

The Textual Practice of Amateur Games: Analysis of Roland Barthes' Rescue of the Legitimacy of the Writing Subject

ZIBIN LI

ABSTRACT

As the core way of Roland Barthes's late textual practice, "amateur" always rejects the ideological power of discourse construction, especially the power collapse within the language system, and tries to break the long-standing "intransitive" dilemma of writing through a non-utilitarian textual game. However, it also shifts the responsibility of narrative to social structures and releases a sense of lost historical disillusionment. Based on the textual manifestation of the concept of "amateur", including its position, goals and other specific forms of practice, and combined with the relevant research on modern symbolic media, this paper will explore Barthes's legitimacy argument against the writing subject, as well as the intimate connection between the text and the author in the practice of "amateur". In this way, we explore Barthes' argument for the legitimacy of the writing subject and the intimate connection between text and subject in "amateur" practice.

INTRODUCTION

Structuralism, which has long focused on the study of linguistic systems, is so desperate for a shared structure of conventions that all consciousness of the material world can be produced with epistemic symbolic precision. For conservative semantic studies, this had the advantage of once and for all achieving the subversion of the authority of elite critics while demystifying literature. But Roland Barthes realized that this syncretic linguistic structure has a certain endogenous defect, because it is always rejecting all kinds of objectivity outside the system, including the constitutive conditions of symbolic forms as well as the historical construction of semantic connotations. The former concerns the origin of almost the entire structure, but because of its internal a priori nature, language can only give way to a concrete narrative about itself and then succumb to the myth of "origin". The latter is so focused on the solid structure of the discipline that the most dynamic individual subjects disappear under the repression of the system. As he himself says: "What I studied in the early days was just the literary dimension of this semiotics." [1] It is precisely this closed-loop approach to research that

Zibin Li
School of Hainan University, Haikou 570228, China

has led literary creation based on linguistic symbols into the problem of "surplus" of meaning. With the emergence of modern media, linguistic symbols are unable to survive in an ecological environment where they coexist with new representational tools. Therefore, Barthes advocates a "healthy" semiotic practice that tries to break away from the established closed formula and instead engages the outside of the literary system, i.e. the "presence" of the signification. It can be said that this practice is a reconfiguration of the pragmatic meaning of language, an exploration of the "here" and "other" of the text. According to Barthes, this shore is the coital activity of the text and the individual body, while the other shore is the effect, the "pleasure" of writing: "Because I need a general 'pleasure' on the one hand, I can always talk about the transcendence of the text I can always talk about the transcendence of the text, about the transcendence of any (social) function and (structural) operation therein." [2] This also requires that the subject of the practice be able to fully display its own arbitrariness, which corresponds to the argument for the legitimacy of "amateur".

THE CONNOTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF "AMATEUR"

Specifically, "amateur" is a deconstructive device derived from the identity of enthusiasts, and involves the sum of all acts, positions and methods that are "utilitarian", as well as Roland Barthes' attempt to achieve "pleasure". It is also Roland Barthes's attempt to achieve "pleasure" through the path of disutility. This "utilitarian" textual realization has two layers, the first of which is the distancing and rejection of the goal from the standpoint of preventing any kind of final result. This aesthetic process, which is always constant in the "ongoing tense," tends to dissolve the risk of being named and interpreted in a certain way, because the completed narrative will undoubtedly fall into a "historical" repetition. This repetition may be alienated into a lucrative industry of words that nominally occupies the trust of the established powers or is constructed into new ideologies that continue to justify themselves in order to assert their power. "Every ideological activity is presented in synthetically accomplished forms of utterance." [3] So for the competent "amateur," the first thing to guard against and avoid is falling into this kind of practical abruptness.

The next step is to play the game of out-of-focus and blind wit as much as possible. The "amateur" is not a great person at all, or at least they are not professional enough to develop specialized and fragile nerves, nor to mind any non-sensory knowledge and experience. This presupposes that the individual will actively fall into a self-moving playfulness, where even a slightly "interested" attempt is enough to make him revel in it. The resulting thrill of the unknown and the stray is the source of the "amateur's" mastery of the hobby and its maintenance.

The unproductive path proposed by the amateur is constructed in Kant's Critique of Judgment as a sort of "utopian" prophecy: "On the one hand, it is static, treating the 'object' as 'objective. object' as 'objective'; on the other hand, it is 'emotional', treating the 'object' as causing 'subjective' pleasantness, so that this 'causal' relation, which is not merely theoretical, has practical effects." [4] So the path does not resort to the process of

objectification, but rather breaks into the concrete formal logic as the sole cause and effect of the direct induction of pleasure. Neither does it need to lend itself to the inclusion of objects in order to achieve some kind of advantage, nor does it need to bother with the tipping monopoly that comes with the intellectual or empirical order.

It is not difficult to find that "amateur" is undoubtedly a partial inheritance of Kant's "non-utilitarian pleasure", but the difference is that the pleasure Kant cares about is an aesthetic projection based on free spirit, and its form and pursuit will be entirely rational and moral. In other words, intellectual experience would necessarily refer to a rational kingdom of "what ought to be", thus inducing the individual pleasure mechanism to be oriented to a naturally rational "absence". The derived "pleasurable" emotion is only an objective existence that remains in the natural ideal. While the "amateur" does not deny the existence of a sublime object, it tends to fragment it and place it in the whole process of individual behavior. At least Barthes does not risk trusting any external moral reason, questioning the ideological risk of transforming the "presence" of the "absent", while avoiding the Romantic prophecy of solitude. Therefore, the "amateur" "unprofitable" does not ambiguously seek the inclusion of the "present", because it is itself composed of the ever-present and omnipresent "The perceptible 'now' is so big that everything else shrinks and becomes smaller in front of it." [5].

The domestic scholar Huang Hecheng elevates "amateur" to a "doctrinal" position, focusing on a certain empirical force that resides in "amateur", to accomplish a political sense of He is concerned with a certain empirical force embedded in the "amateur", and wants to accomplish the super-gramming of the opposing world in a political sense. "Firstly, as the antithesis of expressive intent and asceticism; secondly, as the antithesis of scientism; and finally, as the antithesis of consumer society." [6] It is important to note that such an ambitious orientation leads to an indirect defocusing of the object of criticism, which then slips into the narrative misconception of "resistance for resistance's sake", since, after all, Barthes's own political awareness was rather limited, and he was more of an uninterested spectator. At least "amateur", as an important breakthrough insight in Barthes's later period, is not limited to the rancor of a certain fragment of history but is situated in the whole process of historical construction in order to achieve a breakthrough in the language system. Why does the "amateur" reject history indiscriminately, and what kind of self-healing limitations does the textual structure have? It is still necessary to consider the specific environment outside the language, including some hidden connection between the subject and the object of reference inside and outside the system.

LANGUAGE GAMES: SYMBOLS, APHASIA AND MEDIATED COMPENSATION

"Pleasure"—The Separation of Text and Symbol

The text had long been regarded as a self-regulating discursive structure, or rather it was entirely a traced set of intellectual materials where linguistic symbols worked in

combination and aggregation, and thus reproduced meaning and produced information in a constant stream. This structure appears to be closely related to the actual linguistic expression, but in fact it never considers the content part as an object, always in a deliberate distancing. It is also what Saussure called: "If linguistics allows itself to attend to actual speech, it falls into desperate confusion." [7] That is, the specific content of semantics, along with the individual subjects who transmit it, cannot be contained within the structure. Barthes's "amateur" is precisely the "escape" of this structure: "It refers to a dialectic of desire, or more precisely, a 'reverse error' dialectic." [8] The key here is that "amateur" is a concrete act, not any aesthetic conception of sensory material, and does not require aesthetic forms to obtain aesthetic value. Moreover, it can only be about the human body, a device for unlocking the "sexual eroticism" of language. Therefore, the "pleasure" as a result of the practice will undoubtedly take place somewhere outside the symbol and present a "surplus" of meaning separate from its symbolic representation. This also foreshadows that the pornography of the text will face a certain structural problem of dumping, and what "amateur" tries to break through is the symbolic narrative of "sex", because the symbol is never the topic of "sex", but the topic of "sex". "It is about the technique of "desire" for whom it is used.

In deconstructing psychoanalysis, Jameson found that Freud's "sexuality" is not "eternally human", and that its mechanism of operation is rooted in the underlying logic of "family members". The mechanism of its operation is rooted in the underlying logic of "family members". But the symbolic generation of "family" is not purely natural, at least the community in organic society does not need such a unit, rather it is the need of modern history that makes it necessary for individuals to participate in the mass production of society in the form of "nuclear family". As an extension of history, the "useful" ideological apparatus of the supporting symbolic system allegorizes an implicit and ongoing symbolic movement, thus constructing a unified and efficient operational order. At the same time, the function of "sexuality" is separated, and its most popular part can only be the "fundamental responsibility" to stimulate reproduction and reproduction - "this is because psychoanalysis is essentially an analysis of the "sexuality" of the world. This is because psychoanalysis is essentially a 'system of sexual symbols' that suggests a more fundamental, collective human 'desire'." [9] The core of this is how to use desire "naturally" and to achieve the social value added of "sex," such as how to produce a labor-satisfying and healthy baby, or to secure social stability by driving the sexual pleasure component of it into the private sphere as a symbolic representation separate from social. It is noteworthy that "sexuality" is a symbolic representation that is separate from social expectations.

It is noteworthy that "sex" has become a kind of opportunistic choice of behavior, not so much as a repression or concealment of "sex", but as a strategy of using desire. "People expose sex and confine it to a discursive existence. From forcing each person to transform his sexual experience into a unique law of eternal discourse." [10] The reason why the individual does not perceive sexual "pleasure" is not that it never happens, but that the public discourse does not choose it. This is the result of some kind of collapse of the social structure, but it also means that the semantic part is almost occupied, and the "amateur" can only go beyond the symbolic to the co-temporal exploration of the non-

semantic space. Closely related to this is the peculiarity of the "amateur" object, which, although it is always related to the body, appears to be very strange, that is, what Barthes calls: "This is the moment when my body pursues its own idea - because my body does not own me. for my body does not possess the same idea that I possess." [11] This is never the body in the biological sense, as it is already contained within a system of coercion, restriction and deprivation of meaning, and any new reference to the self can only rely on a new projection, the pure "body of ecstasy constituted by erotic associations." [12]

In short, "amateur" is not simply to discover the body, but to break up the existing body and construct it into a completely unfamiliar "other", and to reacquaint it through the form of objectification. Or the subject falls into a certain state of amnesia of self-cognition, including the most primitive and self-consciousness, which is also "enchanted" and forgotten at the same time. At this point, the subject will enjoy without any concern, reassembling and assembling at will, because all results are unknown, all actions are reasonable, and there is no a priori objectivity, only pure physical exploration and play. But in what way should this play of bodily desire be realized? Or is the mere use of linguistic symbols sufficient to withstand the entire process of the game's operation? These questions will involve a research turn within language, but also a search for answers in the interaction between text and the emerging heterogeneous media by placing new epistemic contexts.

The "Lost Language" System

The post-structuralist turnaround, the separation of the referent from the referent, means that the previously trusted sign system is in a difficult position to be self-sufficient. Although it was first caused by writing itself, Levi-Strauss attributed it to the "energy" loss of the communication process, or to the unwanted transmission by various means. But this is clearly a common problem of established media, not enough to cause a sudden failure of the sign. Derrida emphasizes that the written word can only be a constructed imprint, because the sign itself has a high priority. Therefore, the key lies in the internal structure of the sign, or in a kind of distrustful dilemma of its denotative power, namely the denotative crisis of "energy" and "reference".

The referential capacity of the "energetic" is challenged by contemporary psychoanalysis, and what Lacan finds is the "energetic of the energetic" in the bodily sense, for example, that men are removed from "manhood" only when they lose their sexual organs. "This means that the ability to refer to the body is challenged by contemporary psychoanalysis. This means that the sign that can be referred to is not self-sufficient in itself, but is still subject to the constraints of the "key sign" that is subordinate to it. Only this relationship is not always obvious, and can only be constantly questioned and interrogated. But as far as its epistemic content is concerned, the work being done does not add new information, but rather results in the murder of language, leaving the historical subject in a state of "onion-peeling" loss.

However, the "referent" is seen as a sort of epistemic threat even later in Barthes's life: "The referent always poses a threat, especially in the scientific field of literary

studies... To avoid the danger of a resurgence of theology through reference, it is particularly necessary to emphasize the pleasure of production, to make oneself a producer, that is, an amateur." [13] Two things are emphasized here, the first being the technique of theological rhetoric, or "reference" to the myth itself. It can be used in the name of "nature" to accomplish ideological empirical claims through the construction and repeated confirmation of "factual" narratives. Thus, both the historical narrative and the logical definition of the reference are unquestionably a contemporary myth.

Secondly, there is the trap of scientism, "not only because of the inevitable linguistic character of all legal inquiry (which hinders the writing of the text), but also because we cannot yet imagine a true generative science." [14] Barthes detects the illusion created by the critical subject's "scientific analysis" of the text: that language itself is not objective, and that no one can even guarantee its objectivity. Further, there is always an interpretive relationship between science and writing, and the consensus is only a sorting and highlighting of the sensory material into some kind of admired "fact", but it is ultimately a construction, not unlike all theological rhetoric. "This activity is truly revolutionary because of the rejection of fixed meanings. It is ultimately a rejection of God and his consubstantial objects—reason, science, law." [15] What the "amateur" seeks to reconstruct is the private sphere where meaning is "disembodied", while avoiding falling into the pure objectivity of the "expert".

"Pleasure of the Figure"—Amateur Media Substitution

However, the occurrence of the private sphere carries with it a fully self-sufficient symbolic game, in which the conscious subject quickly appropriates the "inspiration" and displaces the "interest" inherent in it, or subverts the noumenal without any pretense, so that all is sufficient. The codes and symbols that are sufficiently "epistemic" may become their machinic devices. In short, when language gets stuck in a difficult situation, the "amateur" player does not hesitate to turn to a heterogeneous medium outside the textual framework. This medium was constructed in the late Barthes period to resemble "photographic literature," an aesthetic technique that stimulates literary productivity through visual symbols such as images. It is important to note that even though the pictorial symbol naturally holds a part of the function of representation, its cooperation with language only occurs after the challenge of the "amateur" to the "narrative myth", which is almost the most important precondition for the creation of this presupposition.

For this reason, images will perform two functions in the textual game: one is to compensate. Although Barthes is concerned with the signs of being "present", the encoding and decoding of language alone does not allow the individual to transcend the general process of symbolic recognition, i.e., language lacks a certain purely intuitive bodily grasp. It is important to emphasize that the absence here is for the subjects who observe the "amateurs", who are not, after all, direct participants in the game. For these spectators, all the energy hints are no longer "useful", which creates an imbalance of "pleasure" inside and outside the game. The image, as a purely visual symbol, is able to detect a certain detail simply by looking at it, just like the music, which can make even an incompetent layman dance to "Ode to Joy". What is being shaped here is a sensory

mechanism similar to the "stinging point", i.e., through a visual stimulus with a universal memory point, the "amateur" can use it to achieve the transmission of "unspeakable information". The "amateur" object is also sufficient for the aesthetic grasp by virtue of the basic bodily experience. In other words, although it is difficult for the "amateur" to anchor a stable aesthetic path into his own play space, the "stabbing point" device provided by the heterogeneous media enables the "amateur" to. In other words, although the "amateur" can hardly anchor a stable aesthetic path to enter his own play space, the "puncture point" device provided by the heterogeneous medium enables the "amateur" spectator to gain some direct experience in the physical sense, thus achieving a compensatory aesthetic mechanism between the subject and the object.

The second is translation, which involves Barthes' deconstruction of the path of the idea of "absence". "Barthes soon realizes the contradiction between the temporal distance necessary to write about the 'now' and the 'present' and finds a solution in the ideal form of 'shorthand writing'. in which a solution to the problem is found." [16] It is important to note that even if the personal sphere constructed by the "amateur" has to frequently mark the time of the moment, the "absent" cannot escape by the will of the subject. Thus, Barthes needs a device that is good at capturing the "moment" and tries to do justice to the work of extraction and restoration in that device. The recurring reference in *The Ming Room* is to a form of mourning: "Death is the essence of that photograph." [17] And the ability to store the photograph is a form of mourning. The images that store this microscopic experience of death are unquestionably elevated to the form of a "transparent" medium. It is not difficult to find that when the image behind the camera is created, the external space-time will be framed in a certain fair way, while the endogenous subject will be fractured into the present subject and the recorded object. The former is sufficient to preserve the output of the "amateur" practice, because this act of production has no end result, and all its meaning will be attached to the whole process; the latter can be objectively and precisely. The latter can be objectively and precisely redeployed and used when the individual needs a "non-real" memory. Therefore, the image in the "amateur" sense is not an intentional compositional device, but a key evidence of the translation between "absence" and "presence", and can be seen as a mechanical program to perform the function of recording. It can also be seen as a mechanical program that fulfills the function of recording, because it is inherently visible and does not have any extension.

It is easy to see that what the "amateur" is trying to do is to break through the textual barriers, to make a more self-sufficient and self-referential mode of writing happen in the non-linguistic place, and thus to reverse the epistemic crisis. In his "Autobiography of Roland Barthes," Barthes attempts to use both textual and pictorial media to construct a space for self-expression, and to use the tension of the coexistence of heterogeneous media to realize the literary demand for the three-depersonalization of self-writing. [18] Thus, this path of organizing the media into the text is quite legitimately described, and only after that is the "amateur" position of identity and the "pleasure" effect of practice to be considered.

THE "GAP"—THE REALIZATION OF AMATEUR GAMES

Beginning with realism, a certain formula was produced that gave fixed meaning to literature, and at the same time marked the realization of the ideological "naturalization" of pretensions. "Far from being neutral, realist writing is, on the contrary, full of the most spectacular signs of fabrication." [19] This fabrication is always an attempt to pass off facts and falsify meaning by means of "healthy" symbols, i.e., fully recognized, but never purely natural, units of power. Robert Grenier reinforces the responsibility of "falsification" in the author's position: "The writer then has an obligation to write in a way that is very different, even shocking, to draw attention to the fact that reality is not like that." [20] But its truthfulness is not the same. But his true identity is reduced to a sounding board for certain intentions, and he gradually falls into a literary production that lacks initiative.

Barthes later perceived two dilemmas of "authorship": one was the utilitarian logic of exchange. "The basic vice of consumer society is the emphasis on the 'usefulness' and 'profit principle' of all cultural behavior." [21] At the very least, it requires the conversion of access to the spiritual realm into a realistic bargaining chip that can be traded, and the "author" unquestionably takes on the role of producer. This act of production is, first of all, non-self-sufficient, and it seeks to enter into some kind of contract with the "readers" of the market in the sense of supply and demand; after all, it inevitably generates "value" and creates wealth, even if these audiences are often stuck in repetitive mental consumption. Moreover, the linguistic production of the "author" has to be ideologically alert at all times, perhaps to fulfill certain disciplines on the historical subject, such as the complementation of the "imaginary community" in eighteenth-century English literature. Perhaps it has to be "castrated" because it is partly "unauthorized," with the end result that "new books are constantly published, new radio and television programs, new films, all kinds of social news, but always with the same meaning. the same meaning." [22] Instead, the historical subject is plunged into the loss of aesthetic "stagnation".

The second is the failure of interpretive authority, which is also the central idea of Barthes's late *The Author is Dead and Writing Zero*. In terms of structure, literature is about reality but does not refer to it. Although the codes that construct the text are recognizable in the "factual" part, the links between them are empirical embellishments, so the meaning of the whole corpus is basically not transferable. In addition, the infinity of symbolic extension is inward, which is the aforementioned "enlightenment of enlightenment", but the upper limit of all enlightenment is closed. "Blake's sunflower is a symbol of anything in heaven, however, it cannot go beyond the real sunflower." [23] In other words, there is no such thing as an "arbitrary" symbol, but only a fragmentary intercepted reproduction and transfer of the meaning of the symbol, and the subject of this micro-technique is the author. In this sense, the author is never the creator of the sign, but ultimately the practical carrier of the sign itself. However, Barthes argues that consumer societies are not aware of the movement of symbols themselves, or that they need to create a set of author-driven illusions that sprout economic ownership of the creator's talent and, in so doing, produce the material wealth of words. But this authority should not be assumed by the author, who is, after all, only a "relator" of the medium,

serving the function of organizing form and reproducing meaning. So, Barthes decisively abandoned his "authorship" in his "amateur" and needed to cultivate a group of "enthralled" players, preferably relatively discrete and with blurred boundaries. "it resists the market created for the work (by virtue of its isolation from mass communication)" [24], or at least they do not have to resort to the circulation of "products" in exchange for "pleasure" of a profitable nature. "

And is it possible for "amateurs" to be competent "readers"? Barthes' answer is no: "What I need is not the reader 'himself' but this space: the dialectical possibility of desire, the unforeseen potentialities of intoxication: the bets have not yet been placed, the game can still be played." [25] It is easy to see that the "amateur" can be a competent "reader". It is easy to see that Barthes emphasizes the "path" itself, which is self-legitimizing for writing, and that any subject at either end (the author and the reader) is only justly endowed with "freedom" and not with the "power" that rules the discourse. "power". Not only is the voice of the "author" rejected, but the position of the "reader" is even more insignificant, as they both need to escape from the techniques of identity construction and transform from critics (or consumers) to producers. Therefore, the "amateur" players have to construct a new order, a free space that does not experience any established forms and is only subordinate to the writing itself, which also foreshadows a certain long-neglected link, the "gap" This also foreshadows a certain long-neglected link - the "gap" - which has occurred.

This "seam" is first and foremost about the eroticism of the language as a whole. "Isn't the most erogenous zone of the body the splitting of the garment? In the case of sexual perversion (which is the state of operation of Bun-no-young) there is no 'erogenous zone'... It is the flash itself, more precisely: the flickering presentation, which is disorienting." [26] This is entirely about the aesthetic pleasure of erotic dress, and any straightforward glimpse is tasteless, especially on a practical level of utilitarianism. Only such hazy cracks in the clothes can intensively breed the "sex" of the erotic. By the same token, the textual orgy is more concerned with the naked language and meaning, where a "undressing" type of stripping pleasure is needed, and thus impose a progressive, perverted play.

Secondly, to dismember the traces at the "seam" to satisfy the endless imagination of individuals about the result of nudity. Or rather, as long as one refuses to see the entirety of the object, the space here can be anything one can think of. This also means that the "amateur" player will frantically search for and imagine the result, but will never achieve it, much less actually discover the nakedness. That is, what Lacan calls "the premises and locations of 'being and not being, yes and no'." [27] For they enjoy only the imagination of nakedness, and only the process of being fully "present" and peeling back the "gaps" is pleasurable enough. "On the side of the rhetorical devices, there is no longer any overall linguistic structure (identifiable interruptions), and all the subtle changes that correspond to the nominal are in the gaps." [28] It is important to note that the "gaps" here are neither exactly fractured nor neatly spaced. In other words, although Barthes rejects the whole, the presupposition of his writing space is still relatively flexible, and he also needs to add complete or fragmentary parts to complement each other's techniques.

For the fragmentary "tear" is imposed on the language itself but is merely a device for entering the space.

The above parts together constitute the whole process of the "gap" game, which is not only a macro search to find and identify pornography, but also a micro-operation to enter and enjoy it. Although the whole space is not friendly to subjects outside the writing, because the external textual links are always subject to frequent fragmentary beatings, and even make the reading subject fall into a complex and obscure interpretation loop. But it does not matter, because the "amateur" never cares about the "readable" work but places the creative object in an open structure and violently reorganizes and rewrites it, the "work the work", along with the author who produced it, disappears from the writing space, thus transforming it into a "writable" text. At the same time, there is a reassembling of literary practices, an inwardly referring literary program about the "pleasure" of the text, and an "emancipatory" intimacy between the subject and the writing.

SUMMARY

Roland Barthes is concerned with the "aphasic" defects of linguistic symbols and tries to rediscover the value of texts in an "amateur" writing game. This process will fully experience the external "presence" of language, including the historical conditions of constructive discourse and the coexistence space of epistemic media, and achieve the overcoming of textual barriers while breaking the ideological illusion. In addition, "amateur" will also produce a group of ideal gamers who are so "sexually charged" that they will be excited to perform unprofitable literary attempts, even to the point of forgetting and straying into an unconscious state outside their own selves. Ingeniously, this separation is reinvented in the path of the "amateur" and organized into a new bodily experience. In short, whether it is an additive repair of the linguistic system or an attempt to re-legislate the individual, it is free to proceed in Barthes' "amateur" space. Although the part of media integration has been practiced, the feasibility of its specific aspects and the actual production capacity need to be further studied and verified.

REFERENCES

1. Roland Barthes, *Myth*. Translated by Annette Raffles. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.
2. (France) Roland Barthes: *The Joy of Literature*, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
3. (France) Roland Barthes: *The Joy of Literature*, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
4. Ye Xiushan, Kant's main thought and historical significance of Critique of Judgment [J]. Zhejiang Academic Journal, 2003.
5. Ernst Cassirer: *Language and Myth*, translated by Yu Xiao et al Sanlian Publishing House, 1988, p. 59.
6. Huang Xiyun, Roland Bart: Three connotations of "amateurism" [J]. Foreign Literature Review, 2005.
7. Terry Eagleton, *Western literary theory of the 20th century* [M]. Translated by Wu Xiaoming Beijing: Peking University Press, 2007.

8. Roland Barthes, vol. II, 1994, p. 1695.
9. Xu Ben, Metacriticism and Metahistory—Jameson's Marxist hermeneutics [J]. Literature and Art Research, 1987.
10. Foucault: History of Sexual Experience, translated by She Piping Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2009.
11. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
12. Huang Xiyun, the overturned fallacy—about a key concept in Roland Barthes' later thoughts [J]. Foreign Literature Review, 2003.
13. Lejeudukal é idoscope, sponsor Jean-Louis Ezine. Œ Uvrescomplex è tes, vol. IV, p. 849, p. 849.
14. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
15. Jonathan Keller: Roland Bart, translated by Fang Qian Beijing: Sanlian Bookstore, 1988.
16. Lu Yichen, "Photographic Imagination" of Literature—Take French modern and contemporary literature as an example [J]. Contemporary Foreign Literature, 2016.
17. Roland Bart, Camera Lucida: Reflection on Photography. Transmission. Author: Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, pp. 14-15.
18. Lu Yichen, "Photographic Imagination" of Literature—Take French modern and contemporary literature as an example [J]. Contemporary Foreign Literature, 2016.
19. Roland Barth, writing zero. Transmission. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Noon Press, 1968.
20. Bu Zhaoxia, self-reference: from Jacobson to Roland Barthes [J]. Foreign Literature, 2006.
21. Huang Xiyun, Roland Bart: Three connotations of "amateurism" [J]. Foreign Literature Review, 2005, pp. 127-135.
22. Seuil, Lepleisirdutexte 1973, pp. 57-58.
23. Ashis Biswat, Roland Barthes' critical analysis of post-structuralism (taking the Death of the Writer as an example) [J]. International Journal of Linguistics. Literature and Translation, 2021, pp. 195-197.
24. (Japan) Taiping Fukuhara: Lacan - Mirror Stage, translated by Wang Xiaofeng, et al Hebei Education Press, 2002, pp. 52-53.
25. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
26. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
27. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.
28. (France) Roland Barthes: The Joy of Literature, translated by Tu Youxiang Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2016 edition.