

ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУ
ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ
LITERATURE

МРНТИ 17.09.91

10.51889/3469.2022.67.29.002

**Белобровцева И.¹*

¹*Таллинский университет, Таллин, Эстония
Д.ф.н., профессор,
venefil@tlu.ee*

**КАРТИНА И РЯД КАРТИН – «ДЬЯВОЛЬСКАЯ РАЗНИЦА»: Ю. М. ЛОТМАН ОБ
ИЗОБРАЗИТЕЛЬНОМ ИСКУССТВЕ**

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается изобразительное искусство как предмет исследований и размышлений Ю.М. Лотмана, точнее автор попытался «проследить в работах, написанных в свойственном ему диалогическом духе, ведущую нить исследования» на примере одной статьи, весьма характерной в отношении как выбора объекта Лотмана, так и способа его исследования. В анализируемом тексте идет речь о возможности перевода языка изобразительного искусства, а именно серии графических листов эстонского художника Юри Аррака, иллюстрирующих произведение литературы, на язык слова, где пошагово развивается мысль Лотмана, втягивая в предмет исследования все новые виды искусства и области науки во имя создания универсальных законов культуры. На основе мотивов стены, животных и человеческих лиц, также на базе анализа всех компонентов композиции графических картин художника, Лотман связывает их с мифологией.

Ключевые слова: Лотман, изобразительное искусство, Аррак, графическая серия рисунков, рассказ, антирассказ, миф

**Белобровцева И.¹*

¹*Таллин университеті, Таллин, Эстония
Ф.ғ.д., профессор,
venefil@tlu.ee*

**Ю. М. ЛОТМАННЫҢ БЕЙНЕЛЕУ ӨНЕРІ ТУРАЛЫ: СУРЕТ ЖӘНЕ БІРҚАТАР
КАРТИНАЛАРДАҒЫ «БІЛІСТІҢ АЙЫРМАШЫЛЫҒЫ»**

Аңдатпа

Бұл мақалада Ю.М. Лотманның жұмыстарындағы бейнелеу өнері зерттеу тақырыбы ретінде қарастырылады, дәлірек айтқанда, автор Лотманный объектісін таңдауға және оқу тәсіліне тән мақаланың мысалында «оған тән диалогиялық ерекшелікте, зерттеудің жетекші тобында жазылған шығармаларда іздеді». Талданған мақалада бейнелеу өнерінің тілін мәтінге аудару мүмкіндігін көрсетеді, атап айтқанда, әдебиеттің жұмысын суреттейтін Эстониялық суретші Юрий Аррактың графикалық композициясын жалпыға ортақ мәдениет заңдылықтарын құру үшін Лотман бес қадам негізінде өнердің жаңа түрлері және ғылым салаларымен қарастырып талдау жасайды. Сонымен қатар, қабырға, жануарлар мен адам бейнелерінің мотивтарының негізінде Лотман оларды мифологиямен байланыстырады.

Түйін сөздер: Лотман, бейнелеу өнері, Аррак, графикалық суреттер сериясы, әңгіме, анти-әңгіме, миф

**Belobrovtsseva I.¹*

¹*Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia
Doctor of Philology Science, Professor,
venefil@tlu.ee*

PAINTING AND A NUMBER OF PAINTINGS ON “THE DIABOLICAL DIFFERENCE”: YU. M. LOTMAN ABOUT FINE ART

Abstract

In this article the fine art as the subject of research and reflection of Yu.M. Lotman is discussed. More precisely, the author tries to “trace the thread of research in the works he wrote in his characteristic dialogical spirit”, using the example of an article that is very characteristic both in terms of the choice of Lotman's subject and the method of his research. The analyzed text deals with the possibility of translating the language of fine arts, namely a series of graphic sheets by Estonian artist Jueri Arrak illustrating a literary work, into the language of words, developing Lotman's thought step by step, making all new types of art and science the object of research in the name of creating universal laws of culture. Starting from the motifs of the wall, animals and human faces, and based on the analysis of all components of the composition of the artist's graphic paintings, Lotman connects them with mythology.

Keywords: Lotman, fine arts, Arrak, graphic series of drawings, story, antistory, myth.

Introduction. The breadth of interests and depth of research thought of Y. M. Lotman are amazing. Having no desire to repeat myself, I will quote the preface article “Lotman's Paradox” by S.M. Daniel, written jointly with R. G. Grigoriev, where we are talking about the “Renaissance scale” of Lotman's personality: “He was a thinker of universal scope” [1, 5].

Fine art has often been the subject of Lotman's research and reflections, as well as researchers of his scientific and popular science creativity have often come to the conclusion that it is organic to include this topic in Lotman's global picture of the art world. I will name only some works in which Lotman's ideas about the role of fine art in the structure of a literary text found a lively response. In addition to the already mentioned “Lotman's Paradox”, there is a chapter “Optimal Projection” in Alexander Flaker's book “Pictorial Literature and Literary Painting” [2, 71-87]; a book by Vladimir Paperny “Culture Two” [3]; an article by Silvia Burini “Yu. M. Lotman and the semiotics of fine arts” [4, 836-847] based on a whole complex of works by an outstanding scientist devoted specifically and only to fine arts. It seems extremely important that the author of the article attempts to “trace the leading thread of research in the works written in the dialogical spirit characteristic of Lotman” [4, 837]. I will try to trace this thread of research by the example of one Lotman's article, which is very characteristic of him in relation to both the choice of the object and the method of its research.

First of all, two necessary introductions.

First. I'd like to talk about an article that has not been published in Russian yet, but exists in translations in three languages: in 1982 it appeared in German [5, 11-22] and in Estonian [6], in 1984 in Finnish [7, 54-59]. However, there is a serious difference between German and Estonian (as well as Finnish, which is a translation from Estonian) texts: The article in Estonian is much longer than the German version, almost four typewritten pages. The German article fully corresponds to the Russian original “Графическая серия – рассказ и антирассказ (Graphic Series – Story and

Anti-Story)”, stored in the Estonian Semiotic Heritage Foundation of Tallinn University and also does not contain these four pages. So far, it has not been possible to find their original, which makes it impossible for me to quote Lotman's train of thought in this part of his article and allows me to give them only in a retelling.

The second preface. Those who were researched the creative heritage of Yu. M. Lotman as well as students, who listened to his lectures, are well aware that he had favorite quotes that were repeated more than once in oral speeches and written works [8]. In such works as “Анализ поэтического текста (Analysis of the poetic text)”, “Структура художественного текста (The Structure of the literary text)”, “Семиотика и литературоведение (Semiotics and literary studies)”, “Непредсказуемые механизмы культуры (Unpredictable mechanisms of Culture)”, etc., even in the lecture notes of Lotman, preserved by the author of this article, there are more than once such quotations from L. N. Tolstoy as a description of the boys' game in the story “Детство (Childhood)” and even more often the writer's well-known answer to the critics of “Анна Каренина”: “If I wanted to say in words everything that I meant to express in a novel, then I had to write the novel that I wrote first. <...> In everything, almost in everything that I wrote, I was guided by the need for a collection of thoughts linked together to express themselves; but each thought, expressed in words in particular, loses its meaning, terribly decreases when one is taken without the coupling in which it is located. The coupling itself is not composed by thought (I think), but by something else, and it is impossible to express the basis of this coupling directly in words; but it is possible only mediocre - by describing images, actions, positions in words” [9].

Research results. Yu. M. Lotman was endlessly interested in the idea of coupling in literature and art, when individual components acquire “the unity of all meanings”. A barely noticeable change of focus reveals a new meaning, not even assumed by the author, of what was said or depicted. The lines from Pushkin's letter to Vyazemsky, repeatedly used by Lotman, meant the same thing: “I'm not writing a novel now, but a novel in verse is a diabolical difference” [10].

It is to this “diabolical difference” concerning a separate component in its relation to the whole text that the above is mentioned article by Lotman is devoted, having in the original the title “Графическая серия – рассказ и антирассказ”, written, as follows from the first phrase, “in case”, to the exhibition of graphics: “The exhibition offered to the audience is a convenient occasion to identify some structural and aesthetic features of that kind of graphic art, the independence of which is beginning to become more and more obvious to us” [11] (Here and further references to the article by Yu. M. Lotman are given according to the original, which is stored in the Estonian Semiotic Heritage Fund of Tallinn University and does not have a cipher).

Not knowing exactly which exhibition we are talking about (although you can guess from the German-language publication that it was Germany or Austria), and reading the article further, you can understand that we are talking about the relationship of a book illustration with a verbal text: “Speaking about the graphic series, it should be emphasized that we will be interested not just in any set of artistically unified graphic sheets, namely illustrative, that is, one that is directly or more loosely connected with the verbal text, does not exist without it”. Note that the term “взрыв – explosion” is not yet used here, which will later form the basis of the book “Культура и взрыв (Culture and Explosion)” [12], but there are already characteristics that prepare this term: *столкновение – collision, напряжение – tension, контроверса – contraverse*.

Discussion. Lotman's research is comparable to a whirlpool, because once started, they involve into their funnel everything that happened to be in its immediate vicinity, but in general everything that turned out to be on the surface of the river. And although in this case we are talking about the possibility of translating the language of fine art, namely a series of graphic sheets by the Estonian artist Juri Arrak illustrating a work of literature, into the language of words, the article allows us to trace how Lotman's thought develops step by step, drawing all new types of art and fields of science into the subject of research in the name of creating universal laws of culture.

Step one: separate graphic drawing-illustration. Here Lotman refers to Y. N. Tynyanov's article "Иллюстрации (Illustrations)" from 1923 which proved the impossibility of illustration at all: "Every <...> work claiming to illustrate another will be a distortion and narrowing of it" [13]. However, according to Lotman, Tynyanov protested against illustration as a trivial repetition of a verbal text "allegedly by means of graphics or painting adequate to it" [13]. This is exactly what Tynyanov's conclusion related to the language of poetry and graphics are fundamentally inadequate, therefore, their juxtaposition is useless. Lotman, on the contrary, believes that the juxtaposition of the languages of text and illustration is not useless precisely because of their "semiotic heterogeneity", which in this case becomes an active sense-forming factor. "The illustrator, in order to remain faithful to the meaning of the illustrated text, should strive not to double it tautologically, but to create another text capable of entering into semantic relations with the main one". This "another text", which, at first glance, can be considered an illustration, becomes, to a certain extent, an interpretation in relation to the main one.

Comparing the interaction of the illustration with the verbal text, Lotman compares this process with the conflicting relationship of the literary text and the reader's codes of its decryption. Insisting that in the latter case, the text not only narrows, but also enriches, he extrapolates this conclusion to the study "so the text-illustration not only narrows, but also enriches".

Lotman, who had one of the main comprehensive approaches to the text was to realize its dialogical nature, comes to the conclusion that "a pair of 'verbal text – illustration' can be considered as the clearest model of the dialogical nature of the text". Moreover, "the twofold nature of illustrative graphics, in his view, puts researchers "in front of some of the most pressing modern problems of text study". And if "Tynyanov thought that the illustration is the extreme periphery of the text problem, now we have the right to say that it is in its center. It is very possible that the theory of illustration will turn out to be the theory of text as such".

Step two is the art of emblematics that drawn into the funnel of the "whirlpool" by the example of which Lotman demonstrates the dialogical nature of the relationship between graphics and words. "The emblem consists of three components: a graphic text, a verbal explanation to it ('legend'), external to the drawing and having an official character, and a motto included in the graphic text as part of it. The legend describes and explains its relationship to the drawing is simple and transparent, but that is why it is <...> passive as a meaning-forming factor. The relationship of the motto and the graphic text is always a relationship of riddle – guessing, hint – decoding. They are built on mutual tension and are mutually active in the process of meaning generation".

As an example here, in addition to the emblem from the classic collection of Diego de Saavedra Farhado, he cites Goya's "Caprichos", where the captions to the texts of the drawings do not explain their meaning, do not double it, but, most often, aggravate their mystery. "But that is why they are inseparable from drawings; they are included with them in joint artistic work".

Step three. The following aspect is involved in the study. According to Lotman, in order to transmit information, "the text must be multilayered, semiotically heterogeneous", must represent "a dialogue between languages. And the more distant they are from each other, the more difficult, 'impossible' this dialogue is, the more untranslatable the language between which the text establishes correspondence, the more active the process of meaning formation is". Lotman finds an analogy to a pair of untranslatable, but actively interacting languages in the functional asymmetry of the cerebral hemispheres. They work, in semiotic terms, 'in different languages' and, in this sense, are similar in structure to the bilingual text model. And, since the left hemisphere uses discrete, and the right uses continuous languages, the dichotomy of 'verbal text – drawing' gets an exceptionally interesting parallel.

Step four brings us close to the graphic series stated in the title of the article: 'What general questions does the illustrative series pose to us as a special type of text?'

On the one hand, the graphic series is the flesh of the flesh of artistic illustration. On the other hand, in the series, what separates an isolated drawing–illustration from a deliberate and integral series-composition appears, emerges.

Along the way, as if dotted, the article outlines the features of the dialogical essence of the text in the “neighboring” types and genres of art. The graphic series is compared with all genres of short stories using a chain of interconnected images – from icon ‘marks’ to comics and photo novels. Here Lotman for the first time has the name of a specific author from another art form, which is the Estonian director-animator Rein Raamat, who created the hand-drawn animated film “Стрелок” (1976) using the technique of so-called ‘swims’, which Lotman describes “as a series of graphic sheets falling on the screen one after another” [14].

At the same step in the article, a parallel arises between the graphic series and ‘text grammar’, a field of linguistics that deals with connections between pieces of verbal text that are more extensive than a sentence. Suggesting that a coherent narrative text is governed by patterns of several types, depending on the genre and length of the text, Lotman identifies three possible ‘types of connection between large segments of text’ that are characteristic of a verbal text, a graphic series and a musical narrative.

Last **step** number **five**. The poetics of the graphic series, considered by Lotman mainly by analogy with the poetics of a verbal text: he identifies repetitive elements ‘that link phrases into super-phrasal unities’ (and simultaneously introduces an amendment to universality – ‘and film frames into editing phrases’); outlines more complex connections, leitmotif, likening them to music – ‘Caprichos’ of Goya gives “a whole score of motor interweaves, the analysis of which would allow us to talk about the score of visual means developing according to the laws of complex counterpoint”.

The article (in the German version) ends with a conclusion that finally establishes the relationship between a separate illustration of a verbal text and an illustrative series. Denying the illustration the opportunity to ‘give a pictorial analogue to a separate episode of the narrative, torn out of the general movement of the plot’, Lotman opposes a graphic series to it. It is capable to “simultaneously depict not only an action unfolding in different grammatical tenses <...>, but also in different moods: optative, conditional, etc., in the synchronous space of the sheet. In fact, the artist gives not one expressed moment of action, but a paradigm of states”. This allows Lotman to bring the structure of the graphic series closer to poetry and correlate it not with a single fragment of a verbal text, but with its whole. At the same time, in relation to the illustrative series, the verbal text acts as a presupposition, as a necessary ‘prior knowledge’ for such a series.

At the same time, the graphic series ‘hides the possibilities of syntagmatic deployment, i.e. turns the drawing into a potential story’. In all this Lotman sees ‘the wealth of semantic reserves of the illustrative series, story and antistory at the same time’.

This concludes the German text, while the Estonian version continues. It should be said here that Lotman's very manner of presenting his thoughts to a foreign reader is very instructive and to a large extent pedagogical. So, the examples that he gives in the text of the article written for translation into German, with a few exceptions, go back to German or Austrian culture (the legend and the motto of the emblem from the collection of Saavedra are given in German; in the article, he quotes German linguists Peter Hartmann and Siegfried Schmidt, and not only quotes, but also enters footnotes in German by hand into typescript; refers to graphic series by Holbein, Durer, Austrian artist Hans Fronius). This seems to say a lot about Lotman's attitude towards the reader, about the oncoming traffic towards him. Such a premise is supported by the fact that in the translation of the article into Estonian, a piece appears in it dedicated to a graphic series of charcoal drawings made by perhaps the most sought-after Estonian artist both at home and abroad who is the avant-garde artist Juri Arrak.

This time the article refers to another exhibition held at the Tartu Art Museum in the fall of 1982. The series seems to Lotman to be the luck of the artist and a field where you can demonstrate

some interesting aspects outlined in the theoretical part of the article. We are talking about what motivates us to consider this or that set of drawings as a series, that is, a whole text. Leaving aside purely technical characteristics, Lotman talks about deep features which is, first of all, about the repetition of motifs that creates the paradigmatics of the text, in the modifications and metamorphoses of which the viewer unmistakably recognizes the transformations of the same.

The motive of the wall is given as an example. A wall of large stone blocks in one form or another is present in many drawings and its ponderous geometricality so falls out of the amoebic, i.e. shaky, fluid world of Arrak images that immediately attracts the viewer's attention. Lotman considers the drawing “Стена (Wall)” as the key one that is a composition consisting of a small black wall and a snow-white snowdrift opposing it, from which cosmic cold blows. In this way, a multi-layered meaning is transmitted from the scale of the former civilizations lost in the world space to the fragmentary desolation. The “Стена” creates an image that is repeated fragmentally with various transformations in other drawings. At the same time, the motivational significance of this image is so high that as soon as angular hewn stones appear in the graphic sheet “Натюрморт (Still-life)”, the whole motif begins to sound in the viewer's mind.

The motive of the wall is highlighted in the article as characteristic of the artistic world of the Barracks, along with the motifs of amoebic, flow and mane [15, 9]. In the world of the Estonian artist, according to Lotman, form clearly opposes formlessness, geometricity to amorphousness, numbness to flow, eternity to decay [16, 14].

The motivic core is manifested not so much in drawings depicting shapeless, crumbling faces and heads, as in the folklore “Оборотень (Werewolf)”, which the artist immortalized at the moment when the monster tears off its human form and turns into a wolf in front of the viewer [17, 16] which is presented in Picture 1.



Picture 1. “Оборотень (Werewolf)” by J. Arrak (1982)

Lotman sees here an analogy with the Romantics, who have known both the mechanical world of human nature, and the horror of natural elements, inhuman chaos. Such a feeling of two nightmares was deeply inherent in Gogol, who was equally afraid of the mechanical geometry of the bureaucratic world of St. Petersburg (and more broadly, the deadness of civilization) and the metamorphosis of the forces of nature, the world of connecting things that are not connected to the human mind. This is the world of “Вия”, where a witch is a beautiful girl, a dead and a living person are the same person, and beauty and ugliness as in nature are fused together.

Lotman finds an analogue of this in Arrak in a peculiar image of a human face. Not every humanoid face in Arrak is a human face. It is not beauty or harmony that makes a truly human face, but suffering, grief, and deep mental anguish. Another motivational juxtaposition is connected with laughing, grinning, grimacing non-people and suffering people's faces. The central carrier of this motif is the drawing “Смерть единомышленника (Death of a like-minded person)” in Picture 2 [18, 19]. Just as the wall invisibly appeared where it is not in the drawing, so the suffering human

face is an invisible motif of the series of “masks” and “pagliacci” [19, 13] that is illustrated in Picture 3.



Picture 2. “Смерть единомышленника (Death of a like-minded person)” by J. Arrak (1981)



Picture 3. “На маскараде (At the masquerade)” by J. Arrak (1982)

Conclusion. The combination of repetition and modifications of the same motifs allows Lotman to see a coherent graphic text in Arrak's drawings. And his next question, which arises in connection with the graphic series, is the question of its composition. Does such a graphic text have a mandatory reading sequence? If we turn to other types of art, then in literature the novel does not allow moving chapters, and in cinema, rewinding frames changes the meaning of the film. But for the graphic series of drawings by Arrak, Lotman suggests a different type of composition, coming from mythology. The myth (as well as the epic) has no ‘beginning’ or ‘ending’, it does not form a coherent story. In everyday life, there are always only individual fragments, and their unity is given by their common connection with the deep core of the myth. It is precisely this composition, reflecting the artist's deep focus on the myth that Lotman finds in Arrak's drawings.

The conclusion of the article loops the course of Yu. M. Lotman's reasoning about the graphic series, which can simultaneously be considered as a “story and an anti-story”, is an ultra-dynamic kind of modern culture that can compete with such different areas of it as poetry and prose, film and myth.

Список использованной литературы

1. Даниэль С. М., Григорьев Р. Г. Парадокс Лотмана. // Лотман Ю. М. Об искусстве. Санкт-Петербург: Искусство – СПб, 1998. С.5.
2. Флакер А. Оптимальная проекция. // Живописная литература и литературная живопись. – М.: Три квадрата, 2008. С.71 – 87.
3. Паперный В. Культура два. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 1996.
4. Бурины С. Ю. М. Лотман и семиотика изобразительных искусств. // Лотмановский сборник 3. – М.: ОГИ, 2004. С.836 – 847.
5. Lotman J. Die grafische Folge: Erzählung und Gegenerzählung. // Figura 3 Zyklen: Internationale Buchkunst-Ausstellung. – Leipzig, 1982. S.11 – 22. [in German]
6. Lotman J. Pildijada: jutustus ja jutustuse eitus // Sirp ja Vasar. 1982. 1 okt. Lk.8; 7 okt. Lk.16. [in Estonian]
7. Lotman J. Kuvasarja: kertomus ja vastakertomus: (J. Arrakin ja F. Goyan kuvasarjosta) // Taide. 1984. Nr 4. P.54 – 59. [in Finnish]
8. Лотман М. Ю. За текстом: заметки о философском фоне тартуской семиотики (Статья первая). // Лотмановский сборник 1. – М.: ОГИ, 1995. – 217 с.
9. Письмо Л. Н. Толстого Н. Н. Страхову. 1876. 23 и 26 апреля. // Собр. соч.: в 22 т. Т.17. – М.: Худ. Литература, 1984. – 784 с.

10. Письмо А. С. Пушкина П. А. Вяземскому. 1923. 4 ноября. // Полн. собр. соч.: в 10 т. Т.10. – М.: Изд. АН СССР, 1956. С.70.
11. Лотман Ю. М. Графическая серия – рассказ и антирассказ.
12. Лотман Ю. Культура и взрыв. – М.: Гнозис, 1992.
13. Тынянов Ю. Иллюстрация. // Поэтика. История литературы. Кино. – М.: Наука, 1977. С.317.
14. Раамат Р. Стрелок. 1976. [Электронный ресурс] Режим доступа: <http://fenixclub.com/index.php?showtopic=143427>
15. Аппак Ю. Люди на балконе (1977) // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstimuuseum. Tartu, 1982, p. 9
16. Аппак Ю. В саду (1981). // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstimuuseum. Tartu, 1982, p. 14
17. Аппак Ю. Оборотень (1982). // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstimuuseum. Tartu, 1982, p. 16
18. Аппак Ю. Смерть единомышленника (1981). // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstimuuseum. Tartu, 1982, p. 19
19. Аппак Ю. На маскараде (1982). // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstimuuseum. Tartu, 1982, p. 13.

References

1. Danijel' S. M., Grigor'ev R. G. (1998) *Paradoks Lotmana [Lotman's Paradox]* // Lotman Ju. M. *Ob iskusstve*. – Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo. S.5.
2. Flaker A. (2008) *Optimal'naja proekcija [Optimal projection]* // Zhivopisnaja literatura i literaturnaja zhivopis'. – М.: Tri kvadrata. S.71 – 87.
3. Papernyj V. (1996) *Kul'tura dva [Culture two]*. – М.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
4. Burini S. (2004) *Ju. M. Lotman i semiotika izobrazitel'nyh iskusstv [Y. M. Lotman and semiotics of fine arts]* // Lotmanovskij sbornik 3. – М.: OGI. S.836 – 847.
5. Lotman J. (1982) *Die grafische Folge: Erzählung und Gegenerzählung*. // Figura 3 Zyklen: Internationale Buchkunst-Ausstellung. – Leipzig. S.11 – 22. [
6. Lotman J. (1982) *Pildijada: jutustus ja jutustuse eitus* // Sirp ja Vasar. 1982. 1 okt. Lk.8; 7 okt. Lk.16.
7. Lotman J. (1984) *Kuvasarja: kertomus ja vastakertomus: (J. Arrakin ja F. Goyan kuvasarjosta)* // Taide. Nr 4. P.54 – 59.
8. Lotman M. Ju. (1995) *Za tekstom: zametki o filosofskom fone tartuskoj semiotiki (Stat'ja pervaja).[Behind the text: notes on the philosophical background of Tartu semiotics (Article one)]* // Lotmanovskij sbornik 1. – М.: OGI, 1995. – 217 p.
9. *Pis'mo L. N. Tolstogo N. N. Strahovu. 1876. 23 i 26 aprelja. [A letter from L. N. Tolstoy to N. N. Strakhov. 1876. April 23 and 26.]* (1984) // Sobr. soch.: v 22 t. T.17. – М.: Hud. Literatura. – 784 p.
10. *Pis'mo A. S. Pushkina P. A. Vjazemskomu. 1923. 4 nojabrja. [Letter of A. S. Pushkin to P. A. Vyazemsky. 1923. November 4]* (1956) // Poln. sobr. soch.: v 10 t. T.10. – М.: Изд. АН СССР, P.70.
11. Lotman Ju. M. *Graficheskaja serija – rasskaz i antirasskaz [Graphic series – story and anti-story]*
12. Lotman Ju. (1992) *Kul'tura i vzryv. [Culture and Explosion]* –М.: Gnozis. [in Russian]
13. Тынжанов Ю. (1977) *Illjustracija. [Illustration]*// Pojetika. Istorija literatury. Kino. – М.: Nauka. P.317.
14. Raamat R. Strelok. 1976. [Electronic resource] Available at: <http://fenixclub.com/index.php?showtopic=143427>

15. Arrak Ju. (1982) *Ljudi na balkone [People on the balcony] (1977)* // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstmuuseum. Tartu, p. 9
16. Arrak Ju. (1982) *V sadu [In the garden] (1981)*. // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstmuuseum. Tartu, p. 14
17. Arrak Ju. (1982) *Oboroten' [The Werewolf] (1982)*. // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstmuuseum. Tartu, p. 16
18. Arrak Ju. (1982) *Smert' edinomyshlennika [The Death of a like-minded person] (1981)*. // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstmuuseum. Tartu, p. 19
19. Arrak Ju. (1982) *Na maskarade [At the masquerade] (1982)*. // Jüri Arraku joonistused: [näituse kataloog] / Tartu Riiklik Kunstmuuseum. Tartu, p. 13.