

DOI 10.36074/logos-24.11.2023.41

## THE PROBLEM OF THE POST-STRUCTURALIST APPROACH FOR INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF TEXT

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8529-4882

Tomilina Anna Oleksandrivna

PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of English Philology Department  
*Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University*

Korniienko Volodymyr Vladyslavovych

student of the Faculty of Foreign Languages  
*Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University*

UKRAINE

For the first time, the concept of intertextuality was illuminated and outlined by scholar J. Kristeva. According to her interpretation, intertextuality is a process where each newly created text emerges based on previously created ones and is constructed as a mosaic of quotations. Intertextual connections, where possible, interact with different cultures at all possible levels of manifestation, acquiring a massive and chaotic nature. Within such a complex system, texts may contradict, intertwine, and unravel in relation to each other via repetitions, illogical and irrational constructions, allusions, etc. [1; 2].

Research on intertextuality by post-structuralist scholar R. Barthes is considered to be significant. According to his theory the concept signifies and characterizes the text formed as a result of the intertextual process. This concept was introduced as the intertext – a ‘new canvas’ made from old quotations. Within intertextuality, other texts exist at various levels in more or less recognizable forms, to be more precise, texts from previous cultures and texts from the present culture [3; 4]. Therefore, one can observe the dependence of intertextuality on the socio-cultural context.

This dependency has always existed in all texts, and one of the first writers who not only could comprehend it but also formulate his vision of this process in poetic conservatism is believed to be T. Eliot. For instance, he asserted that a text written by a Western individual would have unity in the heritage of Christianity, ancient civilizations of Greece, Rome, and Israel, from which its origins can be traced for two thousand years [5]. This shapes T. Eliot’s well-known statement that immature poets imitate, while mature poets steal. This idea is also referred to as carnivalism.

On the one hand, T. Eliot’s sarcasm about not taking things too literally is rational, on the other hand, referring to R. Barthes and J. Kristeva, one can see how the carnivalistic idea forms the basis of the intertextual process: a text cannot be a closed system or a self-sufficient unit. Consequently, the fundamental problem of the post-structuralist approach has arisen: how to distinguish between two notions: a text and intertext?

According to R. Barthes’ approach, such boundaries do not exist because a text cannot exist outside its socio-cultural context. The focus of this approach is grounded in the reader because the author attempts to confine the infinite nature of the text, which, according to R. Barthes, should not be limited. As a result, reduction occurs, not only devaluing the author’s persona with its originality but also hindering the interpretation of intertextuality. R. Barthes termed his approach ‘the death of the author’ [4].

J. Kristeva, not as a post-structuralist scholar, does not involve the 'death of the author' in her approach, but significantly dilutes the author's presence in her subsequent research in the fields of linguistic structuralism and psychoanalysis. J. Kristeva's approach is based on J. Lacan's inverted system of Ferdinand de Saussure's 'signifying over signified'. In this system, the subject (author) acts as both an object (text) and a proper subject, thus, the author has a polyphonic nature. Therefore, by his inversion, J. Lacan compelled the 'signifying' to act as a subject for another 'signifying' [1; 2].

**Conclusions.** Intertextuality is a text that actively interacts with others through references within the socio-cultural context. This phenomenon was first introduced and studied by scholar J. Kristeva, and later by post-structuralist R. Barthes.

Approaches to defining intertextuality by R. Barthes and J. Kristeva involve the complete or partial dissolution of the author's persona. As a result, not only the boundary between the text and intertext disappears but also the significance of the author's persona. As a result, the reader can freely interpret the text, being validated regardless of how close they come to the truth.

This reduction leads to undesirable relativism, which undermines the results of intertextual analysis. Therefore, during its conduction, it is recommended to disregard post-structuralist dialogism. By adhering to this recommendation, analysts can avoid these issues and conduct intertextual analysis whose results can be objectively evaluated.

#### References:

- [1] Kristeva, J. (2004). *Psychoanalysis and Modernity*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- [2] Kristeva, J. (1986). *Word Dialogue and Novel* (p. 34-61). New York: Columbia University Press.
- [3] Барт, Р. (1989). *Вибрані роботи. Семіотика. Поетика*. Вилучено із <https://ibl.pp.ua/3/011181.html>.
- [4] Барт, Р. (2001). *Від твору до тексту; Антологія світової літературної-критичної думки XX ст.*. М. Зубрицька (ред.) (с. 491-496). Львів: Літопис.
- [5] Eliot, T. (1949). *Notes towards defining the culture*. London: Faber and Faber limited.