

## CONCEPTUAL AND SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF SEMIOSIS OF Y. M. LOTMAN AND C. S. PIERCE

**Тюкмаева А.М.\***

Mirzo Ulugbek National University of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)  
luxin.tenebris@mail.ru

**Тюкмаева А.М.\***

Национальный университет Узбекистана им. Мирзо Улугбека  
(Ташкент, Узбекистан)  
luxin.tenebris@mail.ru

**Abstract.** This article presents an analysis of the conceptual and semantic aspects of semiosis as interpreted by Yuri M. Lotman and Charles S. Peirce. The comparison reveals both convergences and divergences in their approaches to understanding the nature of sign systems and the mechanisms of semiotic communication. Particular attention is given not only to the theoretical foundations of semiosis but also to its cyclical nature and to the interaction of signs and their meanings within cultural contexts determined by historical, social, and cultural factors. The study focuses on a comparative examination of two paradigms of sign thinking – Peirce’s concept of intentionality and Lotman’s model of the text as an integral semiotic space, which elucidates the complex nature of sign relations and their cultural-communicative function. In addition, the paper discusses practical applications of semiotic analysis in literary studies, art theory, and socio-cultural research, thereby opening new perspectives for further development of the humanities methodology.

**Keywords:** semiosis, conceptual-semantic aspects, Yu. M. Lotman, C. S. Peirce, sign systems, intentionality, semiotic analysis.

### *Introduction*

In the context of research conducted by the distinguished representatives of semiotic science, Yuri Mikhailovich Lotman and Charles Sanders Peirce, semiosis, understood as the process of sign activity, serves as a central concept that enables a deeper understanding of the mechanisms underlying the emergence and functioning of cultural phenomena, as well as their semiotic and communicative dimensions. The analysis of semiosis in the works of these scholars emphasizes the necessity of a comprehensive approach to the study of sign actions as fundamental components of human communication, drawing attention to the interrelation between the sign, the interpreter, and the context within which interpretation occurs.

In Lotman’s conceptual framework, semiosis is viewed as a process of decoding and interpreting symbols within a cultural system, where special importance is attached to the role of codes, understood as intellectual constructs. By defining the boundaries of possible meanings of signs, codes model the dynamics

\* Author-correspondent - Tyukmaeva A.M., luxin.tenebris@mail.ru

of meaning formation within the multilayered structure of cultural phenomena. Within this theoretical perspective, the concept of the model becomes a key analytical tool that demonstrates the interconnections and correlations between accumulated knowledge and empirical experience of reality.

The semiotic space shaped by this dialogue is characterized by a multiplicity of contextual and spatial components, each contributing to the formation of a holistic perception of the sign, its semantic richness, and its functional significance within the cultural system.

### *Methodology*

This study employs a qualitative, interdisciplinary methodology combining semiotic, structural, and conceptual-semantic analysis to examine the theoretical foundations of semiosis in the works of Yuri M. Lotman and Charles S. Peirce. The research design is grounded in comparative and interpretive approaches that aim to identify both the convergences and divergences in their conceptualizations of sign processes and meaning-making. Semiotic analysis is used to explore the internal structure and functions of sign systems, while the conceptual-semantic approach provides tools for interpreting the interrelations among key categories such as sign, code, model, and context. The study also incorporates elements of hermeneutic interpretation to reveal the philosophical and cultural dimensions underlying the theories of Lotman and Peirce. This methodological framework enables a comprehensive understanding of semiosis as a dynamic process of cultural communication and cognitive interaction, situated within a broader interdisciplinary context of semiotic and cultural studies.

### *The Contributions of Yuri M. Lotman and Charles S. Peirce*

Within the framework of a multifaceted analysis of the conceptual and semantic foundations of semiosis developed by the prominent thinkers Yuri M. Lotman and Charles S. Peirce, special attention should be paid to the points of intersection and divergence in their understanding of the nature of the sign and the symbol, which have had a significant impact on the development of modern semiotic theory. Lotman, viewing the semiosphere as a complex hierarchical system of signs, emphasizes the multilayered nature of cultural texts and their role in processes of sociocultural dynamics, highlighting that signs not only transmit information but also participate in the formation of cultural identity.

Peirce, in turn, within the framework of his triadic model of the sign, distinguishes three main categories—icons, indices, and symbols—which make it possible to explore more deeply the mechanisms of interaction between signs, objects, and interpretants, thereby substantially expanding the boundaries of semiotic analysis.

Turning to the works of other theorists of the sign, such as Ferdinand de Saussure, who focused on the binary opposition between signifier and signified, allows us to identify methodological parallels with Lotman's approach, which considers signs not only as elements of a linguistic system but also as instruments of interaction among different cultural codes.

In turn, Umberto Eco, emphasizing intertextuality and the importance of cultural contexts, develops Lotman's ideas by giving them an additional dimension. He interprets semiosis as a dynamic and open process in which meaning is formed not in isolation but through interaction with a multitude of other signs and symbols that participate in the construction of the cultural space of meaning.

Since for Yuri M. Lotman semiosis is associated with the process of meaning generation and the interpretation of signs within a cultural system, the concept of the code, which defines the potential meanings of a sign, and the notion of the model, which describes the relationship between knowledge and reality, acquire particular significance. Lotman emphasizes the key role of context and the spatial organization of the cultural field in the process of interpretation, which presupposes the necessity of considering contextual and spatial factors. Their combination forms the conditions for the emergence and transformation of meanings, creating the necessary environment for the functioning of sign systems and underscoring the importance of a detailed analysis of the relationships between signs, their interpretations, and their cultural surroundings. The complex interrelation of codes, models, and context constitutes the methodological foundation for a deep understanding of the processes occurring within the cognitive and semantic space of culture.

At the same time, Charles S. Peirce, drawing on the ideas of his predecessors and elaborating on previously formulated concepts, refines the theory of semiosis as a multistage and multidimensional process of interpretation based on the use of signs for the purposes of perceiving and understanding the surrounding world, functioning within a complex structure of sign relations [1]. According to his conceptual framework, signs are classified into three main categories: iconic, indexical, and symbolic, each characterized by a particular level of abstraction and type of correlation between the sign and the object it represents.

Thus, iconic signs represent analogies or similarities created through visual or sensory characteristics, implying a degree of resemblance between the sign and its object. Indexical signs, by contrast, establish contextually determined relations based on the principle of cause and effect, making them dependent on the presence of certain features or conditions that point to the existence of the referent [2]. Symbolic signs, possessing a high degree of abstraction, function through arbitrary and culturally established meanings, emphasizing their dependence on the sociocultural context within which they are formed and interpreted.

It should be noted that Charles S. Peirce emphasizes that semiosis is not an isolated process but a dynamic interaction between signs and their interpreters. Each act of semiosis takes place through the direct interaction of signs within specific social and cultural conditions, leading to the formation and transformation of cognitive structures. Thus, the significance of the sociocultural context in the process of semiosis not only illustrates the complexity of sign relations but also highlights the necessity of analyzing the interaction of signs both within individual acts of communication and within broader cultural and historical narratives. This perspective turns Peirce's theory into an important methodological tool for the study and understanding of human cognition and interaction.

*Lotman's Semiotic Model of Culture*

In the formation and development of Russian semiotics, a significant and undeniable role was played by the outstanding theorist of the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School, Yuri M. Lotman. Building on the ideas of his predecessors and contemporaries, he defined his own research approach as structural-semiotic, focusing on the interpretation of signs within the context of their social functions and semantic connections. Within his theory, Lotman identifies three key characteristics that, in his view, are fundamental to understanding semiotics as a multilayered and multifunctional discipline.

First, drawing on the concept of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, Yuri M. Lotman argued that semiology, as the science of signs, is directly linked to the context of social life, in which every sign acquires meaning only in relation to other signs and social practices. This principle emphasizes the importance of contextualization in the processes of communication and meaning-making [3].

Second, Lotman considers semiotics as a universal methodological tool of the humanities, capable of penetrating various fields of research and providing a multifaceted analysis of cultural objects. This approach makes it possible to reveal their meanings and functions within diverse cultural and social systems, demonstrating the interdisciplinary potential of the semiotic method.

Third, in Lotman's definition, semiotics appears not only as a system of signs but also as "a distinctive feature of the researcher's scientific methodology and the nature of their cognitive consciousness," implying that the understanding and interpretation of signs are mediated by individual and collective cognitive processes that shape a specific type of scientific perception [4].

The idea put forward by Yuri M. Lotman is based on the fundamental postulate of the "presumption of semioticity," which implies the necessity of considering any cultural phenomena as sign-based constructions, thereby greatly expanding the possibilities for their in-depth semiotic analysis [5]. In this context, it should be emphasized that human existence and the entire complex of cultural artifacts subject to semiotic interpretation constitute a system in which each object functions as a sign, integrating into the broader context of culture.

Since within the cultural continuum there are no elements free from signification, the analysis of any of its components inevitably begins from a semiotic perspective, which underscores the priority of the semiotic approach, particularly in the context of the semiotics of culture.

In this light, one of the key concepts of the Tartu–Moscow School becomes the research problem of the text. According to Yuri M. Lotman, the text is regarded as a multidimensional, complexly structured, and multilayered phenomenon. His methodological approach can be defined as "textocentric," since it is the text that occupies a central position in the structure of cultural semiotics, serving as both a source of meaning generation and a mechanism for the reproduction of cultural discourse.

Thus, the text, as a cultural phenomenon, represents a complex and multilayered structure encompassing all levels of cultural production and perception, which allows it to be considered a multifaceted phenomenon. According to Yuri M. Lotman, "the spectrum of texts that fill the cultural space can be represented as an axis, with artificial languages on one end and artistic languages on the other. All other texts occupy various

positions along this axis, located closer to one of the poles” [6]. At the same time, all other textual formations are situated along this axis depending on their degree of proximity to the defined poles, thereby forming a multidimensional semiotic space of the text.

In Lotman’s interpretation, the text can be viewed both as an integral part of culture as a whole and as an “individual element” functioning as a work of art or as a “text of life,” which highlights the diversity of its functions and forms of manifestation within the cultural environment.

According to Ferdinand de Saussure, the text is understood as a “manifestation of language,” which implies its belonging to the sphere of speech and the presence of both systemic and non-systemic characteristics that determine its structure and content [7]. In this context, the text does not possess intrinsic value in isolation but serves as a particular form of representation through which the object of cultural interest is revealed. This emphasizes the fundamental distinction between language and text as that between “the expressed and the unexpressed, the material and the ideal, the spatial and the non-spatial” [8].

According to Yuri M. Lotman, language and text are not synonymous, since the text represents a broader concept encompassing a variety of forms, levels, and meanings that reflect the complex structure of cultural communication.

In developing his conceptual model of the text, Yuri M. Lotman draws attention to a number of key characteristics that form the basis for understanding this phenomenon: “expressiveness, boundedness, and structuredness” [9].

Expressiveness is understood as the presence of a system of signs through which the text formulates its content and acquires the capacity to oppose the elements of the external textual environment. In this context, expressiveness, as opposed to non-expressiveness, functions as a characteristic that allows the text to be perceived as the embodiment of a specific systemic structure-its physical explication in sign form.

The boundedness of the text manifests itself in its dual opposition: on the one hand, to the material signs that do not constitute its internal content, and on the other, to a multitude of structures lacking clearly defined boundaries, among which natural languages occupy a special place. The concept of boundary within the text may take various forms-it may indicate the beginning and end of a work, the frame delimiting a painting, or the ramp separating the stage from the audience-where “expressiveness, contrasting with the unexpressed, makes it possible to perceive the text as the realization of a certain system, its physical embodiment” [10].

Thus, the text, possessing a complex hierarchical organization in which less significant elements are subordinated to more significant ones, testifies to the presence of internal semiological boundaries and to the necessity of interpretation within its own structural integrity.

The final property, structuredness, is closely connected with boundedness: “the text is not a simple sequence of signs between two external boundaries” [8]. Since the immanent structure of the text forms its internal coherence, Yuri M. Lotman identifies structural heterogeneity as one of the most important properties of the text, implying the presence of linguistic multiplicity, in which “this multiplicity may manifest itself as a consequence of double coding or as a combination of several subtexts, each encoded differently, yet in a certain sense functioning as a unified whole” [11].

Thus, the text, possessing a multilayered and multivalent structure, performs a wide range of functional and discursive roles, among which the communicative

function-associated with the transmission of stable and reliable information-occupies a central place. The optimal paradigm of communicative interaction is considered to be the situation in which the original text and the result of its decoding demonstrate complete correspondence, which may be regarded as an ideal scenario.

However, according to Yuri M. Lotman, “this is possible only if the sender and the receiver use completely identical codes, which essentially means that, in semiotic terms, they represent, one might say, the same entity in two variants” [12]. Nevertheless, the conditions required to achieve such a level of correspondence are virtually unattainable in real communicative practice. As the thinker notes, ideal transmission is possible only when the sender and the receiver of the message operate with identical codes-that is, when they are, in essence, two aspects of one and the same semiotic system.

Within this semantic model, the text functions primarily as a passive carrier of information, whose role in the communicative process is reduced to the transmission of data without active participation in the interpretation of content. Researcher O. N. Leuta, analyzing the legacy of Yuri M. Lotman, emphasizes that “from a structural standpoint, the text in this context appears as an embodiment of language, where all elements that lack essential significance for the linguistic system become secondary within the structure of the text and, consequently, are incapable of conveying substantive meaning” [13].

As a result, the secondary function of the textual object manifests itself in its creative aspect, which lies in its ability to generate meaning at the moment when the text ceases to function solely as an instrument of information transmission and begins to produce new meanings: “in this case, the value of the system is formed through an unexpected shift in meanings that arises in the process of interaction between the text and its reader” [14]. In this context, the systemic value is determined precisely by the unforeseen shift in meanings that occurs during the interaction of the text with the receptive audience.

Describing the phenomenon of the “shift of meaning,” it is important to note its fundamental unpredictability, which significantly complicates the possibilities of analytical comprehension. The newly generated texts that emerge as a result of this interaction represent “unfinished” works that, from the standpoint of traditional aesthetic norms, may be regarded as “improper.” At the same time, they lack complete correspondence between the codes of the sender and the receiver, which is typically considered a necessary condition for the successful realization of a communicative act.

A text that possesses the ability to generate new meanings demonstrates a polystructural character, manifested in the multiplicity of languages and internal heterogeneity, which makes it an object of multilevel analysis and interpretation.

### *Conclusion*

According to the analysis conducted, Yuri M. Lotman, drawing on a principle analogous to that underlying Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky’s concept of the biosphere, formulated his own theoretical conception of the semiosphere, which presupposes the existence of a complex system of signs and symbols within the context of cultural and communicative interaction. In this model, spatial construction reflects the spatial organization of the real world, allowing culture to be viewed as a geographically and



temporally determined system. Thus, cultural space, understood as a form of self-description and cognitive representation of reality, serves as a central element in the processes of semiosis, defining the specificity of perception, interpretation, and reproduction of meanings within particular historical and cultural conditions.

Summarizing the analysis of the conceptual and semantic aspects of semiosis in the works of Yuri M. Lotman and Charles S. Peirce, it should be emphasized that their ideas, despite differences in methodological approaches, complement each other and contribute to a deeper understanding of the nature of sign activity. Lotman's research, asserting that semiosis represents a key mechanism for decoding meanings within cultural systems, focuses on the interrelation of codes, models, and contexts, forming a systematic foundation for the analysis of semiotic processes as an integral part of cultural practice. In this way, the necessity of a historical and sociocultural approach within a broad interdisciplinary perspective of sociolinguistics and cultural studies is affirmed.

Charles S. Peirce, in turn, by proposing the triadic model of semiosis, introduced into semiotics the elements of dynamism and interactivity, viewing the sign as an active participant in the cognitive process that directly influences the formation and transformation of interpretations. The joint consideration of Lotman's and Peirce's ideas allows semiosis to be understood as a continuous dialogue between signs, contexts, and individual perceptions, creating a methodological foundation for further research in philosophy, cultural studies, sociology, psychology, and linguistics. In this context, cultural artifacts appear not as static objects but as dynamic constructions whose meanings are continually reinterpreted depending on historical, social, and individual experience.

In the context of postmodern discourse, characterized by the fragmentation and contextuality of meanings that transform sign systems into a field of multiple competing interpretations, the need for a reflexive approach to the study of the sign as a key element of cultural interaction becomes particularly relevant. This expands the problem field of contemporary semiotics, stimulating the development of new directions in the study of meaning-making processes and the self-reflection of culture.

In summary, it may be concluded that semiotic concepts perform not only an instrumental function in the analysis of cultural artifacts but also possess a creative potential, determining the mechanisms of cultural consciousness formation. They contribute to the comprehension of complex processes of meaning, interpretation, and interaction within the contemporary sociocultural context, where culture appears as a dynamic, self-developing space of meanings.

### *List of references*

- 1 Ch. S. Peirce. Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, Harvard University Press, vol. 1-6, 1931-1935; vol. 7-8, 1958.
- 2 Houser N. Introduction to EP Volume 1 in book «The essential Peirce» [Electronic resource] // Peirce Edition Project. – Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. 2008.
- 3 Лотман Ю.М. Внутри мыслящих миров// Семиосфера. СПб., 2000. С. 153.
- 4 Гриненко Г. В. Семиосфера и семиотика культуры [Текст] / Г. В. Гриненко // Культура и образование. – 2013. – № 1 (10). – С. 32-39.
- 5 Лотман Ю.М. К современному понятию текста // Лотман Ю.М. История и типология русской культуры. С. 188.

- 6 Лотман, Ю. М. Семиосфера [Текст] / Ю. М. Лотман. – СПб.: Искусство-СПб, 2010. С. 150.
- 7 Мечковская, Н. Б. Семиотика Язык. Природа. Культура [Текст] / Н. Б. Мечковская. – 2-е изд., испр. -М.: Академия, 2007. – 432 с.
- 8 Лотман, Ю. М. Текст в тексте / Ю. М. Лотман //Текст в тексте. Труды по знаковым системам. XIV. – Тарту, 1981. – С. 7.
- 9 Лотман Ю.М. Внутри мыслящих миров// Семиосфера. СПб., 2000. С. 153
- 10 Куликова, Т. В. Экзистенциально-антропологические смыслы границы [Текст] / Т. В. Куликова // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского. – 2010. – № 3-1. -С. 369-375.
- 11 Лотман Ю.М. Текст как динамическая система // Структура текста-81. Тезисы симпозиума / Институт славяноведения и балканистики АН СССР. М., 1981. С. 105.
- 12 Лотман, Ю. М. Статьи по семиотике культуры и искусства / Ю. М. Лотман. – СПб.: Академический проект, 2002. – С. 227-228.
- 13 Леута О.Н. Ю.М. Лотман о трех функциях текста // Вопросы философии. 2002. № 4. С. 165.
- 14 Лотман Ю.М. Мозг-текст-культура – искусственный интеллект// Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. С. 581-582.

### *Transliteration*

- 1 Ch. S. Peirce. Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, Harvard University Press, vol. 1-6, 1931-1935; vol. 7-8, 1958.
- 2 Houser N. Introduction to EP Volume 1 in book «T'e essential Peirce» [Electronic resource] // Peirce Edition Project. – Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. 2008.
- 3 Lotman YU.M. Vnutri myslyashchih mirov [Inside the Thinking Worlds] // Semiosfera. SPb., 2000. S. 153.
- 4 Grinenko G. V. Semiosfera i semiotika kul'tury [Tekst] [Semiosphere and Semiotics of Culture] / G. V. Grinenko // Kul'tura i obrazovanie. – 2013. – № 1 (10). – S. 32-39.
- 5 Lotman YU.M. K sovremennomu ponyatiyu teksta [On the Modern Concept of the Text] //Lotman YU.M. Istoriya i tipologiya russkoj kul'tury. S. 188.
- 6 Lotman, YU. M. Semiosfera [Tekst] [Semiosphere] / YU. M. Lotman. – SPb.: Iskustvo-SPB, 2010. S. 150
- 7 Mechkovskaya, N. B. Semiotika YAzyk. Priroda. Kul'tura [Tekst] [Semiotics: Language. Nature. Culture] / N. B. Mechkovskaya. – 2-е изд., испр. -М.: Академия, 2007. – 432 s.
- 8 Lotman, YU. M. Tekst v tekste [Text in the Text] / YU. M. Lotman //Tekst v tekste. Trudy po znakovym sistemam. XIV. – Tartu, 1981. – S. 7.
- 9 Lotman YU.M. Vnutri myslyashchih mirov [Inside Thinking Worlds] // Semiosfera. SPb., 2000. S. 153
- 10 Kulikova, T. V. Ekzistencial'no-antropologicheskie smysly granicy [Tekst] [Existential-Anthropological Meanings of the Border] / T. V. Kulikova // Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo. – 2010. – № 3-1. -S. 369-375.
- 11 Lotman YU.M. Tekst kak dinamicheskaya sistema [Text as a Dynamic System] // Struktura teksta-81. Tezisy simpoziuma / Institut slavyanovedeniya i balkanistiki AN SSSR. M., 1981. S. 105.
- 12 Lotman, YU. M. Stat'i po semiotike kul'tury i iskustva [Articles on the Semiotics of Culture and Art] / YU. M. Lotman. – SPb.: Akademicheskij proekt, 2002. – S. 227-228.
- 13 Leuta O.N. YU.M. Lotman o trekh funkciyah teksta [Lotman on the Three Functions of the Text] // Voprosy filosofii. 2002. № 4. S. 165.



14 Lotman YU.M. Mozg-tekst-kul'tura – iskusstvennyj intellekt [Brain–Text–Culture – Artificial Intelligence] // Lotman YU.M. Semiosfera. S. 581-582.

**Тюкмаева А.М.**

**Ю.М. Лотман мен Ч.С. Пирстің семиозисінің концептуалды-семантикалық аспектілері**

*Аңдатпа.* Мақалада Ю.М. Лотман мен Ч.С. Пирс еңбектеріндегі семиозис ұғымының тұжырымдамалық және семантикалық аспектілеріне талдау жасалған. Жүргізілген салыстырмалы зерттеу олардың таңбалық жүйелердің табиғаты мен семиотикалық коммуникация механизмдерін түсіндірудегі ұқсастықтары мен айырмашылықтарын айқындауға мүмкіндік береді. Негізгі назар семиозис феноменінің теориялық негіздерімен қатар, оның циклдік сипатына және тарихи, әлеуметтік әрі мәдени факторлармен айқындалатын мәдени контекстердегі таңбалар мен олардың мағыналарының өзара әрекеттесу ерекшеліктеріне аударылған. Зерттеу таңбалық ойлаудың екі парадигмасын салыстырмалы тұрғыда талдауға бағытталған: Пирстің интенционалдылық концепциясы және Лотманның мәтінді біртұтас семиотикалық кеңістік ретінде қарастыратын моделі. Бұл тәсіл таңбалық қатынастардың күрделі табиғаты мен олардың мәдени-коммуникативтік функциясын ашуға мүмкіндік береді. Сонымен қатар, жұмыста философия, өнертану және әлеуметтік теория салаларындағы семиотикалық талдаудың қолданбалы мүмкіндіктері қарастырылып, гуманитарлық ғылымдар әдіснамасын одан әрі дамытуға жаңа бағыттар ашылады.

*Түйін сөздер:* семиозис, тұжырымдамалық және семантикалық аспектілер, Ю.М. Лотман, Ч. С. Пирс, таңба жүйелері, интенционалдылық, семиотикалық талдау.

**Тюкмаева А.М.**

**Концептуально-семантические аспекты семиозиса Ю.М. Лотмана и Ч. С. Пирса**

*Аннотация.* В статье представлен анализ концептуально-семантических аспектов семиозиса в интерпретации Ю.М. Лотмана и Ч.С. Пирса. Проведённое сопоставление позволяет выявить как точки пересечения, так и принципиальные расхождения в их подходах к пониманию природы знаковых систем и механизмов семиотической коммуникации. Особое внимание уделяется не только теоретическим основаниям феномена семиозиса, но и его циклическому характеру, а также специфике взаимодействия знаков и их значений в культурных контекстах, детерминированных историческими, социальными и культурными условиями. Исследование направлено на сравнительный анализ двух парадигм знакового мышления - пирсовской концепции интенциональности и лотмановской модели текста как целостного семиотического пространства, раскрывающего сложную природу знаковых отношений и их культурно-коммуникативную функцию. Кроме того, рассматриваются практические возможности применения семиотического анализа в литературоведении, искусствоведении и социокультурных исследованиях, что открывает перспективы дальнейшего развития гуманитарной методологии.

*Ключевые слова:* семиозис, концептуально-семантические аспекты, Ю.М. Лотман, Ч.С. Пирс, знаковые системы, интенциональность, семиотический анализ.

*Received 18.10.2025*

*Accepted 12.11.2025*