

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1176.41.2019.188682

УДК 792.01:115.4]:391"19"

**SEMIOLOGICAL TURN
AS AN INTERPRETANT
OF FASHION SPACE
OF THE 20TH CENTURY**

Nataliia Barna

*Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,**ORCID: 0000-0002-5176-0136,**e-mail: Barna2005@ukr.net,**Open International University**of Human Development "Ukraine",**23, Lvivska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine, 03115*

The purpose of the article is to determine the sociocultural determinants of the formation for interpretation systems of fashion activity as a factor in the global problems of our time. The research methodology has used the methods of fashion semiological analysis by R. Barthes and system-semiotic analysis of pop culture, advertising, and fashion by J. Baudrillard. Scientific novelty lies in the linguistic-semiotic interpretation of fashion as a cultural phenomenon. Conclusions. It was found that in the context of theatrical influences fashion has its own figurative feature, which is analysed as a specific discourse. The fashion space of the 20th century is the totallogy of scenism, which begins from a theatre wall, a ramp, a proscenium, and ends with an open-air theatre of large stadiums, festivals, and theatrical political battles. The philosophical-aesthetic and cultural dimensions of fashion are associated with the linguistic-semiotic direction of research, with a semiological turn. However, there is still no unambiguous interpretation of this turn. Some call it linguistic-semiotic, others semiological. Sometimes it is said that this turn actually reflected the dichotomy of the transcendental philosophy of Neo-Kantianism and the entire post-Kantian synthesis that arose in the 20th century, as well as the philosophy of dialogue. The article presents an analysis of discursive fashion practices of the 20th century.

Keywords: culture; fashion; semiotics; semiological turn; discourse

Introduction

If the transcendental subject of the classics was monistic and carried one ascending "I", that is, consciousness was defined as the unshakable harmony of the universe, then the postmodern dialogism indicates the heterogeneity of culture subject or subjects living by interaction and dialogue. Semiology, to a certain extent, used both paradigms. So, on the one hand, it remains monistic (the phonism of Ferdinand de Saussure, the socio-praxiological dimension of Charles Peirce), and on the other hand, it expresses the problem of the event interpreter, the interpretant, as well as the problem of sign connotations, which sometimes eliminate the monism of the ascending principle. The reference crisis associated with the loss of denotatum, acutely assured already in post-structural reflective tendencies, in particular, in the works of U. Eco and others. The main thing is that the semiological turn, starting from Ferdinand de Saussure, made linguistics the main interpretive scene of the culture in the 20th century. The old verification scheme, which can be called creationistic, where God (the real true reality) acted as the creator of the world, who created another reality, is replaced by a "linguistic" theurgist. The Word becomes God. So, according to G. Shpet (1914), the word is the Universe. The word carries in its depths that culture scenism, which subsequently turns into polyscenism.

Scientific novelty. It has been found out that theatrical fashion space of the 20th century is the totallogy of scenism, which begins from a theatre wall, a ramp, a proscenium, and ends with an open-air theatre of large stadiums, festivals, and theatrical political battles, the theatre of political purges during totalitarianism, concentration camp theatres. The totalitarian monsters of Stalin Gesamtkunstwerk and the Third Reich will be studied in structuralism as mechanisms for culture homogenization. Philosophical-aesthetic and cultural dimensions of fashion are associated with the linguistic-semiotic direction of research, with a semiological turn. It has been determined that there is still no unambiguous interpretation of this turn: some scholars call it linguistic-semiotic, others call it semiological, and some argue that this turn actually reflected the dichotomy of the transcendental philosophy of Neo-Kantianism and the entire post-Kantian synthesis that arose in the 20th century, as well as the philosophy of dialogue.

The problem of the semiotic turn was investigated in the works of R. Barthes, J. Baudrillard, J. Derrida (2000), Iu. Legenkii, Ch. Morris (1983), P. Pavis (1976; 1991), Ch. Peirce (2000), V. Savchuk, A. Usmanova (2007) and others.

In the studies of R. Barthes (1994; 2003), fashion is mainly studied as a system of vestimentary code (clothes code), where the subject, visual and verbal levels are determined. The researcher considers the verbal level, which prompts the creation of certain fashion rhetoric, to be generative. J. Baudrillard (2000) captures the cyclism, temporality, fashion elusiveness, because we are talking only about the fashion of the 20th century. Iu. Legenkii (2003) tried to turn the verbal space of fashion rhetoric into a project-model one, where culturally defined modes dominate: garter, drape, placket, monad space. This approach allowed us to turn the rhetorical model of fashion into a formative plane. V. Savchuk (2013) in the context of media populations of the visual space defined ontological, linguistic-semiotic and visual turns. A. Usmanova (2007) noted the visual dominants of modern culture. However, the aesthetic and cultural aspects of cultural matrices formation for fashion interpretation as a semiotic phenomenon are still not well defined.

The purpose of the article

The purpose of the article is to determine the sociocultural determinants of the formation for interpretation systems of fashion activity as a factor in the globalization problems of our time.

The research methodology is represented by the method of fashion semiological analysis by R. Barthes and system-semiotic analysis of popular culture, advertising, fashion by J. Baudrillard, on the basis of which a discursive fashion analysis was carried out.

Presentation of the main material

The sign-discursive continuum becomes an interpretative configuration of communicative, dialogic fashion scenes becomes, which was explicated as part of a semiological turn. The dialogue reflects a certain extent the intentions of the transcendental axiology of the post-Kantian example and the philosophy of dialogue, which to a certain extent tried to turn into semiology or semiotics. And so it happened.

However, it is the formation of sign structures as the basis of interpretation that is interpreted differently. It is believed that the rise of semiology and semiotics as a doctrine of sign systems started at the turn of the 19th-20th centuries, when scientists such as F. de Saussure and Ch. Peirce were the unknown fringe group of science. And suddenly their ideas fell into the circle of philosophical reflection of transcendentalism and dialogism. There is a synthesis of sign systems and philosophical reflection, which in the end turns into synergic versions of cultural creation, speech acts analysis, etc.

The interpretation of the symbol as a binary system (the unity of the definable and the definitive) becomes fundamental for the emergence of various reflective constructions. Very quickly, theorists rejected an atomistic understanding of the symbol: discourse becomes dominant in French semiology, the language of culture – in the Tartu-Moscow school, and pragmatism – in the American school. There is a variety of theories that correlate with philosophical schools of thought, in particular, the Husserl's phenomenology of G. Shpet (1914), which also has the signs of semiotics.

The dialogue turns into a polylogue: the construction of culture dialogism by M. Bakhtin (1986) – into the construction of the polylogue of J. Kristeva (2004), the dialogics or polylogics of culture by V. Bibler (2014). All schools that are associated with the semiological turn use the methods of structural linguistics, interpretation of culture in the linguistic equivalent, because natural language as a sign system remains a universal interpretant.

The concept of “language” is universalized and takes on the meaning of “language of culture”. Culture is interpreted as a complex system that expresses the dynamics of linguistic valencies and is formed as a kind of systemogenesis of symbolic connotative realities that are associated with certain semiotic codes or connotation varieties, starting from sign language, pictographic communication skills, as well as mythological mnemonic schemes originating from ethnic culture, non-verbal communication system and others. The general is the understanding of culture as a text, a certain space, oversaturated with symbolic connotations and appeal to certain concepts that become certain signals to aesthetic, ethical information. The problem of semiotic equivalence of interpretation systems arises.

Understanding the languages of culture as certain codes of information transfer represents the multifunctional nature of human communication as an expression of will, syncretism, synthetism of the generation and

perception of information. This is especially noticeable in the modern media space, where each subject of an information act produces and perceives communicative values as the subject of an information message in one communicative time and space on many communicative scenes. However, the culture semiological interpretation programs are in one way or another focused on the exchange of values, on the development and exchange of places – communicative zones, or scenes of human and media communication. The scene, in this case, becomes the buffer, space where the action and event are identified, and the actants of the stage event who play, and those who perceive the information, form a general syncretic or synthetic act of polyscenism, in which a fashion image appears as self-sufficient cultural integrity.

Theatricality in fashion is an implicit installation of entertainment, symbiotic scenism, which adapts all theatrical innovations. This is demonstrated, in particular, by the work of fashion designers such as J. Galliano, Yamamoto, etc. It is important that literature-centrism, a focus on poetics went through all directions and all movements of cultural practices: cinema, theatre, architecture, design, fashion. Literature and poetry were drawn into the interpretation semiotic panorama of their cultural configurations. One of the semiotically oriented fashion theorists was R. Barthes (1994; 2003).

R. Barthes (1994) writes: “We recall now that in any semiological system, the relation between two elements is postulated: the definable and the definitive. This relation connects objects of a different order, and therefore it is an equivalence rather than equality relation. It should be noted that contrary to the usual understanding of these words, when we simply say that the definable expresses the definitive, in any semiological system there are not two, but three different elements; therefore, what I directly perceive is not a sequence of two elements, but a correlation that unites them. So, there is the definable, the definitive and there is a sign that is the result of the association of the first two elements” (p. 76).

The author subsequently uses the language of phenomenology, to which he was always inclined. In particular, this is observed in the work “Camera Lucida” (Barthes, 1997). The constitutive principle or noem, according to E. Husserl (2013), is defined as stating “it was”, that is, in the photo there always exists post-reality. As we see, Barthes’s semiology is a definite reincarnation of Husserl’s phenomenology in sign connotations. The most important universal of phenomenology, which E. Husserl (2013) defines as intentionality (orientation of consciousness to the objective world), R. Barthes (1994) turns into the idea of “concept”, and only then uses the Husserl’s idea of the “noem”.

G. Deleuze (1997), who in the paper “The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque”, defined the phenomenon of pli (formation or unity, fold) as a “seamless” connection, flow of continuum substructures, was not far from the phenomenological interpretation of cultural creation. The researcher considers the new communicative scene as an imperative of the multiplicity of shaping possibilities, a new matrix of thousands of “plateau”, thousands of possibilities to be different in the context of the new continuum paradigm of space transformation. Deconstruction is eliminated and converted into pli or into formation. As it is known, these ideas were borrowed by architects and designers.

R. Barthes (1994) defines myth as the “thief” of language. What is the essence of the new reflective myth in design, fashion, and advertising? Its essence is that it turns meaning into form, “steals” language. The myth does not steal a language in order to use it as examples or symbols, but in order to naturalize the formed text with its help. At the same time, R. Barthes (1994) uses an interesting term – “theft”. “Theft” is an unexpected possibility of appropriation without value exchange equivocations and value equivalents transformation. This is the myth of miracle, dispersion, when convincing by a miracle, and the result is actually theft of values. You may not use the rude word “theft”, but R. Barthes (1994) uses it very appropriately.

Theatrical interpretation of the sign, discourse was carried out by P. Pavis (1991) and S. Neretina (1996), who study the “theatrology of the sign” and the “pragmatics” of theatrical discourse. P. Pavis (1991) states: “Pragmatics has recently grown so enormously that it has taken the place of semantics and has become one of the dominant branches of semiotics (since the time of Peirce or Morris it has been divided into semantics, syntax and pragmatics). This development was uncontrollable; it took place in different directions and in accordance with different methodologies, so pragmatics becomes, according to the rude but fairly definition of one of the Italian researchers, “linguistic dump” (p. 242).

So, semiotics considers pragmatics as a linguistic phenomenon, as the most abstract function of the protagonist, the producer of event values. The event itself can be a fairy tale, fantasy, comic book, fashion event, communication in various circumstances (with intermediaries, without intermediaries). A fashionable event in the context of various cultural practices is focused on the action definition, the functioning of the discursive mechanism, which is interpreted in the linguistic field of pragmatics as a particular function of discursive cultural practices.

Conclusions

The stratification of the two systems of semiotic turn (semiological and semiotic) determined the analysis priorities for such concepts as sign, discourse, language, dialogue, dispersion, pragmatics, etc. Structuralist and poststructuralist reflection in the postmodern version produces the concepts of “fold”, “rhizome”, “plateau”, “genetic algorithm”, etc. In fashion reflection, they are learned sporadically and fragmentarily, because theatreology as a synthetic discipline allows you to broaden your horizons of thinking and interpret fashion scenism as semiological phenomenon. The next step of the semiological analysis is to create a specific fashion grammar.

Список використаних джерел

- Барт, Р. (1994). *Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика* (Г.К. Косиков, Пер.). Москва: Прогресс.
- Барт, Р. (1997). *Camera lucida* (М. Рыклин, Пер.). Москва: Ad Marginem.
- Барт, Р. (2003). *Система моды. Статьи по семиотике культуры* (С.Н. Зенкина, Пер.). Москва: Издательство имени Сабашиниковых.
- Бахтин, М.М. (1986). *Эстетика словесного творчества*. Москва: Искусство.
- Библер, В.С. (2014). *Михаил Михайлович Бахтин или Поэтика культуры*. Москва: DirectMEDIA.
- Бодрийяр, Ж. (2000). *Символический обмен и смерть* (С.Н. Зенкина, Пер.). Москва: Добросвет.
- Гуссерль, Э. (2013). *Кризис европейских наук и трансцендентальная феноменология: введение в феноменологическую философию* (Д.В. Кузницына, Пер.). Санкт-Петербург: Наука.
- Делёз, Ж. (1997). *Складка. Лейбниц и барокко*. Москва: Логос.
- Деррида, Ж. (2000). Структура, знак и игра в дискурсе гуманитарных наук. В Г.К. Косиков (Ред.), *Французская семиотика: От структурализма к постструктурализму* (с. 407-426). Москва: Прогресс.
- Кристева, Ю. (2004). *Избранные труды: Разрушение поэтики* (Г.К. Косиков, & Б.П. Нарумов, Пер.). Москва: РОССПЭН.
- Легенький, Ю.Г. (2003). *Метаистория костюма*. Киев.
- Моррис, Ч.У. (1983). Основания теории знаков. В Ю.С. Степанов (Ред.), *Семиотика* (с. 63). Москва: Радуга.
- Неретина, С.С. (1996). *Концептуализм Абельяра. Слово и текст в средневековой культуре*. Москва: Гнозис.
- Пави, П. (1991). *Словарь театра* (К. Разлогов, Пер.). Москва: Прогресс.
- Пирс, Ч.С. (2000). *Начала прагматизма* (В.В. Кириющенко, & М.В. Колопотина, Пер.) (Т. 2). Санкт-Петербург.
- Савчук, В. (2013). *Медиафилософия. Приступ реальности*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство РХГА.
- Усманова, А. (2007, 6 октября). Визуальные исследования как исследовательская парадигма. Взято из <https://web.archive.org/web/20071006101629/http://viscult.ehu.lt/article.php?id=108>.
- Шпет, Г.Г. (1914). *Явление и смысл. Феноменология как основная наука и ее проблемы*. Москва: Гермес.
- Pavis, P. (1976). *Problemes de semiologie theatrale*. Montreal: Presses de l'Universite du Quebec.

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of verbal creative work]*. Moscow: Iskustvo [in Russian].
- Barthes, R. (1994). *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika [Selected works: Semiotics. Poetics]* (G.K. Kosikov, Trans.). Moscow: Progress.
- Barthes, R. (1997). *Camera Lucida* (M. Ryklin, Trans.). Moscow: Ad Marginem [in Russian].
- Barthes, R. (2003). *Sistema mody. Stati po semiotike kultury [Fashion system. Articles on the semiotics of culture]* (S.N. Zenkina, Trans.). Moscow: Izdatelstvo imeni Sabashnikovykh.
- Bibler, V.S. (2014). *Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin ili Poetika kultury [Mikhail Mikhaylovich Bakhtin or Poetics of Culture]*. Moscow: DirectMEDIA [in Russian].
- Baudrillard, J. (2000). *Simvolicheskii obmen i smert [Symbolic exchange and death]* (S.N. Zenkina, Trans.). Moscow: Dobrosvet [in Russian].
- Deleuze, G. (1997). *Skladka. Leibnits i barokko [Fold. Leibniz and Baroque]*. Moscow: Logos [in Russian].
- Derrida, J. (2000). Структура, знак и игра в дискурсе гуманитарных наук [Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the humanities]. In G.K. Kosikov (Ed.), *Frantsuzskaia semiotika: Ot strukturalizma k poststrukturalizmu [French Semiotics: From Structuralism to Poststructuralism]* (pp. 407-426). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- Husserl, E. (2013). *Krizis evropeiskikh nauk i transtscendentalnaia fenomenologiya: vvedenie v fenomenologicheskuiu filosofiiu [The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology: an introduction to phenomenological philosophy]* (D.V. Kuznitsyna, Trans.). St. Petersburg: Nauka [in Russian].

- Kristeva, Ju. (2004). *Izbrannye trudy: Razrushenie poetiki [Selected Works: The Destruction of Poetics]* (G.K. Kosikov, & B.P. Narumov, Trans.). Moscow: ROSSPEN [in Russian].
- Legenkii, Ju.G. (2003). *Metaistoriia kostiuna [Metahistory of the costume]*. Kyiv [in Russian].
- Morris, Ch.W. (1983). *Osnovaniia teorii znakov [Writings on the general theory of signs]*. In Ju.S. Stepanov (Ed.), *Semiotika [Semiotics]* (p. 63). Moscow: Raduga [in Russian].
- Neretina, S.S. (1996). *Kontseptualizm Abeliara. Slovo i tekst v srednevekovoi kulture [Abelard Conceptualism. Word and text in medieval culture]*. Moscow: Gnozis.
- Pavis, P. (1976). *Problemes de semiologie theatrale [Problems the semiology theatrical]*. Montreal: Presses de l'Universite du Quebec [in French].
- Pavis, P. (1991). *Slovar teatra [Dictionary of the theatre]* (K. Razlogov, Trans.). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- Peirce, Ch.S. (2000). *Nachala pragmatizma [The beginning of pragmatism]* (V.V. Kiriushchenko, & M.V. Kolopotina, Trans.) (Vol. 2). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
- Savchuk, V. (2013). *Mediafilosofia. Pristup realnosti [Media Philosophy. Fit of reality]*. St. Petersburg: Izdatelstvo RKhGA [in Russian].
- Shpet, G.G. (1914). *Iavlenie i smysl. Fenomenologiya kak osnovnaia nauka i ee problemy [Phenomenon and meaning. Phenomenology as basic science and its problems]*. Moscow: Germes [in Russian].
- Usmanova, A. (2007, October 6). *Vizualnye issledovaniia kak issledovatel'skaia paradigma [Visual research as a research paradigm]*. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20071006101629/http://viscult.ehu.lt/article.php?id=108> [in Russian].

The article was received by the editorial office: 20.11.2019

СЕМІОЛОГІЧНИЙ ПОВОРОТ ЯК ІНТЕРПРЕТАНТА ПРОСТОРУ МОДИ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ

Барна Наталія Віталіївна
Доктор філософських наук, професор,
Відкритий міжнародний університет
розвитку людини «Україна»,
Київ, Україна

Мета статті – визначити соціокультурні детермінанти формування систем інтерпретації модної діяльності як фактора глобалізаційних проблем сучасності. У методології дослідження використані методи семіологічного аналізу моди Р. Барта та системно-семіотичний аналіз масової культури, реклами, моди у Ж. Бодрійяра. Наукова новизна полягає у лінгво-семіотичній інтерпретації моди як феномена культури. Висновки. Встановлено, що мода в контексті театральних впливів має свою образну особливість, яка проаналізована як специфічний дискурс. Простір моди ХХ століття – це тоталогія сценізму, що розгортається, починаючи від театральної вигородки, рампи, простеціуму і закінчуючи театром просто неба великих стадіонів, свят, театральних політичних баталій. Філософсько-естетичні та культурологічні виміри моди пов'язують з лінгво-семіотичним напрямом досліджень, з семіологічним поворотом. Однак і досі немає однозначного тлумачення цього повороту. Одні називають його лінгво-семіотичним, інші семіологічним. Інколи мова йде про те, що цей поворот фактично віддзеркалював і відбивав дихотомію трансцендентальної філософії неокантіанства і всього пост кантіанського синтезу, який виник у ХХ столітті, а також філософією діалогу. У статті подано аналіз дискурсивних практик моди ХХ століття.

Ключові слова: культура; мода; семіотика; семіологічний поворот; дискурс

СЕМИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ПОВОРОТ КАК ИНТЕРПРЕТАНТА ПРОСТРАНСТВА МОДЫ ХХ ВЕКА

Барна Наталья Витальевна
Доктор философских наук, профессор,
Открытый международный университет
развития человека «Украина»,
Киев, Украина

Цель статьи – определить социокультурные детерминанты формирования систем интерпретации модной деятельности как фактора глобализационных проблем современности. В методологии исследования использованы методы семиологического анализа моды Р. Барта и системно-семиотический анализ массовой культуры, рекламы,

моды у Ж. Бодрийяра. Научная новизна заключается в лингво-семиотической интерпретации моды как феномена культуры. Выводы. Установлено, что мода в контексте театральных воздействий имеет свою образную особенность, которая проанализирована как специфический дискурс. Пространство моды XX века – это тоталлология сценизма, которая разворачивается, начиная от театральной выгородки, рампы, простцениума и заканчивая театром под открытым небом больших стадионов, праздников, театральных политических баталлий. Философско-эстетические и культурологические измерения моды связывают с лингво-семиотическим направлением исследований, из семиологическим поворотом. Однако до сих пор нет однозначного толкования этого поворота. Одни называют его лингво-семиотический, другие семиологический. Иногда речь идет о том, что этот поворот фактически отражал дихотомию трансцендентальной философии неокантианства и всего пост кантианского синтеза, который возник в XX веке, а также философию диалога. В статье представлен анализ дискурсивных практик моды XX века.

Ключевые слова: культура; мода; семиотика; семиологический поворот; дискурс