

University of Tartu
Department of Semiotics

Daria Arkhipova
SOME PRINCIPLES OF ART CRITIQUE
ELABORATED FROM THE WORKS OF JURI LOTMAN
Master Thesis

Supervisors: Tyler Bennett, MA
Silvi Salupere, MA

Tartu
2016

I have written the Master Thesis myself, independently. All of the other authors' texts, main viewpoints and all data from other resources have been referred to.

Author: Daria Arkhipova.....

(signature)

.....

(date)

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
1. Critique and semiotics.....	6
1.1. History of critique analysis	6
1.1.1. <i>Historical specificity of Russian literary critique</i>	9
1.1.2. <i>TMSS impact in criticism</i>	11
1.1.3. <i>Lotman's vision of critique</i>	13
1.2. Semiotic perspective to the functions of art critique.....	14
2. Lotmanian perspective to the artwork as an object of critique research	21
2.1. Artwork as a text	23
2.1.1. <i>Intra-textual and extra-textual capacities for critique</i>	26
2.2. Artwork as a system.....	28
2.2.1. <i>Noise in the artistic system</i>	30
3. Methodology of analysis an artwork as a system.....	33
3.1. Communication process influence on the intra- and extra-textual analysis.....	37
3.2. An example of artistic text analysis: between critique and semiotics.....	42
Conclusion	54
Bibliography	56
Kokkuvõte.....	60

‘The gift of great critique is rare: to feel art as being a creator, but for some reason not to be creator’ (Solzhenitsyn 1975: 253).

Introduction

The aim of the present work is to describe the possibility of applying some main semiotic concepts, elaborated on the basis of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School and Juri Lotman’s works in particular, to contemporary art criticism.

The phenomena “art critique”, which is a central category of the presented research is one of the possible ways to describe contemporary movements represented in media within literary form as a reflection on contemporary artworks. Art criticism is meant as a social institution which has the capacity to influence audiences and to encourage them to become spectators. Therefore, an art critic is an agent of this socio-cultural institution. However, the purpose of this work is not to define and describe art critique, but to show the possibility to apply Lotmanian concepts, which could help to order the contemporary artistic environment.

From the very beginning the importance of understanding the main object of the research has to be shown. The object of the research is elaboration of some semiotic principles to the tools of contemporary art analysis in art critique within relevance for socio-cultural aspects.

The point of view which considers the art critic as a translator of the artwork and the work of critique as an act of translation is no less important (Torop 1995:31-33). Supporting this idea is significant to underline the notion of translation used by Lotman (1992), the one considered in this work. Translation (in Russian “*трансляция*”) as transmitting of information from one sign system to another which reaching the most possible equality in meaning.

Currently the situation in critique is various and during last fifty years has been presented in different types of critiques according to the field of competence. However, deep in the roots critique has been defined as one united agent of culture.

There are two approaches in criticism roughly defined as Western and Russian types, or schools. Following this idea, Lotmanian concepts, accomplished with some other approaches from both schools, can give the possibility for the current artistic environment to be ordered with a scientific approach.

However, nowadays we have the movement which can be trivially called information noise. There is nothing new in this fact. It is only worthwhile to point out that art and environment refluxing together and the ability to define one from another is becoming less and less common. Information noise, which has been mentioned by Juri Lotman as a part of the communication process, nowadays is a necessary part of information consumption. The need for information is so high that the phenomena of simulation of information appears, in art particularly. In the book “Travels in Hyperreality” Umberto Eco (Eco 1986) uses notion of *horror vacui*, referring to the fear of humanity of empty space, which has to be filled with something. But then the substitution of art receives some meaning, which is imputed there artificially. With examples for this phenomena, Eco discusses the phenomena of art museum exhibitions, presenting to audiences the information (artworks) in large amount but not in quality. The example, which can be provided from nowadays’ reality which every human meets every day, – is YouTube, Instagram and other sources’ content, proposing different filters and automatic video-editing tools, or any other applications which “create” art. However, art is the product of the human conscious and unconscious; art as a product of machine creativity is nonsense. Therefore, this research would also count the noise’s influence on the process of defining and analyzing artworks.

The problem nowadays is the need to react to any contemporary cultural event. Critics are writing about art events because it is needed, but not because these events belong to art or deserve to be enlightened, under pressure of time for quick reaction. Besides, it is not even worth to be mentioning the part of critique working on marketing and increasing size of audiences, giving cliché names and just putting words in the lines instead of providing spectators with analysis and encouraging creators to produce quality art. However, possibility to have some core tools for analysis would help to improve analysis within the conditions of time pressure and huge variability of objects.

Firstly, during the last several decades art has been changing. Artists have overcome the issue of genres and kinds of arts, which has changed the reality of the artistic world. Today to

impress audiences it is not enough just to create the aesthetically well-made artwork; the artwork or performance has to combine all possible techniques or impress with some radical extraordinary implementations of unexpected details. Otherwise the artwork would not be even noticed in the stream of information noise (Lotman 1977: 75-78). After all artistic text hardly can be separated from non-artistic one, or the one made as a technical creation according proved working scheme.

Secondly, after contemporary authors (creators) vanish, along with their genres and any possibility to dedicate their art to some stable existing movements, it is more and more difficult for audiences to understand their artworks. Contemporary art evokes a great amount of misunderstanding from the side of audiences and critics. Thus if there are no borders anymore and no possibilities to range the artworks, even the understanding that one is a painting or another kind of art including movements and music or sounds, then there could be a scientifically stable approach for description of the mentioned phenomena. And Lotman's scientific research and concepts are fully oriented to artistic and cultural environment mechanisms description and analysis.

Thus the research considers the following questions:

- what principles are significant for analysis in the processes in which art critique takes part?
- what are the semiotic tools which might help to reach a holistic point of view of the artwork in critical analysis?

The main part of the work represents the application to the possible methods in (literary) art critique today.

In the *first chapter* we describe the significance of semiotics for art criticism. First, the enlightened influence of the Russian critical tradition stands as a basis for development of analytical socio-cultural research in literature as one of the oldest criticized arts. Second, the correlation between research in art criticism analysis and scholarship in Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School and Juri Lotman's works is considered. Third, the view on semiotic sources in relation to the functions of criticism nowadays is presented: useful application of solutions to the problem in adequate analysis of contemporary artworks.

The *second chapter* presents Lotman's view on criticism (1976) and applicable semiotic analysis of artworks within artistic environment. There are presented two approaches in dealing

with artworks: as a text and as a system (Lotman 1967, 1971, 1992). Therefore, the research has enlightened that both applications merged together give the possibility to present a deep analysis of artworks. Moreover, Juri Lotman's theory supported by research of Peeter Torop state intra- and extra-textual elements influence to the meaning making process in criticism analysis. Therefore, they analyzed in relation to each other revising systemic approach. At the same time, the analysis of artwork as a system would give the possibility to undercover regularities in the work. The artistic elements working together present the artwork as a unity with some meaning within inner systemic relationships and in relation to other artworks and contexts as a whole.

The *third chapter* presents a methodological approach of the textual and systemic analysis described in the previous chapter. It is dedicated to the role of the dominant of artworks and the possibility to form a holistic view on the text. That should be a significant tool in work of criticism on the way to become scientifically justified. Here Lotman's theory finds support from the works of Jakobson, Evan-Zohar and Kristeva. Moreover, for the practical application of the theoretical part has been chosen the movie "Batman v Superman. Dawn of Justice", currently presented to audiences, to avoid historical influence. The analysis enlightens the systemic relationships in text and explains its position within context. This application could enlighten the possibility to define the position of the chosen artworks in the socio-cultural environment and its influence to the other artworks in contextual environment.

Thus the main task of the work is to develop the applications for contemporary artworks on the basis of Lotman's concepts, taking the most relevant and significant parts of chosen theoretical framework. The presented research has been made with the aim to make closer semiotic methodological capacities and art criticism, and give the possibility to this socio-cultural institution to gain an enriched new position in culture. Presumably, the presented ideas can be argued with other approaches relevant to semiotic capacities of art critique, though one would assume that the following presented research methodology would be better able to define an artwork's relevance in a certain culture.

1. Critique and semiotics

1.1. History of critique analysis

The oldest art critique existing is literary critique has its roots in Ancient Greek thinkers and philosophers. However, there is the common practice that in the cultural departments of every editorial office there are several people, each of them specializing only in paintings, or theatre, or literature, etc., not even considering the specialized media, working with critics who are professionals in some particular area. Nevertheless, in a rapidly changing artistic environment where cinema becomes theatre or painting becomes some variation between cinema and installation, specific knowledge might not be enough to place the new artwork among others, or to predict what to expect from artists in the near future. Therefore, the flexible semiotic approach with capacities for modeling the object of analysis should be practically applicable for criticism, because criticism has to change following the artistic environment, and semiotic tools, which can be applied in many spheres, so it can significantly clarify the work of critics with artworks nowadays.

The roots of the notion of critique come from ancient Greek *kritike*, where it has the meaning of the faculty of judgment. Moreover, the Oxford dictionary (2003: 255) provides the description of critique as “a detailed analysis and assessment” and of *criticism* to “evaluate in a detailed and analytical way”, coming originally from French. Moreover, *critic* is defined there (Oxford 2003:255) as “a person who reviews literary or artistic works”, originating from “Greek *Kritikos*, from *krites* ‘a judge’” (2003:255).

Therefore, it can be inferred that the critical process presumes the analysis of some object, with consequent transmitting of the evaluated information to some receiver. However,

nowadays critique should be considered not only as analytical conclusions presented to some audience, but rather communication relations, which influences all the participants. Thus criticism presumes literary and communicative reflection on some culturally significant event. Moreover, criticism presumes some audience, which has some reaction to the critique's reception, on which the critic as an agent has a significant impact.

Another important question is – what is the function of critique nowadays, to which semiotic methodology can be applied?

The question of functions is significant, because it can show what needs to be changed in current criticism.

Considering the multiple critical reviews and feedback of significant reviewers it is possible to infer that nowadays art critique as a whole is a segment of media, which on the point of globalization development has lost the capacity to place artwork in the deserved place among all others (Elkins 2003). The proof for that is a great gap between awarded artworks and the artworks, which stay in cultural memory. Surely, there exist many arguments pro and contra for this statement, yet giving awards for some artwork is not necessary proof of the significance of this artwork. Nevertheless, if this confirmation is remembered only by the tables of an award history, – what good is this proof anyway?

At the same time, critique is between scientific analysis and reading. Referring to Boris Egorov (a member of TMSS), critique, precisely literary critique, not only analyzes artworks, but provides the author with suggestions for further development and audiences with an account of how and what to read (Egorov 1980: 30). Criticism shapes cultural reality by producing the connections between its components and possibly providing potential expectations to the artistic environment. Nevertheless, a significant impact comes from personalities in the critical sphere: the role of influence depends on the status of the critic in the cultural-social hierarchy. This fact is shown in the history of European and Russian critique, and continues to rise in current media performances of critique as reflection in some textual form.

Western critique always has been oriented to the description of the artwork in order to influence the author in his further works, when Russian criticism been oriented to social reflection of the artwork and its value for the socio-cultural environment. Thus the main feature of Russian criticism has been expressed in analytical and public oriented articles (writings).

In environments where everyone has inner critic and the possibility to express themselves publicly, the role of literary critique and art critique in general as an institution is challenged by society and artists. However, the main role of literary critique, as the oldest variation of this institution, is to sort or range artworks and to encourage artists to develop. Moreover, one more function for critics might be the possibility to define for audiences the most influential artworks, which can play important roles for culture.

However, looking to the most significant personalities in the criticism of different periods, it is possible to conclude that the border between criticism and scientific research is rather vague. Most of the critics of different cultural epochs are known as core philosophers - Plato and Aristotle as ancient roots of critique, theologians - St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, scientists - Hegel, Kant, Freud and Lacan; or the great amount of critics that are artists themselves - Schiller, Emerson, Poe, Zola, Wilde, and Woolf. Some can be defined as talented authors and researchers: Derrida, T.S. Eliot, Kristeva, Eco, Jakobson, and others (Habib 2005).

Discussing the point of what functions have to be fulfilled by critique in society and what qualities a critic should have, referring to the practices as Mark Fisher, Marek Bartelik, Artemiy Troitsky and others, it is possible to conclude that the successful critic is in the middle of journalist and researcher. Being a journalist for the art critic means to be at the event's place, to inform audiences in a correct format: in time, adequately and understandingly, satisfying the needs of the audience. Nevertheless, being a researcher means much more and occupies the main part of the art critic's work. Moreover, the central question of what kind of researcher is the art critic, can be addressed by asking, what can the contemporary critic do for the artistic environment and culture as whole.

Boris Egorov in the description of the specificity of Russian critique, points out that the role of literary critique in the literary process is not only secondary to support literature, but also independent - a special form of literary existence (Egorov 1980: 3). This statement refers to the ideological role of literary critique in Russia, but as well as to analysis of the artwork in some context while presenting independent work about socio-cultural environment in relation to significant masterpieces of the epochs.

Thus it could be productive for the research to provide brief overview of the specificities of the Russian criticism tradition from a perspective of its possible reference to nowadays' artistic environment.

1.1.1. Historical specificity of Russian literary critique

The question why especially Russian critique, and precisely Russian literary critique as the oldest type of it, represents significant importance for this research, resides in the fact that Russian critique demonstrates the independence and completeness of this type of socio-cultural research compared to literature, even though the connection and mutual influence is highly significant.

Historically, art critique has been considered as literary critique, in relation to the main object of its analysis – literature. In the historic development two main schools can be roughly defined, which lead critique to its current condition. This differentiation is supported by many researchers. One of them is Boris Egorov; in his work “About mastering in literary critique” he separates the Western critical tradition and the Russian one (Egorov 1980: 32-36). Thus it is possible to talk about one of the schools of this research as the Russian literary critique approach. The specificity of Russian literary critique can be described as socio-philosophical analysis and aesthetic analysis at the same time. Egorov points out that the specificity of the Russian approach lies in its orientation to a broad audience rather than orientation to author (writer) or professionally oriented researchers and particular audiences as it used for Western critique (Egorov 1980: 35). The problem of this type of critique formation has been caused by the political situation in Eastern Europe. The philosophical analysis of the socio-political reality has existed only in the form of fictional literature, and all the discussions that have been held in literary magazines by editors and critics. This situation is proved by the participation of imperators in literary conversations on the pages of such magazines. However, Russian culture has reached a high level in recognition of significant artworks also thanks to literary critics.

Russian literary critique has played an important role not only for the analysis of artworks as such, but also for the personalities of critics and their ability to connect socio-political problems and to overcome censorship, which was official and non-official in different times of Russian historical development.

The specificity of Russian critique had a significant role in the social and cultural standing since the 17th century. The object of critique is a society through the prism of personalities or human beings.

Discussion of the topic of what makes Russian critique great can provide only the answer: great artworks. And the Russian cultural tradition has all the reasons to introduce such

works to the world, even though there are multiple cases when critical work could have been created about the artwork, which never existed. This type of fabrication of the cultural environment represents the phenomena which also significantly and shape the critique as an independent part of artistic reality, which can influence socio-cultural identity. And in this case such phenomena are possible for critique - not only in the strictly text oriented sphere, but also in the audience oriented one.

Russian literary critique has close connection with journalism.

The importance of the critic's personality can be defined through the relation between the publication, as a reaction to some literary event, and the reaction of society to it. Russian critique tradition always placed the artwork in its socio-cultural context. This is shown in the works of most of critics - Dobrolubov, Belinsky, Nekrasov, etc. - searching for the reflection of the social and cultural situation. And therefore to make an impact on the environment in which the text exists foremost. For the Russian critique tradition in the analysis of artistic text is a possibility to artistically analyze the context through the prism of the artwork. The linguistic and literary features were important for analysis, but have been estimated only as a tool for the author to express the contemporary (for them) situation in the Russian Empire or Soviet space.

Applying this belief to current artistic reality it is possible to conclude that even in fiction (scientific fiction, etc.) all the exposition and conflict is built as an interpretation (or reflection) of the reality. And the conclusion of any narration is modeling of the information (stated in exposition) according to the laws of the artistic text as a system.

The Russian literary tradition is closely related to the scientific approach as well. The history of Russian literary culture and criticism presents names of the greatest researchers and socially active persons, who are in some order related to universities. Among others have to be mentioned the figures of Mikhail Bakhtin and Dmitry Likhachev, who had a great impact on the forming of criticism and literary research in the 20th century, not only in Russia, but also abroad. It is also significant to point out Russian formalism, which influenced artistic society and research, including the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school.

However, till now the gap between scientific research and its influence on art criticism has not been pointed out.

1.1.2. TMSS impact in criticism

The Tartu-Moscow Semiotic school can be considered one of the most significant bases for developing the methodology of analysis for the critique of artworks, considering different aspects of the research object.

The analysis of form came to the TMSS from formalism, and had a significant place in the research of most scholars. Boris Egorov in his book “About mastership of literary critique. Genre. Composition. Style” points out that analysis of form can evaluate literary critique as artistic work, not only consisting of meanings and interpretations, but also scientific and analytical features and ideological orientation (Egorov 1980: 7).

Most works published in *Sign System Studies* in issues 1-25 in relation to art consider two main visions: artworks from the point of view of linguistics and artworks from the point of view of literary studies. These two areas are closely related to literary critique, taking the broad notion of this cultural phenomenon. Moreover, literary critique cannot be imagined without these fields of research on the point of estimation of art.

The methods of analysis of artworks used in the TMSS vary – from linguistic and literary ones to mathematics and cybernetics. For example, a co-authored work by Boris Gasparov, Emma Gasparova and Zara Mints describes precise methods taken from mathematics to analyze word use frequency (Gasparov, Gasparova, Mints 1967:290). For the analysis of artworks this method would rather be used for reflecting on the question of authorship or defining artistic styles. Although for the estimation of art this method can be applicable for presenting artworks to audiences from an unfamiliar point of view, this method does not give a beneficial basis for enlightening the position of artworks among their cultural heritage or the possibility for this work and its author to persist in cultural memory.

From the semiotic point of view that is based on linguistics, fruitful ideas for the methods of the estimation of art can be found in an article by Juri Lekomtsev. Lekomtsev connects his research with the approach to research of Schrodinger. In some particular system S we have some amount of emotionally perceived and relatively equivalent phenomena, which work with each other according to some time-space rules, and have some common syntax in their relationships. This presumption should give us the possibility to measure all possible impacts of the surrounding outer world (Lekomtsev 1964: 125). Thus, some system S can be stated as an

artwork, which has some emotionally perceived elements, and which can have some significant value working together in some time-space context according some rules of syntax. This adds some new meaning to the statement made by Lekomtsev, and describes important aspects of the possibility to define some constant rules for an artwork's existence and the rules according to which the artwork is measurable and comparable.

Lekomtsev was one of the first researchers in Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School who applied Peirce and Morris' ideas for the semiotics of art. He suggested that we could see artwork holistically as a sign with iconic, indexical and symbolic features and as a sign placed in the language of art having semantic, syntactic and pragmatic functions. Therefore it is possible to go further and make the presumption that an artwork as a sign with great symbolic capacities and strong semantic, syntactic and pragmatic functions has high potential to persist in cultural memory in the case of gradual processes in a spatiotemporal continuum.

We can infer from Juri Lotman's work (1973: 81-100) "Semiotics of Cinema" that with the growing length of the narration the predictability of the outcome and epilogue increases. Hence, we can conclude that within the artwork (for example, a movie) exists some system with specific laws, reasoning and causal relations. This statement can be applied not only to movies, but also to all other artworks as far we can consider them as systems. To defend the idea with an example, we can refer to an overview of Anton Chekhov's "Three sisters". The play, which can be considered as a text – as a book, a play on the stage, or a movie version – has its own modeling system composed of other subsystems. The way this system is constructed is delimited by its narration and all its particular characters. Though the question most critics have asked when estimating the play (Why were the sisters not able to realize their dream and go to Moscow?) is rather easy to answer with the argument that the system of the artwork does not allow them to do so, modeling the work in this way may oversimplify the critic's conclusion. After all, in every new re-reading, especially on the stage, other modeling systems influence the inner system of the text. The theatre director's own modeling system can add some new elements to the system of text and it can lead to completely new holistic realizations in some time-space context. Hence, it is reasonable to say that context plays a role in determining the reception of the artwork and its boundaries with other systems and texts.

The notion of text is a central one for Lotman and for other researchers of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School. About the notion of text, Lotman considers A. Pyatigorsky, D.

Lyhachov, B. Tomashevsky, V. Shklovsky and others. One definite conclusion is that a text is complete and “...fixed in some form... related to the author’s idea ... and exists only in a context” (Lotman 1994 [1964]: 203-204).

One logical conclusion to point out here is that, according to research in the TMSS, every artwork is both a text and a system at the same time. Therefore, every artwork has the same features of text and system. These two statements can significantly change the estimation of art with the presumption that systematic predictability exists for every single creation and their interrelations from a holistic point of view.

1.1.3. Lotman's vision of critique

Juri Lotman has not been a critic. His works have never been associated by himself with the work of magazines and newspapers, which are for writing reviews for upcoming artworks. However, Lotman’s articles, related to literary studies, cinematography and even to formal approaches in semiotics, can give broad sources in methodology for contemporary critique.

Starting with the article of Juri Lotman “The Problem of Meaning in the Artistic Text” (Lotman 1970 [1977]: 32-49), which is part of his book “Structure of Artistic Text”, Juri Mikhailovich comes up with the important question, from which point of view should the artwork be researched to coherently understand its meaning?

Lotman mainly focused on literary research, and one of his major works was written in application to Russian classic literature. One of his interesting and most published work is “Textbook in Russian Literature for Middle School” with an addition for schoolteacher (Lotman 2001 [1994]). From one side, the textbook (of literary studies at school) has no relation to critique. But from the other side, these are the first aesthetic skills everyone learns at the age of middle school; this is the first manual for the interpreting and understanding (decoding) of artworks; these guide the first preferences the individual makes towards world literature and all further artworks, which would be compared and estimated according to the basics. This is radical to claim, but in a way, the critic does the same for the audience that the schoolteacher of literature does for the child – he helps them to understand the artwork, to decode it and analyze it. And as far it depends on the schoolteacher – how well one can explain and represent a novel or a poem to students, the same way it depends on the critic – in which way the audience will be

able to understand the artwork even though a critic has to choose artworks himself, when the schoolteacher has a manual.

Arguing the point of the relation between critic and literary scholar, one has to mention the fact, that history knows many scholars who have been successful critics and thanks to their background did well on the process of identification of artworks, which subsequently have been significant for culture. However, the consideration of the research is the researcher's capacities in critique from the semiotic point of view. And the research supposed to solve the problem of lack of ability to discover the significant artworks influential for culture, and misunderstanding in communication between author-critic and their audience. However, as a researcher the critic has the function to educate the audience and prepare it for new forms of art and new values. Thus the works of Juri Lotman on the topic of literary studies represent how the gap between critic and researcher can be filled, and the capacity of semiotics to influence the methodology of understanding and interpreting of artworks.

Talking about arts interpretation, Lotman was interested not only in artistic text and literature analysis, he also tried to apply semiotic methodology for cinema in his book "Semiotics of Cinema". There he openly argues with reviews on famous works of 60's and 70's and possible approaches in their adequate analysis.

Applied to Juri Lotman, his following claim about possible applications of critique is important:

"Some readers believe that the most important thing is understanding a work, others that experiencing aesthetic pleasure is most important; some scholars regard the structuring of concepts as the primary purpose of their work (the more general, abstract the concept, they would claim, the more valuable it is); other insist that any concept "murders" the essence of a work of art by subjecting it to logic and thereby impoverishing and destroying it" (1977:57).

1.2. Semiotic perspective to the functions of art critique

Most of the varieties of criticism which exists nowadays represent written texts, which published in some press (published form) or other socially available source of information, with consideration of some audience. Also it can be mentioned the other version of representing in form of video or radio (audio), but though this is the same text with its own origins. Thus the

representation of the work of critic - as far critical review - can be reflection on the any kind of arts. Critical review can be published, or filmed, or recorded, though it is the same product of co-creation referred to some audience, including artwork, author, and other critics and context (environment in which they all co-exist).

Furthermore, according to the hypothesis that every artwork can be considered as a text, from the semiotic point of view, then theoretically the part of critique, which works with texts and analyzes them is literary critique. However, this term can be considered as the main metalinguistic possibility for the research object description for controversial placement in world spread terminology used in criticism.

In the western tradition, which is the major one nowadays around the world, applied to terminological specificity, criticism can be divided to art criticism (concerning visual arts, as such painting), literary criticism (concerning literature, prose and poetry), music criticism (concerns music and audio), theatre criticism, film criticism, etc. Following this idea, it can be inferred, that there are several types of arts , which are the objects of some precise specialists, or even methodology (to work with them), which do not overlap to each other. However, nowadays the arts become convergent and there are more and more vogue ideas how to divide them in some specific units, as it was even fifty years ago. Nowadays it is more likely to describe all the types of artworks with the term “performance” which is rather broad and do not point out any specifics of all artwork.

However, following the Russian tradition of critique, which still uses the general term for reflecting to all kinds of critique in artistic environment - “литературно-художественная критика” - literary translation can be described as “literary-artistic critique”.

Though for all listed types of critique the result of their work can be presented as co-creative texts, when translating the artwork to the audience there is always a cultural unity in the form of text.

One of the most important differences between the cultural studies researcher and the critic is not only in their approaches to the object with which they work, but also the work produced by them. This is the work (which critic produce on some artwork) is co-creative and publicistic (journalistic).

Publicistic text presumes a journalistic oriented text, related to some precise situation in time and space. For the publicistic text the reaction of audience highly important. It often applies

to the emotions of the audience, it is rarely oriented to a specific meta-language used in a scientific sphere (though it is mostly followed by an author-critic style of communication in writing), it can be rhetoric, but usually expresses an opinion on some phenomena in some socio-cultural context.

Following Oxford dictionary (2003: 1422) the notion publicistic comes from the noun publicist, which itself originates from “late 18th cent.: from French *publiciste*, from Latin (*jus publicum* ‘public (law)’”, and a publicist is “a person responsible for publishing a product, person, or company”, or “a journalist, especially one concerned with current affairs”.

From the above mentioned can be concluded that the publicistic text is a text written by a person qualified in some area and for a broad audience, in relation to some current affairs, significant for all the participants of the communication act expressed through the some form.

The position of critic, as an agent of critique as social institution and a part of cultural process of criticism, can be taken by any authority positioned this way by community. Undoubtedly, the value of the critical text will depend on the weight of the critic’s personality among others and her/his previous achievements. Moreover, the critic is a vague figure, which has the features of the author and the audience, and represents both sides at the same time as being in opposition to them.

It is important to define the tasks and functions of critique as an institution and a part of culture. This provides an understanding of how the dimension of semiotics can accomplish critique and help overcome existing gaps.

One of the main concerns bothering the artistic environment and all related areas is the fact that nowadays critique lost the significance it had previously. However, this statement presumed by some critics (Elkins 2003: 58-59) as a mythological one in respect to the fact that in different countries through time criticism has had ups and downs of influence on the artistic environment and audience, and this can be presumed as a waves of changes in artistic movements and the need for a mediator between author and his creation and audience.

Critique is not only reflection to some artistic event, it is also creative work, connecting social and cultural sides of reality expression.

One of the important functions of critique is to educate. This function lies between the philosophical and aesthetic features of critique. Moreover, the education function can be fulfilled with the idea of estimation, which should base on analysis. Critic cannot stay neutral. He might

point out the strong and weak sides of artwork realization of author's ideas. Therefore, he educates audiences how to analyze artworks. However, nowadays this function is mostly forgotten, with idea to be neutral to the artwork and not express an opinion, even sometimes in the case of commercial interests.

Promotion can be count as unavoidable and tough aspect of the critique's functions, which it fulfills nowadays. But is usually not a task for the critic or criticism in general. One bright example is the attempt of critics to endorse an artwork. Surely commercial application cannot be avoided nowadays, but this function was never an issue criticism or one of its main features - to educate. Obviously galleries or editorials would like to have a number of positive reviews, which should increase the audience of the artwork. Estimating the artwork is supposed to orient what the artwork itself is, rather than what the audience wants to see in this artwork.

However, one might reasonably ask the question, is there really anything wrong with art criticism? The fact that something has to be changed in art criticism today is not obvious for most practitioners, but from multiple discussions it can be inferred that art has changed since 50 years ago, and it continues to change rapidly. And following the world famous credo of Andy Warhol "...while they are deciding, make even more art". Thus art nowadays is created or constructed, but relates to the topic of the overflowing of the environment, dealing in quantity and not in quality. However, art changes all the time and critique has to change accordingly.

Nevertheless, many critics, in spite of the area of art they are specialize in, agree on the point that there is, perhaps, some methodology of analysis which, indeed, varies from one artwork to another, from movement to movement, but has the same core, which can be applied to all pieces of art. This methodology lies among scientific research, with historical, psychological, aesthetic, etc., approaches, but grounded in ratio-sensational perception. No critic can estimate an artwork without meeting it.

However, it is reasonable to presume that all these views in analysis of artistic texts have a right to exist and even co-exist together to show the most complex application to the object of the research. And it has to born in mind that the researcher is first of all a reader as well, as far as the critic is a reader and researcher at the same time.

James Elkins, American art historian, the critic and the author of the book "What happened to Art Criticism?", reflecting on the myth about possible changes in critique mentions the evidence that when many of his colleagues become nostalgic of the golden age of critique,

they claim that it was better before in the time of salong, that critique does not have a strong voice nowadays, that it has to be more serious and have some theoretical base (which is hard to argue with), that the critic has to have a position and show reflection on the judgment (Elkins 2003: 56-79). The words of Elkins are confirmed with the opinion of Edinburgh theatre critic Mark Fisher (2015), who connects the disturbance in the sphere of contemporary critique with the fact that media where they used to publish the reviews has changed and professional critics have become those for whom this field of work is only a hobby. The fact that quality of critique nowadays is significantly low is unlikely to be compensated for with the quantitative factor, presuming that the above mentioned problems and ways of development should be resolved in order to make a significant move in cultural analysis approachable to every participant of an aesthetic environment.

Mark Fisher, the theatre critic in Edinburgh, describes in his recent book “How to Write About Theatre” (Fisher 2015: 10-45) that the presented methodological approach, can be applied to other arts (literature, movie, installation), not only theatre. He states that some aspects that are particular to live artforms such as theatre, dance and music, but the basic critical approach is the same. At the heart of his book are three questions formulated which can be expressed as: what is the artist trying to do, how well did they do it and was it worth doing in the first place. It can be inferred that these questions can be applied to any artwork because they allowed the critic to discuss the art on its own terms as well as bringing their own perspective to bear on it (Fisher 2015).

However, pointing out semiotic perception of art criticism, there straight definition provided by Lotman in “Culture and Explosion” in relation to Russian culture. Referring to Russian criticism he states:

“The literary-critical heritage of Belinsky contains some unexpected ideas /.../ They relate to the opposition between geniuses and men of talent and between, respectively, literature and publicity (in Russian: публицистика). Geniuses – the creators of art – are unpredictable in their oeuvre and do not allow themselves to be directly influenced by the critic. At the same time, between the genius and the reader there is always some kind of “inaccessible line” (according to Pushkin). The reader’s lack of understanding of the creative act is the rule rather than the exception. From this, Belinsky reached the audacious conclusion that the genius working towards eternity and posterity may not only be misunderstood by his peers but may even be considered useless to them” (Lotman 2009[1992]: 135).

Though, there is a problem when reader want *to feel* that he understands the author and his artwork. This is important to point out, that not the understanding itself as a result, but feeling

of process of understanding of genius' work gives the appreciation and satisfaction to the reader. This conclusion can straightly send us to the core of principle of auto-communication of Lotman, because according to him the confirmation of already familiar with re-thinking of it could give this satisfaction. At the same time, when revolutionary (ingeniously) new information evoke explosion and takes time to be understood and accepted. In this case it is work of critic, as professional and authority, to explain the "explosion" and integrate it into the socio-cultural environment. To transform "explosive" process into "gradual".

Lotman also points out to the processes which are currently have high importance: substitution between the wish to understand genius art with possibility to make ordinary understandable author genius. After all, this is one of the main problems today in artistic environment, which lead to avoiding novelty. That subsequently leads to regression processes of rehearsing already familiar narratives and forms, which itself gradual process of stable but not developing paradigm.

Nevertheless, art criticism is hard work taking deep knowledge in the arts and developed methodology which should be conventionally approved to be understood. This would subsequently lead interpretation process to more clear vision of dynamics in artistic environment.

Moreover, Juri Lotman states, that every narration based on the communication act, because it presumes the one who produces information (narrator, author or addressor) and the one for who these all produced (reader, audience or addressee), the channel through which communication proceed presented in many variations of different structures (from phone connection to native language, norm of art or culture monuments and message (text). The classic scheme made by Jakobson used till nowadays, it includes all above stated elements (Lotman 1973: 48)

Following this statement made by J. Lotman, the narration, as inherent part of any text, presumes communication. All the texts made by some author (addressor) with the point to provide some message to some audience (addressee), and exist within communication act. Therefore, the principle of communication has to be one of the core factors in analysis of the text.

Text is a significant category which can be applied to different objects. This is the method of formalization and modeling of the object, measurement being the important for the analytic side and not omitting the irrelevant part.

Working with some precise piece of art there is always the possibility of perceiving one as a textual unit, of comparing it with others, or defining the uniqueness of it.

2. Lotmanian perspective to the artwork as an object of critique research

Lotman's "Semiotics of Cinema" remains scientific book about his ideas on cinema analysis, it is doubtful fact that many cinema critics kept their hands on it. However, the structure of the book suggests the structural analysis which might be useful for every practitioner - which main parts of the movie should to be analyzed and in which way: the shot, elements and levels of cinematic language, narration, plot and meaning, montage, realization of time and space, the actors, and foremost the directions of development (Lotman 1977). Besides Lotman addresses his conclusions strictly to critics. One of examples:

"What does the plot mean, and are those critics correct who saw in it a sermon on relativism and illusionism, a refusal to believe in truth or the ability of man to attain it?" (Lotman 1977: 103)

Then Lotman comes with contra-argumentation to the critics' interpretation of Antonioni's movie "Blow-up". He explains the possible semiotics oriented structure of analysis of the movie. However, this Lotman's research methodology for movie analysis can be applied for other kinds of arts.

Moreover, nowadays the world knows many convergent arts, where creators use many different tools. Sometimes this tools are completely new for the artistic world. Thus it can be hard to define what is art and what it is not. Juri Lotman mentioned (Lotman 1971: 21) that art is everything we consider as art. In relation to contemporary art this question remains open. However, a critic – regardless of the area in which he works – has to be confident in representing the works to his audience and publicly defines them as art or not. For example, five hundred years ago design was not part of the arts, whereas now it is part of majority of art museums' exhibitions.

Dealing with art, a critic works precisely with artworks. Artwork is the main object. However, artwork is broad notion, which has been discussed for many years. The question of what we can consider as art and artwork arises frequently. Still, from most of the works of Juri Lotman and his colleagues can be gleaned the idea, that semiotics deals with models, and art – and artworks in particular – can be perceived as models. And to each model it is possible to develop an applicable methodology to analyze it.

Moreover, the methodology developed in the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School gives the opportunity to see the artwork from two positions: artwork as a text and artwork as a system.

One group of researchers in the TMSS came from a linguistic background; semiotics and linguistics gave birth to the idea of modeling system. In the case of this research, it is valid to consider art as a secondary modeling system.

However, we can state that the artwork is a system, if art itself a system. To reach a deeper level, we should look at what the artwork consists of. Through from all Lotman's works related to analysis of artistic text can be inferred that every artwork composed on a minimum two languages: natural language and poetic one. Therefore, these two in minimum evaluation can be: the language of art (which is conventional) and the language of the author (which represents the author's artistic model of the world). Artwork itself represents a system of signs ordered according to laws of languages on which it is based. Following stated above, might rise a reasonable question – why Lotmanian statement about “minimum two languages art based” can be interpreted this way. Firstly, because art have to be expressed in some form. This can be natural (primary) language or secondary one, any of already existed linguistic forms of expression, or new convergent one. Secondly, applying to the nature of art, which starts with process when author (addressor) translating the world into some linguistic system, in some expressed form, it is possible to assume the autocommunication process within the translation. This process presumes translation the world (others) to the language of the author (our), if following the core ideas of Bakhtin (1984) and Lotman's (1971) in translation.

Arguing on the features of art as a model it is valid to start with Juri Lotman's idea that every system A is a whole, but consists of smaller parts – subsystems A1, A2,An (Lotman 1998 [1970]: 14). Developing this idea, it is possible to conclude that every subsystem has the same features as the whole, but can also exhibit its own sub-features, which can be specific for subsystem A1 and not for A2 or An. Thus, every artwork has the same features as the art system

it belongs to. This can lead to conclusion, that the elements of artistic text have something in common. And this common feature of levels and elements is creating uniqueness of the piece of art, which enlighten it among others. Moreover, following all stated above it is possible to presume that this special feature is a dominant of artwork. And in case artwork can be expressed as one, the unity within a culture, dominant could help to present artistic text as a sign.

Artwork is a sign, first of all. To read an artwork and understand it the audience has to have acquired some agreed upon rules: rules of artwork (stated by the author), rules of context (stating by historical approach) and rules of language and form (the way artworks exist).

Lotman points out that on the one hand the cinema text may be seen as discrete meaningful units – the signs, on the other hand – it is a continuing imagination, the cutting of which would present unnatural operation. However, if there are no discrete units, there are no signs – there are no meaning (Lotman 1973: 47).

Therefore, the analysis, followed by many researchers, and the principle of structuring and deconstructing (in the meaning of process, not applying to Derrida's notion) relates to the process of the cutting the artistic text to the elements or signs. Therefore, these signs then can be analyzed itself, in some context of reality, in relation to other signs in this artwork, in relation to other signs in other artwork. Therefore, every (found) extracted sign in the artistic text can have at least 4 different meanings, which might not correlate with each other. All these meanings of each sign can have right to be presented as possible interpretation. Moreover, the history of the poetry analysis confirms this presumption. However, this might be important understanding which might influence critical approach in art: every artistic text has to analyzed as a discrete system and continues unity the same time.

2.1. Artwork as a text

The question what the text is in the presented research have to be delimited to underline the features, which are significant elements in analysis of artwork as an object of criticism. However, there is still different positions on what can be considered as a text, as well as there is no one clear answer to what can be considered as an artwork. However, there are several visions, which can navigate in which way these two theoretical objects can be limited. Following the

discussion opened at the previous chapter, one of the main visions on this issue should be elaborated from the works of Juri Lotman.

According to Juri Lotman's view, the text as a semiotic object has several important features:

- a text has to be a formed expression in some language or languages, (systemic and non-systemic elements)
- a text is demarcated, united and completed, coded, a hierarchically bounded and structured system,
- a text has the structure of a secondary modeling system (Lotman 1977:51-53).

Completing the idea of artistic text and the features it is supposed to have, it is reasonable to add that to be considered an artistic text:

- a text has to have an expressed completed idea, which brings a new vision of the world,
- artistic text has to be based on some analysis of conflict in reality,
- a text has to encourage the audience to analyze the world from a new side of rational-emotional perception.

Moreover, comparing stated above with features of artistic text, which can be inferred from table made by Peeter Torop for "Total translation" (1995: 19), can be added that artistic text has structure including such main elements as:

- 1) *intra-textual*: phonemes, graphemes, words, etc. These features, can be presumed as minor, but creating the language in which text is fixed.
- 2) *intra-* and *extra-textual*: rhythm, meter; title, paragraph, chapter, part, book, episode, etc. (the ones rather related to *intra-textual*, than to *extra-textual*); from that can be conclude that text as a message have to be coded in some order, and these elements are part of its structural formation.
- 3) *intra-* and *extra-textual*: theme, motif, narration and plot with exposition, action, conflict, culmination and epilogue, etc. (the ones rather related to *extra-textual* than to *intra-textual* ones); what leads to understanding of text being hierarchically bounded has elements which fulfill its own function to realize author's idea, and one of the main parts which presumably should be presented in every artwork is a conflict as a core of any narration

4) *extra-textual*: individuality of author's method and evolution, conventionality of relation to socio-cultural tradition; therefore, can be inferred that being secondary modeling system, text a priori has conventional features, which are determined with contextual artistic and socio-cultural environment (systems).

This list is not complete, but gives parameters according which possible to evaluate the presented object on the point of belonging to category text and artistic text.

However, the comparison of the theoretical approaches is not main consideration on this stage of research. Presented above should state that every text has to have all mentioned features as obligatory to be considered as a text and as an artistic text. At the same time, it has to be clear that all elements related to any artwork as a model of a text in all kinds of arts: visual, audial, performing, literature, convergent, etc.

Referring to Jakobson, in his presumption about existing of possibility to find out the grammar of art, stresses that all types of art create network of artistic conventions. When art becomes an object of semiotic research there are no doubts appear that all arts, no matter what kind they are (based on the spatial relationships, as a painting of sculpture, or syncretic, spatio-temporal, as theatre or circus performances or cinema), they all dependent on sign (as a discrete unites of text and as a system). For Jakobson the talks about "grammar" of art is not just a metaphor, but important fact that all kinds of art present itself the order of polar and significant categories, which themselves based on the marked and non-marked elements. Though all kinds of art create the network of artistic conventions (Jakobson 1996 [1974]: 156-157).

The fact that there are exist several artistic conventions firstly represent the idea, that there is a logical connection in "unpredictable art environment", secondly brings the capacity not just (simply) to formalize the results of creative processes, but discover the logic of relations in it.

The features of text and their correlations are important not only for the creator (author) and researcher, but also for the audience, because as far as the author should follow all these points to make a text, an audience has to follow them to acquire the sufficient understanding of it (text). In other words, all mentioned elements can be considered as conventional elements which can be principles of communication between author and audience. Every artwork can be examined by the principles of text, stated by Loman, or some of principles of defining artistic text, presented by Torop in the table he uses in "Total translation" (Torop 1995: 19).

Therefore, with semiotic analysis it is possible to define intra- and extra-textual capacities in every artwork. Both intra- and extra-textual features forming a text, and can be considered together or separately, in relation to epistemology of chosen analysis.

However, looking to the particular components of a text as a unity, it is possible to find out that there are no texts without a language it is materialized through.

The rules of representing the multi-dimensional and limitless space of reality within the limited, two-dimensional space of a painting become its specific language. For example, the laws of perspective as a means of representing three-dimensional objects in a two-dimensional image in a painting become one of the basic makers of the modeling system. (Lotman 1977[1971]: 217)

Language itself as a part of the artwork also represents its potential meaning-relations, as far as language is a code with its own history, and the history can be seen in two directions: past history and future history, or potential history.

2.1.1. Intra-textual and extra-textual capacities for critique

The analysis of (inner) intra-textual capacities is significant to analyze the work, however the deep inner analysis of texts is a significant privilege of the literary researcher. From a semiotic point of view there are many techniques (methods) through which the artwork can be described (deconstructed), however, the holistic description of the artwork:

-analysis of artwork as sign(s) - word analysis, sentence analysis, character analysis, narrative analysis (in sense of iconic, indexical and symbolic analysis); while symbolic interpretation is always intra-textually related.

-deconstructive methods of Derrida;

-semantic, syntactic and pragmatic analysis based on Morris.

-chronotropic analysis by Torop (Torop 1995: 175) (3 chronotopes in movie analysis)

However, in analysis of intra-textual capacities of artwork while reaching the deep can be meet some problem in evaluation the object in relation to the contextual artistic and socio-cultural environment. Therefore, analyzing inner textual relations, the researcher, interpreter or audience in general, can come up with admiring the elements which itself can be described well, but they become more meaningful only in correlation with existing and presumed artistic and socio-cultural contextual elements. Important not what are the words, the smears, the moves or the sounds used (even though it is still significant in some approaches) but the way how they

used in relation to other elements, how they combined to each other and what their structure can mean in relation to the other structures which have been used already. Following Shklovsky (Shklovsky 1984: 15), art is not about what we see, but about how it is seen. According to this position the dominant level in an artwork can be derived from a theory of center and periphery and the relation between the dominant of the text and hegemonic values in society. Therefore, in some system the dominant of the text can evoke conflict with some contextual system (in which the artwork is placed) and become a norm for others, alternating over time.

Extra-textual capacities of the text based on the communication principle. Therefore, all the features of text, as extra-textual ones, have to be analyzed in the context of communication, which can be perceived as a part of translation process art criticism stated for.

The translation (in Lotmaninan terms) is a special form of communication process as well. The possible interpretation of a text depends on the one's personality and reflection, which stimulates him to decode the artwork, though the extra-textual capacities are in constant communication with the context in which the artwork exists.

But coming with the idea that critique is one of the possible types of translation of text Peeter Torop (1995:18) points out that every artistic text, being polyphonic and representing polylogue (multiple dialogism) has many levels. Though the translation of the text cannot be fulfilled through the description of its parts, even the most possible accurate and detailed, it is more significant to enlightening the dominant - the level of the text on which is unity is based. In Jakobson definition "focusing component of a work of art: it rules, determines, and transforms the remaining components. It is the dominant which guarantees the integrity of the structure" (Jakobson 1981: 751).

The analysis of extra-textual capacities of an artwork as a text should be the most powerful tool in the hands of the critic, because this is the main basis for dominant of artistic text. This would give the possibility to enlighten the relationships of some precise artwork with other already existing artworks. No artwork appears in a vacuum. This is a reflection to the world from the author's point of view, expressed in some form, thus it has, logically and theoretically, a place among other artworks in cultural environment.

An artwork as a text has significant features in order to be a system itself, as well as part of the bigger system. Along with the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School and precisely Juri Lotman's works, every artwork can be simplified to such a model as text, even though text is an

object a critic works with. But the other side of this statement assumption about the approach which can navigate the critic work with such model. Furthermore, every text as a part of an artistic system can be estimated and defined according to many different visions, but following the works published in *Sign System Studies* and Juri Lotman's monographs, it is possible to narrow down this list to several of the most important aspects.

Assuming that every artwork as a text is a model of reality, all features of a text have to be suitable and applicable to any artwork in the artistic model. It is then possible to develop a methodological tool for working with such objects on a similar basis.

2.2. Artwork as a system

Looking back to the Russian formalists movement, which presumes a close connection with the TMSS, it can be defended that in the research of art forms important distinctions have been made which subsequently helped to develop a new paradigm in literature and other areas in particular. Also, these specific conclusions in the works of the formalists brought new methods for researchers as well as for creators. Form as a main object of consideration for the formalists has been researched from different sides, yet this vision was not complete and cannot be fully applied to art estimation nowadays. However, its application in addition to the vision of the artwork as a text and system should bring positive results to the holistic estimation of art.

Form is one of the ways to analyze a piece of art. Lotman mentioned that the audience used to follow forms which resemble less artistic ones. This fact gives the presumption of getting rid of the limits of existing cultural paradigms in art, but finally leads to new artistic forms (Lotman 1964: 207), because art mostly develops in the moments when authors try to find new artistic forms in communication with an audience. In the case when authors try new forms, these forms have to be recognizable by the audience. Thus in the artistic text have to be systemic relationships which might be recognized by the addressee, who is unfamiliar with whole but acquired with elements and can understand logic of their interrelations with each other.

According to Lotman artistic texts have a capacity to transform into modeling systems (1977:55), from what can be inferred that artwork, having possibilities of creating the signs which consequently can become parts of primary or secondary modeling systems.

Briefly discussing the concept of primary and secondary modeling systems (Lotman 1971), the position of the artwork in this theoretical division can be acknowledged in several ways.

When artwork is a text, expressed in some primary modeling system, it is a priori has the other modeling system to be expressed as an artwork. The presumption that every artwork can be composed with at least two languages, in combination of primary and secondary system (language) is the main tool semiotic can provide to the art critic as a descriptive approach to an artwork - the possibility to model the object as a system or composition of systems.

In Lotmanian understanding language can be described as system. Thus every system can be used as a language for production of new combinations of the composed object, which is art itself, but with the presumption of a holistic unified structure.

Lotman (1998) has been pointing out the fact that any non-artistic translation of an artistic text presents only a particular area of meaning of the described artwork. When the work of criticism presents itself an artistic interpretation of an artistic work, the underlying specificity of the meaning making process of the artwork in some particular context, it still does not give a holistic explanation.

Principles of language in correlation of elements (system of intra- and extra-textual elements) – formed by language of author and language of art – relate to each other in systematic way. Some amount of intra- and extra-textual elements form the dominant. All the elements, besides the fact they correlate with each other creating the system, they also have some correlations out of text. Therefore, there is not only one possible dominant in the text, but only one possible position of the text to other texts.

Moreover, referring to the level of the dominant in an artwork, as a part of the system, every artwork can be simplified to the part of some modeling system, or *expression* in it.

However, it has to be kept in mind, that the language is the way of world understanding is conscious self-description of the world for one who operates the language. There cannot be made an equivalence between world existence and primary language, but on the level of description language is used for some environment in a way this world is expressed. Moreover, a secondary modeling system is not a complete continuity of the primary language, but as a secondary modeling system it has relation to the primary ones.

Moreover, Juri Lotman claims that the meanings of elements in some system can be defined in relation to each other (Lotman 1977[1971]: 35). Therefore, the meaning making process is dependent on relations in the system, and change according to the changes in the system. There is a correlation of the systems, which are related to each other, but cannot be claimed to have a hierarchy.

2.2.1. Noise in the artistic system

Juri Lotman, discussing the problem of noise, (Lotman 1977: 75-77) points out that every communication channel contains noise, which consumes information, and “if the level of noise is equal to the level of information the message will be zero” (1977:75). The process of entropy destructing the system with noise leads to loss of message.

The point is that noise is not a part of a system (artwork as a system, culture as a system). According to Lotman noise as a factor can be an extra-system one or belong to another system. In both cases that assumes communication and diffusion (extra-systemic interference) of the message carrying system and the incoming factor on the part of the surrounding environment.

Therefore, foregrounding the idea that an artwork can have the features of a text and system at the same time, it is possible to conclude that extra-systemic and extra-textual features can shape the environment of an artwork’s existence.

The noise is received by the senses even though it is not part of systematic information received rationally. Noise is no less informative, but this is latent information, which can be analyzed only as part of the system it belongs to, the system where noise becomes meaningful information. Moreover, possible to assume the reverse process: when information lost from the system and becomes noise.

Also particular to art is its absorption within contextual environment, systematic or noisy-alike. And this creates a new system on a higher level on the base of an already existing systems (Lotman 1997: 10).

Defining art as a system surrounded by noise, Juri Lotman points out:

Art - and here is manifest its structural kinship to life - is capable of transforming noise into information. It complicates its own structure owing to its correlation with its environment (in all other systems the clash with the environment can only lead to the fade-out of information) (Lotman 1977 [1971]: 75).

This statement is important to express the fact that the artistic system, within interaction between extra-textual elements and other systems, is not distracted, but experiences the semantic inner changes, with subsequent interrelation, takes the features from the invading system and gives out of its some own features.

However, if the artwork does not present any information itself for addressee (in representing the world model) it also can be considered as a noise (as well as an artwork which is presented in an unknown sign system).

Consider the important aspect of the research to discover the regularities according to which an artwork as a system can be analyzed with semiotic tools, and give scientific explanation to the processes which might curate artwork in relation to other systems. All these factors would influence the process of recognition and coding.

Coding process can be compared to the procedure of translation as something with already familiar elements in an order of new structure creation. The unfamiliar elements cannot be recognized, even though these elements can be perceived. Therefore the act of communication as information exchange cannot appear.

According to Juri Lotman (2000) communication cannot be realized without translation as an inherent part of it, as a meaning creating process. Moreover, Lotman states that translation is an elementary act of thinking (2000:143), when unfamiliar structures convert to the ones with which the receiver can operate. Thus it is possible to conclude that no communication or interpretation proceed without translation.

Therefore, the role of criticism in the communication process is to provide adequate translation to the all participants so as to encourage their thinking-translation process around some artwork and integrate it into the culture on the level of the artwork (as a main reason of communication appear).

Thus significant elements of such definition a are:

-capacities of the artwork - discovering the artwork as a text and system and part of other systems, or polysystem. This is always a limited position it can take in some art environment.

-(interpretation) translation process - it includes not only inner-communication, but also meta-textual translation (communication), extra-textual translation (communication). Moreover, following Evan-Zohar ideas, the translation process does not crystallize as it happens. It might change its appearance according to the cultural system it takes place in (Evan-Zohar 1990).

The task for the critic is to help authors in successful communication of these new forms, or to teach audiences to recognize them. In an article on visual and auditory signs, Jakobson gives an example of adding different natural sounds to radio theater performances (Jakobson 1964: 216-217). This example shows the principle of changing the form of the text if we can perceive radio theater performance as text. The experiment of adding new forms to the language of radio finally led to understanding the inability of the audience to handle the such changes. The natural sounds, which were supposed to bring new meaningful signs to the text, were not perceived and happened to be meaningless for the audience. This example simply presents the difficulty for the audience to recognize some signs among speech and music, which are two main elements of radio theater performance. The recognition of natural sounds for the audience happens only if they are closely familiar, even on an unconscious level. This situation cannot even be compared to misinterpretation as a possible part of communication, but rather to the position of signs outside of the perception of the modeling system. For example, at the Eurovision contest of 2012, the winning song “Euphoria” can be perceived as an artistic text. Yet even in spite of fact that the song got the highest grades from the audience around Europe (in this case we will not take into account its visual performance) the full meaning was not received. In the beginning of the song provided the steamship horn sounds. The audience to recognize this sound has to be familiar with it, otherwise it will be just noise. But precisely this sound puts the song as a text into a context. Without it the meaning of this artwork as a sign is perceived in completely different way.

3. Methodology of analysis an artwork as a system

Artwork considered as a system can be described in three ways, which are addressed in this chapter:

- artwork as a system itself (inner systemic relationships);
- artwork as a system in relation to other systems (the other systems shape the inner structure of artwork);
- artwork as a part of the contextual system (it composes the system being part of it).

Artwork as a system has inner structure and systematic relations between the elements it consists of. The elements relate to each other in some order, which are presumed by the secondary modeling system of the artwork's regularities in composition, considered not only as narration and form, but also as semantic and syntactic aspects. Accordingly, these two structuring forces of every artwork have inner predictability, which has to be defined and verified by critics and enlightened for audiences. From the acquisition of these laws of the artwork can proceed the possibility to compare the object of criticism to the reality, which is depicted in it.

It is might be a peculiar fact that some expectations of the audience can presume the system of the artwork, which can be created not inspirationally, but according to some modeling rules. Coming from position that every artwork can be deconstructed and analyzed from the frame till to the core, the reverse process seems to be possible as well. Thus the work will represent some structure, which, according to signifying laws, might have all the features of an artwork, but unlikely such object would be an artwork itself. Though, it is possible to create an object with machine tools according to all mentioned features an artistic text can consist of, but there is one element which can be produced only by humans –novelty. However, the principle of novelty and creativity is not the aim of our research.

Talking about the systems and levels of which an artwork is composed – we can define 3 levels:

-primary modeling system of the artwork – primary language, the language of the world description in which the author is thinking and in which can be decoded the artwork. Juri Lotman talks about primary language as primary modeling system, and following the idea described above that world understanding or perception is strictly dependent on the primary language environment, we can make conclusions about the shaping capacities of this fact in artworks.

-secondary modeling system – the language of art, in Lotmanian description the possibility to describe the world through tools which do not belong to the primary language and has more capacities for the representation of surroundings (depicting the world). Secondary modeling systems have similar rules to the primary modeling ones. They have inherent semantic, syntactic and pragmatic levels, with more tools and capacities for meaning making processes.

However, this description does not fully describe the phenomena which can be named as the language of the author. Juri Lotman in his works rarely points out that there is a special artistic style inherent to each author which can be distinguished in each artwork, and he does not refer to this as a specific characteristic, which might be analyzed according linguistic rules. Commonly this peculiar phenomenon can be said to be one of the secondary modeling systems, having similar features. However, it is based on primary and secondary modeling systems themselves, meaningfully arising from them and their contextual systems (environment).

In description and interpretation of artworks this aspect has to be pointed out in correlations between dominants and values. And for any interpreter, especially for the critic, the ability to see dependence between the dominant in an artwork and the values of the socio-cultural environment, their tendency of changes, would give the possibility to follow artistic movements and advise in further directions.

Shklovsky, referring to Viktor Zhirmunsky, points out that the structure of the system is a unity and wholeness, where all elements are in a relation to each other (Shklovsky 1984: 18). Here the unifying factor can be a dominant, which would as well present the novelty of the artwork.

Representing itself a system of correlated levels, the artwork can be deconstructed into syntactic, semantics and pragmatics (Morris 1971 [1938]). In relation to each other all these elements enlighten the dominant of the artwork as a system. Thus, reversing this statement, all

the levels of the artwork have to work on some dominant as a core of the author's idea. In proving this idea, we can take Lotman's statement in particular on the analysis of cinema about pragmatic and syntagmatic levels and the way to define their semantic meaning as a whole (Lotman 1976: 101).

All the levels are in equal relations to each other and it is hard to define which one is rather dominant, and which is not in the artwork in itself. However, when an artwork is part of a communication system the dominant level arises over the others according to contextual values and the values of each participant (of communication). This statement can be defended with Jakobson's theory of the dominant (Jakobson 1981: 752). It can be possibly inferred that these two (three) modeling systems are the main shaping components of any artwork.

Talking about artistic evolution (development) in cultural history Jakobson points out that "shifting and change are not only historical statements (first there was A, and then A1 arose in place of A) but that shift is also a directly experienced synchronic phenomenon, a relevant artistic value" (Jakobson 1981: 756). This switch in artistic world presumes change in the socio-cultural paradigm. And the reason-cause logic of this change moves not from artistic world to socio-cultural, but in the opposite direction. However, the artistic perception forms under the socio-cultural paradigm and describes it, and as a sensitive reflection of the world it usually performs the (artistic) description of the new ontological perception first. The ability of an author to feel changes in socio-cultural values and depict the new paradigm in adequate way brings novelty to the world in understanding itself. Then such author can be called genius and establisher of a new canon in art. Therefore, such novelty might not be recognized by the audience at first. And, simplifying the presented theory, the role of criticism is to find out the ways of an adequate communication between the author- the artwork -the audience. But this process is only possible if several criteria are presented:

- artwork presents itself as a text and system which adequately represents novelty in current values,

- critic rightly evaluates the artwork in relation to the contextual environment, author and audience,

- critic adequately describes communication among author - artwork - audience within context.

Moreover, predictability in such situations can be evaluated on the basis of elements included in the communication system. Probably, the situation itself can be metaphorically compared to the equation, where the unknown variable is artwork. This is the limit of abstraction of the theory. However, it is still a system. And if there are no new invading elements in the system of communication, in some period of time in some context, it can be possible to predict the appearance of some artwork. Therefore, it can be concluded that every communication system has some capacity of predictability, which should be discovered by the critic along the holistic view.

The holistic view, dominant oriented, as a notion does not exist without correspondence with the phenomenon of values.

Value, according to the Oxford dictionary, consists of “principles or standards of behavior” (2003: 1278). Continuing with this idea, values are the shaping principles, which inform not only human action but also influence the epistemological perception of the world. To simplify the idea, which lies behind the relation of the holistic view and values, it is possible to establish values as the most significant and highly rated (and followed) part of life, and the holistic view as a composition of these parts in the relation to minor ones. The holistic view is not a collection of all the possible information taken from some raw object. This presumes a systematic approach, but by defining what is in the core and what is apart.

Therefore, for every text, which we presume as an artwork, necessarily has “dominant” features which are shaping its structure. This structure presumes to have natural possibilities to make connections with other structures in some limited way and to avoid connections with some other structures. This provides a boundary to the structure of the system which might otherwise appear in connection with an extra-systemic object (artwork) and contextual system (environment).

At the same time, values presume a hierarchy of significant and non-significant factors in some context during a specific time period. Here the reference to a hierarchy of significant and non-significant factors can be clarified through the notions of center and periphery stated by Juri Lotman (1992).

By discussing the Lotmanian understanding of hierarchical relations in the artistic text, and specifically of these concepts placed among other systems and contexts, the theoretical frame can be complimented with other researches. For this research, to make it more applicable

to the current artistic reality, it would be beneficial to supplement the views of Juri Mikhailovich with the work of Evan Zohar on polysystem.

Categorizing the context in which an artwork as the object can be placed, it is possible to see the relations in different ways. One of them is context in relation to the object (or system placed in it) at the communication processes through the boundaries. Thus boundaries and linking elements are parts of the system as such, influencing each other. Therefore, it can be applied as a side interpretation of the Evan-Zohar theory of polysystems:

According to Even-Zohar's model, the polysystem is conceived as a heterogeneous and hierarchized conglomerate (or system) of systems which interact to bring about an ongoing, dynamic process of evolution within the polysystem as a whole. From the first part of this definition, it follows that polysystems can be postulated to account for phenomena existing on various levels, so that the polysystem of a given national literature is viewed as one element making up the larger socio-cultural polysystem, which itself comprises other polysystems besides the literary, such as for example the artistic, the religious or the political (Shuttleworth 1998:197).

The possible boundary of any artwork has to be considered according to the system in which the object is placed. This might be a trivial idea, but in every new context, which we can subsequently call a "surrounding system", the object can show new features, though the features which are inherent to it and which can be posed to the system and become central. Then the possibility of an artwork to change the dominant relative to the context, or precisely to the values dominating in the context (the center) could be stated.

Information leads to entropy, but all the chaos leads to some organization (*упорядоченность* in Lotmanian terms). In some precise system the object can have only one possible status and not its opposite, they cannot be inherent to the same object all at once.

The understanding and description of this topic is important for the communication process, with regard to defining its shared messages and meanings, and the possibility to increase and broaden it. This question still relates to the philosophical approach, but in application to semiotic methods can be developed more precisely in potential communication system relations.

3.1. Communication process influence on the intra- and extra-textual analysis

Being part of the contextual system, the artwork is eventually involved in communication processes. There is the possibility to presume that the main agents of this communication process are author (addressor) and audience (addressee). Moreover, it is legitimate to expect a mediator

in this communication, whose role is to be an influential agent in the result of the interaction. In this research we would consider a critic as a possible mediation power in the communication that builds around the artwork.

Therefore, for the critic it is an important possibility to adopt with every artistic text he works with, being able to adequately reflect on any novelty, new codes and new aesthetics in general. There are arises three possible stages of critic participation as mediation in communication:

- to adequately analyze and interpret artwork itself (what have been undiscovered in previous chapter),

- to describe an artwork according some contextual environment, presuming the influence of extra-textual communication processes within the text,

- to understand the mechanisms of communication where he has to connect author and audience through interpretation of the artistic text, its message, code and language in some particular context,

- to make translation (in Lotmanian terms) of the artistic text to the audience and socio-cultural environment the way it would be appreciated.

However, this research is not taking into consideration the last 2 aspects of this communication process, because this is a much broader topic, which considers deep analysis of communication mechanisms in relation to linguistic, psychological, cognitive and stylistic analysis of the critic's writings. At the same time, criticism is involved not only in research work with art, but also in creating reviews as an artistic form.

Describing the first and the second statements, a critic should follow movements in the artistic environment, changes in the minds of authors – their new concepts, artistic tools, etc., and the specificity of his audience, being able to describe what the artistic text presents, how it is presented and why. The analysis has to be argumentative and clear, with stated positions of critic.

Thus, the first stage of the research has been described with Lotmanian concepts, how the artistic text can be interpreted, and according to the communication process we will describe how the meaning of an artwork has to be translated in some contextual environment.

In one of his works Lotman points out that "...the issue of meaning is always an issue of re-coding" (Лотман 1998: 46).

Can it be stated that the process of communication is a process of translation? And if it is translation of the artwork – is it a process within one language or something different?

Silvi Salupere (2008: 431) points out the role of communication in Lotman's research on translation. From the Lotmanian description it can be understood as the translation from some language "I" into your language "you", as a communication process (Лотман 2000b [1977]: 563). However, in the attempt to describe the level of these languages of communication, there follows a complication from one side, but concretization from another, with the statement that criticism is a medium of translation from the author's language to the language of the audience. Moreover, here the identification processes in communication appears to be overcome when the dialogical situation becomes monological, and an audience takes the author's depiction of the world as its own.

This is an inherent feature of all artworks made on the principle of the magic fairytale. The understanding of monological and dialogical relations in the text has roots in Bakhtinian research, whose influence may be found in works of Juri Lotman. However, to open the specificity of monological relationships we would appeal to explanation by Julia Kristeva, which would better accomplish the stated above.

Kristeva using a Bakhtinian approach to dialogism, explaining that there are two possible logics of relations in the text. The first one proceed with logic 0-1 which describes dogmatic discourse and is monological. The second is logic 0-2, dedicated to carnival discourse, breaking the laws of language and establishing new ones, expressing dialogism on all levels of the text (in Kristeva's application on novel) (Kristeva 2004: 165-194).

The first case is proposed by Kristeva for epic genres, which can be scientific explanations of the situation, when the audience meets some artistic text which is based on some principles of the magic fairytale. Then there is no expectation of radically new information: good will win, bad will fall, and everyone will get what they deserve. However, in this type of artworks the communication act stated consist of the autocommunicative part of possible interaction, where autocommunication in Lotmanian terms can mean the process of reinterpretation within known information. These artistic text made by the author and anticipated by audiences to present an analysis of already familiar environments, but from the new coding according to the dominant.

The second case of communication presumes disagreement in information exchange, when at the primary stage of communication, the participants have not much shared information. And there are two ways of this process development: information increasing and information decreasing. The first one we can call progressive resolution, when in the end the shared information between participants reaches a maximum. The second one we would call regressive, a communication process when the message does not increase and its relations cannot be perceived as dialogical, as far as dialogue presumes the development of several ideas together to the point of one higher level (result) of communication, becoming the medium for two primary ones.

However, criticism in its nature presumes dialogical relationships. And productive analysis and reviewing is possible only when the shared information in the beginning is minimal and in the end it is increasing. Otherwise there is no reason for the communication: neither if the critic can only agree with everything in the artwork, nor if the critic cannot agree with anything.

Moreover, Torop (1995: 164-189) points out many times that critique, as extra-textual translation, is the possibility to describe one literary work through another with its own meta-language. However, current critique does not have a precise meta-language which could be used by every agent of this process, and this leads to heterogeneity in the artistic world. The different realizations of criticism are complementary to each other in language, but not in meaning. Still, the problem is rather in methodology than in the metalanguage used in description.

In communication processes among the author, his creation and the audience, the critic fulfills the role of the mediator in transmitting the message. Moreover, the transmission process cannot proceed in isolated conditions. It is always affected with context and its inherent noise factor, which affects the communication process.

One great example of criticism as translation and interpretation can be elaborated on the basis of religion.

Art in general, as well as an artwork in particular, is estimated by criticism on the point of the aesthetic qualities it consists of. However, this aesthetic inherent element has deep roots in history. "Many scholars believe that art originally had a ritualistic and mythological function" states (Danesi 1994: 206). Thus reversing this idea in an opposite way, it is possible to conclude that a priest's speech during mass is a sort of artistic text. It is a worldwide idea that the saint's writings cannot be interpreted by an audience (followers and adepts) alone. The understanding of

the holy Bible is not perceived (by the Catholic church, for example) by the addressee without a mediator who is supposed to put the words of the author (in this case of God) in the context of the current situation. This example leads to two important conclusions:

First, the priest (or other religious leader, in the case of other religions) decides the particular part of the saint's writing, which is more likely to apply to some precise situation, about which the spirit leader imparts some environmental context, related to the addressee. Thus the work of the critic, as an art criticism leader in the applied research, is also a reaction to the current event within the system of the cultural artistic environment.

Second, the work of the critic is also a reaction to the current events within the system of the cultural artistic environment.

Moreover, the rediscovery of art through time is a normal practice in the context of different cultures. However, the most important artworks change the system of cultural art perception on the point of reevaluation of forms or values. Forms and values can be changed not only with the point of renewing them, but also according to the contextual environment with the point of increasing understanding of interpretation.

Therefore, artwork as a text can be analyzed:

- as a text,
- as a polysystem of modeling systems within a text,
- as a part of other systems (polysystem),
- as a part of the cultural system.

This range gives a gradational evaluation of the possible complex holistic view, which develops the analysis of the artwork, which should proceed as a systematic analysis.

The analysis would demonstrate the rising volume of research with concretized meaning-making processes, with the possibility to involve more and more elements and the increasing predictability of the whole system.

As an example for such an approach we can take many currently developing artistic projects. The principle of the project, as well as a claim of most critics towards it, is the fact that it is planned art – what is a priori non-sense, because it rejects the principle of novelty. Moreover, the majority of current artistic content consists of projects, made according to the systemic approach and socio-culturally proved with previous experience. All such projects are made on the principle of epic genre. Especially bright examples can be found nowadays in

cinematography. For instance, most TV series, the continuous screen adaptations of J. R. R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit" and "The Lord of the Rings", G. R. R. Martin's "A Song of Ice and Fire", DC or Marvel comics, etc.

The notion of a "bad review" does exist, but hardly can be presumed the notion of "bad art", because art cannot be good or bad. However, art can be understandable and not understandable. When the system in an artwork is created by an author in a way that the audience is easily able to understand, this presumes the fact that the most important aspect of such a text would not be the exchange of new information, but the reevaluation of the already known, following the principle of autocommunication, where the addressee needs support of own ideas about this world, but not new ones.

Nevertheless, the system of the artwork is a phenomenon which can evoke discussion on the topic of the difference between creation and craft.

According to Kant (1994: 161) true artwork has to present something new outside of any rules, but at the same time must retain some meaning.

However, can art be created just by following some laws of an artistic system or other notions of artistic semantics, syntactics and pragmatics? The answers for this question are myriad, expressed in projects coming out every year: mostly about cinematography production, literature and other audio and visual artworks. Most of such artworks follow well developed canons for creating some type of artwork for some precise audience. Audiences easily recognize all included meanings in the artwork because they all are already familiar, easily acceptable (to the audience) and largely share values among social groups, but there is nothing significantly new in such artistic expression, therefore nothing is changed in the artistic and socio-cultural environment, thus no any development could follow such an artistic event. This is craft, not art. This statement is a priori in contradiction to the idea of art itself.

3.2. An example of artistic text analysis: between critique and semiotics

To prove the validity of the concepts discussed in the current work an object within contemporary artistic space, the movie "Batman v Superman. Dawn of Justice" by director Zack Snyder produced by Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc. has been chosen.

The main aim of this part is to apply concepts and demonstrate the analysis. Therefore, in the case of the presented object it should be clearly stated that the object is not perceived as a masterpiece or art falsification (which are presumably the two bordering stages of artistic environment); it is a text, which would be analyzed and all conclusions about its features will be scientifically argued.

This object is chosen for the analysis according to several criteria, which are significant to proving this research.

First of all, the described object has to be a new. In this case it is possible to show how the semiotic methodology can be applied to the current artistic environment, avoiding the moment of historical impression. Historical influence is an important part of the work of the literary researcher, because scientists, in opposition to critics, can work with any object existing in world history. However, art critique has as one of its functions to reflect on the current artistic environment, informing and educating the audience it orients to. For the literary or culture researcher this issue does not exist, because the choice of object is framed according her/his background and scientific interests.

Secondly, the movie “BvS” is an artistic text existing in many translations and with significantly high intertextuality. Therefore, this text has many potential connections with other texts in the culture (specifically American, or with mass culture).

Thirdly, the fact of the multiplicity of text-translations, makes it is possible to analyze how the same text has had a changing dominant through, and how it might influence the analysis of it for criticism. The task for the researcher is - foremost - to work with the inner capacities of the artwork, when for criticism it is to put the all potential capacities into today's context.

To support this statement a short example is provided of the difference in the work of the researcher and critic with Dostoevsky's novels. The researcher can choose Dostoevsky's novel and analyze motif or narration strategy, or any other aspect, therefore definitely not making parallels between the current political environment and situation in Russia, presented in novel. Dostoevsky wrote in the 19th century and about that time, and it is not logical to try to fit him in to the realities of today. The main task of our analysis is not to precisely analyze each episode and element, but to form a holistic analysis based on the theory described in previous chapters. The analysis of all elements presented in this artistic text that might lead to a full description, however, would not give the possibility to estimate the artwork in relation to other artistic and

the socio-cultural environment, and would not help to state the value of this artistic text, which is the stated aim of this research.

With application of the concepts elaborated on the basis of Juri Lotman's works it is reasonable to start with the analysis of “BvS” as an artistic text. It is possible to define “BvS” as an artistic text according the fact that it was produced at a cinematography studio (Warner Brothers and others), the director of the movie is considered as an author, and it has been presented in the cinemas (artistic space) for some millions of audiences.

Answering the question is “BvS” an artistic text, we can compare the object to the methodology stated in the second chapter.

-a text has to be a formed expression in some language or languages, (systemic and non-systemic elements) – “BvS” presents itself as a movie produced with use of the secondary language of cinema as art; there is the possibility to define more languages in the analysis of this movie, as natural one, poetic language of comic screen adaptations, artistic language of music, etc.

-a text is demarcated, united and completed, coded, a hierarchically bounded and structured system. The movie “BvS” is presented one unit, a heroic screen adaptation of comic books, based on 3 proto-texts (comic stories), structured into episodes, which are in fixed relation to each other, with boundaries made of first and last scenes, however with open boundaries for easier connection of this text to other ones, which will be discussed further.

-a text has the structure of a secondary modeling system – “BvS” is a movie made according to principles of cinematography, which can be considered as a secondary modeling system.

Moreover, the other three additional features of the artistic text can show:

-the artistic text has to have an expressed completed idea, which brings a new vision of the world – “BvS” is the first movie merging two heroes' –Batman and Superman – stories, nominally presenting novelty, the question of completeness of the idea presented in “BvS” and socio-culturally addressed novelty would be answered further.

-the artistic text has to be based on some poetic analysis of conflict in reality – “BvS” already in the title nominally presents a conflict, however the validity of this conflict and its relation to reality and the socio-cultural environment have to be discussed further.

-the artistic text has to encourage the audience to analyze the world from a new side of rational-emotional perception – “BvS” evokes an emotional response from the audiences, with well-known heroes, with action scenes, however there are some gaps in narration and other artistic techniques, which influence the successfulness of emotional reflection and rational rethinking of the audiences’ values.

However, intra-textual features and their analysis could give the possibility to conclude on the applicability of the principles described in previous chapters' artwork analysis principles and also to enlighten some important aspects of the object of analysis “BvS”.

The analysis of intra-textual capacities can be applied to any artwork despite the fact that firstly it is theoretically developed for literary artistic texts. To enlighten this idea let us make a small comparison to painting. The painting “Batman” by Dutch artist Paul Mijering made in acrylic technique, which nowadays can be counted as mainstream in order of simplicity of materials and application, according to the amount of semi-professionals and art lovers using it and the mass appreciation of the results of such creativity. The specificity of this painting allows an author to make smears almost not recognizable and guarantee gradual change between colors on the painting.

Discussing on the definition of acrylic as a material for creation, many dictionaries characterize *acrylic* as a synthetic paint, quick drying, which can be used as thin or thick cover on some surface, can be used with matt or gloss finishes. Moreover, it is popular to use acrylic paint on many different types of surfaces, as design decoration to clothes and shoes.

Therefore, in spite of whether the authors consider the mentioned above or not, the artwork presented in such materials has intertextual relations to the meaning of “fully-applicable”, easy-transferable to almost everything, suitable and popular, and after all – approachable. In this case approachable would not mean cheap, but the relation to the hierarchy of materials used to express the artistic text would be always behind it. This is the foremost step in the description of the intra-textual capacities of artwork.

Working with a painting the research still has ground in textual and linguistic principles of analysis, which are described in the theoretical part.

Starting with the material artwork expressed it is possible to move further to the minor linguistic intra-textual capacities. In painting, as well as in any other kind of art, the material of expression would presume such linguistic capacities as phonemes, graphemes, words and

collocation (or combination of words) as a minimal textual unities of meaning. The connection between these two factors is obvious. If the painting is made with oil paint the smears will be precisely visible, the difference between colors used, and the length of smears would express the author's specifics as linguistic elements – words. For example, Van Gogh's (long and wavy) smears in the paintings can be compared to Mayakovsky's (self-created) words in the poems, where change between colors and their relation to each other is like a combination of words and rhythm.

Particularly this application also can be made to cinema, where the minimal unit can be defined a shot. This is the minimal framed sign of artistic text. The shot is the most discrete unit of the movie. From some point a shot can be count as a picture. Therefore, elements of its analysis can be in correlation to those described for painting from one side. From the other side it is dynamic, it does not exist by itself. If we presume that the shot is an image on the screen, with some speech and music (or sound) perceived by audience in one time, this could broaden the description but narrow the meaning, because the more factors are known about the object of analysis the more framed it is.

Analyzing a “BvS” shot itself, the material can be considered as a Hollywood production that has contextual meaning as an approachable artwork for wide audiences. Moreover, this fact also presumes a minor personification of the author through the work, which foremost excludes the possibility to see director's personal modeling system behind the artwork. It is possible to see a tendency in colors, heroic pathos in sounds (mostly major tonality), and many zoom-ins to the faces of heroes. The relation of these intra-textual features of shot in relation between each other. If in linguistic terms they would be composed in phrases (not episodes, because each episode is a much bigger part of the artwork, which can be compared to the chapter), they would seem chaotic. The reason for this conclusion coming from the narration level, which is rather an extra-textual capacity of the artwork and will be discussed further, but on this stage it can be stated that the shot is protagonist oriented. Cinema as a kind of art that can be compared in relation to the reality of watching someone's life through the window as it is happening now. And like any artwork, the movie shows the reality from someone's position, in other words with someone's eyes. Movies made for cinema (which are around 2 hours) usually present one protagonist, around whom narration and shot mainly build. In case of “BvS” the author's idea clearly comes from epic narration including two protagonists. Therefore, the shot is “shared” between two

perspectives, which from the title are presented in opposition. The movie lasts for two hours and half and in rough division each of the protagonists – Batman and Superman – have less than 1 hour each, even not including the shots taken by other characters and side-views (which are inherent for Hollywood action movies).

The shot as a minimal discrete unit has the strongest semantics among cinematic elements, and the most straightly expressed. Therefore, in describing the colors used in “BvS” shots it is possible to state that the authors did well using the gamma of black and brown for episodes related to Batman, and inherent Superman colors – red and blue – but with exaggerated contrast, which expresses tension as a motif. The neutral episodes are mostly presented in white or yellowish colors. This exposition of colors states the most obvious relation of stereotypical presentation of the “BvS” characters in mass culture and comics, where they are originating.

Shot is an important element of cinema description with double dependence. Foremost, this is a step-stone for all other levels of artwork analysis, where the other extra-textual levels frame it and work together for the dominant.

Lotman in his “The Structure of the Artistic Text” stated, that one of the main functions of art is to save information. The most beneficial feature of this is the possibility to keep a big amount of information in less complicated forms of fixing. Applying this statement to the object of our analysis “BvS”, as well as for most artworks in popular mass culture, it can be defined: they all usually have an easy structure which is rather obvious for audiences. However, the amount of information kept can be doubtful. Nowadays author try to input to their artworks one or two strong ideas, with the point of not overloading the complexity. This leads to the conclusion, sited in second chapter, that audiences still want to meet the artwork with high cultural values, want to understand it, but – for many reasons – not appreciate complicated structures which are hard in interpretation and can show up ambiguously.

Following this statement, one of the most widespread problems of contemporary art is simplifying the structure and form in order to present some discussable socio-culturally important idea. However, this attempt might not be successful without fulfilling the principles of an artistic text composition (what usually lacks in most contemporary works and leads to a lack of reasoning in the system of the artwork).

Moreover, it seems for most of authors the novelty of the artwork is reached through making the familiar elements unfamiliar and pretending to expect from the audience the

possibility for recognition. However, as it was stated above, in the analysis related to intra-textual elements, the length of the artwork did not allow both protagonists to have enough time to be presented, and therefore – it can be seen from “BvS” – the authors decided to minimize the exposition in narration. No doubts this fact has affected the system of the artwork in general, because for development in the narration to the conflict for the culmination (the part where the dominant is expressed the most brightly) and subsequent conclusion, the exposition as a reasoning basis is needed. And in the case that it is not presented in the artwork it will be reestablished from the context, related to the audience – other artworks or experience. At the same time, referring to the novelty of the authors of “BvS”, some context can become noise.

Therefore, it is reasonable to start the analysis of extra-textual capacities from the relation to noise as a framing feature for “BvS” and text and a system.

The noise in the case of the movie “BvS” can be stated as a relation to all existing mediations of it, with the specificity of noise that it increases the entropy of information. In the case of the object of the analysis the noise can be divided to 3 possible circles of contextual noise: close related contextual noise (other artworks and artefacts related to the “BvS”), contextual noise of the artworks built on the same principle of artistic expression (the other comics “artistic” production, eg. Marvel), and the contextual noise of other movies in the category of Hollywood action. All these categories with different powers influence the artwork, provoking entropy: the loosing or deforming of information.

In the context of the current research we would consider the first circle of contextual noise including the artworks and artefacts directly related to the movie “BvS”. In this group would come all strongly related representations of Batman and Superman. This vision is important for the explanation of the extra-textual elements of the object of research, because as it was stated above – in simplified structure and form the main characters do not get sufficient exposition for the development of the system of narration. At the same time this part is a mandatory element of any artistic structure.

First of all, the authors themselves provide the audience with the framing movie “Man of Steel”, which can from one side be the prologue, or the exposition, for “BvS”, because the final episode of one is the integrated first episode for the other one. However, “Man of Steel” can be considered only as the exposition of Superman's character. And in the comparison of these two narrations can be inferred that Superman's qualities are different: from the aim of saving planet

he turns to one who saves only his beloved, instead of being neutral emotionally he becomes aggressive and angry, and in the eyes of society he converts from “one of us” to the paternal ruler and source of lynching, though there is no mediating narration which could explain these changes. From the absolutely positive hero he becomes an ambiguous figure in the narration, which can be complicate the perception for everyone who is familiar with the artwork “Man of Steel”. In the presented research this is perceived as contextual prologue or exposition.

This situation of exposition for Batman's character is even more vague. The authors did not claim any possible contextual connections, but for the audience they for sure exist in general thanks to the valuable screen adaptations of “Batman” by Christopher Nolan and the comic books, where Batman is presented as a defender against bad and crime, but equitable and never taking someone’s life, being above violence and lynching. In the short episode, the integrated part with “Man of Steel” (the integration exists only in later artwork “BvS”), the authors confer deadly hate to Superman, because he by accident destroyed Wane’s building (Batman’s family’s business empire location) and many of his workers died or were injured. Therefore, it can be inferred that for authors this is a strong motive for Batman's search for Superman’s death and even finding the only tool to kill him – the kryptonite. In the movie “BvS” Batman is presented as one who does not even search for explanation as to what exactly happened when his workers were “attacked”, which presents him in a light of not thinking violent chastener. This interpretation of Batman’s character is rather far from not only stereotypical imaginations of him, but also from most artworks and artefacts related to his figure. In other words, with this vision of Batman as exacting justice at any price – he lost his canonical attractiveness grounded back in 1939. The main concern of the controversial situation, where Batman in “BvS” is created in opposition to the stereotypical character rather evokes a misunderstanding from the side of the interpreter, audience or critic, is in the fact that there not any supportive information for the hero’s actions in conflict and culmination in the narration.

Therefore, in the system of narration is presented two heroes who are contextually presumed good, but in an ambiguous text, without good motive for their conflict. The extra-textual features of narration levels as exposition, conflict, culmination and conclusion (which are inherent for every artwork) subsequently do not present a stable system and, therefore, hardly work to support the dominant of “BvS”.

As it was stated before, in the artistic text the conflict and culmination is directly related to dominant. In other words, the values and ideas the author would like to present to the audience do not come across. As Juri Lotman point out in his “Semiotics of Cinema” (1973) the author’s position (opinion or idea) is expressed through the main character: the protagonist represents it directly or indirectly. In the case of “BvS” two protagonists are presented, who are presumed to be in conflict (without enough reasoning for that), and neither themselves, nor their conflict expresses the real opposition of right and wrong vision on some position, nor do the supporting characters.

The system of narration is supported with one other character, a participant of the conflict and culmination levels – Lex Luthor. This character is not stated in exposition of “Man of Steel” nor “BvS”. However, he is a core element in the term of narration from conflict to culmination, pushing Superman to meet Batman for a fight with the statement that the second has to be killed, otherwise the “step” mother of the first one will die. Therefore, this intimation becomes a reason for Superman to assent to Batman’s call. Meanwhile, Lex Luthor creates a supernatural creature from the fossils of dead General Zod, who may be known by the audience from “Man of Steel” (which can be doubtful). And the reason why Lex Luthor acts this way might be considered as a wish to destroy Superman, so the movie should be titled “Luthor v Superman”. However, in this part of the narration contextual noise also affects the perception of the character, and the spectator might confirm the fact that this character does not represent Lex Luthor at all (if not taking into account the richness), but according to actions rather reminds of the Joker (the violent antagonist creating mess for the purpose of mess). This fact can be proved with the final episode where Lex Luthor is in the prison laughing as a mentally destroyed crazy man. It is the right of the authors to see the characters this way, even contextual information in this case works on the principle of noise. At the same time the main problem of the narration in “BvS” is lack of exposition and undeveloped characters, caused by limited time for epic narration which has been chosen by authors.

Therefore, the motif and theme of this artistic text are in the weak position and hardly support the dominant expression of the author’s idea.

However, if the text “BvS” would be considered not according the title, as a presumed navigation, but in relation to supportive antagonist Lex Luther, the system of narrative elements can present the following dominant which might be expressed in, from the first sight, the side

episode at the U.S. Capitol. This is only one episode in the artwork having socio-cultural reference to the reality and can be significant for audiences through their own experience, when justice is not always just. The core of the episode is based on the vague arguments of Superman's guilt in the conflict in Africa, presumably provoked by Lex Luther, and inability of governing structures and society to sufficiently react to it. This can be interpreted as weakness of society and governance in front of superpowers (as Superman) and tricksters (Lex Luther), and their consequent decisions to destroy everything are uncontrollable and therefore scarring. And the explosion in the end of this episode, made by Luther, can express the author's position that this way cannot be the right solution on the way to protection.

Moreover, extra-textual features have to be analyzed in communication in context, because they do not exist without the correlation with external connections and are dependent on them in the meaning making process.

In the analysis of the background of the movie "BvS" plot has been provided by three DC comic books "Batman: The Dark Knight Returns", "Kingdom Come" and "The Death of Superman", which are related to each other in the context of the DC Universe (the system of related comics produced by DC comics inc.), however their system has not been built adequately in the frame of "BvS" as artistic text and system. And the major problems of "BvS" as a text is:

- ambiguity of title as a part of the text in relation to the narration: the conflict expressed in the title does not reflect the real conflict presented in the narration, therefore confusion between its parts arises (the fact that title "Batman v Superman. Dawn of Justice" has been made with commercial purposes to attract spectators interested in an explanation of the possible conflict between two a priori positive characters);

- the problem of plot and montage, which does not adequately describe the dominant of the artwork;

- the problem of artwork incompleteness: it has been stated that this artistic text does not have exposition, which can be counted as minus-device in the plot (in Lotmanian term) of the artwork; however, an incomplete system with minus-device has to be able to be restored from the context, which in case of "BvS" became contextual noise (because the authors of "BvS" have changed the stated poetic language formed for the artworks describing these two protagonists);

- the stated above problem of contextual systems which are meaningfully in opposition to "BvS" and influencing information entropy inside of the artistic system;

-the system of “BvS” structure hardly encourages the audience to analyze the world from a new side of rational-emotional, because the fast change of the narration episodes in relation with a high amount of action scenes does not (1) give time to rethink the viewed and (2) lacks reasoning for strong emotions;

-the novelty of “BvS” can be considered as revision of the canonic characters of DC comics, however this novelty can be hardly interpreted as the dominant of this work, because the limited structure of intra- and extra-textual elements does not compose the relevant representation of form and narration; however, if there were added new contextual elements supporting the authors’ ideas (within other related artworks newly created and the expressed dominant reoriented) then the artistic text could be perceived as accomplished.

The fact that the dominant of the artwork can be defined for audience only in relation between the extra-textual capacities of the artistic text itself and socio-cultural values in some precise spatio-temporal frame, leads us to the need to analyze the meaning making process between “BvS” and probable audiences’ from the side of criticism. In the case that the audience would be presumed to have some general understanding of globalized spectator, who belongs to Western mass culture, is familiar with the heroes (even if not interested in, at least knows what is their function and where they are coming from), and would appreciate to read the authors’ idea in the artistic text “BvS”, then perhaps the movie could be vindicated.

It is understandable that, given that the authors are trying to adapt heroes created in 40’s to current socio-cultural values, where no strict binary opposition is presumed any more, the good can be bad and vice versa. However, within the limits of this artistic text this task can be hardly realized. The usage of minus-device (in Lotmanian term) has not been applied sufficiently, therefore characters happened to be incomplete, which disturbed the narration structure and relation of extra-structural elements in the system of artwork. That subsequently leads to misinterpretations and loss of meanings from the semantic point of view.

Concluding the analysis, the authors probably might have a will to develop a genre of comic screen adaptation from mythological and magic fairy-tale type of text with monological narration to dialogical one. According to the comic books on which the movie “BvS’ is based, it is possible to conclude that the principle of their structure is based on the mythological principle (Eco 1979) and magic fairy-tale, which presume not providing new information but encouraging

the audience to rethink and re-interpret already familiar ones, the end of every magic fairy-tale based on the fact that good always wins.

However, the context, which turned to contextual noise in this case, and the extra-textual capacities of artistic text, did not allow the film to reach this aim. The other bordering factors hidden in the methods of expression have been taken by the authors from the sample Hollywood movies devoted to superheroes. Thus episodes with fights did not fulfill any other function than an entertaining change of shots. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, based on the same cinema syntactic, which presumes binary opposition and the relation of protagonist-antagonist, the ideas of rethinking of values cannot be realized.

Conclusion

The current work presents the endeavor to enlighten the principles of analysis of artistic texts which can be used for art criticism practices. The main source of the research are the works of Juri Lotman, taken with the assumption that some of his concepts can be applicable in contemporary art criticism.

To fulfill the objectives of the research several categories of analysis have been enlightened: artwork as a text with intra- and extra-textual elements and artwork as a system itself and placed among other systems. This division has been applied to revise the work of art criticism from an epistemological point of view. Therefore, some principles of artwork analysis were extracted, intra- and extra-textual elements relation to the dominant within current socio-cultural values. Applied together the principles of these elements of analysis derive a holistic vision of the artistic text in some context.

The elaborated principles have been applied to the movie “Batman v Superman. Dawn of Justice” as an example. The investigation showed the capacities of intra- and extra-textual elements, as a separately placed system and in relation with contextual systemic processes; therefore, the result describes the artwork’s downsides and suggests probable concerns of improvement.

The research drives to several conclusions, which can give some tools for art criticism analysis. First, it has been selected which features of an artwork are most relevant for investigation and how they support the dominant of the artistic system. Second, the analysis of the dominant within a contextual system would explain the artistic value of the artwork and scientifically justify probable audiences’ interpretation.

The significance of the research can be found in the methods and devices of art criticism analysis, formed on the principles of semiotic research specified from works of Juri Lotman (1971, 1977, 1992), with support of theories of Roman Jakobson (1981), Itamar Evan-Zohar (1990) and Julia Kristeva (2004[1966]). These tools can give the possibility to describe an artwork and state the position of the critic scientifically. Therefore, the criticism would be considered as a reasonable analysis of precise elements of the artistic text and its capacities to achieve a particular place within the artistic environment.

The current research can be step stone for future research. It evokes interest to the processes which influence interpretation processes within art criticism. Moreover, it leads to the idea that one important impact comes from the communication processes surrounding the artistic text placed in some context.

Moreover, this research can be recommended for consideration by critics and practitioners in artwork analysis. It provides the possibility to apply scientifically supported argumentation to strengthen critics interpretations.

Bibliography

- Bal, Mieke and Bryson, Norman 1991. Semiotics and Art History. *The Art Bulletin* 73(2): 174-208.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1984. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington. Indiana University Press.
- Barnouw, Dagmar 1980. Review: Critics in the Act of Reading. *Poetics Today* 1(4): 213-222.
- Bartelik, Marek 2005. *Early Polish Modern Art: Unity in Multiplicity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Eco, Umberto 1979. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 1986a. *Travels in Hyper Reality: Essays*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Fort Washington: A Harvest book.
- 1986b. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 1990. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation: World, History, Texts*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Delivered at Clare Hall, Cambridge University, March 7 and 8, 1990.
- 2010 [2004]. *History of beauty*. New York: Rizzoli.
- Egorov 1980 = Егоров, Борис. *О мастерстве литературной критики. Жанры. Композиция. Стиль*. СПб: Советский писатель, Ленинградское отделение.
- Elkins, James 2003. *What Happened to Art Criticism*. Chicago: Prickly paradigm press.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar 1990. *Polysystem studies*. Poetics today, vol. 11 (1). Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics. 9-27.
- Deeds Ermarth, Elizabeth 1988. Conspicuous Construction; Or, Kristeva, Nabokov, and The Anti-Realist Critique. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 21(2/3): 330-339.
- Fisher, Mark 2015. *How to Write about Theatre. A Manual for Critics, Students and Bloggers*. Edinburgh: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

- Gasparov, Boris; Gasparova, E; Mints, Zara 1967. A Statistical approach to the Study of the Content Plane of Artistic Text. *Труды по знаковым системам V (Sign System Studies 5)*: 288-310.
- Grovier, Kelly 2013. *100 Works of Art That Will Define Our Age*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.
- Habib, Rafey 2005. *A history of literary criticism: from Plato to the present*. New Jersey: Blackwell publishing.
- Jakobson, Roman 1964. On visual and Auditory Sign. *Phonetica* 11: 216-220.
- 1996[1974] = Якобсон, Роман. *Язык и бессознательное*. Москва: Гнозис.
- 1981. *The Dominant*. Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry. Vol. 3 of *Selected Writings*. Paris, The Hague: Mouton, 751-756.
- Kant 1994 = Кант, Иммануил. Об учении о методе применения вкуса. *Собрание сочинений в восьми томах. Юбилейное издание 1794-1994*. Том 5. Москва: Чоро. 197–198.
- Kristeva 2004 = Крестева, Юлия. Слово, диалог и роман. *Избранные турды; разрушение поэтики. Слово, диалог и роман*. Перевод Б.Косикова. Москва: РОССПЭН. с.165-194.
- Lekomtsev, Juri 1967. On the semiotics of Visual Arts (painting). *Труды по знаковым системам III. (Sign System Studies)*: 125-132.
- Lepik, Peet 2008. *Universals in the Context of Juri Lotman's Semiotics*. Tartu Semiotic Library 7. Tartu University Press.
- Lotman, Juri 1967 = Лотман, Юрий. Тезисы к проблеме «Искусство в ряду моделирующих систем». *Труды по знаковым системам III (Sign System Studies 3)*: 130-145.
- 1970 = Лотман, Юрий. *Материалы к курсу по теории литературы. Вып. I. Типология культуры на русском языке*. Тарту: Тартуский государственный университет.
- 1973 = Лотман, Юрий. *Семиотика кино и проблемы киноэстетики*. Таллин: Ээсти раамат.
- 1976 [1973]. *Semiotics of Cinema*. Transl. by Mark E. Suino. Michigan Slavic Contributions 5. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- 1977a [1974]. Primary and Secondary Communication-Modeling Systems. *Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology* (ed. & transl.) Daniel Lucid. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 95–98.

- 1977b [1971]. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Trans. by Gail Lenoff and Roland Vroon. University of Michigan.
- 1977c. The dynamic model of a semiotic system. *Semiotica* 21(3/4): 193-210.
- 1982. The Text and the Structure of Its Audience. *New Literary History* 14 (1): 81–87.
- 1987. On the contemporary concept of text. Livstegn: Tidsskrift for Norsk forening for *semiotikk* [Proceedings of the first symposium "Semiotics in Theory and Practice", 2-3 Oct. 1986, Bergen (Norway): Norwegian Association for Semiotic Studies] 3: 159-163.
- 1988a. The semiotics of culture and concept of a text. *Soviet Psychology* 26(3): 52–58.
- 1988b. Text within a text. *Soviet Psychology* 26(3): 32–51.
- 1992 = Лотман, Юрий. *Культура и взрыв*. Москва: Гнозис, Прогресс.
- 2001 [1994] = Лотман, Юрий. *Учебник по русской литературе для средней школы*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Lotman, Juri & Uspensky, Boris 1978. Myth — Name — Culture. *Semiotica* 22(3/4): 211–233.
- Doležel, Lubomír 1980. Review: Eco and His Model Reader. *Poetics Today* 1(4): 181-188.
- Mignolo, Walter and Van Wert, William F. 1974. Julia Kristeva/Cinematographic Semiotic Practice. *SubStance* 3(9): 97-114.
- Morris, Charles 1971 [1938]. Foundation of the Theory of Signs. *Writings of the General Theory of Signs.*, Paris: Mouton, The Hague. 19-67.
- Ojamaa, Maarja and Peeter, Torop 2015. Transmediality of cultural autocommunication. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (published online 8 May 2014).
- Salupere 2008 = Салупере, Сильви. О понятии «перевод» в трудах Юрия Лотмана. *Sign Systems Studies* 36.2: 417-436.
- Shapiro, Gary 1974. Intention and Interpretation in Art: A Semiotic Analysis. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33(1): 33-42.
- Shkolvsky 1984 = Шкловский, Виктор [1983]. Искусство как прием. *О теории прозы*. Москва: Советский писатель, 3-27.
- Shuttleworth, Mark 2011. Polysystem. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha ed, In: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge, 197.
- Solzhenitsyn 1975 = Солженицын, А. 1975 Бодался теленок с дубом. *Очерки литературной жизни*. Париж: ИМКА-пресс.

Torop, Peeter 1995 = Тороп, Петер. *Тотальный перевод*. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского университета.

Ward, Ossian 2014. *Ways of Looking: How to Experience Contemporary Art*. London: Laurence King Publishing.

Wittig, Susan 1974. Toward a Semiotic Theory of the Drama. *Educational Theatre Journal* 26(4): 441-454.

Kokkuvõte

Kunstikriitika lähtealustest Juri Lotmani tööde valguses

Käesoleva töö eesmärgiks oli näidata semiootilise tekstianalüüsi põhimõtteid, mida oleks võimalik kasutada tänapäeva kunstikriitikas. Töö tõukub Juri Lotmani kunstiteksti analüüsile pühendatud töödest. Juri Lotmani vaateid kunstitekstile kui süsteemile on kõrvutatud ja täiendatud teiste teoreetikute (eelkõige Roman Jakobson, Julia Kristeva, Umberto Eco ja Itamar Even-Zohar) vaatepunktidega, et anda võimalikult terviklik pilt kunstiteose erinevate aspektide analüüsi võimalustest.

Töö sisuline osa jaotub kolmeks: historiograafia, Lotmani teoreetiliste lähtepunktide tutvustus ja metodoloogilised printsiibid rakendatuna tänapäeva kunsti kriitilises analüüsis. Esimene peatükk „Kriitika ja semiootika“ annab ülevaate kriitika mõistest ja semiootika olulisusest kunstikriitikas. Eraldi rõhutatakse vene kriitikatraditsiooni mõju kultuurilis-sotsiaalse sfääri analüütilistele uurimustele ja tuuakse välja Tartu–Moskva semiootikakoolkonna, eriti Juri Lotmani tööde roll kunstiteksti analüüsimeetodite arengus. Käsitletakse ka semiootilise vaate panust tänapäeva kunstikriitika funktsioonide selginemises – kas ja kuidas on võimalik kunstiteksti adekvaatne analüüs.

Teine peatükk „Lotmani vaade kunstiteosele kui kriitilise analüüsi objektile“ annab ülevaate Lotmani kunstiteose käsitlestest. Eristatakse kahte põhilist koherentset lähenemist: kunstiteos kui tekst ja kui süsteem. Mõlemad lähenemised põimuvad ja annavad koostöös võimaluse analüüsida kunstiteost kui tervikut. Lotmani õpilase Peeter Toropi totaalset tõlke kontseptsioonist lähtuvate laiendustega osutub võimalikuks täpsustada tekstisiseste ja -väliste elementide, mis mõjutavad teksti tähenduse kujunemisprotsessi, omavahelisi suhteid. Kunstiteksti kui (modelleeriva) süsteemi analüüs võimaldab välja tuua rea seaduspärasid, rõhutades selle seotust teiste kultuuritekstide ja laiema kultuurikontekstiga.

Kolmas peatükk „Kunstiteose kui süsteemi analüüsi metodoloogia“ võtab kokku eelmises peatükis kirjeldatud põhimõtted, luues ühtse holistliku lähenemise kunstiteose analüüsile. Rõhutatakse dominandi rolli ja võimalust hinnata teksti kui tervikut. Antud peatükis saab Lotmani teooria täiendust talle lähedaste ja paljuski samadelt lähtekohtadelt tõukuvate Jakobsoni, Evan-Zohari ja Kristeva teoreetilistest vaadetest. Kolmanda peatüki lõpus rakendatakse eelnevalt esitatud teoreetilist raamistut konkreetsel materjalil – selleks on filmi „Batman vs Superman. Dawn of Justice“ kriitiline analüüs, mis valgustab antud filmi kui kunstiteksti läbikukkumise põhjusi.

Antud uurimus võimaldas näidata Juri Lotmani kultuurisemiootiliste kontseptsioonide kasutuse võimalikkust ja vajalikkust tänapäeva kunstikriitikas ja võib pakkuda huvi kunstikriitika vallas tegutsevatele praktikutele.

Non-exclusive licence to reproduce thesis and make thesis public

I, _____ Daria Arkhipova _____

(*author's name*)

(date of birth: _____ 24th of June 1992 _____),

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to:

1.1. reproduce, for the purpose of preservation and making available to the public, including for addition to the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright, and

1.2. make available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright,

SOME PRINCIPLES OF ART CRITIQUE ELABORATED FROM THE WORKS OF JURI LOTMAN

(title of thesis)

supervised by _____ Tyler Bennett, MA _____ Silvi Salupere, MA _____,

(supervisor's name)

2. I am aware of the fact that the author retains these rights.

3. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe the intellectual property rights or rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act.

Tartu, _____ 20 May 2016 _____ (*date*)