DOI 10.31489/2023HPh2/375-381

UDC

IRSTI 13.07

A. Tasbolatuly[1*], S. Hejazi[2], Z.N. Ismagambetova[1]

[1] Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan;
[2] Fondazoine Bruno Kessler, Roma Tre University, Italia
(E-mail: Alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru.hejazi@fbk.eu. zuchra-50@mail.ru)

Symbolic Concepts of Culture and the Problem of Language of Cinema

One of the urgent tasks in culturological science is the study of the problem of the language of cinema in the context of culture. An important role in the formation of the language of cinema was played by theoretical and methodological symbolic studies of culture. In this regard, in this article, the authors consider the main provisions and tasks of the symbolic study of culture, the formation of symbolism in the construction of the language of literature, poetry, in general, their role in the formation of a symbolic understanding of cultural phenomena in human life. The authors of this article analyze the influence of symbolic studies of culture on the formation of the language of cinema. The main objectives of the article are to determine the theoretical contribution of symbolic studies in the study of culture, to show their influence on the formation of the language of cinema. To this end, the authors analyzed the main works of scientists involved in the study of culture from the standpoint of a symbolic approach. The novelty of the study lies in determining the role of symbolic studies of culture in shaping the language of cinema. Determining the contribution of symbolic concepts to the study of culture, the authors of the article emphasize the influence of these studies on the formation of the language of cinema, but at the same time, the construction of a symbolic language.

Keywords: symbols, symbolic concepts of culture, sign, cinema, film language, symbolism, film symbols, symbolic film language of culture, literary language.

Introduction

Cinema occupies an important place in modern human life. Cinema is not only one of the dominant factors influencing human socialization, but cinema describes a variety of social practices and forms of human social behavior in society. In modern conditions, cinema begins to construct and represent a new reality — cinematic reality with the help of signs, and symbols, and with the help of language it is possible to describe its location. Scientists in the field of philosophy of culture, cultural studies, and art history draw attention to the need to study this aspect of the problem.

Over the past thirty years of the 21st century, in the philosophical, humanitarian, and social sciences, including in the field of the science of culture, the task of studying the meaning of the linguistic description of the surrounding world, various social practices and attitudes to the surrounding reality have become an increasing priority. An analysis of research in the philosophy of culture, in the field of cultural research, shows that the problem of linguistic meaning in human social life is one of the urgent problems and priority areas in the field of media and multi-media research, including cinema. Recently, it has become one of the modern areas of cultural research. Therefore, the study of language as a sociocultural structure, as part of behavior, and as socio-cultural action, modeled by the institutions of cultures, set by society, becomes an urgent task of the science of culture, philosophy of culture, and cultural studies. In this regard, a significant place is occupied by symbolic studies of the language of not only media and multimedia institutions, but also studies of such a problem as the language of cinema.

The ideas and provisions developed by scientists in the symbolic study of culture played an important role in the formation of the language of cinema. Among the well-known researchers, the American school of C.W. Morris, French scientists Claude Lévi-Strauss, Algirdas Greimas, Tsvetan Todorov, Roland Barthes, Yulia Kristeva, Michel Foucault, Georges de Lacan, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida should be noted. In Italy, semiotic research was carried out by Umberto Eco.

Of the Russian researchers, the works of Yu.M. Lotman, Z.G. Mints, I.A. Chernov, V.N. Toporov, V.V. Ivanov, B.A. Uspensky, and L.O. Reznikov, V.A. Shtoff, M.S. Kagan, A.K. Baiburin, A. Gryakalov,

* Corresponding author's e-mail: *Alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru*

I.I. Dokuchaev, S.T. Makhlina, S.V. Chebanov, T.V. Chernigovskaya, L.F. Chertov, A. Utekhin, as well as J.N. Tynyanov, M.B. Eikhenbaum, V.B. Shklovsky, and S. Eisenstein and others should be noted.

An important task in the aspect of the identified priority tasks of sociocultural knowledge is also the determination of linguistic meanings in the models of human behavior presented in a cinema, the analysis of the place and role of symbols in cinema, and the analysis of interpretations. As studies show, the place of symbols in the language of cinema is very important, in particular, they are significant: what and how the protagonist of the movie says, it is important to reveal the thought that he expresses, and the thought that the director wanted to convey, or some final thought he wanted to convey through this symbol. As follows from the analysis of research, cinema models our life in a certain symbolic space, in cinematic reality, denoting various aspects of behavior, communication, and attitude to the surrounding symbolic reality with the language of meanings, the language of symbols. This aspect of the problem in the domestic and foreign scientific literature has not been sufficiently studied and therefore today is one of the urgent tasks in cultural studies.

The goal of this article is to analyze the influence of symbolic studies of culture on the formation of the language of cinema. The main objectives of the article are to determine the theoretical contribution of scientists to the symbolic studies of culture and to show their influence on the formation of the language of cinema. The novelty of the study lies in determining the role of symbolic studies of culture in the formation of the language of cinema.

Methodology and research methods

This study was based on the methods of historical and cultural approach. As well as the method of historicism, the method of cultural analysis and culture-relativism. We thought that these methods would reveal our scientific article well.

Discussion

The genesis of symbolic studies of culture dates to the beginning of the 20th century, based on a generalization, rethinking of the place and role of symbolism as an artistic movement in literature, painting, and other arts, which reached its peak in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in France, Belgium, Germany, Norway, America, and Russia. This period in the development of art is characterized by increased attention to the role of symbolism in the struggle against everyday realism and militant materialism at the turn of the 19th-20th centuries, which played an important role in the renewal of art at the beginning of the 20th century.

The process of rethinking the place and role of symbols in art leads to the fact that many leaders and ideologists of symbolism perceive the world as a manifestation of the secret language of symbols. As a result, the whole world appears in the understanding of the symbolists as a manifestation of deep hidden meanings. The Symbolists were inclined to look primarily in words and objects for signs of something else. As the ideologists of symbolism believed, the symbol seeks to capture all things and phenomena in their theory and practice.

It is no coincidence that contemporaries perceived the first Symbolists primarily as preachers of extreme forms of subjectivism and egocentrism, and this is no accident. N. Arutyunova, exploring symbolic images in Russian literature and poetry, notes thus, Valery Bryusov, a well-known leader and ideologist of symbolism in the 1890s, noted that the secret of modern art lies in the realization of “the deep thought that the whole world is in me” [1]. In their works, the Symbolists tried to depict the life experienced by every soul, full of dark, invisible moods, tender feelings, and fleeting impressions. Symbolist poets are innovators, filling poetry with new, vivid, impressive images, sometimes trying to achieve their form, playing with words and sounds that critics consider meaningless.

Symbolism, as noted by theorists, distinguishes between two worlds: the world of things and the world of ideas. The symbol becomes a kind of conventional sign that connects these worlds in the sense that it creates. Every symbol has two sides: the signified and the signifying. This other side turns into an unreal world, and art is the key to unraveling this mystery. The ideologists of symbolism figuratively depict the artistic features and aesthetic principles of the “symbolic” direction in art (what was said here about poetry applies to other types of art) and draws attention to the fact that with the help of symbols the language of poetry [2-4], in including the language of art is filled with deep meanings, images, in which the play on words, the ambiguity of verbal expressions acquire special significance, accents on sounds, colors play an important role,

which is enhanced by intuition, imagination, while the subconscious of the poet, artist, writer also plays a special role [5, 6].

Analyzing the application of the symbolic method in relation to various types of art, we conclude that poetry, cinema literature, and other types of art are beginning to widely use not only artistic meanings in creating an artistic, poetic, and literary image, but also begin to work with symbols, images, thus setting an ambiguity covered with a mystery. Due to the ambiguity of the word, the symbolic image creates a whole range of associative meanings, which due to the power of imagination and fantasy, create the opportunity to express some transcendental beauty of the universe with the help of a symbol [7, 8].

An important contribution to the study of symbolic studies of culture was also made by well-known philosophers such as the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, the German philosopher F. Cassirer, the American cultural scientist L.A. White, Russian scientist M. Bakhtin and others.

It is known that F. Saussure first drew attention to the symbolic understanding of culture. According to him, the science of culture should be singled out along with linguistics, which studies only the linguistic system of signs, and art that has intuitively outlined the important place and role of symbols in the artistic vision of reality. He believed that this science can investigate all sign systems in their entirety. According to F. Saussure, culture can be considered as a strictly hierarchical "text", the basis of which is a natural language associated with other "languages", i.e. systems of signs in science, everyday life, and especially in art [9].

The idea of the place and role of the symbol in culture was further developed by the German philosopher F. Cassirer, a representative of the Marburg school of neo-Kantianism. The philosopher believed that the whole world of culture is the result of human symbolic activity. All spheres of culture are symbolic forms, which, on the one hand, denote real objects of reality, and, on the other hand, each sphere creates its world of meanings.

American scientist L.A. White developed in his research the idea of culture itself assigning meaning to objects and phenomena of cultural reality with the help of symbols, and signs, and therefore, the scientist's task is to reveal the meanings given to symbolic forms with the help of cultural analysis, to identify ways of constructing meanings in structured contexts.

The results of studies of the sign and symbolic nature of language had a significant impact on the formation of symbolic and semiotic studies of culture, including the language of art.

Symbolic and semiotic studies of culture, as the conceptual space expanded, gradually had a theoretical influence on studies in the field of art, including cinema.

One of the first approaches to the study of the place and role of signs not only in culture, but in cinema are the works of J.N. Tynyanov, M.B. Eikhenbaum, V.B. Shklovsky, and S. Eisenstein. In 1933, R. Yakobson in his article "The Decline of Cinematography?" for the first time draws attention to the need to focus on the fact that "every phenomenon of the external world turns into a sign on the screen". Based on this idea, he believed that this phenomenon should be considered the main feature of the film [10]. In 1946, the French film critic J. Cohen-CEA drew attention to the fact that the film does not always clearly represent the sacred unit (for example, morphemes or words in natural language) and the peculiar grammatical structure of the phenomenon. Therefore, the viewer himself, based on intuition and association, has to think up images, and symbols, and capture the natural meanings hidden in the reality that connects the movie character with an indefinite and constantly changing nature. This idea of J. Cohen played an important role in the formation of new approaches to the comprehension of signs, and symbols, presented in non-verbal behavior and the acting of an actor.

In 1931, the Czech philologist Ya. Mukarzhovsky published the work "An attempt at a structural analysis of the actor's phenomenon". In this work, he attempted to analyze Charlie Chaplin's life written by C. Chaplin. C. Chaplin's life was presented by Mukarzhovsky as a kind of symbolic structure [11, 12]. In it, each element receives meaning only in relation to another element. Based on this approach, the scientist proposed the first classification of actors' gestures as symbols. Developing this idea, C. Metz put forward the idea of a cinematic sign. According to Metz, cinema is not language, but speech, in the course of which language is constituted. The film, as it was, "speaks" with the help of heterogeneous sign systems — sociocultural, stylistic, perceptual (associated with perception), etc., which introduce their own codes into the film. In the film, these codes are superimposed on each other, intertwined and create the basis for "reading" the film, identifying iconic units [13-16].

It should be noted that studies of the place and role of signs, and symbols in movies, manifested in the acting of an actor, in his behavior in communication, in directing and screenwriting, including operator and

camera work, show how important the symbolic and semiotic components become in cinema. R. Bart in his work "The Problem of Meaning in Cinema" [17], Mitry in his book "Aesthetics and Psychology of Cinema" [18], French scientist M. Merleau-Ponty, P. Wallen, P. Pasolini and others draw attention to this. All scientists note the close connection of signs, symbols, and human behavior, which in the movie acquires a symbolic function. This symbolic specificity of cinema begins to work on three or more sign levels, for example, the icon (consisting in relation to the similarity with its object), indices (consisting in relation to the physical relationship with the object), and symbols (symbols of objects). This aspect was once noticed by the Italian semiologist Umberto Eco, who proposed the theory of "triple division" in cinema. The "triple division" of film language, according to Eco, is much richer than the language of literature and creates the illusion of reality, masking multi-level works.

As follows from research, language is an important component of this system. On the one hand, language, according to this concept, acts as a sign system, while language is not only a means of communication, the exchange of thoughts, and ideas, but at the same time, language registers and consolidates the results of thinking in words, acting simultaneously as a means of forming human thought. Thus, language is understood as the result of human activity, as a system of norms developed in culture, in accordance with which there is a comprehension of some information carriers specially created for this purpose. On the other hand, in our opinion, these studies have shown that the symbolic studies of culture have made a positive contribution to the study of the language of cinema. One of the important aspects of such research is the study of the problem of recoding the language of book culture into the language of cinema, where an important task is to analyze the meanings of symbols, signs in the space of cinema-reality, their forms and methods for constructing and describing sociocultural forms of interactions, people's behavior on the screen, in which certain meanings are reproduced, which are characteristic of a certain historical era, fixed in the style of clothing, manner of communication, behavior, facial expressions, and gestures. Thus, symbolic studies of culture are now widely supported and in demand in contemporary cinema. Everywhere in any cinematic reality there is a symbol. The symbolic studies of culture not only influenced the formation of the language of cinema but also expanded the possibilities of cinema in creating visual symbolic realities, and contributed to the creation and development of a new reality, a new naturalness, to the dynamics and syntax of images.

Results

In modern conditions, screen art, in particular cinema, is part of the dominant culture. Cinema is becoming not only one of the most popular types of art but also one of the dominant institutions of culture, which is entrusted with both the function of socialization and the function of inculturation. Cinema broadcasts and consolidates the most significant and general types of social behavior, communication, and a system of socially significant values, has a significant impact on the human psyche, shaping his worldview, performing the function of conveying moral and aesthetic values, cultural communication, conveying through symbols, symbolic structures of generally significant for a person ways of cultural and ethnic identity.

Based on the basic principles, ideas, and methodological approaches of the symbolic concepts of culture, in our opinion, it can be stated that any genre of cinema widely uses a sign and symbolic systems in the construction of cinema reality, and each sign and symbol represents a certain action. So, for example, in historical cinema, there is an audiovisual image (sign), which is customarily singled out. A visual sign conveys visual information to the viewer, a visual range that interprets it in a certain sense in accordance with the algorithm set by a given culture. The use of sound to highlight an image (sign, symbol-image), which is provided by an audiovisual sign, is a certain sequence of events occurring in a frame. Cinema captures movement with photographic accuracy, and the movement itself acts as a sign that conveys the image through an icon symbol. At the same time, the meaning of each sign is constructed in accordance with the algorithms of the mother culture, in accordance with its system of values, behavior, and communication features. Cinema, therefore, is able to create its own meanings by breaching sequences of absolutely any level: a color frame — a black-and-white frame, movement — immobility, a visual range — darkness, a sound range — silence, and so on.

As the analysis shows, in modern cinema symbols are widely used, images-symbols, in which certain meanings are invested for understanding the meaning and ideas of the ongoing event, or action, determined by the mother culture. Metaphors, comparisons, deep relationships through artistic analogies, symbolic metaphors, and analogies of "smell of sound", "color of note", and "aroma of thought" testify to the proximity of various external phenomena, the search for a single fundamental principle, the original source of all thoughts and feelings, "their eternal meaning", while each of the listed elements appears as a complex symbolic and

semiotic system, as a complex language of cinema, and the content of the elements present is constructed in the context of the basic culture.

Modern films make extensive use of symbolic language to convey a particular meaning. The car number or graffiti on the buildings of city streets, or costumes can act as symbols, and the interior of the room can convey to us the features of the era, the behavior of people of a certain culture, the values and features of ethnic culture, the features of cultural identity. The language of cinema has recently become much richer due to the development of multimedia communications. With the help of the symbolic language of cinema, it is possible not only to broadcast certain ideological and organizing symbols, which were very productively used in the creation of Soviet films but also to invest in accordance with ideological patterns of the dominant Soviet codes of socialist culture or codes of mass culture, as is typical for the modern language of cinema.

The language of cinema not only constructs images-symbols, but also fills the new cinematic reality with new meanings, and cultural codes of the 21st century. The language of cinema performs an educational function, visualizing the myth of a new reality, and teaching a new system of symbolism. The language of cinema visualizes the image of joy from carnival participation with everyone, generating affects, emotions, and spiritual and social energy of involvement in what is happening.

With the advent of cinema, an active process of cultural assimilation on the screen begins. With the widespread use of computer systems, the culture of transcoding the language of book culture into the language of the screen has become universal. The new reality speaks of a change in cultural eras, the end of the era of "book" (written, typed) culture, where the book was the main carrier, keeper, and transmitter of cultural information, and the advent of a new era of "screen culture", where the main carrier, keeper and transmitter of cultural information becomes a sign, a symbol, a symbol-image.

Conclusion

Summarizing the analysis of the tasks posed in this article, we come to the conclusion that studies of the symbolic method in art, and symbolic concepts of culture have influenced the understanding that symbols have a special place and significance in human life, symbols denote various aspects of our everyday and traditional ethnic culture, symbols are widely used in cinema art, and also influenced the formation of the language of cinema. Each symbol in the cinema can denote the world around us and define the world it represents. Each symbol, as it was, "hides" the world, and "hints" at the existence of many hidden worlds. Each symbol and sign can designate what could not be said in one or another era and reveal what prevented the author from saying openly in his historical time, in a specific cultural era. Through the language of art, the language of cinema, one can construct a kind of visual reality, where various events and objects can be described in the symbolic language of cinema. From the first eras of cinema to our time, the connection between cinema and symbolism is very close. At first, when there was no sound in the cinema, actors or characters conveyed the script to the audience through some kind of symbol. Since the advent of sound in cinematography, directors have used symbolism in many ways. Even the clothes of the actors, their actions, and the style of make-up can be understood by seeing the symbolism of the direction desired by the director. In this regard, we call cinema art and symbolism a cultural direction that develops very closely and complements each other. And we say with full confidence that the benefits of this synthesis are enormous.

References

1 Арутюнова Н.Д. От образа к знаку / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Мышление, когнитивные науки, искусственный интеллект. М.: Наука, 1988. — С. 154–162.

2 Базин А. Что такое кино? / А. Базин. — М.: Искусство, 1972. — С. 9.

3 Бальмонт К.Д. Элементарные слова о символической поэзии / К.Д. Бальмонт // Горные вершины. — М.: Книгоиздательство «Гриф», 1904.— С. 75–95.

4 Бальмонт К.Д. Поэзия как волшебство / К.Д. Бальмонт. — М.: Скорпион, 1915.

5 Лавров А.В. Русские символисты / А.В. Лавров. — М.: Прогресс–Плеяда, 2006.

6 Лотман Ю. Сюжетное пространство русского романа XIX века / Ю. Лотман // Избранные статьи: [В 3-х т.]. — Т.3. — Таллинн: Александра, 1993. — С. 91–106.

7 Браиловский М. Кинематография и футуризм / М. Браиловский // Синий фон. — 1913. — № 23.

8 Бурлик Д. О футуристическом кино / Д.О. Бурлик // Киножурнал. — 1913. — № 22.

9 Соссюр Ф. Заметки по общей лингвистике / Ф. де Соссюр. — М.: Изд. группа «Прогресс», 2016. — 274 с.

10 Якобсон. Р. Язык и бессознательное / Р. Якобсон. — М.: Гнозис, 1996. — С. 170.

11 Мукаржовский Я. Опыт структурного анализа феномена актера / Я. Мукаржовский // Исследования по эстетике и теории искусства. — М.: Искусство, 1994. — С. 207.

12 Мукаржовский Я. Искусство как семиологический факт / Я. Мукаржовский // Исследования по эстетике и теории искусства. — М.: Искусство,1994. — С. 190–198.

13 Metz C. Essais sur la signification au cinema. Vol. 1-2 / C. Metz. — Paris: Klincksieck, 1968. — 72 p.

14 Metz C. Langage et cinema / C. Metz. — Paris: Larousse, 1971.

15 Metz C. Le signifiant imaginaire / C. Metz // Psychanalyse et cinema. — 1977. — No 23. — P. 3-55.

16 Metz, Ch. (1990). Film Language. University of Chicago.

17 Барт Р. Проблема значения кино / Р. Барт // Система моды. Статьи по семиотике культуры. — М.: Изд-во им. Сабашниковых, 2003. — С. 358.

18 Mitry, J. The Aesthetics and Psychology of Cinema. Indiana University Press. — 1997.

Ә. Тасболатұлы, С. Хеджази, З.Н. Исмагамбетова

Мәдениеттің символдық концептілері және кино тілі

Мәдениеттану ғылымындағы өзекті міндеттердің бірі — мәдениет контексіндегі кино тілі мәселесін зерттеу. Кино тілінің пайда болуы мен қалыптасуында мәдениеттің теориялық және әдіснамалық символдық зерттеулері маңызды рөл атқарады. Осыған байланысты осы мақалада мәдениеттің символдық зерттеулерінің негізгі ережелері мен міндеттері, әдебиет тілін, жалпы поэзияны құруда символизмді қалыптастыру, олардың адам өміріндегі мәдени құбылыстарды символдық түсінуді қалыптастырудағы рөлі қарастырылған. Авторлар мәдениеттің символдық зерттеулерінің кино тілін қалыптастыруға әсерін талдаған. Зерттеудің негізгі міндеттері — мәдениетті зерттеудегі символдық зерттеулердің теориялық үлесін анықтау, олардың кино тілін қалыптастыруға әсерін көрсету. Осы мақсатта мақалада символдық көзқарас тұрғысынан мәдениетті зерттеумен айналысатын ғалымдардың негізгі жұмыстары талданған. Өнердегі рәміздердің әсері мен мағынасының негізгі аспектілері анықталды, сонымен қатар идеялар, ғалымдардың мәдениет тіліне қосқан үлесі және олардың кино тілін қалыптастырудағы рөлі талданды. Зерттеудің жаңалығы — кино тілін қалыптастырудағы мәдениеттің символдық зерттеулерінің рөлін анықтау. Символдық тұжырымдамалардың мәдениетті зерттеуге қосқан үлесін анықтай отырып, мақала авторлары бұл зерттеулердің кино тілін қалыптастыруға, сонымен бірге символдық тілді құруға әсерін атап көрсетеді.

Кілт сөздер: рәміздер, мәдениеттің символдық ұғымдары, белгі, кино, кинотілі, символизм, кинорәміздері, мәдениеттің символикалық кинотілі, әдебиет тілі.

Ә. Тасболатұлы, С. Хеджази, З.Н. Исмагамбетова

Символические концепции культуры и проблема языка кино

Одной из актуальных задач в культурологической науке является исследование проблемы языка кино в контексте культуры. Важную роль в становлении и формировании языка кино оказали теоретико-методологические символические исследования культуры. В этой связи в настоящей статье рассмотрены основные положения и задачи символических исследований культуры, формирование символизма в конструировании языка литературы, поэзии в целом, их роль в формировании символического понимания культурных феноменов в жизни человека. Авторы провели анализ влияния символических исследований культуры на формирование языка кино. Основные задачи исследования — определение теоретического вклада символических исследований в исследовании культуры, показ их влияния на формирование языка кино. С этой целью в статье проанализированы основные работы ученых, занимающихся исследованиями культуры с позиций символического подхода. Определены основные аспекты влияния и значения символов в искусстве, а также проанализированы идеи, вклад ученых в язык культуры и их роли в формировании языка кино. Новизна исследования заключается в выявлении роли символических исследований культуры в формировании языка кино. Определяя вклад символических концепций в исследование культуры, авторы статьи подчеркивают влияние этих исследований на формирование языка кино, но и в то же время конструирование символического языка.

Ключевые слова: символы, символические концепты культуры, знак, кино, киноязык, символизм, киносимволы, символический киноязык культуры, литературный язык.

References

1 Arutyunova, N.D. (1988). Ot obraza k znaku [From image to sign]. *Myshlenie, kognitivnye nauki, iskusstvennyi intellekt - Thinking, cognitive sciences, artificial intelligence,* 154–162. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

2 Bazin, A. (1972). Chto takoe kino? [What is cinema?]. Moscow: Iskusstvo [in Russian].

3 Balmont, K.D. (1904). Elementarnye slova o simvolicheskoi poezii [Elementary Words on Symbolic Poetry]. *Gornye vershiny — Mountain peaks*. Moscow: Knigoizdatelstvo «Grif», 75–95 [in Russian].

4 Balmont, K.D. (1915). Poeziia kak volshebstvo [Poetry is like magic]. Moscow: Skorpion [in Russian].

5 Lavrov, A.V. (2006). Russkie simvolisty [Russian symbolists]. Moscow: Progress–Pleiada [in Russian].

6 Lotman, J. (1993). Siuzhetnoe prostranstvo russkogo romana XIX veka [The plot space of the Russian novel of the 19th century]. *Izbrannye stati — Selected articles*, V. 3. (Vols. 1-3). Tallinn: Aleksandra [in Russian].

7 Brailovskii, M. (1913). Kinematografiia i futurizm [Cinematography and futurism]. *Sinii fon — Blue background, 23* [in Russian].

8 Burlik, D. (1913). O futuristicheskom kino [About futuristic cinema]. *Kinozhurnal — Movie-magazine, 22* [in Russian].

9 Saussure, F. (2016). Zametki po obshchei lingvistike [Notes on General Linguistics]. Moscow: Izdatelskaia gruppa «Progress» [in Russian].

10 Yakobson, R. (1996). Yazyk i bessoznatelnoe [Language and the unconscious]. Moscow: Gnozis [in Russian].

11 Mukarzhovsky, Ya. (1994). Opyt strukturnogo analiza fenomena aktera [Structural Analysis of the Actor's Phenomenon]. *Issledovaniia po estetike i teorii iskusstva — Studies in aesthetics and art theory*. Moscow: Iskusstvo [in Russian].

12 Mukarzhovsky, Ya. (1994). Iskusstvo kak semiologicheskii fakt [Art as a Semiological Fact]. *Issledovaniia po estetike i teorii iskusstva — Studies in aesthetics and art theory*. Moscow: Iskusstvo [in Russian].

13 Metz, C. (1968). Essais sur la signification au cinema. V. 1-2. Paris: Klincksieck [in French].

14 Metz, C. (1971). Langage et cinéma. Paris: Larousse [in French].

15 Metz C. (1977). Le signifiant imaginaire. *Psychanalyse et cinema, 23*, 3-55 [in French].

16 Metz, Ch. (1990). Film Language. University of Chicago.

17 Bart, R. (2003). Problema znacheniia kino [The Problem of Meaning in Cinema]. *Sistema mody. Stati po semiotike kultury — Fashion System; Articles on the semiotics of culture.* Moscow: Izdatelstvo imtni Sabashnikovykh [in Russian].

18 Mitry, J. (1997). The Aesthetics and Psychology of Cinema. Indiana University Press.