

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1176.41.2019.188528

UDC 791.32:81'22

**ROLAND BARTHES
AND YURII LOTMAN:
SEARCH FOR MEANING
IN FILM NARRATIVE**

Mihael Konstantinov^{1a2b}¹*Doctor of Philosophy,*²*Postdoctoral Researcher,*

ORCID: 0000-0001-7641-7388,

e-mail: mih112344@gmail.com,

^a*Department of Hebrew & Comparative Literature
University of Haifa,*^b*Teacher of cinema at Jerusalem Pedagogical
Institute "Michlalah Jerusalem College", Israel*

The purpose of the research is to carry out a comparative analysis of the concepts of semiotics of cinema by Roland Barthes and Yurii Lotman in the context of their understanding of the nature of film language, since understanding and methods of studying of contemporary digital audiovisual art are the topic of current interest in contemporary art history. The research methodology. The contemporary study of digital audiovisual art, as a rule, takes place within the context of interdisciplinary work, therefore, one of the methodological principles of such work is structural and semiotic approach. Today, this methodological approach to study the audiovisual art is the most developed in the semiotics of cinema, therefore the visual semiotics is viewed through the semiotics of cinema. The scientific novelty of the research. For the first time a comparative analysis of Yurii Lotman's and Roland Barthes's semiotics of cinema within the framework of the structural and semiotic approach was carried out. The potential of this methodological approach in the study of audiovisual art has been revealed. Conclusions. The article highlights the special aspects of understanding and application of semiotic concepts by the mentioned authors based on the cinematographic material. Thus, Roland Barthes thought that problems in a semiotic study of the cinema occur when a linguistic approach is applied, and Yurii Lotman believed such study to be completely acceptable. This resulted in a different understanding by these scientists of the nature of film language, its minimal meaningful unit, the role of syntagmatics and paradigmatics in the film narration. Different perceptions of the nature of film language and its components are an important basis for the study of contemporary digital audiovisual arts. The main difficulty of semiotics of cinema is the issue of non discrete iconic (analogue) sign in the study of cinema within the framework of the structural and semiotic approach. This problem can be solved based on the legacy of semiotics of cinema of R. Barthes and Yu. Lotman. Another important characteristic of the structural and semiotic approach is its ability to be combined with other methodological approaches in the interdisciplinary study of digital audiovisual art

Keywords: Barthes; Lotman; semiotics of cinema; film language; connotation; secondary modelling systems; sign

Introduction

Visual semiotics, in particular, semiotics of cinema acquires particular relevance in the era of screen culture. On the one hand, developments made by the founder and head of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School Yu. Lotman can be considered as classic in this area. On the other hand, the same can be said about the developments made by the French structuralist, who later turned to the post-structuralism of R. Barthes. There are few comparative studies of the heritage of these two authors for now. Thus, S. Zenkin compared Barthes and Lotman's approaches to visual image (Zenkin, 2012), Lei Han compared Lotman's autocommunication model with Barthes's representations of "Self" and "Other" (Han, 2014), and Kim Soo Hwan analyzed their understanding of "Other" in cinematograph (Kim, 2015). Finally, R. Zainetdinova examined Lotman's theory in the context of French and Italian semiotics as a whole (Zainetdinova, 2007; 2009).

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that for the first time a comparative analysis of Yurii Lotman's and Roland Barthes's semiotics of cinema within the framework of the structural and semiotic approach was carried out. The article demonstrates the special aspects of understanding and application of semiotic concepts by these scientists on the basis of cinematographic material. Thus, Barthes thought that problems in a semiotic study of the cinema occur when a linguistic approach is applied and Lotman believed such study to be completely acceptable. This was expressed in their different understanding of the nature of film language, its minimal meaningful unit, the role of syntagmatics and paradigmatics in the film narration.

The purpose of the article

The purpose of the article is to conduct a comparative analysis of the basic principles of the concepts of semiotics of cinema by R. Barthes and Yu. Lotman in the context of their understanding of the nature of film language and film narrative.

Presentation of the main material

Roland Barthes (1915–1980) and Yurii Lotman (1922–1993) are two significant names in cinema semiotics. Both scientists were guided by the ideas of F. de Saussure and C. S. Peirce, but had different views on semiotic analysis of cinema. We have already pointed out the difference in scientists' approaches in studying structure as such and to the fact that Barthes preferred synchronic approach in studying structure and Lotman – diachronic (Konstantinov, 2016).

R. Barthes is a prominent name in several fields of studies of the twentieth century (mythology, structuralism and semiotics, post-structuralism), therefore his approach to cinema has been changing depending on the field of study. In this article, we shall explore Barthes's work on cinema related to the structuralism period of his career.

Barthes maintained a contradictory attitude towards cinema, because he saw in the cinematography the insidious effect of the machinery presentation used by the ideology of power (Watts, 2016, p. X; XII), which he opposed. Lotman until the mid-eighties of the twentieth century considered cinematography as a metalanguage art of contemporary culture, which describes the whole contemporary culture and art. The Tartu researcher speaks about this in the articles "The place of cinema art in the mechanism of culture" (1977) (Lotman, 1998) and "SVD: melodrama genre and story" (1982) (Lotman & Tsivian, 1984).

Y. Lotman defines a film as a cinema text built on the rules of film language as a code (language, according to Lotman, is the code in the history of its development), the minimal semantic unit of which is a film shot (like a word in a natural language). At the same time, film editing is the main organizing element of the film and its narrative, which creates artistic information in the film text (Lotman, 1976, pp. 56-57). On R. Barthes's opinion, all these concepts concerning the cinema were not so simple.

As an example of the crisis of the semiotic approach to the cinema, we will point out the problem of recognition: whether there is a film language based on the linguistic structure or not. Metz and Barthes (Barthes, 2016, pp. 129-130; 134) denied the existence of such language and Lotman fundamentally recognized its existence. At the same time, the Tartu researcher understood the problem. It became the topic of his seminar and lecture delivered in 1987 at the University of Tartu. Thus, the scientist's lecture begins with the question: "... What is language and to what extent is it applicable to cinema?" As a result, the author concludes that cinema has a language that can be explored and fully described using the linguistic principles of semiotics (Lotman, 1988).

Both scholars created a secondary semiotic system for the study of art and culture. Barthes developed *connotative semiotics* – a system of secondary meanings. A connotation, as a rule, is a complex system where the role of the first system is played by natural language (such as literature as a connotation) (Barthes, 1968, pp. 89-90). The connotation itself also has its own "language" (Barthes, 1968, p. 30). The connotative meaning should be supported from the outside: linguistic and cultural traditions, cause-and-effect relations, clichés, etc. Barthes's connotative structure can be compared, to some extent, with Lotman's *secondary modelling system*: both are built upon the first level (natural language or analogue of the image); both have "their own language". But if Barthes actively uses the connotation in cinema and photography (Barthes, 1977b, pp. 43-44) as an encoding image system (Barthes, 1977a, pp. 19-20) (more details are given below), Lotman does not use his term to study cinema.

In 1960 two Barthes's articles that represent his theoretical understanding of film language were published: "The problem of meaning in the cinema" and "Traumatic Units" in Cinema: Research Principles". These are the first works of the scientist in which he deals with purely theoretical issues without ideological components.

In the article "The problem of meaning in the cinema"¹ Barthes, unlike Lotman, indicates that the film cannot be reduced to a pure grammar of signs, in other words, to semiotic formations (Barthes, 2015, p. 37). The author of the article indicates that the film and its signs primarily perform a communicative function because they transmit to the addressee-viewer a message expressed in the cinema signs (Lotman shares this

¹ The indicated article by R. Barthes has not been translated into English, therefore we use the translation of this article in German.

point of view). At the same time Barthes distinguishes two types of cinema signs: built with the help of a code (as a word in linguistics) and built with the help of analogy (as iconic sign). The main function of the first type of sign is informative – communication, of the second type – more emotional. The director, as the addresser, chooses depending on the general plot and his style the needed signs either from the dictionary of cinema signs – *koine* (general) that is the functional type of language used as a mean of communication or in the symbolism of the universal type – a more universal language that is perceived unconsciously.

According to Barthes, level of understanding of cinema text depends on the culture of the viewer, evolution of culture and fashion. We know that the sign is formed from a compound of signifier (form of expression) and signified (content). According to Barthes, the signifiers in the cinema are decoration, costume, landscape, music and, to some extent, gestures. The distribution of signs in the film is uneven: at the beginning of the film they are in abundance in order to acquaint the viewer with the film; signs are also concentrated at the end of the film to leave a certain “feeling” for the viewer after the film. The signifier is heterogeneous as it can refer to two senses (vision and hearing). This heterogeneity of the signifier in cinema when reasonably applied acquires aesthetic value. Unmeasured number of signifiers lowers the aesthetic value of the film. A characteristic feature of the signifier is combinativity – the possession of its own syntactic rules. The signifier can be presented as continuous (decoration) and momentary (gesture). Barthes states that in the cinema close-ups and zoom in give special mobility to the signifier (Barthes, 2015, p. 41).

According to Barthes, the signified is characterized by a conceptual character – it is the idea itself. The signifier actualizes this idea, but does not establish it. That is why the dynamic movement from the signifier to the signified emerges. The scientist draws attention to the fact that in semiology it is not entirely accurate to postulate the equivalence of the signifier and the signified; there is no equality as in mathematics, but rather a dynamic process (Barthes, 2015, p. 42). According to Barthes, the signified receives only an episodic, discrete and marginal role; it indicates what is beyond the film or has already happened. The reality, which is completely in the development of the film, as if invented, created by it, then it cannot be the subject of meaning, therefore the meaning is transcendental to the film, and not immanent to it (Barthes, 2015, p. 43).

In the conclusion, the researcher points out the specific and historical properties of the cinema sign: analogical relations between the signified and the signifier but not an arbitrary one as in linguistics; in the view of the fact that the distance between the signifier and the signified in the cinema sign is very short and therefore makes it impossible to come to the semiology of symbolism, and we are dealing only with direct analogies. Christian Metz in his article “The Cinema: Language or Language System?” (1964) (Metz, 1991) discusses this issue in details. The filmmaker often cannot use either a symbol or a sign in the meaning of Saussure’s ideas (arbitrary), only an “analogue”. “The rejection of conventionality entails the strict observance of naturalness. This is the paradox of our semiology of spectacles: it forces us to constantly invent new words, but it does not allow us to create a single abstract concept” (Barthes, 2015, p. 45).

In the article “Traumatic Units” in Cinema: Research Principles” (1960) Barthes addresses the problem of the cinema sign. In the previous article the scientist indicates that the signifier is heterogeneous and can affect both vision and hearing. In this article the author emphasizes again that the verbal and visual characters in the film are fundamentally different from each other. Despite the complexity of the iconic cinema sign (difference between the signifier and the signified), we usually use verbal signs to describe the film signifier in the language. Therefore, the question of the relationship between film and verbal signs arises. Barthes defines this relationship as *trauma* (Barthes, 2016, p. 131).

Another problem in the study of the film signified (image) is that the film image is characterized by a diachronic character expressed in the constant movement of appearing and disappearing images. However, there is a limitation to any systematic analysis since this analysis can use only fixed elements. We can say that the cinematic image is purely diachronic or temporary while structural studies, at least according to Barthes, imply stabilization and a kind of panchromism of certain functions. As we noted above, in the approach to the structure studying Barthes prefers, according to the Saussure’s tradition, synchronism and Lotman prefers diachrony. For Barthes the third difficulty of the semiotic analysis of the film is that the film language is not built strictly on linguistic principles in contrast to the natural language. This complicates the semiotic study of cinema. Therefore Barthes states: “... by using linguistic instruments we are in no way claiming to recognize that cinema is a language in the exact sense of the term, as the popular metaphor all too frequently implies” (Barthes, 2016, p. 129). The author further adds that if the film signs and verbal signs coincide (a situation where we can verbally clearly describe what we see on the screen), despite the similar relationship between the signifier and the signified in the film, this establishes the equivalence between these two types of signs (graphic and verbal), one of which is being actualized or, it can be said, reproduces another element (the meaning of the

image conveyed in its verbal description), and then the semiological analysis is valid; and at the same time we can speak about logomorphism in the cinema: “Let’s say that cinema is a logos, it is not a language. These are the epistemological boundaries of our analysis” (Barthes, 2016, pp. 129-130).

In this regard, the more interesting situation for analysis is when the film and verbal signs do not match. In such situation the film sign becomes theoretically visible and the verbal language becomes approximate (vague). We feel a discrepancy between verbal and film signs, that is, what the *trauma* is about. Barthes further points out the peculiarity of the film signifier – it consists of two elements: *support* and *duration*. *Support* – is a materially visible thing / object on the screen. Barthes provides an example: an elderly woman and a young man are looking at each other. We can define this picture in three ways: son and mother; lovers – an elderly woman and a young man; or as a mother and a “problem son” (incest). In this cinema shot the gaze (for example, of the son) appears as a *support*. Depending on cinema shot *duration*, we begin to identify young man’s gaze as one of a lover or not. It turns out that the *duration* of the shot determines the meaning of the shot. Barthes calls it a *morpheme* (a morpheme is the minimal meaningful unit in a language – a word). At the same time, we feel the *duration* only in the opposition of short / long. It is clear that there is no *duration* without *support* (the image on the screen – a shot), and these two conditions are necessary to determine the meaning of a film shot. *Support* is a form of expression of a meaningful film unit and its content is the *duration* in opposition of short / long (Barthes, 2016, p. 133). Thereby, the minimum meaningful cinema unit consists of *support* – as the form, and *duration* – as the content.

SIGNIFYING UNIT	
<i>Support</i>	<i>Morpheme</i>
GAZE	Duration
	<i>Terms of Opposition</i>
	Short Long

Picture 1 (Barthes R., 2016, p. 133).

In 1963–1964 Barthes gave several interviews on the problem of semiological research in cinema. We want to dwell on two of them published under the following titles: “On Film” (1963) and “Semiology and Cinema” (1964).

In the “On Film” interview Barthes continues to address the issue of applying the linguistic approach to the cinema. To solve this problem he proposes to determine the meaningful non-analogue elements that can be codified and make it possible to treat them as elements of the language. After isolating such cinematic elements, it is necessary to trace what happens when they change (as signifiers) with the signified in the film. Then we can distinguish linguistic units and combine them into *types*, systems. Barthes notes that the cinematic plan of expression is a *large signifying unit*, which on the denotative level indicates a signified that does not belong to the same category as the signifier. This situation does not fit into the requirement of linguistic research. And therefore, there is the opportunity to resolve this problem only on the connotative level. As a starting point, Barthes suggests taking the rhetorical models highlighted by Jakobson: metaphor in poetry and metonymy in prose.

According to Jakobson, metaphor and metonymy are all possible options for constructing an artistic text (Jakobson, 1971, p. 259). Barthes points out that film editing, in other words, any signifier expressed by adjacency, is metonymy. Since film is editing, it could be called metonymic art (Barthes, 1985a, p. 15) and therefore cinema is a syntagmatic art that manifests itself in the construction of the film’s narrative (Barthes, 1985a, p. 17). Therefore, we conclude that Barthes considers cinema a prosaic art built on the principle of metonymy. European art, according to Barthes, is characterized by the synonymy of signifiers: several signifiers correspond to one signified. Therefore, the scientist declares that it is not the meaning of the self-signifier that matters in art, but its place in the syntagma – the relationship between the chain of signifiers. Barthes further indicates that the syntagma is responsible for the meaning as well as for the sign itself (Barthes, 1985a, p. 18), and there is limited number of syntagmas construction options. And syntagma determines what can follow it. This determinacy of construction of syntagmatic chains Barthes calls a *catalysis*, which the director empirically applies (Barthes, 1985a, p. 17) based on his inner ideology, his philosophy of life (Barthes, 1985a, p. 18). It turns out that the meaning in the film no longer depends on the content of the signified, but on the syntagma (Barthes, 1985a, p. 19). This understanding of the way of meaning formation in the film does not contradict the understanding of the meaningful unit in the cinema expressed in the article “Traumatic Units” in Cinema: Research Principles”,

because the *duration* of the shot determines the syntagma of film construction. Such cinema understanding is close to the understanding of Metz's *The Large Syntagmatic Category*. Barthes, like Metz, does not allow the emergence of symbolic (paradigmatic) cinema, but only metonymic. Therefore, on Barthes's opinion, we can talk about the intersection of linguistics and cinema under condition of reliance on the linguistics of syntagma but not on the linguistics of sign (Barthes, 1985a, p. 18). Lotman preferred symbolic cinema, and, according to Lotman, metonymic cinema characterizes mass cinema.

Referring to Levi-Strauss, Barthes states that in art as well as in cinema the meaning (or rather signifier) is the highest category of rational basis (Barthes, 1985a, p. 22), so even the absence of the meaning has a secondary meaning – to be the absence of the meaning (this is not Barthes's *minus-device*). The meaning is inevitable for man. Barthes claims that to “kill” the meaning is extremely difficult (Barthes, 1985a, p. 22). Therefore, art, and cinema being its part, as a manifestation of freedom is trying, especially today, not to create something meaningful but, on the contrary, to *suspend* the meaning (from French word “suspendre” – to suspend), to construct meanings, but not to fill them to the full extent (Barthes, 1985a, pp. 19-20). The technique of *suspended meaning* (fr. *un sens suspendu*) in cinema is a very complex operation, which requires both excellent mastery of the technique and absolute intellectual loyalty. After all, this means getting rid of all the parasitic meanings which is extremely difficult. Barthes explains that in *suspended meaning*, each meaning refers to the next, which, in turn, also remains indefinite. Such continuous movement from one reference to another becomes the movement of the film (Barthes, 1985a, pp. 21-22).

In the interview published under the title “Semiology and Cinema” (1964), Barthes points out that, in addition to the complexity of the semiotic study of visual arts consisted in the fact that its sign system has analogous character and is difficult to codify, these systems are also “poor” systems since they almost do not support combinatorial operations. The *analogy* makes it almost impossible to combine a limited number of units in a rich and delicate style. Barthes calls the visual systems *symbolic*, and by symbol he means *analogous connection between the signifier and the signified*. At the same time, Barthes makes a working hypothesis: since cinema is a public discourse, it contains elements that are not directly symbolic but are already interpreted, even “culturalized” and “conventionalized”; and these elements can form secondary sign systems superimposed on analogous discourse. Barthes calls them *rhetorical elements* or *elements of connotation*. The denotation and connotation levels of the film are inextricably intertwined. Thus, according to Barthes, they will be the subject of semiology analysis (Barthes, 1985b, p. 31).

Speaking of the semiotic approach to the cinema, Barthes prefers to establish a certain period of research characterizing one element (for example, one actor's play in different films during the several years – for example such actor as Jean-Paul Belmondo), i.e. Barthes prefers a synchronous approach to film research (Barthes, 1985b, p. 34). We have already pointed out Barthes's preference in the semiotic study in general. In the study of cinema Barthes does not prefer Propp's functional analysis: the definition of the invariant plot structure and universal attributes constituting paradigmatic equivalents, reducing the content of motives to formal features. Barthes indicates that the attributes of the individual (hero – *note of M.K.*) are not his essence, initially he is determined by his place in the narrative network. Only afterwards, when a person is grammatically “declined”, the paradigm is established (Barthes, 1985b, p. 35). Therefore, in the study of cinema Barthes prefers to start from the film syntagma.

Back to Lotman's research on the issues Barthes is talking about, we can say that for Lotman, film language is built on linguistic principles, so its minimal meaningful unit is a shot, like a word in a natural language. Lotman recognizes the importance of the connotation level of film language, but he believes that the semiotic approach can be applied at the denotative level, because the film language unit is a shot.

For Lotman the paradigmatic construction in the cinema is more significant, because the film editing Lotman presents as two ways of paradigmatic relationships and not a metonymic construction as in Barthes's research. The first way is when in different shots we see the same denotation taken in different modes. Second way is two different denotations taken in the same mode (Lotman, 1976, pp. 57-58). In this regard, Lotman points out that film editing can also perform a metonymic function (Lotman, 1976, p. 23). Lotman also shows that in mass cinema syntagmatic constructions based on clichés (Barthes's sub-code) are becoming increasingly important. These clichés are a characteristic feature of film language in mass cinema and in the actor's performance (Lotman, 1976, pp. 90-91), they are crystallized cinematographic form, bearing a mythological worldview. Moreover, according to Lotman, the cinema cliché expresses the principle of *defamiliarisation* by V. Shklovsky (Lotman & Tsivian, 1984, pp. 69; 73).

Reflecting on the analogousness of the cinematic signifier, Lotman points to the bipolarity and asymmetry of human thinking that is very close to the essence of cinema. The human brain is divided into two hemi-

spheres – one of it operates with discrete units and the other one with non discrete (analogue and image)². The artistic text of the film (or image) is a heterogeneous text in which two types of languages coexist: discrete / non-discrete (analogue in Barthes's research). The antithesis of iconic (continual)/verbal (discrete) languages is allowed in the heterogeneous text through the verbalization of iconic signs and the iconization of verbal signs (Uspenskij, Ivanov, Toporov, Pjatigorskij & Lotman, 1973), "replication of reality" (Lotman, 1990a, pp. 54-55), as well as through transformation (recognition but not translation) (Lotman & Uspenskij, 1975, pp. 18-19) and the reorganization of mythological consciousness into a narrative structure (Lotman, 2019, p. 52). Therefore, Lotman believes that cinema can be fully described using the structural and semiotic approach.

If Barthes does not accept V. Propp's functional approach in the cinema study, then Lotman does. Moreover, Lotman often refers to the functional aspect in the cinema explored by Yurii Tynyanov (Tynyanov, 1982, pp. 27-28). And the functional aspect in the semiotic research is one of the main elements in the scientific approach of the Tartu researcher (Lotman & Pjatigorskij, 1977).

In 1964, Barthes released a significant article "Rhetoric of the Image". In this article the scientist analyzed the levels of message in the advertising text. This work is of great importance to us, because these levels and their relations are present in any film, and we have already mentioned them.

The first level has a language substance and is expressed in the film captions and objects that have a verbal message: dialogues, signboard, newspaper, page from a book, etc. Barthes indicates that the function of language message is dual: the *anchorage* function and the *relay* function. Since any image, as a rule, is polysemous (multiple meaning), the language text introduces monocemy into the image, in other words, *anchorage* of certain denotative meanings of the image occurs. The *anchorage* function can have an ideological orientation to emphasize a certain meaning in the image. This is achieved due to the fact that the language message may not be related to the whole image but only to some of its element, highlighting its significance (Barthes, 1977b, pp. 38-41). The *relay* function of language message more often appears in non-static images (in series). Barthes emphasizes that the verbal text and image are here in a complementary relations; both the text and the image in this case are fragments of a larger syntagma. So the unity of the message is achieved at the highest level - at the level of the plot, told story and diegesis. Links between words are rarely found in static images, but they acquire a special role in the cinema, where dialogue does not just clarify the image, but makes it possible to move from the utterance to the utterance, using meanings that are absent in the visual imagery, ensuring the development of action (Barthes, 1977b, p. 41).

According to Barthes, the second level of message is denotative. It is impossible to create a simple denotative image, since any even "naïve" image is "replication of reality" while creating a symbolic message. The denotative level of the message is like a threshold of the whole image, beyond which the addressee perceives only scattered lines, shapes and colors. The denotative level of the image indicates the objectivity of the visible. Barthes notes that in photography, due to its analogousness, the denotative level is manifested most of all, and it expresses *having-been-there*. A new space-time category arises, which localizes in the present an object inherent to the past. That is why the photo cannot express the illusion of presence. Barthes believes that the difference between photo and cinema is not quantitative (in the movement of the image) but qualitative: in the cinema *having-been-there* gives way to *being-there* things. And this makes it entirely possible to create a history of cinema, and moreover, this story will not lose connection with previously existing forms of art based on fiction (Barthes, 1977b, pp. 44-45). Therefore, an illusion of presence is created for the viewer in the cinema. Barthes defines the task of denotative message in naturalizing a symbolic message, giving the natural look to the semantic mechanism of connotation (Barthes, 1977b, p. 45).

The third level of message is connotative – *rhetorical*. The signs of this level – the *symbolic* message (usually cultural or connoted) are discrete. The specificity of this level lies in the fact that the number of possible interpretations of the same *lexia* (of the same image) individually varies and depends on the cultural and social experience of the addressee and his belonging to the cultural and social structure - society. In every society there is a certain set of "dictionaries" for reading the connotation, therefore the same image - *lexia* - can activate different dictionaries of the addressee. As a result, it turns out that the *language* of images consists of various dictionaries, idiolects and sub-codes: their semantic system penetrates through the image. The image language is not just a word transmitted by someone (for example, a subject that combines signs or creates messages), it is also a word received by someone, accepted: the language must include all kinds of semantic *surprises* (Barthes, 1977b, p. 47). Reflecting on his polyglottic model of communication, Lotman points out to such *surprises* (Lotman, 1990b), (Konstantinov, 2017a).

² More detailed analysis of this issue was given in the article "The transformation of the concept of art as a "modelling system" by Yu. Lotman". The genesis of Lotman's understanding of his "secondary modelling systems" was reviewed (Konstantinov, 2017).

Barthes indicates the complexity in the metalanguage description of connotative signifieds, because this metalanguage does not reflect its specificity. A connotative signified requires a description by different systems with different substances in order to reveal its specificity. The connotative signifier is divided up into types depending on its substance (image, speech, objects, gestures), but their signifiers, on the contrary, are not differentiated in any way. Barthes defines the general area for connotative signifieds as *ideology*, which is expressed with the help of connotative signifiers. He defines the connotative signifiers as *connotators – rhetoric*. Hence, rhetoric is the signifier side of ideology. Moreover, the visual image does not consist only of connotators and their understanding does not mean the understanding of the entire visual image (*lexia*). Since not all vocabulary elements can become connotators, a certain amount of denotation, without which the very existence of the discourse becomes simply impossible, always remains in the discourse. The connotation is defined by paradigmatic terms, and iconic denotation refers to syntagmatics: as a result of relations formed between them discrete connotators are conjoined, actualized as if “talk” through denotative syntagma (Barthes, 1977b, pp. 50-51).

Conclusions

A film as an audiovisual art work is a complex formation: the interaction of discrete and non-discrete language codes greatly distinguishing film language from a natural (linguistic) language. Therefore, for its structural and semiotic study, according to Barthes, it is necessary to proceed to the connotative level of film language. And also there is no single definition of the minimal meaningful unit of film language in the semiotics of the cinema, what indicates on its unstable properties as a language system. All these properties characterize the contemporary digital audiovisual art as well.

The author views the prospects for further research on the topic proceeding from the fact that the semiotics of the cinema is the main component of modern visual semiotics. By developing cinema semiotics concepts, we are thereby expanding the capabilities of visual semiotics in the study of contemporary digital audiovisual arts.

References

- Avtonomova, N. (2009). *Otkrytaia struktura: Jakobson - Bakhtin - Lotman - Gasparov [Open structure: Jakobson - Bakhtin - Lotman - Gasparov]*. Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskaia enciklopediia [in Russian].
- Barthes, R. (1968). *Elements of Semiology*. (A. Lavers, & C. Smith, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang [in English].
- Barthes, R. (1977a). The Photographic Message. In S. Heath (Ed.), *Image-Music-Text* (pp. 5-31). London: FontanaPress [in English].
- Barthes, R. (1977b). Rhetoric of the Image. In S. Heath (Ed.), *Image-Music-Text* (pp. 32-51). London: FontanaPress [in English].
- Barthes, R. (1985a). On Film. In R. Barthes, *The Grain of the Voice: Interviews 1962-1980*. (L. Coverdale, Trans., pp. 11-24). New York: Hill and Wang [in English].
- Barthes, R. (1985b). Semiology and Cinema. In R. Barthes, *The Grain of the Voice: Interviews 1962-1980*. (L. Coverdale, Trans., pp. 30-37). New York: Hill and Wang [in English].
- Barthes, R. (2015). Das Problem der Bedeutung im Film [The problem of meaning in the movie]. *Montage AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation*, 24(1), 37-45 [in German].
- Barthes, R. (2016). "Traumatic Units" in Cinema: Research Principles. In Ph. Watts, *Roland Barthes' Cinema* (pp. 127-136). Oxford University Press [in English].
- Han, L. (2014). Juri Lotman's autocommunication model and Roland Barthes's representations of Self and Other. *Sign Systems Studies*, 42(4), 517-529 [in English].
- Jakobson, R. (1971). Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances. In R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. (Vol. 2: Word and Language, pp. 239-259). Hague: Mouton [in English].
- Kim, S.H. (2015). Photogenie as "the Other" of the semiotics of cinema: On Yuri Lotman's concept of "the mythological". *Semiotica*, 207, 395-409 [in English].
- Konstantinov, M. (2016). Poniatie struktury u Yu. Lotmana i R. Barta [The concept of structure by Yu. Lotman and R. Barthes]. *Visnyk Dnipropetrovskoho universytetu*, 1, 92-98 [in Russian].
- Konstantinov, M. (2017a). Model of Communication Act in Art by Ju. M. Lotman. *European Philosophical and Historical Discourse*, 3(1), 98-104 [in English].
- Konstantinov, M. (2017b). Transformatsiia poniatiia iskusstva kak "modeliruiushchei sistemy" u Yu. Lotmana [The transformation of the concept of art as a "modelling system" by Yu. Lotman]. *Hileya: Scientific Bulletin*, 116, 153-157 [in Russian].

- Kozlov, A. (2000). *Strukturalnaia semiotika Yu.M. Lotmana kak nauchno-gumanitarnaia kontseptciia [Structural semiotics Yu. Lotman as a scientific and humanitarian concept]*. Moscow: MGU [in Russian].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1976). *Semiotics of Cinema*. (M. E. Suino, & A. Arbor, Trans.). University of Michigan Press [in English].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1988). Iazyk kino i problemy kinosemiotiki [The language of cinema and the problems of cinema semiotics]. *Kinovedcheskie zapiski*, 2, 131-150 [in Russian].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1990a). Iconic rhetoric. In Yu. Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (A. Shukman, Trans., pp. 54-62). Indiana University Press [in English].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1990b). Three functions of the text. In Yu. Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (A. Shukman, Trans., pp. 11-19). Indiana University Press [in English].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1998). Mesto kinoiskusstva v mekhanizme kultury [The place of cinema art in the mechanism of culture]. In Yu. Lotman, *Ob iskusstve [About art]* (pp. 650-660). St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo [in Russian].
- Lotman, Yu.M. (2019). The Phenomenon of Culture. In Yu. Lotman, & M. Tamm (Eds.), *Culture, Memory and History: Essays in Cultural Semiotics*. (B. Baer, Trans., pp. 51-75). Palgrave Macmillan [in English].
- Lotman, Yu.M., & Pjatigorskij, A.M. (1977). Text and function. In D.P. Lucid (Ed.), *Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology* (pp. 125-135). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press [in English].
- Lotman, Yu.M., & Tsvian, Iu.G. (1984). SVD: zhanr melodramy i istoriia [SVD: melodrama genre and story]. In *Tynianovskii sbornik: Pervye tynianovskie chteniia [Tynianovsky collection: The first Tynianov readings]* (pp. 46-78). Riga: Zinatne [in Russian].
- Lotman, Yu.M., & Uspenskij, B.A. (1975). Myth – name – culture. *Soviet Studies in Literature: A Journal of Translations*, 11(2-3), 17-46 [in English].
- Metz, C. (1991). The Cinema: Language or Language System? In C. Metz, *Film language: A semiotics of the cinema* (M. Taylor, Trans.). University of Chicago Press [in English].
- Tynyanov, Y. (1982). The fundamentals of Cinema. (L. O'Toole, Trans.). In B. Eikhenbaum (Ed.), *The poetics of Cinema*. (Vol. 9, pp. 22-32). Oxford [in English].
- Uspenskij, B.A., Ivanov, V.V., Toporov, V.N., Pjatigorskij, A.M., & Lotman, Yu.M. (1973). Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In J. van der Eng, & M. Grygar (Eds.), *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture* (pp. 1-28). Hague: Mouton [in English].
- Watts, Ph. (2016). *Roland Barthes' Cinema*. Oxford University Press [in English].
- Zainetdinova, R. (2007). Yu.M. Lotman v kontekste sovremennoi zapadnoi filosofii [Yu. Lotman in the context of modern Western philosophy]. *Diskurs Pi*, 7, 124-128 [in Russian].
- Zainetdinova, R. (2009). Teoriia Yu.M. Lotmana i frantsuzskaia i italiianskaia semiotika [Theory of Yu. Lotman and French and Italian semiotics]. *Vestnik Iuzhno-Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Series: Sotsialno-gumanitarnye nauki*, 32, 92-98 [in Russian].
- Zenkin, S. (2012). Semiotika zritel'nogo obraza: Rolan Bart i Iurii Lotman [Semiotics of the visual image: Roland Barthes and Yuri Lotman]. In S. Zenkin, *Raboty o teorii: Stati [Works on Theory: Articles]* (pp. 262-274). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie [in Russian].

The article was received by the editorial office: 08.10.2019

РОЛАН БАРТ ТА ЮРІЙ ЛОТМАН: ПОШУК СМISЛУ В КІНОНАРАТИВІ

Міхаель Константинов^{1a2b}

¹Доктор філософії,

²Пост-докторант,

^aХайфський Університет,

^bЄрусалимський педагогічний

інститут «Єрусалимський коледж Міхлалах»,

Єрусалим, Ізраїль

Мета статті – проведення компаративного аналізу концепцій семіотики кіно Ролана Барта і Юрія Лотмана в контексті розуміння ними природи кіномови, оскільки розуміння і способи дослідження сучасного цифрового аудіовізуального мистецтва є актуальною темою сучасного мистецтвознавства. Методи дослідження. Одним із методологічних засад такого міждисциплінарного дослідження є структурно-семіотичний підхід. На сьогодні цей методологічний підхід у дослідженні аудіовізуального мистецтва найбільш розроблений у семіотиці кіно, тому

візуальну семиотику ми розглянемо на прикладі кіносемиотики. Наукова новизна. Вперше здійснено порівняльний аналіз кіносемиотики Юрія Лотмана і Ролана Барта в рамках структурно-сеmiotичного підходу. Висновки. Висвітлено особливості розуміння і застосування семиотичних понять зазначеними авторами на матеріалі кіно. Так, Ролан Барт бачив великі проблеми в семиотичному дослідженні кіно на основі лінгвістичного підходу, а Юрій Лотман вважав, що таке дослідження цілком припустимо. Це проявилось в різному розумінні цими вченими природи кіномови, її мінімально-значущої одиниці, ролі синтагматики і парадигматики в кінооповіді.

Ключові слова: Барт; Лотман; кіносемиотика; кіномова; конотація; вторинна моделювальна система; знак

РОЛАН БАРТ И ЮРИЙ ЛОТМАН: ПОИСК СМЫСЛА В КИНОНАРРАТИВЕ

Михаэль Константинов^{1a2b}

¹Доктор философии,

²Пост-докторант,

^aХайфский Университет,

^bИерусалимский педагогический институт

«Иерусалимский колледж Михлалах»,

Иерусалим, Израиль

Цель исследования – проведение компаративного анализа концепций семиотики кино Ролана Барта и Юрия Лотмана в контексте понимания ими природы киноязыка, поскольку понимание и способы исследования современного цифрового аудиовизуального искусства представляют собой актуальную тему современного искусствоведения. Методы исследования. Одним из методологических засад такой междисциплинарной работы является структурно-сеmiotический подход. На сегодняшний день данный методологический подход в исследование аудиовизуального искусства наиболее разработан в семиотике кино, поэтому визуальная семиотика рассматривается на примере киносемиотики. Научная новизна. Впервые проведен сравнительный анализ киносемиотики Юрия Лотмана и Ролана Барта в рамках структурно-сеmiotического подхода. Выводы. Освещены особенности понимания и применения семиотических понятий указанными авторами на материале кино. Так, Ролан Барт видел большие проблемы в семиотическом исследовании кино на основе лингвистического подхода, а Юрий Лотман считал, что такое исследование полностью допустимо. Это выразилось в различном понимании этими учеными природы киноязыка, его минимально-значимой единицы, роли синтагматики и парадигматики в киноповествовании.

Ключевые слова: Барт; Лотман; киносемиотика; киноязык; коннотация; вторичная моделирующая система; знак