

Yulia JUSZCZENKO,
Tatiana SHARBENKO

Intertextual Semiotics
of Roland Barthes in the Context
of Western European Post-Structuralism

Roland Barthes, a semiotician, literary critic, essayist, publicist, representative of the French post-structuralism, was a prominent figure in the Western European philosophical discourse of the 20th century.

Born in Cherbourg, he received a classical humanitarian education in Paris, was involved in teaching activity in Bucharest, organized the Center for the study of mass communication, was honored the title of Professor of the Higher Practical School, chaired the Department of Literary Semiology in the Collège de France.

Despite the severe fate trials, caused by the serious illness and long-term isolation from intellectual society, Roland Barthes was reached success with confidence. "Being an "outsider in the academic and literary world", he joined the youth, providing them with his own experience, his intellectual skills" [13]. At the same time it should be noted that in the formation of his own views Roland Barthes was greatly influenced by the ideas of A. J.

Greimas, L. Hjelmslev, R. Jakobson, Claude Levi-Strauss, etc. It was their works that persuaded the French philosopher in the necessity of semiotic interpretation of cultural and social phenomena. And familiarity with the creative works of M. Bakhtin, linguopsychological ideas of J. Lacan and semiotics of U. Eco led him to post-structuralism.

Nowadays, Roland Barthes' oeuvre has been actively studied by Ukrainian scientists, and the works of Y. Shvets, L. Komisar, O. Danylenko, O. Skalatska, S. Kutsepal, Y. Polikarpova, O. Mykytynets are considered to be the most significant. The creative activity of Roland Barthes was of great interest among the Western philosophical discourse and his heritage was the object of interest for J. Kristeva, J. Baudrillard, Louis-Jean Calvet, J. Culler, Ch. Morris, O. Ette, P. Burger, B. Komment, D. Kolesh and others. However, the issue on the development of the above mentioned problem has not been fully elucidated. We believe it is reasonable to substantiate the peculiarities of Roland Barthes' intertextual semiotics in the context of Western European post-structuralistic discourse. This aim is realized in the following tasks: to find out some aspects of the semiotic concept of the philosopher and reveal the concept of intertextuality based on his oeuvre.

A philosopher, in the works of whom the ontological problematic is displaced by methodological one and cultural reality is conceived, first and foremost, through the light of personified meanings, gives the new status to semiology as the science. Roland Barthes opens the entire spheres of culture that previously were unattainable, leading to a number of interesting developments made in this field. He realizes that the time has come when semiology should be a self-reflexive discipline, and for this purpose it has to realize their own, not formulated but anticipated preconditions to overcome them, find not only the new object of study (connotative semiotics), but also to distinguish in this object a special thing that requires special analytical methods (such thing will be a text for Barthes); it should go beyond the following categories of classical semiotics as "communication", "message", etc., and move the focus from the final "sign" onto its "origination", in other words, transit from the common "semiology" into "semianalysis" (according to J. Kristeva's terminology), into "text analysis" (according to R. Barthes' terminology) [10].

While criticizing the concept of the sign arbitrariness, formulated by Ferdinand de Saussure, where the sign is the unity of signifier and signified, and a signifier is unmotivated, i.e. arbitrary relative to the signified, not naturally connected with it in reality, Roland Barthes is convinced that a word and a concept denoted by the word can never be the same, since what

is being signified will never be presented in the sign. The sign, according to Barthes, acquires the feature of a symbol, when an especially close relationship is established between the signifier and signified, transforming them into a synthetic unity; and a major property of the sign, i.e., to convey the meaning, can be limited to the notion of interpretation or transitivity of a sign, i.e., to the possibility to convey its content by the other, more explicit extensive signs.

Throughout the creative period of his life, R.Barthes was concerned about how the "thing" acquires the status of the sign, i.e., to be not only the reality, but also to represent it. He was interested why being denoted, any reality transforms into a sign, what are the relationships between the signifier and signified. Semiotic problematic leads the philosopher into the space of intertextual phenomenon.

The phenomenon of intertextuality (*fr.intertextualite*) is a valuable heritage of philological semiotics and one of the most controversial concepts of the contemporary philosophical discourse, studied by various fields of humanitarian knowledge: semiotics, the theory of communication, linguistics, philology, etc. This phenomenon was the object of interest for representatives of diverse philosophical outlooks, schools and trends, and gained the particular importance in the philosophy of post-structuralism, the most prominent peculiarity of which became textocentrism. Post-structuralistic paradigm represents a qualitatively new, nonclassical understanding of a text: a text (in a wide sense) reflects not only the reality, but it is the reality of culture itself and, consequently, the reality of the entire world. According to L.Komisar, the emergence of the idea of intertextuality played the role of "copernician revolution" not only in contemporary literary criticism, but in all fields of philosophy and culture [9, P.3]. Linguistic study of intertextuality can be found in the works of M. Riffaterre and J. Culler (school of semiotics). In the modern scientific discourse intertextuality is considered as a text category (R. Beaugrande, U. Dressler); as precondition for textuality (R. Beaugrande, J. Lotman); as a productivity and a generator for meanings, as unconscious substrate, inscribed into cultural environment (J. Kristeva, J. Lotman); as cognitive model of language description (L. Jeannie); as information reality (S. Rabault); as interpretation of dialogism (J. Kristeva) and being analysed from the point of view of means for its realization in the specific texts (O.Abramova, L.Babenko, S.Zolyan); as a subjectless practice (J. Kristeva, M. Foucault), etc. The problem of multiple relationships of the text with other texts was of great concern for I. Arnold, A. Bennett, J. Derrida, U. Eco,

C. Levi-Strauss, S. Fish, M. Foucault and others. The concept of R.Barthes' intertextual semiotics was formed under the influence of works by J. Lacan and M. Foucault and ideas of Italian literary critic and linguist U. Eco, French philosopher J. Derrida and determined by familiarity with the dialogic concept of M. Bakhtin. Certain stimulus was also an influence of his student J. Kristeva, who introduced the concept of intertextuality into scientific usage. This concept has been postulated on the basis of the analysis of the concept of M. Bakhtin's "polyphonic novel", who introduced the phenomenon of text dialogue with other texts (and genres).

Julia Kristeva considered the texts as a combination of two axes, provided by specific codes: interrelated information contexts and references. Vertical axis combines the text with other texts, and a horizontal one consolidates the author and a reader of a message. The combination of these axes points to the fact that each text and each reading depend on previous codes [14]. In this connection, Kristeva asserted that any text is the intertext and the result of other discourses. Kristeva defines intertextuality as a "textual interaction that occurs within a single text" and emphasizes that in the process of intertextualization a text is being constantly transformed, formed and reconsidered" [7].

According to J. Kristeva, the key notions of the concept of intertext are genotext ("all semiotic processes [...], ruptures, marked in the society and on the human body") and phenotext ("a structure that can originate the meaning"). Phenotext is a hierarchically organized, structured semiotic product that has a rather stable content. Phenotexts are really existing phrases of natural language, designated to direct influence on a partner during communication. Genotext is the sovereign kingdom of "difference", where there is no center and the periphery; it is non-structured meaningful multiplicity, which acquires structural ordering only at the level of phenotext, a kind of "cultural solution" that crystallizes in the phenotext [11, P.281].

The problems of text analysis, procedures of reading-writing and intertextuality are reflected in the following works of Roland Barthes: "S/Z", "Writing Degree Zero", "Textual Analysis of a Tale by Edgar Poe", "Empire of Signs", "From Work to Text", "The Death of the Author" etc. French philosopher distinguished the writing and the text. The writing appears as complete integrity, unity of which is determined by the unity of its semantic intention. Consequently, the writing is aimed at suggestive infusion of predefined meaning to the reader. The writing appears as a message, designated for communication. Roland Barthes opposed intentionality and

integrity of writing to non-intentionality and semantic multiplicity of the text. The text is not an aesthetic product with fixed meaning, not a structure but a structuring; it is not an object, but the work and activity; it is not a set of separate characters that possess defined meaning, but the range of existence of transfer traces. Taking into account the views of Kristeva, the Barthes' concept of "writing" matches her concept of "phenotext" and the "text" matches the concept of "genotext": "a writing is the material fragment, which occupies a certain portion of the book space, and a text is a field of methodological competitions", "a writing is a static part of the "book space", which fits into the genre classification, has a specific signified and denotative meaning, keeps relationship with literary tradition and the author's intention" [1]. However, the text is the field of methodological operations that moves through a series of writings outside the genre, incremented the endless production of a signified by its own symbolic energy, generating a plurality of meanings as a result of existence of total anonymous citation, an abundance of "languages of culture", inter-and hypertextuality and anonymity" [1, P. 421-422].

Roland Barthes identifies a text as not a linear sequence of words, but "a multidimensional space", "the galaxy of signified", where the multiple kinds of writing are combined and confronted, none of which is not deprived of the status to be the original. The meaning of the writing has a multi-level structure that emerges from the layered semiotic text structure, where each semiotic level corresponds to its connotation, its logical sense [2].

Therefore, it can be asserted that, according to the Barthes' concept, writing performs the denotative function, and a text refers to the level of the connotation. While the writing can be characterized as that of what the author "said", then the text is what the issue is, regardless of the author's intention, though the direct phenomenon, which appears to the reader, is the writing, not the text. The path to writing runs through the text. Consequently, the writing is a connotator for the text, and the text is the integer set of cultural meanings, running through the text. The concept of meaning is of particular importance for Barthes. He identifies it as not the meaning of the words, but some secondary senses of lexis, association. The formation of the text meanings is closely connected with its scattering in space and changes in time. To find a single meaning or even one of the meanings is impossible, the meaning changes along with the text and the only thing we can only think, imagine, gone through a multiplicity of texts. Roland Barthes considers that writing should have its own "text", to depend on it and can't exist without text, like "a comet tail can not exist

without a comet", and the relationship between the writing and the text is always active [1].

Here it is appropriate, in our opinion, to mention the Gerard Genette's concept of intertextuality, where the text, which is perceived as the palimpsest, is interpreted as such that is written on top of the other texts, inevitably showed through its semantics. The concept of "clean sheet" loses his sense. Genette stated to a certain extent about "each text as an intertext", but only in another terminology: "And hypertextuality"? It, obviously, is also a universal aspect of literature [...] in that sense all writings are hypertexts" [8, P.117]. The researcher interprets the term "intertext" by such particular expressions as allusions, quotations and plagiarism, and the concept of intertextuality means one of the levels of transtextuality (G. Genette emphasizes that his concept of intertext is obviously more limited than J. Kristeva's one). Therefore, the Genette's concept of transtextuality has something in common not only with the Barthes' concept of the "text", but also the concept, associated with the term "intertextuality".

The U. Eco's opinion is worth considering when, while finding out the principle of "intertextual relationships", he refers to the concept of "intertextual dialogue", considering the phenomenon, when the text is the reflection of prior texts, whereas Barthes denotes the text as an "echo-chamber" (fr., "*chambre d'écho*") that creates stereophony from external echoes. The meaning can be compared with an echo that depends on voice intensity, evoking it. Like an echo depends on voice intensity, the meaning depends on the structure of the codes.

Consequently, each text is the intertext; other texts are presented on it at different levels in more or less recognizable forms: text of the previous culture and texts of the surrounding culture. The meaning arises only as a result of linking together these semantic vectors, bringing to a broad cultural context that stands in relation to any text as the external semantic environment.

For Barthes, "the basis of the text is... its transcendence into other texts, other codes, other characters", and, in fact, a text, both in the process of writing (*l'écriture*), and in the process of reading, is "the sharing of many other texts, endless or, more precisely, lost (those which lost the traces its own origin), codes" [5]. It is the concept of a code that is the key notion in the Barthes' intertextual semiotics, and it emerges to organize textual multiplicity, make it achievable for analytical objectification.

The philosopher compares a code with a thread. Writing is webbed from these "threads", and they lead to the meanings. Every text is a new

cloth, webbed from old citations. Scraps of old cultural codes, formulas, rhythmic structures, fragments of social idioms, etc., they are all absorbed in the text and mixed in it. Barthes' code is an associative field of connotations, referenced by the phrases, "the springboard of intertextuality", the range in which numerous cultural "voices" are displayed, webbing into the text. Location of codes in the text is not linear, they can be multilayered, "exude" against each other, "in the text all codes are traced simultaneously, in a solid space" [3].

Roland Barthes argued that intertextual codes are "not a registry and not a paradigm, that should be reconstructed at any cost; codes are the perspective of the multiplicity of citations, a mirage, webbed from multiple structures; and the units, originated in this code are exactly the echoes of something that has already been read, seen, made, experienced; the code is a trace of this "already" [2, P.445]. Consequently, a phenomenon of citation became principal in the interpretation of textuality. The citation is considered as the adoption of not only (and not as much of) a directly text fragment, but mainly as functional and stylistic code, which represents a way of thinking or tradition behind it. In other words, the citation in the postmodern paradigm is not only an "inclusion" of texts in one another, but the streams of codes, genre relationships, subtle paraphrases, associative references, etc. And hence, post-structuralism is oriented on presupposed quotation marks (not graphically represented), since it is based on the presumption of denial of toughly fixed boundaries between the immanent (internal) and adopted (external).

According to Barthes, "a text ... is formed from the anonymous, elusive and thus already readable citations, i.e., citations without quotation marks" [1, P.417]. It is their identification that requires a certain cultural competence: a citation "will be clear only when the reader guesses about the existence of somewhere quotation marks. Quotation marks, which are absent in the typographic sense, can be detected only due to "extratext knowledge" (Eco).

For Barthes, postmodernistic reading is "... completely webbed from citations... echoes; all these are languages of culture... old and new, that pass through the text and create a powerful stereophony", a lay of citations is actually a play of cultural "languages", where "no language has no advantages over other" [12, P. 334].

In our opinion, another aspect of the creative activity of the French philosopher is worth considering: it is the concept of the author and the reader. Barthes deliberately departs from the traditions of the New time,

considering the unity of the author and his work. Barthes replaces the author for the "writing": "...all writing is itself this special voice, consisting of several indiscernible voices, and that literature is precisely the invention of this voice, to which we cannot assign a specific origin: literature is that neuter, that composite, that oblique into which every subject escapes, the trap where all identity is lost, beginning with the very identity of the body that writes» [4]. Now we don't have to look for a single meaning of writing, based on the author's personality. Barthes proclaims "death of the author" and "birth of the reader". It is the reader-orientation (the "purpose" of the text), but not the text assigning to individual author ("origin") that initiates the emergence of meaning: according to Barthes, intertextual multiplicity is focused in a specific point, which is not the author but the reader. The reader is the space where all the single citations, constituting the writing, are imprinted; the text gets unity not in origin, but in purpose... The reader is someone who brings together all of the features that make up the text. But no reader, even the most "perfect" one, will manage to catch all the meanings of the text, since "the text is endlessly open into eternity". According to Barthes, it is the points of collision of the author and the reader's perception that originate the dialogue, and mismatches form the multiplicity of meanings, which are the basis for future readings, its dynamics, life filling, which the philosopher strived for.

In summary, we believe that the Barthes' concept of intertextual semiotics occupies a prominent place in the communicative-semiotic discourse of Western European post-structuralism. A reconstruction of his views allows defining the peculiarities of the phenomenon of intertextuality, to clarify the specifics of semiotic means and functions in the process of originating and understanding the meaning.

References:

1. Барт Р. От произведения к тексту / Ролан Барт // Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Ролан Барт. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 413–422.
2. Барт Р. Текстовый анализ одной новеллы Эдгара По / Ролан Барт // Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Ролан Барт. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 424–460
3. Барт Р. С чего начать / Ролан Барт // Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Ролан Барт. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 401–411
4. Барт Р. Смерть автора / Ролан Барт // Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Ролан Барт. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 384–391
5. Барт Р. Миф сегодня / Ролан Барт // Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика / Ролан Барт. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 71 – 129

6. Даниленко О. О. Інтертекстуальність як методологічний принцип історико-філософського дослідження у філософії Ю. Крістєвої / О. О. Даниленко // Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції «Європейська наука XXI століття 16–31 травня 2007 / О. О. Даниленко. – Дніпропетровськ: Наука та освіта, 2008. – С. 33–39.
7. Kristeva J. The Bounded Text / Julia Kristeva // *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*/ Ed. Leon Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, Leon Roudiez. – New York: Columbia UP, 1980. – P. 36-63
8. Genette G. *Palimpsestes. La littérature ausecond degré*/ GérardGenette. – Paris: Seuil, 1982. – 576p. P.117
9. Комісар Л. П. Ідея інтертекстуальності в філософії культури : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філос. наук : спец. 09.00.04 «філософська антропологія, філософія культури» / Комісар Л. П. – Київ, 2008. – 16 с.
10. Косиков Г. К. Ролан Барт – семиолог, літературознавець / Г. К. Косиков // Барт Р. *Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика* / Г. К. Косиков. – Москва: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 3–45.
11. Kristeva, J. *Séméiotikè. Recherches pour une sémanalyse* / Julia Kristeva. – Paris: Seuil, 1969. – 384 p.
12. Постмодернізм. Енциклопедія.- Минск: Интерпрессервис; Книжный дом, 2001.- 1040 с.
13. Тесля А. Барт в четвертой степени [Електронний ресурс] / Андрей Тесля // *Суждения. Исторический журнал*. – 2011. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <http://suzhdenia.ruspole.info/node/1390>.
14. Швець Я. Застосування термінів інтертекстуальність та інтертекст у сучасній комунікативній лінгвістиці/ Ярина Швець// *Вісник Нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка»*. Серія «Проблеми української термінології» –2010. – № 675. – С. 195–197.

Transliteration of references:

1. Barthes R. (1989) *Ot proizvedeniya k tekstu* [From Work to Text]. *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika* [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 413–422.
2. Barthes R. (1989) *Tekstovyy analiz odnoy novelly Edgara Po* [Textual Analysis of a Tale by Edgar Poe]. *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika* [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 424–460
3. Barthes R. (1989) *S chego nachat* [Where to Begin] *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika*. [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 401–411
4. Barthes R. (1989) *Smert avtora* [The Death of the Author]. *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika* . [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 384–391
5. Barthes R. (1989) *Mif segodnya* [Myth Today]. *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika* . [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 71 – 129

6. Danilenko O. (2007) Intertekstualnist yak metodologichniy printsip istoriko-filosofskogo doslidzhennya u filosofii Yu. Kristevoï [Intertextuality as a methodological principle of historical and philosophical studies in the philosophy of J. Kristeva]. Proceeding of the «European Science XXI century» (Ukraine, Dnipropetrovsk, May ,16-31, 2007) , Dnipropetrovsk: Nauka ta osvita, pp. 33–39.
7. Kristeva J.(1980.) The Bounded Text. Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art/ Ed. Leon Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, Leon Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, pp. 36-63
8. Genette G. (1982) Palimpsestes. La littérature ausecond degree. Paris: Seuil, 576 p.
9. Komisar L. P. (2008) Ideya intertekstualnosti v filosofii kulturi : avtoref. dis. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. filos. nauk [The idea of intertextuality in the philosophy of culture]. Kyiv, 16 p.
10. Kosikov G. K.(1989) Rolan Bart – semiolog, literaturoved [Roland Barthes - semiotician, literary critic]. Bart R. Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika [Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics]. – Moscow: Progress. – pp. 3–45.
11. Kristeva, J. (1969) Semeiotikè. Recherches pour une semanalyse . Paris: Seuil, 384 p.
12. Postmodernizm. Entsiklopediya.(2001) [Postmodernism. Encyclopedia] Minsk: Interpresservis; Knizhnyy dom, 1040 p.
13. Teslya A.(2011) Bart v chetvertoy stepeni [Barthes in the fourth degree] Suzhdeniya. Istoricheskiy zhurnal. [Suzhdeniya. Historical Journal]. Electronic journal, vol. 11. Available at <http://suzhdenia.ruspole.info/node/1390>. (accessed 15 January 2016).
14. Shvets Ya. (2010) Zastosuvannya terminiv intertekstualnist ta intertekst u suchasniï komunikativniï lnhvistytsi[Application deadlines intertextuality and intertext in modern communicative linguistics] Visnyk Nats. un-tu «Lvivska politekhnik». Serii «Problemy ukraïnskoï terminolohii» [Proceedings of the National University «Lviv Polytechnic»] no. 675, pp. 195–197.

Authors

Julia Yushchenko
PhD, Associate Professor,
Higher medical educational institution of Ukraine
“Ukrainian Medical Stomatological Academy”,
Poltava, Ukraine
E-mail: yulia.yu@ukr.net

Tatiana Sharbenko
PhD, Associate Professor,
Higher medical educational institution of Ukraine

"Ukrainian Medical Stomatological Academy",
Poltava, Ukraine
E-mail: sharbenko@mail.ru

Abstracts

JULIA JUSZCZENKO, TATIANA SZARBENKO. Semiotyka intertekstualna Rolanda Barta w kontekście zachodnioeuropejskiego poststrukturalizmu. Artykuł przedstawia wkład wybitnego francuskiego myśliciela R. Barta w zachodnioeuropejski dyskurs filozoficzny, a także znaczenie jego koncepcji dla nowoczesnych badań filozoficznych. Uwaga koncentruje się nad jednym z najważniejszych osiągnięć Barta - pojęciem „semiotyki intertekstualnej”, prezentującym jakościowo nowe nieklasyczne rozumienie tekstu. Przeanalizowano osobliwości rozumienia i wyróżnienia utworu i tekstu, opisano istotę postmodernistycznej analizy tekstu, zdefiniowano pojęcie „kod intertekstualny”. Pokazano podobieństwa i różnice w interpretacji zjawiska intertekstualności R. Barta, J. Kristevej, U. Eko, Zh. Zhennett i innych.

Słowa kluczowe: Intertekstualność, intertekstualna semiotyka, poststrukturalizm, semantyka, dyskurs, kod intertekstualny, tekst.

ЮЛІЯ ЮЩЕНКО, ТЕТЯНА ШАРБЕНКО. Інтертекстуальна семіотика Ролана Барта в контексті західноєвропейського постструктуралізму. У поданні статті розглядається внесок видатного французького мислителя Р. Барта у західноєвропейській філософській дискурсі, аналізується значимість його ідей і концепції для сучасних філософських пошуків. Акцентується увага на тому, що одним із найбільш вагомих досягнень Барта є концепція «інтертекстуальної семіотики», яка презентує якісно нове неklasичне розуміння тексту. Проаналізовано особливості розуміння та розмежування Бартом твору і тексту, з'ясовано сутність постмодерністського текстового аналізу, визначено поняття «інтертекстуального коду». Прослідковано взаємовпливи та виявлено схожості і відмінності у тлумаченні феномену інтертекстуальності Р. Барта, Ю. Крістєвої, У. Еко, Ж. Женнетт та ін.

Ключові слова: Інтертекстуальність, інтертекстуальна семіотика, постструктуралізм, семантика, дискурс, інтертекстуальний код, текст.

ЮЛИЯ ЮЩЕНКО, ТАТЬЯНА ШАРБЕНКО. **Интертекстуальная семиотика Ролана Барта в контексте западноевропейского постструктурализма.** В данной статье рассматривается вклад выдающегося французского мыслителя Р.Барта в западноевропейский философский дискурс, анализируется значимость его идей и концепций для современных философских поисков. Акцентируется внимание на том, что одним из наиболее весомых достижений Барта является концепция «интертекстуальной семиотики», представляющая качественно новое понимание текста. Проанализированы особенности разграничения Бартом произведения и текста, выяснено сущность постмодернистского текстового анализа, определено понятие «интертекстуального кода». Прослежены и выявлены сходства и различия в толковании феномена интертекстуальности Р.Барта, Ю.Кристевой, У. Эко, Ж.Женнетт и др. • **Ключевые слова:** Интертекстуальность, интертекстуальная семиотика, постструктурализм, семантика, дискурс, интертекстуальный код, текст.

YULIA YUSHCHENKO, TATIANA SHARBENKO. **Intertextual semiotics of Roland Barthes in the context of Western European post-structuralism.** The paper draws upon the contribution of the prominent French philosopher Roland Barthes made into Western philosophical discourse, the analysis of the significance of his ideas and concepts for current philosophical investigations. The focus is made on the Barthes' concept of "intertextual semiotics", as one of his most significant achievement, which presents a qualitatively new nonclassical understanding of a text. The peculiarities of Barthes' understanding and differentiation of the writing and the text have been analyzed; the essence of the postmodernistic text analysis has been elucidated; the concept of "intertextual code" has been defined. The interactions and similarity in interpretations of the phenomenon of intertextuality of R. Barthes, J. Kristeva, U. Eco, G. Genette, etc., have been tracked and revealed. **Key words:** Intertextuality, intertextual semiotics, post-structuralism, semantic, discourse, intertextual code, text.