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| **Keynote lecture 1** |

**Alain Fleischer**

(Le Fresnoy - Studio national des arts contemporains, France)

***Roland Barthes et la photographie. La révélation des images***

[alainfleischer@aol.com](mailto:alainfleischer@aol.com)

*The lecture untitled «Roland Barthes and photography, the revelation of images», is about  how, compared to the apparition of photographic prints in the chemistry bath of the revelator,  Roland Barthes reveals the autobiographical meaning of photos from his family album, in the semiologic bath of speech and langage, creating a unique relationship between  images and text.*

**Alain Fleischer** *-* born in 1944, Paris.

After studying modern literature, linguistics, semiology and anthropology at La Sorbonne

and Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, has been a professor in several universities, art and films schools,  in France and other countries. On behalf of the French Ministry of Culture, has created and directs Le Fresnoy - Studio national des arts contemporains. Laureate of the french Academy in Rome. Doctor Honoris Causa of Université du Québec à Montréal. Doctor Honoris Causa of European Humanities University in Vilnius.

Writer, film-maker, artist and photographer.  Has published more than 50 books (novels, essays, short stories). Has made around 350 films (feature films, experimental cinema, documentaries on art). His works as an artist and as a photographer are regularly shown in different countries.

**October 23, Friday**

|  |
| --- |
| *Panel 1* : ***The Semiotic Challenge*** |

**Eric Landowski**

(CNRS, Paris, France)

***With Barthes and Greimas, from coded signs to open meaning***

[eric.landowski@sciencespo.fr](mailto:eric.landowski@sciencespo.fr)

*It is almost a commonplace to distinguish or even to oppose to one another « two» Barthes — the young « structuralist » researcher and the mature « post-structuralist » thinker. A biographer might find an illustration of their incompatibility in the anecdotal but possibly meaningful fact that after having been during more than ten years, before the end of the 1960s, the best friend of the author of Structural Semantics, namely A. Greimas, Barthes soon later became the best companion of a post-modern group, namely Tel Quel, which rapidly appeared as one of the best opponents to Greimas’s semiotic circle and its enduring structure-based line of research. But things appear more complicated for whom has had both the opportunity of attending Barthes’s seminar at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in its initial period, and the privilege of collaborating with Greimas until his late writing of On Imperfection (1992 — «Apie netobolumą“, Baltos lankos, 2004). Rather than insisting on the differences that progressively distanced these two theoreticians from one another (and, moreover, which now permit to distinguish, within their respective œuvres, two successive styles of research), we shall try to explain how, during that « belle époque », it has been possible to think in the company of both — with Barthes and Greimas. How did their complementary and constantly evolving inspiration contribute to open a common path leading from an initially restricted semiological approach (founded on the notions of signs, systems and codes) to an open semiotic reflexion on everybody’s experience of the search for meaning ?*

**Eric Landowski -** semiotician, former *Directeur de recherche*, CNRS (Paris). At present *Directeur de recherche,* associated to the universities of Limoges (France, Centre de Recherche Sémiotique), of Vilnius (Greimo Centras for Semiotics and Literary Studies) and of Sao Paulo (Centre for Sociosemiotic Research). Chief editor of the journal *Actes Sémiotiques* (on line). Author of four essays in sociosemiotics (*La Société réfléchie*, Paris, Seuil, 1989 ; *Présences de l’autre*, Paris, PUF, 1972 ; *Passions sans nom*, PUF, 2004 ; *Les interactions risquées*, Limoges, Pulim, 2005) and numerous articles among which some translated into Lithuanian in the journal *Baltos lankos*. Most recent publication : « The Greimassian Semiotic Circle », in Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere (eds.), *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth Century Humanities*, London, Routledge, 2015. Forthcoming, in Lithuanian, *Sociosemiotika*, Vilnius, Baltos lankos, 2016.

**Jurgita Katkuvienė**

A.J. Greimas Centre of Semiotics and Literary Theory,

Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University

***Beyond the Meaning: the Last Work of Roland Barthes***

[jkatkuviene@gmail.com](mailto:jkatkuviene@gmail.com)

*In «Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography», the last book published in his lifetime, Roland Barthes puts a question: “What does my body know of photography?” The question is interesting not only for the object concerned – a photograph, but also for the approach to the object, which is defined as “corporeal knowledge”. The emphasis on the body was the reason for interpreters to assume that in his last book Barthes returned back from semiotics to phenomenology. But different aspects of corporeality or “corporeal knowledge” in the description of the meaning (in its origin, formation and production) is important not only in this book, but also in other works: from Writing Degree Zero (1953) and Michelet (1954) to The Pleasure of the Text (1973). My thesis is that in his last work Barthes not so much returned to phenomenology but changed the focus of the approach to the objects of the world. The new step in Camera Lucida is that “corporeal knowledge” assumes an ontological status. Barthes describes such approach to objects of the world, which happens through the “corporeal knowledge”, and which, according to Barthes, doesn‘t belong to the domain of meaning.*

*Barthes described two ways of „reading“ of photography, which are related to two elements of photography – studium and punctum. Referring to punctum and studium, I will analyze how Barthes conceptualizes this phenomenological implication.*

**Jurgita Katkuvienė –** lecturer in A. J. Greimas Centre of Semiotics and Literary Theory at Vilnius University (since 2013). In 2012 she has defended a PhD thesis “Aspects of Corporeality in the Literary Theory of the 20th Century: Roland Barthes and Algirdas Julius Greimas” (VU). During 2013-2015 she did a postdoctoral research (the topic “Semiotics and Phenomenology: the Conditions of Meaning”, VDU). She translated into Lithuanian several texts by Roland Barthes, namely: “The Photographic Message” and “A Lover’s Discourse: Fragments» ( in progress).

|  |
| --- |
| *Panel 2:* ***Roland Barthes in Between the Image and the Text*** |

**Sergei Zenkin**

(Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia)

***The Image and the Imaginary***

[sergezenkine@hotmail.com](mailto:sergezenkine@hotmail.com)

*In his critique of culture, Roland Barthes was preoccupied not only with signs but also with images. Divided into two classes - external (visual) images-signifiers and internal (mental) images-signified, - they were always regarded by Barthes as a dangerous element, carrying uncontrollable social significations. The analyst’s work should purpose to overcome their influence, to liberate the man from their parasitical senses. In order to do this, a deconstruction of image is needed, which can be realized by overwriting texts upon images, by superimposing one image upon another, by hiding and sacralizing certain particularly important images. The paper examines these strategies in several Barthes’ works: «Mythologies», «Roland Barthes by Roland Barthe»s, «Fragments of a lover discourse», «Camera lucida», and others.*

**Sergey Zenkin** - born in 1954, is a research professor at the Russian State University for the Humanities (RGGU) in Moscow. His research works, published in Russian, French, English and other languages, treat different subjects – such as French literature of the 19-20th centuries, literary theory, history of theoretical ideas. He has translated into Russian and published with his long analytical presentations and notes many books of theory, among others Roland Barthes’ *Mythologies, The System of Fashion, Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes.*

**Gintautas Mažeikis**

(Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania**)**

***Desire of Imperial Myth: Critics of propaganda by R. Barthes***

[g.mazeikis@pmdf.vdu.lt](mailto:g.mazeikis@pmdf.vdu.lt)

*The paper is devoted to contemporary Russian Imperial narratives as a mythic cover of emptiness of desire and unsatisfaction, and as the narrative distortion. R. Barthes’s analysis of the cover page from the French magazine “Paris Match” is used for the analysis of contemporary imperial narratives. Two cases are considered: pro-Kremlin and “anti-Bolsheviks” contemporary Imperial myths. Contradiction between them shows radical distortion and political consequences of the choice. The paper juxtaposes desires and wishes, unsatisfaction and inconsistency. Inconsistency is considered in Critical Theory tradition as a result of causal chains, and unsatisfaction as an expectation that has not been fulfilled at all. «Empire» narratives are built nor as a rational project, no as a historical example, but as one-dimensional or multidimensional hiding of Nothingness. The function of the myth is not to make disappear the emptiness of desire but to guarantee the functions of human life through the endless chain of distortions.  Mythic narratives couldn’t be rationally improved but are to be complemented by diplomats' rhetoric of substitution by other positive affirmations. The paper maintains importance of alternative positive narratives, other mythic affirmations in order to substitute the imperial. The paper also criticizes the critiques of propaganda as an enlightened illusion of demolishing of propaganda myths.*

**Gintautas Mažeikis** - is philosopher of Critical Theory . His is also the Head of Department of Social and Political theory and supervisor of postgraduate studies in Social and Political Critique at Vytautas Magnus University (Kaunas, Lithuania). His books and articles are devoted to the topics of Renaissance symbolical thinking, Propaganda and symbolical thinking, Critiques of contemporary dialectics of the Lord and the Serf, Critics of ideologies and theories of leadership. His current work is devoted to the Theory of Self-Othering. He is a participant of many interdisciplinary projects devoted to the contemporary urban studies, political class and creative industries studies and artist projects related to situationist movements.

|  |
| --- |
| *Panel 3*: ***The Pleasure of/in the Text*** |

**Viktoria Kanstantiuk**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***Letter of Pleasure: Between Barthes and Lacan***

[victoria.konstantuk@ehu.lt](mailto:victoria.konstantuk@ehu.lt)

*In the "Pleasure of the text" (1975) Roland Barthes makes an extensive use of psychoanalytic concepts, and that allows him to talk about text, writer, writing, readers and critics. Roland Barthes says little about desire, although in psychoanalysis it is closely linked to the notion of jouissance and anxiety. Two main questions to be examined in the given presentation: What does psychoanalytic optics means for Roland Barthes in his reflexions on the Text? Several key concepts of his writing are to be analyzed, namely: jouissance (enjoyment), pleasure, perversion, fetishism, gap.*

**Viktoriya Kanstantsiuk** – lecturer of the Department of Media at the European Humanities University (Vilnius, Lithuania). Holds BA in Culturology from Belarusian State University (Faculty of Philosophy and Social Science, Minsk, Belarus, 2001); in 2004 she graduated PhD program in History and Theory of Culture (Faculty of Philosophy, European Humanities University (Minsk, Belarus). PhD dissertation (in progress): *Mechanisms of mediation in YouTube in the prospect of social and critical theory*

Research interests:Lacanian Psychoanalysis, Postmarxism, Visual Anthropology, Visual Culture and New Media.

Main publications: “Media/Net Mediation as Social Mediation» (in *Topos*, 2014); «Mediation: Methodological Topicality of Psychoanalytical-(post)Marxist Synthesis in the Understanding of Media “(in *Topos*, 2013); “Decoded Visual Streams: Capitalism and YouTube” (in *Topos*, 2012); “YouTube: Desire in Media and Seriality” (in *International Journal of Cultural Research* (2012); “Freud and Lacan as Media Theorists, or What Media Can Say About Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalysis - About Media” (in *Topos*, 2011) and others. .

**Denis Petrina**

(Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania**)**

***B(arthes)/L(acan): (t/s)extuality: on jouissance***

[denisas.duce@gmail.com](mailto:denisas.duce@gmail.com)

*This paper deals with one of the most problematic yet alluring Barthes’ (and poststructuralist in general) concepts –namely, with the concept of jouissance. Even though Barthes insists on textual jouissance, it cannot (and must not) be restricted to a textual experience only; the logics of jouissance is sexual, which is proved by the fact that the term is rooted in Lacanian psychoanalysis and closely bound to another notion – the notion of the Unconscious. The interrelation becomes even more complicated when we recall the famous Lacan’s phrase: “The unconscious is structured like a language” (that is, the sexual component is changed back into the textual… But is it fixed?).*

*The instance of the letter, the flowing signifier – t/s, differentiating between textuality and sexuality – is at the heart of this paper. Joining together two Barthes’ texts on jouissance – the theoretical one, “The Pleasure of the Text”, and the practical one, “S/Z”, and applying Lacan’s comments (these are sometimes too vague to be defined as a proper explanation) on the key notion, I will endeavor to grasp some of the 'les points de capiton' in order to explore where and how the textuality transforms into sexuality.*

***Denis Petrina -*** MA Student at the program Social and Political Critique, Vytautas Magnus University (Kaunas, Lithuania). Graduated BA program in Media and Communication at the European Humanities University (Vilnius, Lithuania). Research Interests: Critical Theory, Neomarxism, Digital Poetry.

**Veronika Furs**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***Roland Barthes: en quête du Neutre***

[veronika.furs@ehu.lt](mailto:veronika.furs@ehu.lt)

*“Le Neutre” is the title of R. Barthes’ course delivered in College de France in spring semester of 1978. As Barthes points out in the “preliminaries” to the course, the concept of Neutral is that which outplays the paradigm, the one which represents some sort of “tertium (non) datur” in paradigm. The paradigm is something that always presupposes the conflict between two terms and thus produces the meaning. And if ‘Le Neutre,’ as this ‘tertium’ in paradigm, is called to defeat the conflict (= production of meaning), does this mean that it also really annul the meaning? Being, according to Barthes, regarded from structural optics, ‘Le Neutre’, nevertheless, does not refer to neutrality or indifference.*

*The project of the examination of ‘le Neutre’ is not, as Barthes underlines, a disciplinary one: it is “the search of the category of the Neutral insofar as it crosses the language, discourse, gesture, action, the body, etc.” At the same time, as‘Le Neutre’ refers to the paradigm (to the conflict, to the choice), Barthes defines the general field of investigation – and that is the Ethics.*

*In my paper I am going to present the key ideas of the “preliminaries” to this course and to give some commentaries on one of the figures of Le Neutre – that is, the ‘Silence’.*

**Veranika Furs** is Associate Professor of the Academic Department of Media, EHU. She received her PhD in 1997 from Belarusian State University. Since 1999 she teaches in the field of communication studies and discourse analysis. She participated in series of international collective and individual projects (TEMPUS fellowships, fellowships of the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in Paris, SNSF fellowship in Lausanne and others).

**Elena Tolstik**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***Barthes' three texts on de Sade: "sensual pleasure in classification"***

***of writing and theatralization in the Rococo***

[*elena.tolstik@ehu.lt*](mailto:elena.tolstik@ehu.lt)

*In the context of the given paper the 'Barthes's Time' is to be the 18th century. I would like to consider Roland Barthes’ works from within the perspective of art history. According to Barthes, “sensual pleasure in* classification *“ of Sade’s writing is simultaneously bound with two events of the 18th century – The Enlightenment and The Rococo. The first one is revealed in its rational order while the second one is grasped in its theme of erotic.*

*In spite of semblable frivolity, the Rococo has a very important aim - to recreate every-day and intimate human life by the means of art. The Rococo theatralises every-day life and transforms it into illusion. Seemingly, de Sade does the same in his texts. However, in the same epoch these are two different types of theatralization. As well as de Sade’s writing shows its basis in its production, the Rococo art unmasks its own illusion in production of its theatre of life.*

**Elena** **Tolstik** (Toustsik Alena) - lecturer of the Department of History at EHU, Head of the BA program Theory and Practices of Contemporary Art (Vilnius, Lithuania). Research interests -- History and theory of arts, Visual and Cultural Studies. Teaching and research focus: Phenomenon of the Classics, History of art: from the Renaissance to the Modern art.

|  |
| --- |
| **Keynote lecture 2** |

**Dominique Païni**

(Centre national d'art et de culture Georges-Pompidou, Paris, France)

***Les contrariétés cinématographiques de Roland Barthes***

[dpaini@orange.fr](mailto:dpaini@orange.fr)

*Roland Barthes (1915-1980) was at once literary critic, linguist, sociologist, writer, philosopher. Unique among the intellectuals of his generation, he is unclassifiable as by the nature of his work as well as by the enourmous success of his thought, and remains in the center of literary world. What is less known, is that Barthes was also a film theorist and critic. He even appeared once as an actor in a movie Les Sœurs Brontë by André Téchiné in 1977.*

*A famous text that he published in 1975 under the title "En sortant du cinéma » («Leaving the cinema") begins with this sentence: "The subject who speaks here must recognize one thing: he likes stepping out of a movie theater». This is an is allegory of the paradoxical relationship of Barthes to cinema: it is a relation of strong familiarity with this art, an ordinary act of leaving the dark room in the procession of murmuring spectators, and at the same time there is an expression of overt reluctance, a sort of rejection of cinema. He could even declare not to like movies at all (ne pas aimer le cinéma), to which he devoted so many pages of writing. It well may be that because of this ambivalent relation to cinema, Barthes’ approach to cinema is This is probably why the cinema is so little known, and the centenary of his birth seems to be a proper occasion to unveil this relation.*

**Dominique Païni** - producer of many films dedicated to visual arts (*Palettes*, *La Ville Louvre* and others), he was appointed in 1990 as the director of Cinémathèque française and later, in 2001, of the Centre Pompidou. He was the commissioner, in France and Northern America, of the reknown international exhibitions such as *Hitchcock and the Arts* (2001); *Jean Cocteau, on the thread of the century* (2003); *Voyage (s) in Utopia of Jean-Luc Godard* (2006), *Digital Hand* (2008 and 2010), *ABC*, *Belgian Contemporary Art* (2011).

He collaborated on the magazine *Art Press*. His most recent books: *The Exposed Time*, Film Hall in the Museum (Ed. ,Cahiers du Cinema, 2002). *The attraction of the clouds, Cinema as a fine art’ Cinema* (2010 and 2014).

He is also the curator of the exhibition *Antonioni in the origins of pop*, in Ferrara, Paris and Amsterdam.

**October 24, Saturday**

|  |
| --- |
| *Panel 4:* ***Barthes and the Political Unconscious of Our Times*** |

**Andrei Gornykh**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***Roland Barthes: Two Times,***

***or The Energy of Photography***

[andrei.gornykh@ehu.lt](mailto:andrei.gornykh@ehu.lt)

*Roland Barthes shares with Marcel Proust not only passion for the creation of the Novel but a specific – baleful – enchantment of photography. Much in the spirit of Proust, Barthes is enchanted with photographic image of the object of love that tries to find the support and ground in the latter. But unlike Proust Barthes fails to use the specific spell, magic energy of photography to reinforce his object of love. He finds himself delighted, dazzled, entranced with photo-image, describing the situation in compensatory terms of «studium/punctum».  What is the ground of these similarities and dissimilarities? Could these aesthetic visions be interpreted in temporal and historical terms?*

**Andrei Gornykh** is professor of the Department of Media at the European Humanities University (Vilnius, Lithuania). He is the author of books «Formalism: from Structure to Text and Beyond» (2003), «Media and Society» (2013) and various articles on visual culture, considered through the lens of critical theory and psychoanalysis.

**Benjamin Cope**

(Warsaw, Poland)

***The Place of Thought: Mikhail Ryklin's Time of Diagnosis as a reworking of Barthes' Mythologies***

[benjamin.cope@ehu.lt](mailto:benjamin.cope@ehu.lt)

*In his introduction to the book A Time of Diagnosis, Mikhail Ryklin writes that he would have liked to write a book like Barthes' Mythologies, but that he could not because the circumstances in Russia 1995 - 2003 were different. My paper attempts to investigate whether, how and why Ryklin's book in fact differs from Barthes' Mythologies and what this means for the use of critical theory in a post-socialist context.*

**Benjamin Cope** is co-founder of the Laboratory of Critical Urbanism, EHU. Lecturer of Courses on Localised Cultural Industries, Critical Urbanism and Gender and Space. Research Interests: Critical Spatial Theory and Post-Socialist Cities, Analysis of Localised Cultural Events, Media and Cities. Also works at Zacheta - National Gallery of Art in Warsaw, Poland, and occasional member of the Belarusian band, Nagual.

**Uladzislau Ivanou**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

**Roland Barthes, the forgotten political thinker** (in French)

[uladzislau.ivanou@ehu.lt](mailto:uladzislau.ivanou@ehu.lt)

*Roland Barthes - a thinker, semiologist and literary scholar – had left also very interesting writings on various aspects of political science. Yet they are comparatively little known. In critical political sciences Barthes occupies an important place: he reflected on such topics as political ideology, political history, interplay of politics and art, politics and language, politics and gender; on elite and mass culture. Using an interdisciplinary approach, Barthes managed to describe and analyse - simply and creatively - the notions and topics which traditionally were regarded particularly difficult. A principal, important and already classical distinction between politics and the political, proposed by Barthes, is a good example of that.*

*I would argue that the analysis of**Roland Barthes’s texts (such as* Scandale du marxisme, Humanisme sans paroles, Le marxisme est-il une Eglise?, Ecrivains de gauche ou littérature de gauche?, L'antisémitisme est-il de droite ou de gauche?, Sur le régime du général de Gaulle, Que deviendrait une société qui rénoncerait à se distancier?, Entretiens et enquetes, La division des languages, La guerre des langues, Sade-Pasolini, A quoi sert un  intellectuel? Le Bruissement de la langue*) is still very timely. Also, let us recall that Barthes received - shortly before his death - new popularity and relevance in the course of debates on same-sex marriage in France. All this suggests that Barthes’s political and activist contribution still requires further investigations and discussion.*

**Uladzislau Ivanou** is a Lecturer in Political Sciences and Political History of Europe and Belarus, at the Department of Political Sciences, European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania. He is a text translator from French into Belarusian.

Research interests: Gender and Politics, Political Sciences, Gender and Language, Ethnology, Old-believers in Belarus, Sociolinguistics, Belarusians Studies, French Feminisms.

Among his recent publications there are: «Feminization of the Belarusian Language» (Leicester, 2012, **belarusians.co.uk), «**Homosexuality in the programs and discourses of the leaders and ideologists of Belarusian pro-democratic political parties and movements (2000-2012), 2014); «About Women Priests” (2013), “Feminization Nomina Agentis of the Belarusian Language and the Problem of Colonization // Journal “Палiтычная сфера” №16-17 2011; «About Belarusian Influence on Viciebsk’s Old Believers // Journal “Палiтычная сфера” №10, 2008 с.102-107)..

|  |
| --- |
| *Panel 5****: The Resisting Image: Roland Barthes and Photography*** |

**Mikhail Ryklin**

(Berlin, Germany)

***Roland Barthes: Romance with Photography***

[ramarama9000@gmail.com](mailto:ramarama9000@gmail.com)

*Susan Sonntag recalled that, lecturing in New-York in the late 70-th, soon after his mother’s death, Roland Barthes declared himself ready to write a novel, not a text like “Fragments of lover’s discourse” or “Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes”, but real novel, like “A la recherche du temps perdu”. “Camera Lucida”, last book that appeared in his lifetime, is Barthes’s attempt to keep his word. What starts as search of the essence, the eidos of Photography, turns out to be a Romance with a single Photo, that of his five-years-old mother “under the palms of the Winter Garden”. “ I studied the little girl and at last discovered my mother… [in]her sovereign innocence”. The small book, just about 80 pages long, consists of two parts, 24 Paragraphs each. In the first part author declares, the bulk of the photos, however technically perfect they may be, are of no -*

*At best of just superficial - interest, while they do not contain the only thing he cares about, the punctum, the “bite”, the sting. Though most of the photos containing precious punctums stem, as it turns out, from highly*

*acclaimed masters of Photography, the reader is constantly assured, it does not matter much.*

*One asks himself: why? While the only Photo which makes real sense for the author (that in the Winter Garden, of course) has chanced to be made by an obscure provincial photographer and has as an art object no value whatsoever. (Barthes’s sad commentary follows: “After my death it may well end in a garbage can”). The Photo, unlike others, contains no punctums, it is punctum all over, punctum as such. But it did not help to resurrect the narrator’s late mother, on the contrary, in first photo he lost her once again, for the second time. The Photography, if one believes Barthes,completely lacks the liberating power of narration, inherent in all arts (including the cinema), which deal with elapsing time. Its time is, au contraire, a frozen, tragically unmoving one. It ushers in the era of the definitive, undialectical Death. Promising to write a novel, Barthes added, it, to his mind, should be a hymn, a joyful celebration of life.*

*Ironically what appeared two months before Barthes’s death is one of the saddest texts of the world literature (equaled in this respect only by Maurice Blancot’s “L’instant de ma Mort”).*

**Michail Ryklin** - born in 1948 in Leningrad.

Fellow, Institute for Advanced Studies ‘Morphomata’, University of Cologne, october 2015 – march 2016.

Leading Researcher, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, since 1997

Correspondent, Lettre International, Berlin, since 1995

Visiting Professorships and Research Grants in France, USA, Great Britain, Germany; Bulgaria, 1991-2015.

Selected books:

The Spaces of Jubilation. Totalitarianism and the Difference, 2002 (in Russian, German, Spanish); Communism as Religion. Intellectuals and the October Revolution, 2008 (in Russian, German, Corean, Croatian); Pristan’ Dionisa, 2014 (in Russian and German);

Leipziger Book Prize for Euporean Understanding, 2007 (together with Gerd Koenen).

**Viktoria Musvik**

(Moscow, Russia)

***Historical trauma, distance, affect:***

***contemporary Russian photography and Roland Barthes***

[filisida@mail.ru](mailto:filisida@mail.ru)

*In this paper I will speak about the relevance of some of Roland Barthes' concepts about photography, that he developped in several articles and Camera Lucida, to analyzing and teaching contemporary photographers. One particular recurring trend in modern Russian photography is its fascination with the concepts of 'dullness', 'neutrality', research'. Though this is often presented as The Trend, i.e. the most Western and contemporary of all trends, I will show that it is, in fact, much indebted to Soviet photography of the 1950-80s where 'dullness' was the result of censorship and trauma. The link is almost never reflected upon and as a teacher I try to find ways of raising this awareness.*

*Roland Barthes' ideas have been much criticized recently by researchers like James Elkins, T.J.Demos and Margaret Iversen for his exclusion from photography of many 'non-affective', experimental genres or science images. My argument is however that it is exactly what is criticised, his concetration on the documentary and the everyday, that works in the classroom for the aim of overcoming traumatic dissociation in contemporary post-Soviet photography. And he also sets up a model of oscillation between the textual and the pre-verbal and between 'logical thinking' and 'emotional writing' that at the same time sends back to the foundational texts on 'human sciences' by Wilhelm Dilthey and Aby Warburg and appeals to contemporary criticism of the surpression of affect in art theory and the humanities.*

**Victoria Musvik** works as a photography critic and writer in Moscow and as a guest lecturer at the European Himanities University, Vilnius. She has taught at universities (Moscow State University, EHU) and non-academic institutions courses ‘Photography Theory’ , ‘Visual Analysis’, ‘Photography: History, Theory, Collecting’, ‘Visual Studies’, 'Cultural Criticism and Public Intellectual Work', ‘Current Tendencies in Documentary Photography’, ‘Research Photography for a Reporter’, ‘Theories and Practices of Creativity’ ‘Fiction on the Border Between Text and Image' etc. As a researcher, she mostly works on the border with psychology studying researcher's self-awareness and perception of images, texts and complex ‘word-and-image’ objects in two main fields, contemporary photography and early modern culture.

|  |
| --- |
| Panel 6: ***Roland Barthes in interdisciplinary contexts*** |

**Olga Boitsova**

(Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera),

St.-Petersburg, Russia)

***The System of Fashion” beyond fashion:***

***Semiotics of color in Soviet advice books on children’s clothing***

[*boitsova@gmail.com*](mailto:boitsova@gmail.com)

*The paper presents some results of the analysis of Soviet advice books on housekeeping and childcare from 1920s till 1980s. Using “The System of Fashion” by Roland Barthes as a methodological itinerary, I applied his method to Soviet prescriptions on colors of children’s clothing. My analysis shows that light and bright in Soviet advice books are synonymous and both are in opposition to dark, just as it was in French fashion magazines of 1958-1959 analyzed by Barthes. And just as in the French fashion system, in the Soviet public discourse signs were transformed into reasons through “rationalization”.*

**Olga Boitsova -** PhD in History (European University of St.Petersburg, Russia). The title of PhD dissertation - “Amateur Photography in Contemporary Russian Culture” (defended in 2010 and published as a monograph in 2013). At the present moment she is a researcher at Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera), and as a secretary to the Editorial board of “Forum for Anthropology and Culture” journal and teaching semiotics and visual analysis part-time in different institution.

**Julia Martinavičiene**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***The Old and New Rhetoric of Roland Barthes***

[*julia.martinavichene@ehu.lt*](mailto:julia.martinavichene@ehu.lt)

*“Rhetoric of the Image» (1964) by Roland Barthes is one of the most cited works in cultural and visual studies. It is also called «Barthes’s landmark article in visual semiotics» (Bouissac 1998) and «is often thought to initiate pictorial semiotics» (Sonesson As Sonesson remarks, «Rhetoric of the Image» has been «commented on by most exponents of pictorial semiotics, such as Lindekens, Floch, Vilches, Perez Tornero, and Porcher). Exactly at the same time when «Rhetoric of the Image» was published there was one more rhetoric in Barthes’s life: École pratique des hautes études hosted his seminar on «the old rhetoric». In the introduction to the transcription of this seminar Barthes writes that the aim of this seminar was «to confront the new semiotics of writing with the classical practice of literary language» (Barthes 1988). However, the aim was even more ambitious - to give birth to a new rhetoric «which may not yet have come into being» (ibid.). In this context «Rhetoric of the Image» seems to be a part of a larger project of introducing a new rhetoric (in this case for a visual world). However, in most cases «Rhetoric of the Image» is interpreted as a semiotic text with a title that is rhetorical as such. Is semiotics a new rhetoric? What are the connections between rhetoric and semiotics in the XX century? And what is particularly rhetorical about «Rhetoric of the image»? - these questions are central to my presentation.*

**Yuliya Martinavichene** is a lecturer at the European Humanities University. Having obtained MA in Visual and Cultural Studies (2008, EHU) with a particular focus on visual semiotics, since then she has been teaching semiotics and the theory of advertising at the Department of Media (EHU). Her main research interests include visual social semiotics, semiotics of power, and advertising. Her current research aims at conceptualizing a currently underdeveloped field of semiotics of unpredictability with a special focus on contingency in tropological mechanisms of signification.
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**Almira Ousmanova**

(European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania)

***Reading Film as Text: the Methodology of Textual Analysis in Film Theory***

[*almira.ousmanova@ehu.lt*](mailto:almira.ousmanova@ehu.lt)

*Despite the fact that Roland Barthes wrote only a few works dedicated to cinema itself, his ideas were crucial to the development of Film Theory. In my presentation I would like to focus on several issues that seem to be important in understanding better his contribution. I am going to speak of the methodology of textual analysis that Roland Barthes developed with reference to the literary texts ("Textual Analysis of a Tale by Edgar Allan Poe» (1973), «S/Z» (1970), «The Reality Effect»* (1968), *etc.), but which proved to be very productive for the formation of the metodology of film analysis (developed in depth in the works of Thierry Kuntzel, Raymond Bellour and other French film scholars). Talking about Film as Text, these theorists do not focus on the literary textuality of cinema, but rather on its visual texture, which involves another optics of reading. The main question that has been formulated in the framework of this approach – is everything significant in the film? "And if not all, if there are minor "non-significant areas”, then what is, so to speak, the value of this insignificance? (Roland Barthes). Another important issue is the question of how cinematic techniques were converted by Roland Barthes into theoretical tools ( and why textual analysis resembles a "slow-motion process of reading.")*

**Almira Ousmanova** (Ph.D. in Philosophy) is Professor at the Dept. of Media at the European Humanities University (Vilnius, Lithuania). Research interests: Genealogy and Methodology of Visual Studies, Gender Representations in Visual Arts, Soviet cinema, Art and Politics.

She is an author of *Umberto Eco: paradoxes of interpretation* (2000); editor of several collective volumes: *Anthology of Gender Theory* (ed., with Elena Gapova, 2000); *Gender Histories from Eastern Europe* (co-edited with Elena Gapova and Andrea Peto), *Bi-Textuality and Cinema* (ed., 2003); *Gender and Transgression in Visual Arts* (ed., 2007), *Visual (as) Violence* (ed., 2008), *Belarusian Format: Invisible Reality* (ed., 2008.), *Feminism and Philosophy* (ed., special volume of journal *Topos*, 2010), *TechnoLogos: the social effects of bio- and information technologie (*ed., with Tatyana Shchyttsova, special volume of journal *Topos*, 2014*)*. She is an editor-in-chief of a book series in Visual and Cultural Studies (EHU Press, Vilnius).

**Helena Koutchoura**

(Minsk, Belarus)

***“Certified Copy»,Or the Death of the Author in Contemporary Cinema* (**in French)

[*helena\_koutchoura@hotmail.com*](mailto:helena_koutchoura@hotmail.com)

*This presentation aims to analyze the impact of Roland Barthes’ concept of the death of the author on contemporary cinema. Roland Barthes’ concept of the death of the author is initially applied on a literary text but in contemporary film theory, film can be viewed as a «filmic text». If we perceive film as a text, it is possible to analyze the consequences of Roland Barthes’ concept of the death of the author for cinema.*

*Film viewed as a text is a fertile ground for the concept of the death of the author for many reasons. Firstly, film is a collective work in which there is no unique author. Secondly, contemporary cinema relies more and more on quotations and borrowings taken from the previous films, including the greatest films of author’s cinema (« cinéma d’auteur»). The famous phrase of Quentin Tarantino «I steal from every single movie ever made» describes the current realities of cinema’s world.*

*In order to illustrate my ideas about the concept of the death of the author in contemporary cinema, I will analyze the film «Certified Copy» (2010), directed by Abbas Kiarostami, and its quotations and borrowings taken from the iconic Michelangelo Antonioni’s art-house film «L'avventura» (1960). Among other things, the film «Certified Copy» presents a theory according to which a copy is not worse than an original and under certain conditions can be even better than an original. This theory is a contemporary continuation of Roland Barthes’ concept of the death of the author. Thus Abbas Kiarostami’s film «Certified Copy» demonstrates a profound influence of Roland Barthes’ concept of the death of the author on contemporary culture and cinema.*

**Helena Koutchoura** is a lecturer at Centre franco-biélorusse d’Etudes européennes (Minsk, Belarus). She holds a PhD degree in Political Science from the University of Strasbourg (France). She obtained a Master’s degree in European Studies from the College of Europe in 2001. Her main research interests include professionalization of the European parliamentary elites, Europeanization of party politics, European political parties (“Euro-parties”) and European party federations (EPFs), the European Union’s Audiovisual Policy, European identity and cinema, contemporary culture, society and cinema, political and social aspects of cinema, film analysis, film theory.