ambiguous, superficial understanding of postmodern transformations.

The uniqueness of the Ukrainian language is well recognised especially among translators of works of art. No language is characterised by such a filling of positive connotations, metaphors and positive nuances in language units as the Ukrainian language. Therefore, placing its uniqueness on the altar of the effectiveness of the interlingual communication through unjustified neologisation is not in favour of national identification. So, the relevance of our chosen topic of article research is obvious.

BRIEF REVIEW OF PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE ON THE RESEARCH TOPIC

The analysis of scientific publications on this theme showed that the problems of science methodology had become the subject of attention of domestic and foreign philosophers and scientists. The problems of the methodology of scientific research in the aspect of the relationship between philosophy and science are noted in the works of Chursinova (2021), Lebedev (2016), Moss (2012), Nefdt (2019), Stezhko (2020), Karstens et al. (2020) and Zhou, Gao (2020). Papers of the scientists as Duncker (2022), Cherniienko, Malyar (2010), Evans, Levinson (2009), Haitao, Yanni (2020), Klimenyuk (2012), Leshhak (2002) and Nosirova (2023) are shedding light on the current state of linguistic methodology and its correspondence to the demands of the humanistic oriented culture of Postmodernism. The theme of the use of a narrative form in linguistics in the paradigm of the methodology of postmodernism is revealed in the works of Bekhta (2015), Mahkamova (2018), Marmolejo-Ramos et al. (2014) and Onopriyenko (2010). A wide information base for our study caused a review of scientific publications by Behme, Neef (2018), Chakraborty (2022), Gondek (2020), Komarova (2013), Nasution et al. (2021). The methodology and methods of linguistic research are given by Freidin (2009) and Vetrova (2019). The authors I. Vainorenien and N. Lemish set out a set of such modern methodological principles as anthropocentrism, anthropocosmism, epistemicity, expansionism, explanatority and functionalism (Vainorenien, Lemish 2021).

All of the above determined the choice of the topic of the article and its purpose – to substantiate the need for parity between rational and irrational approaches in the methodology of linguistic research.

LINGUISTIC METHODOLOGY AT THE BREAK OF CIVILISATION EPOCHS

It is well known that each epoch makes its adjustments both in culture and science 'Linguistics.' '... Language in its vocabulary reflects more or less accurately the culture it serves and absolutely right is that the history of language and the history of culture develop in parallel' (Sapir 1993: 194). But an influence of culture is not limited only to lexical transformations. Methodological transformations are essential, but much less attention is paid to this topic in the linguistic literature.

The analysis of linguistic practices has demonstrated that linguists have significant differences in their views on methodology and its role for linguistics, that is why we were resorted to

some clarifying of the basic positions of the study. Methodology is interpreted mostly as a number of theoretical provisions that define principles, forms and methods of scientific and informative activity. We believe that the content of the concept of 'totality' should be raised to the level of the concept of 'system', which involves taking into account the strategy, namely: figuring out a way to an aim of a study; providing comprehensive knowledge of the studied phenomena in their dynamics. Such comprehension raises the methodology on extremely high stairs of the generalisation – philosophical, on which even common scientific research methods have a subordinate role. However, the abstractness of philosophy, on the one hand, and the dominance of common sense, on the other, have led to the fact that linguists do not see behind the mass of particular objects the general that determines their place in the research. Linguistic methodology (or methodology of linguistic research) is defined as 'a number of scientific and research aspects and methods of study' (Zherebilo 2010: 177) As we see, the philosophical point of linguistic methodology is not taken into account in this definition.

Let us briefly analyse the consequences of this approach. Philosophy at all historical stages and in all its flows is the inseparable unity of worldview and methodology. The 'separate' methodological principles are a kind of conventionality which was agreed. But linguists, who take worldview for an attribute of their own consciousness (another kind is impossible), are trying to bypass the general philosophical and methodological paradigm of research, prefer to use mostly specific methods and general scientific methods. Such approach injects elements of chaos into linguistics, and this is the problem.

But this issue is not the only one. It is common for everyone to philosophise, but this is the philosophy of common sense, moreover, the common sense gives an orientation in life to scientists – an exception is the sphere of professional activity. And '... it harps on the demand for palpable utility and inveighs against knowledge of the essence of beings, which essential knowledge has long been called "philosophy"' (Heidegger, 1943). Therefore, a philosophical worldview formed by common sense is unacceptable in the scientific research. A scientist has to make choice consciously of his theoretical level of the philosophical worldview, and the methodological grounds for a linguistic expression of the conceptual picture of reality as well.

The only point is what philosophical positions he has. Among linguists, there are significant differences regarding the basic methodological principles due to differences in their philosophical positions. A trigger for that was the transformation of philosophy itself. In the modern era, admiration for the grandiose successes of natural science led to the formation of a logical and rational approach to reality in philosophy (founder of R. Descartes). Over time, the absolutisation of the principles of rationality, objectivity, determinism, a dominance of necessity, the conceptual unity, etc. have become a kind of historical constant. But there is no place for humanism in the principles of reasonable expediency. Rationalism, of course, is an essential criterion of truth, but not the only one.

Postmodernism (J.-F. Lyotard, J. Baudrillard, J. Deleuze, J. Derrida, etc.) has changed the situation – there was the 'centrism' change. 'Ratiocentrism' was replaced by anthropocentrism (logic of the philosophical conditionality of the conditioning methodology of scientific research, their anthropocentric orientation is disclosed by us (Stezhko 2020)), but with an orientation on the diversity of human spiritual values. Today it is wide pluralism and liberalism – a dynamic combination of subjectivism, irrationalism and pluralism of truths (a study object is justified by the interaction of many independent and not bind subjective 'truths'). And not public necessity is the priority of philosophy, but vice versa, philosophy determines freely cultural, spiritual forms of being. 'The sphere of philosophy – this is freedom, not a necessity' (Berdjaev 1916: 22).

The culture of postmodernism put forward the methodological requirements of humanisation to linguistics – after all, language exists for a person and is realised through a person. Today this trend is gradually implementing the practice of linguistic researches. Nevertheless, this process is quite ‘confused’, because there are a certain misunderstanding, what methodological requirements – logical and rational or sensual and irrational – are to follow. A result is... ‘... linguists often do not put a question about a methodological basis of their own research, thinking, obviously, that just a strict adherence to facts or traditional (therefore it seems obvious, right and unshakable) postulates would provide the necessary level of “scientificity” and “objectivity” of their work’ (Leszczak 2002: 46).

Some disregard of the epistemological and cultural guidelines of the postmodern methodology could be explained by their weirdness, unusualness. A brief description of postmodernism grounds is the following: the rejection of the one and objective essence of the universe, which could be deeply covered by cause-and-effect relationships, the conceptual unity of knowledge, objective truth. Instead of that, postmodernism declares the existence of a certain space covered with a text (text is not a reflection of objective reality, but a method of constructing a new, virtual one). The space is pluralistic, therefore any free interpretations are possible for its understanding, but mostly ‘horizontal’ and irrational ones.

Postmodernism gives ironic answers to the question about the reasons for the fragmentation of reality and consciousness, demonstrating the complete disrespect for the logic of reason. The question – What methods of the philosophy of rationalism can be used? – is also ridiculed because all the methods of rationalism are unambiguous like receipts, but the reality is always the Russian roulette, game of chance.

A more detailed analysis of the postmodernism features as a methodology is a topic for a wider research. We think that the idea about identifying the world with a text would doubly be useful for particular sciences, but, obviously, that also a field of thought for representatives of the linguistic methodology is being opened up. And dispute in postmodernism about the specifics of saving popular in use linguistic structures in the language may get a direct interest of linguists.

Let us make a middle conclusion. We may not agree with the loss of viability of the rational methodology, but to agree that rationalism does not have sufficient reasons to postulate about the unconditional objectivity of reality and the objectivity of truth.

Postmodern methodology has also obvious advantages – for example, dynamism and flexibility of the methodological position in accordance with the changing reality. We are not about the ‘centrism’ change, but the process of looking for the conceptual unity using the pluralism of truths. So, now postmodernism is coming to the recognition of emotional intelligence as the standard of a modern scientist who is also capable to ‘visual’ thinking and can represent a complex truth, let us say, using illustrations.

We think that this approach is correct. After all, the complete disregard for rational philosophical provisions does not contribute to the effectiveness of research on linguistic methodology, and ultimately does not meet the needs of the humanistically oriented culture of postmodernism.

NARRATIVE FORM OF THE METHODOLOGY OF SEMANTIC TEXT INTERPRETATION

The parity of rationalism and irrationalism in the interpretation of the text (space, reality) is understood by postmodernism in a very peculiar way for rationalism. Instead of rational methods, a methodological ‘canvas’ is proposed as an ‘area for truth’ for the free play of consciousness

on the choice of options for perceiving an event – meanwhile each option may have ‘traces’ of truth – but in general it does not matter. The main thing is the unlimited freedom for verbal creativity and the fact that the reader is already allowed to participate in the creation of the meaning of the text. We will show the effectiveness of this methodology using the example of narration. A narrator is a liberated intellectual who gets rid of the administratively established rules of the linguistic expression of reality. For him, the freedom of communication is the highest value of linguistic ethics.

Exactly the priority of humanistic dominants in the methodology of linguistic researches is able to ensure the freedom in a human (narrator) self-realisation in the creation of the text meaning and interlinguistic communication, what does correspond to the culture of postmodernism. The text, being at the intersection of multi-linguistic communicators, is able to organise scientific discourse; out of the text, thoughts exist only in the mind of everyone separately. The main direction of linguistics development as a science is its communicative function, and the task is to form an interlingual semantic field. Therefore, it is important to outline the main provisions of the methodology of linguistic research on interlingual communication, its narratives in line with the humanistically oriented culture of postmodernism. Narration as a subjectively modelled reality is seen as an embodiment form of the linguistic methodology of the postmodern project. The very narrative model of reality comprehension reflects most fully the postmodern conceptualisation of interlinguistic communication. So, there are reasons to think that the narrative (discursive) methodologies of linguistic researches are a currently leading form.

Therefore, is it a good time to wonder why we turn to the narrative paradigm of a communication? It is because narratives are widely available for a wide range of narrators with both theoretical and every day level of worldview, therefore, that has a universal character. The narrative is the focus of the unity of the subjective (creative potential of the narrator, his national and cultural self-expression) and the objective – the real reality. At the same time, the narrator is endowed only with his inherent, unique way of being, and, consequently, the way of creating meaning.

According to the postmodernist principle of deconstruction, linguistics should not methodologically pretend to the only possible idea of the narrative, neglecting the creative potential of the narrator. The narrative as itself is recognised as a creating meaning act, as a reflection of the cultural code of the nation – the bearer of the language. The narrative loses its semantic objectivity in its traditional interpretation – as an independence from a subject’s thinking. We find confirmation of this in V. Onopriyenko. ‘Reading never could be an objective process of a meaning discovering, but putting of a meaning in a text that alone has no sense at all. The text as the narrative – it is a story that could be interpreted differently anytime’ (Onopriyenko 2010: 23), he writes. Next we see the following explanations of the subjectivity specifics of the narrative. ‘The text for postmodernism is not considered from the point of a presentation of an original objective available meaning in it, the text just returns to the subject the meaning brought by it’ (Onopriyenko 2010: 23). Each word, got once in the narrative, appears not as a word in general, but as the word of a specific message, subject to the principle of functional implementation of the subjective meaning.

The postmodernist linguistic methodology of the meaning transformation of a text is illustrated by a phenomenon of reference most clearly. A reference is the link that connects a word-generated thought with an object of reality. However, do the associations coincide what about a non-verbal object (of the referent) by narrators – representatives of different languages, cultures, etc.? Of course not. And the history of translations proves that highly.

An interpreter, first of all, is a reader; he creates the dominant part of the narrative. So, '... to comprehend even the simplest texts, readers must engage such intricate processes as feature recognition, lexical access, memory storage and retrieval, integration, updating, etc. What is most remarkable, and often not realized, is that the words on the page merely provide the scaffolding for the meaning of a text. The lion's share of a text's meaning is actually constructed by the reader' (Marmolejo-Ramos et al. 2014: 4). The constructing is the highpoint for 'the remove of author's narrative by reader's narrative' in the sense of the corresponding culturally and mentally interpretation. The author and translator could be representatives of different nations, historical epochs, linguistic cultures, etc. In this case, background knowledge becomes the basis for mutual understanding of communicants, which indirectly contains the components of culture, art, literature and religion. However, this should be the subject of a separate study.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Thus, postmodernism transformations have affected all spheres of science; they did not bypass linguistics causing the need for methodological updating and rethinking outdated philosophical principles from the modern epoch. Therefore, the requirements of the philosophy of postmodernism should become an immanent part of research in linguistic methodology.

But the main thing is the targeting on the effectiveness of the practical implementation of these studies. That is because, according to Protagoras, 'man is the measure for all things'. We take optimal the humanistic orientation of the methodology of postmodernism, since it is aimed at solving issues of a man of common sense with his free searches for simple truth coloured emotionally. Postmodernism offers ways to transmit 'complex one into simple' via emotional intelligence. Only a scientist with emotional intelligence is able to explain the truth not logically and rationally, but visually, sometimes even witty, as, for example, M. Heidegger 'shows' the freedom of searching for truth on the field of wandering by a man of common sense: 'Yet turning towards and away from is based on a turning to and fro proper to Dasein' (Heidegger 1943).

Understanding the depths of complex truths and being able to convey them emotionally to a person of common sense is the marker of the effectiveness of linguistic methodology.

Received 2 March 2023

Accepted 21 June 2023

References

1. Behme, C.; Neef, M. (eds.). 2018. *Essays on Linguistic Realism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Press. Available at: <https://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs.196> <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.196.001beh>
2. Bekhta, I. 2015. 'Narration and Context of the Communicative Situation: Strategies of the Experimental Writing Narrative Discourse Interpretation', in *Data of the Textual Corps in Linguistic Research: Monograph*. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Lvivskoi Politekhniky, 115–129. Available at: <https://vlp.com.ua/node/13628>
3. Berdjaev, N. A. 1916. *The Meaning of Creativity (The Experience of Justifying a Person)*. M.: Izd-vo [b.i.].
4. Chakraborty, D. 2022. 'Critical Assessment of the Linguistic Turn Movement in Philosophy: With Special Reference to Wittgenstein', *Journal of Positive School Psychology* 6(2): 6518–6524. Available at: <https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/12240/7948>
5. Cherniienko, V.; Malyar, V. 2010. 'Marginal Factor of Methodological Nihilism', *Proceedings. Philosophy Series* 7: 136–153. Available at: https://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1&Image_file_name=PDF/Nznuoafs_2010_7_16.pdf
6. Chursinova, O.; Povtoreva, S.; Zhorniak, N. 2021. 'The Use of Structural Methodology in Postmodern Concepts of Technology', *Filosofija. Sociologija* 32(3): 203–211. Available at: <https://www.lmaleidykla.lt/ojs/index.php/filosofija-sociologija/article/view/4492/3631>

7. Duncker, D. 2022. 'Methodology in Language Research: A Sailing Between Scylla and Charybdis', *Forum Linguistico 19, Special Issue*: 7190–7205. Available at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5007/1984-8412.2022.e84043>
8. Freidin, R. 2009. *A Note on Methodology in Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09990665>
9. Gondek, N. 2020. 'Methodological Foundations of the Language of Metaphysics', *Filosofija. Sociologija* 31(3): 242–249. Available at: <https://www.lmaleidykla.lt/ojs/index.php/filosofija-sociologija/article/view/4272/3268>
10. Haitao, L.; Yanni, L. 2020. 'Methodology and Trends of Linguistic Research in the Era of Big Data', *Contemporary Social Sciences* 4(6). Available at: <https://css.researchcommons.org/journal/vol2020/iss4/6>
11. Heidegger, M. 1943. *On the Essence of Truth*. Available at: <https://aphelis.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Martin-Heidegger-On-the-Essence-of-Truth.pdf>
12. Karstens, B.; Klippi, C.; Nefdt, R. 2020. *The Philosophy and Science of Language: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55438-5>
13. Klimenyuk, A. 2012. 'Methodology and Creative Destiny of the Researcher', *Ukraine–Europe–World. The International Collection of Scientific Works. Series: History, International Relations* 10: 35–42. Available at: https://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Ues_2012_10_6
14. Komarova, Z. 2013. 'Fundamentals of the Systemic Methodology in Modern Polyparadigmatic Linguistics', *Terminological Bulletin* 2(2): 5–15. Available at: <https://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/51280/01-Komarova.pdf?sequence=1>
15. Lebedev, S. 2016. 'Methodology of Science and General-Scientific Methods of Research', *European Researcher. Series A* 105(4): 196–207. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.13187/er.2016.105.196>
16. Leshhak, O. 2002. *Essays on Functional Pragmatism: Methodology – Ontology – Epistemology*. Ternopol-Kelce.
17. Mahkamova, M. 2018. 'Modern Problems of Linguistics and Methods of Teaching English', *Obrazovatel'nyj Process* 1: 26–28. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/modern-problems-of-linguistics-and-methods-of-teaching-english/viewer>
18. Marmolejo-Ramos, F.; Elosúa de Juan, M.; Gygax, P.; Madden, C.; Mosquera, R. 2014. *In Press, Pragmatics & Cognition. Reading Between the Lines: The Activation of Embodied Background Knowledge During Text Comprehension*. Available at: https://doc.ero.ch/record/209012/files/Marmolejoetal_2009_preprint.pdf
19. Moss, S. 2012. *The Role of Linguistics in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Routledge. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237243583_The_Role_of_Linguistics_in_the_Philosophy_of_Language
20. Nasution, S. S.; Atmawijaya, T. D.; Aziz, A. 2021. 'The Students' Needs in Learning Research Methodology in Linguistics', *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development* 4(2): 79–87. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i2.935>
21. Nefdt, R. 2019. 'The Philosophy of Linguistics: Scientific Underpinnings and Methodological Disputes', *Philosophy Compass* 14(12). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12636>
22. Nosirova, S. O. 2023. 'Synergetic Linguistics as a New Philosophy of Language Study', *Proceedings of International Conference on Scientific Research in Natural and Social Sciences* 2(2): 136–142. Available at: <https://econferenceseries.com/index.php/srnss/article/view/1176>
23. Onopriyenko, V. 2010. 'Narrativ kak Strategija i Praktika Postmodernistskogo Obnovlenija Metodologii Sociogumanitarnogo Znaniya [The Narrative as The Strategy and Practice of Postmodern Renewal of Social and Humanitarian Knowledge]', *Visnyk Natsionalnoho Aviatyinoho Universytetu* 1: 22–25. Available at: https://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vnau_f_2010_1_7
24. Sapir, E. 1993. 'Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech', in *Selected Works on Cultural Studies and Linguistics*. M.: 'Progress', 'Univers'.
25. Stezhko, Yu. 2020. 'Educational and Scientific Vision of the Semantics of Postmodern Imperatives', in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Scientific-practical Conference 'Education for the 21st Century: Challenges, Problems, Prospects'*. Sumy Publisher SDPU, 426–429. Available at: <https://www.onmedu.edu.ua/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/8525/Ordu.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
26. Vainorenien, I.; Lemish, N. 2021. 'Contemporary Methodological Principles of Causal Dominant Effect Research in Linguistics and Procedure of its Contrastive Studying', *Forum Filologiczne Ateneum* 1(9): 141–161. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.36575/2353-2912/1\(9\)2021.141](https://doi.org/10.36575/2353-2912/1(9)2021.141)

27. Vetrova, E. 2019. *Methodology and Methods of Linguistic Research*. Doneck: DonNU. Available at: https://library.donnu.ru/el/ed/2527_9GUI.pdf
28. Zherybylo, T. V. 2010. *Slovar Lyncvystycheskykh Termynov [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]*. Available at: <https://rus-lingvistics-dict.slovaronline.com/>
29. Zhou, X.; Gao, Y. 2020. 'The Experimental Turn in Philosophy of Language', *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 2(1): 19–26. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v2i1.1201>

YURII STEZHKO

Postmodernizmo filosofija kaip šiuolaikinių kalbinių tyrimų metodologijos žymuo tarpkalbinėje komunikacijoje

Santrauka

Straipsnyje pabrėžiama lingvistinių tyrimų metodologinio palaikymo problema šiuolaikinių kultūrinių transformacijų kontekste. Tyrimo objektas – lingvistinių studijų metodologija postmodernizmo paradigmoje. Siekiama išryškinti lingvistikos metodologiją postmodernizmo imperatyvuose. Problemos taškas yra kalbinės metodologijos neatitiktis šiuolaikiniams globalios komunikacijos poreikiams. Tiriant pateikiama trumpa postmodernizmo santykio su kalbotyra analizė; nustatomos kalbinių praktikų metodinių nesutarimų priežastys; deklaruojamas racionalizmo ir iracionalizmo paritetas teksto interpretacijoje; pateikiamos filosofinės pozicijos dėl kalbinės metodologijos; pagrindžiama naratyvinės formos atitiktis humanistiniam postmodernizmo potencialui. Daroma išvada: postmodernizmo filosofijos reikalavimai turėtų tapti imanentine lingvistinės metodologijos tyrimų ir šių studijų praktinio įgyvendinimo dalimi.

Raktažodžiai: metodologija, filosofija, postmodernizmas, kalbotyra, naratyvas, nuoroda