Tartu
Summer School of Semiotics
2019

SEMIOTIC DIMENSIONS OF SPACES & LITERACIES

Book of Abstracts

Tartu 2019
ORGANISERS:

Department of Semiotics, University of Tartu
Estonian Semiotics Association

SUPPORTERS:

University of Tartu ASTRA project PER ASPERA
(European Union, European Regional Development Fund)
Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, University of Tartu
Base funding to research of national importance
The Gambling Tax Council

ORGANISING TEAM:

Maarja Ojamaa, Katre Pärn, Ulvi Urm, Jorge LuisFlores Hernández, Riin Magnus, Nelly Mäekivi, Tiit Remm, Mari-Liis Madisson, Lauri Linask

MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE:

Mari-Liis Madisson, Riin Magnus, Timo Maran, Maarja Ojamaa, Katre Pärn, Tiit Remm

EDITING: Katre Pärn, Silver Rattasepp

COVER AND LAYOUT: Katre Pärn

PRINT: University of Tartu

FIND US IN THE WEB: tsss.ut.ee
It is with great pleasure that we welcome you to Tartu Summer School of Semiotics 2019, a four-day event taking place from August 17 to 20 in Tartu and the secluded Koigi manor in Järva County. TSSS is the twelfth gathering of the series organized by the Department of Semiotics, University of Tartu in cooperation with the Estonian Semiotics Association.

First, we would like to thank all of you for your participation at the conference.

The proposed theme of our gathering – Semiotic Dimensions of Spaces and Literacies – is inspired by Juri Lotman’s proposition that the primary semiotic dualism lies in the duplication of the world in language and the duplication of the human in space:

Genetically speaking, culture is built upon two primary languages. One of these is the natural language used by humans in everyday communication. [...] The nature of the second primary language is not so obvious. What is under discussion is the structural model of space.

The organizers of TSSS 2019 invite you all to discuss the functioning of cultural languages and models of space as mediators of human and non-human environments and as developers of cultural competence.

Understanding culture via its spatial organization has been a characteristic of Tartu semiotics. The structural models of space facilitate making sense of nature, society and culture as living environments. The creation of such models is simultaneously the creation of descriptive languages for conceptualizing cultural experience and, on a more essential level, cultural mediation. The latter affects both individual and collective capacity to interpret reality and underpins the formation and perception of cultural identity. On the one hand, contemporary cultural dynamics have

---

underlined the necessity of studying the cultural environment in relation to technological advancement: from the digitalization of (everyday) culture to cultural polyglotism, including improved foreign language skills, digital literacy, and the emergence of transmedial spaces of communication.

On the other hand, ecological changes in our living environment have created the need to analyze the mutual influences of human cultural and non-human spaces: the ways that different species both encode and interpret their surroundings and contexts. These include the human modes of textualising space in artistic and non-artistic languages, other species’ modes of learning about their surroundings and the ways their agency becomes manifested in their relations with our mutually shared environments. At the same time, the scientific understanding of these relations clearly needs to be balanced with the development of related literacies for mediating the knowledge to the members of culture.

We invite all the semioticians studying the dynamics of nature, society and culture to Tartu in order to discuss a topic simultaneously universal and current for the era of the Anthropocene – the semiotic dimensions of spaces and literacies.

Topics we proposed for discussion included:

- Making sense of digital fragmentation through spatial models and metalanguage;
- Spatial applications for mediating cultural heritage;
- Developmental changes in the structuring and literacy of space;
- Animal agencies in adapting to anthropogenic and hybrid environments;
- Interactions of semiotic and spatial practices in environmental education.

This book of abstracts comprises all presentations of the conference, including the mini symposium on Peirce’s Semiotic to Inform spatial modeling – primitives of consciousness on August 18, organized by Donna E. West and Tyler James Bennett, as well as the three plenary lectures given by our invited speakers Olga Lavrenova, Kay O’Halloran, João Queiroz. In the book you will also find the programme of the gathering and the list of contacts of our presenters.

We thank you all for participating and do hope that you enjoy your attendance at the TSSS 2019!

The organisers
ABOUT TSSS

Tartu Summer School of Semiotics is a series of gatherings that brings together representatives of semiotics and related disciplines with the aim of providing an environment to converse about core issues in semiotics that are of disciplinary as well as transdisciplinary relevance. It revives the tradition of Kääriku Summer Schools of Semiotics held by the Tartu-Moscow School of Semiotics. As its forerunner, the Tartu Summer School of Semiotics is a gathering that aspires to promote dialogue between scholars and synthesis between approaches.

TSSS 2019 is the twelfth gathering of the series:

I – 1964, Kääriku
II – 1966, Kääriku
III – 1968, Kääriku
IV – 1970, Tartu
V – 1974, Tartu
VI – 1986, Kääriku
VII – 1995, Saarjärve
VIII – 2011, Palmse – Semiotic Modelling
IX – 2013, Kääriku – Autocommunication in Semiotic Systems
X – 2015, Tartu + Leigo – Semiotic (Un)predictability
XI – 2017, Tartu + Leigo – Generalising Gently
XII – 2019, Tartu + Koigi – Semiotic Dimensions of Spaces & Literacies
LOCATIONS

REGISTRATION:
   Näituse 2, Tartu

PLENARY LECTURES AND PRESENTATIONS:
   From August 17-19: Näituse 2, Tartu
   August 20: Koigi, Järva County

INFORMATION AND BOOK EXHIBITION:
   Open during registration and coffee breaks: Näituse 2, Tartu

RECEPTION:
   Sisevete Saatkond, Vabaduse puiestee, Tartu

BUS TO KOIGI:
   The bus leaves from the lower parking lot of Vanemuine theatre (Ülikooli str)
# PROGRAMME

## SATURDAY, AUGUST 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:30</td>
<td><strong>SESSION I</strong> (moderator: Nelly Mäekivi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Peeter Torop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kalevi Kull</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anti Randviir</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mihhail Lotman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:00</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY TALK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Olga Lavrenova – The Cultural Landscape as Metaphor</strong> (moderator: Tiit Remm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:30</td>
<td><strong>SESSION II</strong> (moderator: Riin Magnus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Riccardo Soave</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Óscar Castro García</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ali Minanto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Svens Lurie</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td><strong>Reception</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUNDAY, AUGUST 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session III (moderator: Katre Pärn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td><strong>Ekaterina Velmezova</strong>  Lev Berg’s “semiotic spaces”: A little-known page from the prehistory (?) of semiotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inna Merkoulova</strong>  A dialogue between semiotic and philosophical spaces: Algirdas Julien Greimas and Lev Karsavin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Zdzisław Wąsik</strong>  Semiotic phenomenology of interpersonal distance: Researching lived experience of spatiality in human communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Herman A.H. Tamminen</strong>  Six graves and a trampoline or, verticals of the body, dream and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td><strong>PLENARY TALK</strong>  João Queiros: Conceptual Space Transformation in Arts through Iconic Intersemiotic Translation (moderator: Timo Maran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td><strong>SESSION IV Peirce’s Semiotic to Inform spatial modeling – primitives of consciousness</strong> (moderator: Kyle Davidson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Donna West</strong>  Peirce’s double consciousness to facilitate abductive reasoning: Forums for anticipatory dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ahti-Veiko Pietarinen</strong>  Pragmaticism as a logical study of consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ivan Mladenov</strong>  Before a thought appears (The notion of ground in Peirce's thought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-18:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION V: Peirce’s Semiotic to Inform spatial modeling – primitives of consciousness</strong> (moderator: Rene Kiis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Thierry Montier</strong>  Sketches of a semiotic architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Letícia Vitral</strong>  What happens at the border? Semiosphere and the epistemic function of diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oskar Miyamoto</strong>  Chronesthesia and semiosis as the space-time of the phaneron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tyler James Bennett</strong>  Peirce for subject-critical theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>SESSION VI (moderator: Nelly Mäekivi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anna Barcz</strong> Grey narratives of the Cold War era: The communist reality and environmental pollution in literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mirko Cerrone</strong> Interspecies relationships and their influence on handling: A case study in Tallinn Zoological Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Claudio J. Rodríguez H.</strong> A framework for (social) resemantization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>PLENARY TALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kay O’Halloran – Semiotics Dimensions and Space</strong> (moderator: Silver Rattasepp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td>SESSION VII (moderator: Letícia Vitral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aleksandr Fadeev</strong> Dialogue with culture. The analysis of inner speech in digital learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alin Olteanu</strong> The landscape in the digital age: An ecosemiotic approach to digitalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Victoria Konidari</strong> Semiotic analysis of students’ imaginative geographies: A new direction to tackle educational disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kyle Davidson</strong> Modelling communication in virtual reality using VRChat, VOCALOIDS and virtual online performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-18:00</td>
<td>SESSION VIII (moderator: Ott Puumeister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tereza Arndt</strong> Culture of remembering and materialized memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kadri Kallast</strong> On the interpretation of values of built heritage. An introduction to a work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Karine Ghazaryan</strong> LGBT+ issues in post-revolution Armenian press: The model violator of the pre-established order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TUESDAY, AUGUST 20 - KOIGI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Departure from Tartu to Koigi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Welcome coffee at Koigi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:30</td>
<td><strong>SESSION IX</strong> (moderator: Alin Olteanu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Elżbieta Magdalena Wąsik</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Merit Rickberg</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ott Puumeister</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Eugenio Israel Chávez Barreto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION X</strong> (moderator: Oskar Miyamoto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lauri Linask</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Franciscu Sedda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tiit Remm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:30</td>
<td><strong>DISCUSSION PANEL</strong>: Olga Lavrenova, João Queiros, Kay O'Halloran, Kalevi Kull, Peeter Torop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Departure from Koigi to Tartu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ABSTRACTS

### PLENARY LECTURES

- Olga Lavrenova ................................................. 17
- Kay O’Halloran .................................................. 19
- João Queiroz ..................................................... 21
- Riccardo Soave .................................................. 23

### PRESENTATIONS

- Tereza Arndt ..................................................... 25
- Anna Barcz ....................................................... 27
- Eugenio Israel Chávez Barreto ................................ 28
- Óscar Castro García ........................................... 29
- Mirko Cerrone .................................................... 30
- Kyle Davidson .................................................... 31
- Alexandr Fadeev ............................................... 32
- Karine Ghazaryan .............................................. 33
- Kadri Kallast ..................................................... 35
- Victoria Konidari ............................................... 37
- Kalevi Kull ......................................................... 38
- Lauri Linask ...................................................... 40
- Mihhail Lotman ................................................... 41
- Svens Lurie ....................................................... 42
- Inna Merkoulova .................................................. 43
- Ali Minanto ....................................................... 45
- Alin Olteanu ....................................................... 46
- Ott Puumeister ................................................... 48
- Anti Randviir ..................................................... 50
- Tiit Remm ......................................................... 51
- Merit Rickberg ................................................... 52
- Claudio J. Rodríguez H .......................................... 53
- Franciscu Sedda ................................................ 54
- Riccardo Soave .................................................. 55
- Herman A.H. Tamminen ...................................... 56
- Peeter Torop ...................................................... 59
PLENARY LECTURES
THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE AS A METAPHOR

Olga Lavrenova
Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences (INION), Russia

The paper is devoted to an analysis of geographical images from the viewpoint of the theory of metaphor. The cultural landscape is a process and a result of semiosis, and it is interesting to find a place in it to such a semiotic concept as a metaphor. In a metaphor the meaning is important; in a symbol the form is important. The cultural landscape is a place for both of them, because in culture genetically related to the landscape, actual geographical objects having some visual, quantitative and qualitative characteristics (height of mountains, river length, the breadth of the plains) act as symbols. According to the cognitive theory of metaphor the cultural landscape is a complex concept to which metaphors open up “epistemological access”, and vice versa, the landscape – as a concept, organizes a series of abstract frames (Gestalts) in the mentality of culture. In the study of cultural landscape a metaphor is used as a tool for learning, giving birth to new meanings. The interrelationship between culture and space is metaphorical in nature. For example, the metaphor “life – a river” might well be corresponded with the metaphor “water – this is life”. Both metaphors mentioned refer to well-defined landscape connotations, which implicitly arise in the minds of media culture either during the utterance of this metaphor, or when one looks at the landscape from the high bank of a river. From this point of view a metaphor, which includes names of places, can be considered. The most striking visual metaphors transfer related place names to the category of iconic signs. For example, a sustainable culture-geographical metaphor “the gold-domed Moscow” creates out of two images a new semantically extended mental construct. The first one is a visual appearance of the city, its architectural feature – an abundance of gold-domed churches. The second one is a latent image of the mythological giant with the golden head, symbolizing state power. The second metaphor is hidden away under the pressure of the first, but it is impossible to deny its existence. Spatial metaphors have similar landscape imagery. (For example, the metaphors structuring the concepts “up – down” and specific landscape connotations entering into the very flesh of the language – “Soar to the clouds”, “to be on top of Happiness”, “lay low”). Each concrete landscape appears as a metaphor, depending on the nature and type: a mountain landscape – as a metaphor
for the ontological vertical, a flat steppe landscape – as a metaphor for limitlessness and infinity, a river landscape – as a metaphor for life and ways and so on – all sorts of variations. All these metaphors are iconic, and the brightness of the image, constructed in language, is replaced by the visualization of the image, observed or represented as a landscape in this case.
A multimodal (i.e. multisemiotic) perspective is adopted to investigate Juri Lotman’s (1992) proposal that the primary semiotic dualism lies in the duplication of the world in natural language and the duplication of the human in space. The study of the integration of language with other semiotic choices (e.g. image, movement, gesture, 3D objects) in various physical and digital spaces (e.g. the classroom, live political debates, online communications, social media) provides a compelling account of how the semiosphere (Lotman 2005) is configured today. In particular, the recontextualisation of text and images across online media platforms is considered, together with the notion of semiotic space invasion which is illustrated through an analysis of President Trump’s US Presidential campaign. Lastly, a digital approach for building theory and analytical techniques for semiotic research is proposed in order to handle the complexity of the dynamics of nature, society and culture.

References:
CONCEPTUAL SPACE TRANSFORMATION IN ARTS THROUGH ICONIC INTERSEMIOTIC TRANSLATION

João Queiroz
Federal University of Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais, Brazil

It is well known that several experimental artists who have creatively transformed their fields dedicated themselves to the intersemiotic translation of aesthetic procedures from one sign system into another – Gertrude Stein translated Cézanne and Picasso’s proto-cubist and cubist approaches into literature; Kandinsky translated Arnold Schoenberg’s methods into painting; Morton Feldman translated abstract expressionism’s formal procedures into music; Paul Klee translated polyphony’s music structures into painting; Augusto de Campos translated Anton Webern and Klangfarbenmelodie models into concrete poetry. Intersemiotic translation is an anticipatory, generative, and metasemiotic tool that takes advantage of iconicity (self-referentiality of semiosis) to transform conceptual spaces in arts. As an anticipatory technique, intersemiotic translation works as a predictive tool; anticipating new, and surprising patterns of semiotic events and processes, keeping under control the emergence of new patterns. At the same time, it works as a generative model, providing new, unexpected, surprising information in the target system, and affording competing results which allow the system to generate candidate instances. As a metasemiotic tool, intersemiotic translation creates a metalevel semiotic process, a sign-action which stands for the action of a sign. Here we associate Charles S. Peirce’s pragmatic theory of meaning with Margaret Boden’s notion of creativity as modification of conceptual spaces. For Boden, the most impactful type of creativity achieves conceptual space transformation. We consider Boden’s conceptual space as a regular pattern of semiotic action, or “habit” (sensu Peirce). The central results of this inter-theoretical association are the claims that creativity is a semiotic process and that IT is creative (transforms conceptual spaces) because it is iconic. The icon is the only type of sign that involves a direct presentation of qualities that belong to its object. In operational terms, the icon can be defined as a sign that, when manipulated, “reveals” one or many aspects of its object. In IT, iconicity allows metasemiosis. What is “translated” is not only a sign, but sign-action (semiosis) itself. In this sense, IT involves a sign-action (action of a translation target) which stands for the action of a sign (action of a translation source): a metalevel semiotic process. The self-referentiality of the icon is not reference to the
sign itself alone, but to the sign-action itself. We exemplify with a historical case of conceptual space transformation in dance: the influence of one-point perspective in the emergence of classical ballet. One-point perspective is a technique developed as a solution for how to represent tridimensional space in bidimensional surfaces. In painting, one-point visual perspective consolidated a pictorial space observed frontally by the audience. The application of one-point perspective principles in theatre architecture translated this pictorial space to the newly developed Italian stage. Classical ballet developed in this new conceptual space, exploring more vertical morphologies of dance movement, pictoric visual compositions, and background-foreground visual relations.
CULTURE OF REMEMBERING AND MATERIALIZED MEMORY

Tereza Arndt
Charles University in Prague, Czechia

This paper is focused on communication possibilities of visual media with regards to the transfer of cultural memory, boundaries of their entirety, and the ability to testify credibly of this testimony. How has politics of memory transformed? How is the culture of remembering today connected to externalised ideas about the past? Is it possible to understand remembering as a way of coming to terms with a traumatic past? What kind of visual signs does it bring up? These specific statements at the edge of a document and art are related to so-called materialized memory acquiring a concrete (image) form, and its communication strategies through which the recipient is a direct witness of events. The core of the paper will be related mostly to an issue of (un)representation and picturing in terms of handling the traumatic past. The motivation for creating this topic was an interest in the ways in which a concept of unspeakable and unimaginable is pushed ahead in museum practice, which has become part of the debate on trauma in relation to the Holocaust, which was called by W. J. T. Mitchell as “theory’s cult of the unrepresentable”. It is a paradox, two contrasting movements: an effort to constantly show traumas and at the same time an effort to promote what is unrepresentable – suffering, wars, thus areas where we often think that words and images fail. The visualisation of pain necessarily encounters a problem of aesthetics, which in connection with the suffering of the victims leads us to the question of morality and ethical boundaries. How are memories of tragic moments in the past transferred? Are they represented concretely or just symbolically in museums? Are there any inappropriate things to display? How powerful are “images of wickedness”? How much do they influence us? The chosen material does not represent only one medium, it most likely represents samples of verbally-visual testimonies, examples how memory is materialized, constructed, and how it communicates in different forms of trauma. The theoretical basis will be formed by works of philosophers from the second half of the 20th century, who focused on different types of representation related to memory and displaying of trauma (Georges Didi-Huberman, Jacques Rancière, Susan Sontag, and in part Roland Barthes).
GREY NARRATIVES OF THE COLD WAR ERA: THE COMMUNIST REALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION IN LITERATURE

Anna Barcz
Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, Ireland

In my presentation I would like to trace the contexts of grey colour in selected literary texts. I am particularly interested in how semantic and spatial aspects of this colour function in Eastern European fiction and autobiography, where they create a multi-perceptual model of environmental reality.

Grey is the colour of mundane, unattractive reality in communist society; the colour of fair, uniformed communism as opposed to the colourful reality of unfair, cheerful capitalism of the West, embodied by America. The Soviet Union and its satellite countries are full of grey descriptions in literature. They can be connected to the grey figure of the hyperurbanised reality of the city as Moscow: “I imagined Moscow as something distant, grey, huge and dull. It was unreal, yet we lived in its shadow.” (Andrzej Stasiuk, The East, trans. Eliza Marciniak, Portobello Books, London 2017); or to the foggy, rainy and muddy reality of the tired village after collectivisation: “the mud would kill off all forms of life, rot the vegetation and there would be nothing left” (Laszlo Krasznahorkai, Satantango, transl. George Szirtes, Atlantic Books, London 2012, 64). Grey paints the elements of the psychic dimension of reality, as well as filthy and smoky weather descriptions. In the grey narratives the history of the Cold War era merges with cultural memory to represent the polluted world and language of literature.
SUBJECT AND SPACE:
OBSERVATIONS FROM GENERAL SEMIOTICS

Eugenio Israel Chávez Barreto
University of Tartu, Estonia

A general theory of semiosis must address the problem of what it means to be a subject. This is true both if (i) semiosis presupposes the existence of a subject (i.e. if the lower semiotic threshold coincides with the threshold of the living) and if (ii) semiosis doesn’t presuppose it (i.e. if the lower semiotic threshold includes physiosemiosis). In the first case, semiosis consists in immaterial relations that are ultimately organism-dependent. In the second case, and under some interpretations, semiosis might arise from matter itself (e.g. taking matter as effete mind). In both cases, thus, the underlying questions are those of (iii) whether a sign needs to be actually or virtually interpreted, and (iv) what are the requirements that need to be fulfilled by such an interpreter to actually be an interpreter. This presentation will concern mainly with (i) and (iv), and it will analyse the problem using Luis Prieto’s theory of the subject. According to Prieto, a subject can only be so if it is consciously aware of the numeric identity of its own body as a material object able to undergo transformations that are caused simply by the subject’s own volition (i.e. transformations that are causes without being effects). In other words, a subject is such if it has the faculty to choose to transform its own body (e.g. transforming a “resting hand” into a “grabbing hand”), and in a broader sense if the subject is able to choose at all. However, the possibility of recognizing the numeric identity of the own body as a whole, according to Prieto, depends upon recognizing the own body as being different from other material objects in the surroundings. Thus, one of the first distinctions made by a subject is that of recognizing spatial limits between itself and all the other elements in the surroundings. It is important to notice that Prieto’s theory was formulated mainly as an anthroposemiosic theory, and thus, it only grants the status of “subject” to humans. As such, this presentation will try to take the spatial differentiation between self and other, in Prieto’s terms, as one of the minimal requirements for semiosis beyond anthroposemiosis and into a general semiotic theory.
The concept of a sacred place in spatial language is a phenomenon that transcends the possibilities of univocal phenomenological description. Every individual lives in his own perception of space and time based on at first instinctive and solipsistic encounter of space, to then fill it with different semiotic levels of it.

This multilevel and intersystemic development of perception offers a discursive wealth where semiospheres coexist in vivid interactions. Sometimes they are like a palimpsest experience; others are a linguistic emptiness that generates new semiotic meanings.

I would like to focus my speech on the concept of Khôra as an impersonal space of power where different forms of expressing what Rudolf Otto called the numen are configured. For this, I will use the concepts presented by Julian Kristeva, Jaques Derrida and Nader El-Bizri to express a bio-semiotic synthesis in the phenomenological experience of historical urban landscapes. Finally, I want to cross the sacred landscape through Alexei Lidov’s concept of “Hierotopy” to invigorate an experience, together with Khôra, where our perception of the landscape increases its meaning iconographically, semiotically and symbolically.

**Keywords:** Khôra, numen, semiosphere, palimpsest, Genius Loci, hierotopy
This paper deals with biosemiotic dimensions of human relationship with captive animals and aims to uncover how these factors influence handling practices and human-animal interactions within zoological gardens.

Zoological gardens are quintessential hybrid environments, and as such they are places of interspecies interactions and mutual influences. These interactions are profoundly shaped by human attitudes towards animals, whose roots can be found at cultural and institutional levels (how particular animal species are culturally perceived and managed in zoos) and at a biosemiotic level (similarities between Umwelten). Previous studies have suggested that keepers’ attitude towards animals has a direct influence upon their handling style and, consequently, it has an impact on the animals’ perception of keepers and other humans. This implies that the type of relationship between keepers and animals can translate into handling styles that may affect animals’ perception of humans and worsen their welfare.

We present a case study involving chimpanzees’ keepers at Tallinn Zoological Gardens (Estonia). A series of interviews were conducted aiming to uncover the way keepers understand their relationship with captive animals and how this influences handling. This work proposes a comparative approach by bringing forward the experiences of keepers who work with different animal species belonging to different taxa (*Cebuella pygmae, Pan troglodytes*) and class (Mammalia and Reptilia, i.e. *Crocodylus porosus*). Such an approach aims to highlight the biosemiotic factors behind the emergence of different types of keeper-animal relationships. We expect to uncover whether extremely different Umwelten may prejudice the establishment of human-animal bonds. We also aim to discuss the way animals influence handling practices within zoological gardens by highlighting the agency of animals in daily activities and work routine. Our goal is to analyse the role of personification/depersonification of animals in zoo management, aiming to understand how individual animals influence handling practices within zoological gardens.
MODELLING COMMUNICATION IN VIRTUAL REALITY USING VRCHAT, VOCALOIDS AND VIRTUAL ONLINE PERFORMERS

Kyle Davidson
University of Tartu, Estonia

With the growth of virtual reality (VR) forums and new hardware for tracking player’s limbs in VR, interactions between users within the online space crosses multiple realities and modalities. The replication or simulation of an alternate identity is not limited to the online space, but users of the new VR technology have been able to create fully realised characters, without revealing any aspect of their offline identity, and take the role play fantasy to a new level of embodiment. Additionally, the VR avatar is moving offline and performing in the physical world via projection screens at concerts. VR has never been more accessible to consumers – not just via hardware for people to use but also via websites where VR performers can produce content for online audiences, both recorded and live. Using Lotman, Eco, and Barthes, we hope to model the new structure of the interactions and contextualise them within the wider online culture, addressing how semiotics can aid the construction of meaning between different realities.

Keywords: virtual reality, semiosphere, VRChat, role-play, digital interactions, full-body tracking, online communication
Digitalization of culture and cultural environment in the framework of learning presupposes a question on perception and mediation. Culture either in reality or in a digital form is mediated by various cultural languages. However, in a digitized society the composition of these languages has been changing due to the change of media. In the context of interaction with culture in the digital age one should keep in mind the role of inner speech (Zhinkin 1964) as an important semiotic tool of perception and mediation, which at the same time lies on the very basis of thinking and interaction.

The use of the concept of inner speech in theoretical and empirical works by Lev Vygotsky (1982, 1983: 124, 202) developed the interest in pedagogical psychology for understanding the mechanisms of inner speech and its developmental functions. Interest in the research of inner speech grows with the introduction of digital learning environments where each studied object can be introduced by various cultural languages that form a transmedia world of the studied object. Contemporary digital learning environments put inner speech under focus as an important pedagogical tool that is able to translate various cultural languages into universal inner language. Thus the object of the paper is the research of the role and functions of inner-speech in digital learning where various cultural languages are mediated by multimedia texts.

The paper attempts to analyse the dynamics in the research of inner speech. It aims to understand the mediating functions of inner speech in dialogue with cultural texts in the framework of learning on digital environments. At the same time, the research identifies the role of digitization of cultural texts in shaping inner speech and its developmental functions. The paper concludes that inner speech is an important semiotic tool that can be used on the one hand (1) to understand the way we perceive and interpret cultural experience; and on the other hand (2) to understand the mechanisms of learning where different cultural languages are used as pedagogical tools. Inner speech exists in a form of unconscious speech with its own language of images and concepts. It is that mediator that is responsible for communication by means of cultural languages. The analysis of inner speech makes a step towards understanding the perception of culture and reality.
The paper uses the theoretical framework of inner speech in order to analyse the methodology of the educational platform Education on Screen. The platform is a research project that has been developed at the Department of Semiotics at the University of Tartu. The platform offers solutions in learning literature history, social and culture-related subjects in the context of school curriculum. The paper researches the methodology of the platform in order to identify the way that the learning environment is able to establish a dialog with inner speech in terms of digital learning. The research identifies how inner speech can be considered in terms of the methodology of digital educational environment. It develops the theoretical framework for further research in inner speech that can be used for the better understanding of the learning process in digital environments as well as to develop methodologies of digital education.

In the framework of digital learning inner speech makes a step towards understanding the mechanisms of learning and translation between various languages of culture that represent the studied material. Inner speech research finds its new applications in terms of digital learning environments where texts are represented as imaginative multimedia texts. The paper states that in digital learning inner speech has to be taken into consideration by pedagogical science as an important semiotic tool that operates between various imaginative languages simultaneously. Therefore, inner speech has to be considered by scholars as a mechanism of psychological development, semiosis and imaginative thinking. At the same time, the specific features of inner speech have to be taken into consideration for the needs of learning process design and methodology.
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LGBT+ ISSUES IN POST-REVOLUTION ARMENIAN PRESS: THE MODEL VIOLATOR OF THE PRE-ESTABLISHED ORDER

Karine Ghazaryan
University of Tartu, Estonia

The LGBT+ community has always been marginalized and discriminated in modern-day Republic of Armenia – from the very time of gaining independence in 1991. While in the 1990s the queer community was almost completely invisible in public discourse, the situation started changing as more people from the new generation of Armenians were gradually changing their attitude. But the process of rising visibility of the queer community also attracts hateful and dangerous speech (as understood by Maynard & Benesh), outbreaks of violence and harassment, as well as general strong opposition from mainstream culture (the self) towards the LGBT+ minority (the other). Furthermore, after the Velvet Revolution in April of 2018, the LGBT+ issues became one of the hottest debates in the country. Especially strong outbreaks were registered in August, a month before the municipal elections in Yerevan, and in November, a month before the snap parliamentary elections. Activists affiliated with political forces have been accused of manipulating this topic for the benefit of their political agenda via the means provided by the post-revolution chaotic media field of the Republic. In the context of relations between cultural and societal groups, Juri Lotman called the classification of space, its division between “own” and “other” an “inherent property of culture”. The Lotmanian view of relationships between the self and the other can be summarized in the formula own culture = the only culture / alien culture = lack of culture. Ascribing a divine origin to the pre-established order of own culture and the reverent attitude towards traditions (which the nonlinear nature of collective memory easily allows) underlies public discourse in Armenia and penetrates many aspects of the life of the society. Thus only those new phenomena become realities in Armenia which do not contradict with the pre-established order; others face strong resistance. I look at LGBT+ issues as the culture’s other without structure. Furthermore, I look at the coverage of queer community issues in mass media in the context of mass media’s role as a metalanguage used in culture for self-description. A widely covered case of an attack on LGBT+ individuals from the capital city Yerevan in a rural area of the country serves as an illustration of peripheral village space being perceived as the place of preservation and conservation of the pre-established order. The strong wave of hate
speech in social media as well as prescription of guilt to victims as violators of the pre-established order was followed by accentuation of the special place of the authentic “Armeniannes” of the village as opposed to the modern, thus non-authentic, city. Furthermore, I discuss how the LGBT+ community has acquired a kind of a special status as the model violator of the divine pre-established order, being at the same time strongly bound to mainstream culture by the ties of the same collective memory.

**Keywords:** self and other, centre and periphery, self-description, Velvet Revolution in Armenia
I would like to have the chance to introduce my work in progress at the Tartu Summer School of Semiotics in order to receive comments and suggestions from the audience.

My research in the cultural heritage and conservation PhD programme in The Estonian Academy of Arts is focused on the values of architectural heritage. This research is evoked by ongoing miscommunication and conflicts between heritage institutions and property owners, and proceeds from the view that the authorised heritage discourse promoted by the administration and the community’s take on local heritage are dissonant. At the current phase of my studies I am focusing on urban planning as a means of reconstructing heritage and promoting the authorised heritage discourse. I am studying the values of built heritage as they are represented in the comprehensive plan of Tartu and juxtaposing them with the values expressed in the community’s response to the plan, in order to map out how communities express their relation to their living environment, pointing out the most active value categories in this relation and positioning the role of urban heritage in the communities’ identity.

The fact that some heritage values are more widely recognized by the public than others has made me ponder if that has to do with the semiotic situation of interpretation, and if the key to understanding why some of the values are more embraced than others might be in the semiotic study of the sign relations that unites heritage with its values. I have taken a few steps on some trails of thought in this field and I would like to discuss these at the Summer School because it would be immensely helpful to receive some directions from the semioticians present. For example, if according to Peirce “what a thing means is simply what habits it involves” (CP 5.400), does it follow that the liveable aspect of buildings is so primary that it impedes its interpretation of buildings as cultural heritage? Or, is the interpretation of different heritage values based on different logics, as either indexes, icons or symbols? For example, an indexical sign leads us to realise what we can use a building for (and how that could be profitable) and so we identify the economic and other use values of monuments.
Although the link between education and economy is not new, it is for the first time, to such an extent, that educational underperformance is directly associated with countries’ macroeconomic imbalances and a new kind of social and civic disadvantage (COM, 2016:21). This growing link has inevitably affected the way education policies are designed, with neoclassical growth models and neo-liberal reforms being applied more and more widely. However, alarming results from three indicators of the Horizon 2020 agenda for education reveal an ongoing stagnation in terms of educational progress and seem to put the effectiveness of the above approach into question. The reduction of early school leavers, of educational attainment, and of educational inequality, all included in the initial ET 2010 program and repeated, because unachieved, in the Horizon 2020 agenda, not only continues to be a serious challenge (Education & Training Monitor 2017) but also reveals that school education does not always play in full its role to promote equity and social fairness (COM(2017) 248 final). This presentation draws on spatial and cultural semiotics to propose an alternative direction to deal with educational disadvantage. This alternative direction builds its argument on the fact that the chronic nature of the problem proves the triple need: a) to use a different kind of metrics able to provide new carriers of information, b) to build a new system of meaning in which these carriers won’t be discarded (Lotman 1977: 57), c) to use an aggregate of languages to represent the space of reality (Lotman 2004: 2). Under the above theorization, this work proposes an early warning system which assures new carriers of information within a new meaning system based on the aggregate use of visual and verbal languages. This early warning system of educational disadvantage is based on students’ reflexive imaginative cartographies, explored through two research tools: a) Reflexive cartographies based on dream (under the form of treasure maps) which explore students’ capability to imagine and to perceive a possible self in a future space-time perspective and b) semi-structured elicitation interviews in order to understand and to capture the meanings emerging in those
treasure maps, given that the meanings of visual productions vary from one viewer to the other. We applied this system on 213 15–18 years old vocational education students in Italy (73), France (51) and Greece (76), with all students coming from low socio-economic environments. Semiotic analysis of students’ treasure maps showed: a) that the students’ imaginative geographies reveal new analytical categories of disadvantage which are not covered by the traditional educational and sociological approaches based on statistics and language, b) that in order to have an accurate depiction of the students’ spatio-temporal reality we need both languages, visual and verbal, as, in our research sample, their combination resulted in meanings that would have been missed otherwise, and c) finally, proved the urgent need to hear and to transform the existing but discarded signals to semantic information in the struggle (Lotman 1977: vxi) against the social bomb of educational disadvantage.
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An ontogenetic complexification of umwelt includes several steps, each adding a new dimension into it: emergence of (a) simultaneity (nowness, quality), (b) spatiality (space, direction), (c) affectivity (emotion), and (d) temporality (planning). Assuming that this is the order in which these dimensions of umwelt (as well as of subjectivity) emerge, we can speculate about the mechanisms that are necessary for creating these dimensions.

Spatiality, the existence of space, is thus not a characteristic of the simplest umwelten. However, perception of space may not require representation, which means it is a rather simple phenomenon. In this study, we try to characterise the necessary features of the mechanism that can provide spatiality to an umwelt, and also to describe what the spatiality of umwelt means for an organism’s behaviour.

Frederik Stjernfelt has emphasised the importance and generality of co-localization in meaning-making. We are going to analyse his argumentation and try to specify its conditions.
Autocommunication, communication with oneself, is both functionally and structurally distinct from communication with another. The concept of autocommunication, widely adopted in cultural semiotics after Juri Lotman, finds its historic predecessor in the analyses of verbal communication in the writings of Roman Jakobson. Jakobson, in turn, developed the idea based on papers by C. S. Peirce, Lev Vygotsky, and Ruth Weir. Vygotsky’s discussion of egocentric and inner speech gave autocommunication a special role in the development of thinking in children, as he showed that differentiation of self-directed speech from communication for purely social purposes entails the child’s organisation of his or her own entire behaviour with the aid of symbols. Later, it has been found that autocommunication already appears at an earlier stage of language acquisition, and it is particularly observable during what is known as “crib talk”, which is common before the internalization of verbal “thinking” begins. Both crib talk and egocentric speech often appear as play – as something that comes out within the performance of the activity, for the sake of the activity itself, and they both involve organisation of one’s own activity by introducing secondary means. Jakobson was perhaps a little more concerned with how in autocommunication, instead of transfer of signs from one mind to another, there is transfer of signs from one state of mind to another. But in Lotman’s analyses, another type of autocommunication is outlined as well, not so much about autocommunication as bridging time instead of bridging space, but that of textual devices within the text, which guide the interpretation during autocommunicative activity in relation to the text itself. In the presentation, it will be shown how this second type of autocommunication finds its early appearance in crib talk. The presentation will trace the two types of autocommunication – corresponding to the appearance and formation of various linguistic structures in children’s speech – in the example of crib talk.

From the point of view of language acquisition, crib talk is predominantly metalingual, but by its structural composition and its play-like character, it appears to belong in the sphere of poetry also. What is revealed is a framework involving both cultural and cognitive semiotics for studying the development of symbolic thought in children.

**Keywords:** autocommunication, crib talk, inner speech, Lotman, Vygotsky, Jakobson
Both “language” and “space” are equivocal words. One has to distinguish between language as a socio-cultural phenomenon and language in Saussure’s sense as an abstract system. The first exists in physical space-time, the second in abstract space. Saussure’s language is a precondition of actual communication, but it is still problematic how the abstract system is related to empirical languages. For example, when does a language become another in time (for instance, when is the end of the Latin language and beginning of the Italian language) and space (for instance, where does the German language end and the Dutch language begins, or where does the Dutch language end and Flemish start). In the lecture I will discuss some ways to solve this problem.
Mass conflict is generally mediated through a sequential order of events, emotional states of the conflict actors, and the spatial dimensions in which the events take place. These dimensions not only influence the overall object that is the mass conflict, but also directly influence each other within the development of the mass conflict, often creating rupturing points in the development of the conflict. These rupturing points and the analysis of them happening particularly applies to riots and conflictive protests, since while they sometimes can be led by a sort of leading faction, often the participants have decided to do so without previous (direct) communication between themselves and the leadership of the protest. As such, these environments benefit from semiotic analysis, since the interpretant of the signs exhibited in the conflict area will play a larger role than, say, in a military conflict in which most actions are generally subject to a strict hierarchy of orders. Rather, there is an intuitive and autocommunicative ordering of different actors of the conflict through means of receiving and sending signs autonomously. While some protests and riots are somewhat static spatially speaking, more often than not they exhibit fluid movement throughout the near-by environment, especially if the protest takes place in a city. As such, the movement can be interpreted by taking into account the emotional states, sequence of actions, and spatial placement of the collective of the protesters. I focus on the interaction of semiotic text and spatial environment in the yellow vest movement in France, particularly by examining the protesters in Paris during the time period from November 2018 to February 2019. This analysis involves the overlaying of the temporal, spatial and emotional aspects of the conflict actors who actively interpret incoming text (be it verbal or written) and react to it in the spatial environment of Paris. As such, using video footage and photos to determine the actions and feelings of the protesters, media reports – to determine the sequence of the events, and to place them into the spatial dimension of Paris maps would allow for complex analysis of the *gillets jaunes* protests in Paris through means of semiotics of space and semiotics of conflict. These dimensions are analysed through the use of Lotman’s notions of autocommunication, as well as explosive and gradual processes. This will be supplemented by an analysis of conflict actors and place of conflict, as usually discussed in peace and conflict studies. This approach will allow for
a holistic modelling of the physical protest movement and an analysis of the factors that enabled or disabled pathways and actions of the protesters in the context of the *gillets jaunes* movement.

**Keywords:** semiotics of space, semiotics of conflict, gillets jaunes, autocommunication
In accordance with the theme “Semiotic dimensions of spaces and literacies”, our presentation is devoted to the dialogue between semiotic and philosophical spaces. We analyse a little-known article “The pressentiment of Perfection” by the French-Lithuanian semiotician Algirdas Julien Greimas (1917–1992) about his relationship with the Russian philosopher, poet and historian-medievalist Lev Karsavin (1882–1952), his professor at the University of Lithuania in Kaunas in the 1930s.

Under the influence of the approach and ideas of Karsavin, Greimas returns to the dialogue with his teacher in 1987, with the book On Imperfection. In the book, Greimas explores the human modes of textualising space in artistic (literary) languages. For Greimas and for Karsavin, “Imperfection itself inevitably leads to Perfection, a pressentiment of perfection is already the first step into the world of values”.

**Keywords:** semiotic space, philosophy, dialogue, culture, imperfection
ART, SPACE, AND ECOCRITICISM:
READING THE FOUR WORKS OF A STREET ARTIST IN
JOGJAKARTA

Ali Minanto
Department of Communications, Islamic University of Indonesia

In Jogjakarta, street art is not just a visual art, but tends to be a medium of resistance. As a medium of resistance, street art uses walls in city space as its medium, and it also reaches rural areas. Geneng, for example, a small village to the south of Jogjakarta, became a studio and visual “gallery” of street artists for expressing their ideas. Started in 2014 through Geneng Street Art Project I, street artists collaborated with villagers to create visual works that responded to problems of space that occurred in Geneng, and Jogja in general. Using the walls of people’s houses as a medium, the work of artists responds to the actual situation in the region regarding the issue of malpractice in urban spatial planning policies and land conversion problems in the village. The presence of shopping centres, hotels, and apartments triggered multidimensional conflicts, ranging from land conflicts, water, traffic congestion, to other social conflicts with a continuously expanding scale.

Expressions of resistance against urban spatial policies were expressed in the works of four Jogjakarta street artists: Taring Padi, Media Legal, Nano Warsono, Anti-Tank, and Andreas (Anagard). Taring Padi (TP) is known as a group of leftist artists who declare themselves as a group of artists who reconstruct popular culture and encourage popular democratic practices in Indonesia. In its work at the Geneng Street Art Project, TP created a mural titled “Jogja Ora Didol (Jogjakarta is not for Sale)”. Media Legal (the artist’s name from Isrol) carries the adage of “street art for social justice” that responds to the socio-cultural situation in Indonesia in each of his works. In Geneng, his work entitled “Before All Becomes a Big City (Sebelum Semua Menjadi Ibu Kota)” sucks the attention of the public. Andreas (Anagard) is the initiator of the Geneng Street Art Project and founder of Ruang Kelas SD, a street art community that is very active in criticizing unpopulist government policies, voicing the ideas of the people in the village, and portraying environmental issues and agricultural land problems as they happened in Geneng. The same spirit was also delivered by other street artists, such as Nano Worsono.

The Street art project in Geneng Village is one of the “galleries” of street art in Jogjakarta. In some places, similar expressions also appear sporadically. Interestingly,
street art works that are scattered in the spots of the city and villages in Jogjakarta often involve public participation. The public is not just a consumer of artistic visuality, but also contributes in production and exhibition. The collaborative work of artist-community produces authentic work with a message that is stronger because it reflected the actual conditions faced by society. This engagement strengthens the role of street art as an art of visual awareness and literacy for the community, especially as related to the issue of space and environment. Policies of urban/rural spatial planning that are more biased toward the interests of capital owners, and policies that have an impact on environmental damage are the topics represented in street art works in Jogjakarta.

Through the Peircean semiotic approach, I read four works of street artists that present critical ideas and resistance: Taring Padi (Jogja is not for Sale), Media Legal (Before all become a big City), Nano Warsono (Water is Source of Life, Not for Greed), and Anagard (Good Bye Nature, Welcome Pollution). This research reads symbolic, indexical, and iconic messages presented in each of the works of these artists. The articulation of signs in their work is interesting to be read because it is correlative with the ideological reasoning of the artist as a sign producer, actual problems in the spatial and environmental context, and socio-cultural values as a context. This research is also supported by a visual literacy approach in the context of the power of images (Messaris and Moriarty; Burch, in Smith 2005: 481–502), concepts about the production of space (Henri Lefebvre), and concepts about ecocriticism.
I argue that a recently observed semiotic turn in linguistics and translation studies confirms the prognosis of media theory that human societies of the electronic age resemble tribal, oral societies more than modern societies, as shaped by the print medium. From the point of view of media theory, the landscape, itself a medium, is modelled according to the affordances of mediatic representations for spatial organization. In addition to media theory, semiotics can explain this on account of the similarity between modelling processes in digitalised societies and the human natural environment. As such, surprisingly, while the digital adds new layers to mediating social representations, an ecological shift becomes opportune. Digitalisation (shift from print to digital media) has complex but little-explored consequences for how humans model their environment and society. It presents both challenges and opportunities. Modern philosophy, framed by its corresponding media, has not equipped society with a literacy for interpretative contexts where multitude of sensory channels, meaning modalities and media overlap. My argument is that while the linearity of modern media formed a corresponding linearity of human modelling systems, the multimodal turn of digitalisation offers the opportunity for an ecological turn. Linear modelling systems are unfit for digital societies and, we can now explain in hindsight, for the natural environment too. Unlike linear and analytic modern texts, the subjective environment of the human species is multimodally constructed. Linear representations of the print technology underpin mind-body dualist, modern philosophy that appears un-ecological. It distorts the human multimodal cognitive model of the environment into a linear and monomodal one. Developing a joint understanding of ecological and digital literacy would help to solve the various ecological and social problems emerging from the epistemological skepticism of (late) modernity. The shift towards the digital is, essentially, a phenomenon of translation. Particularly, it is a transduction of texts, in their multimodal and intertextual complexities, from their previous media onto digital ones. To develop an understanding of the modelling competencies that would underpin a digitally literate society, meaning articulation in a digital society has to be analysed in comparison to meaning articulation in pre-digital societies. I propose
rooting such analysis in a semiotic framework for cultural analysis and ecology. Ecoweconomics is precisely such a theory, concerned with the relations of meaning between humans and their environments. I consider that ecoweconomics is particularly insightful, given this theory’s premise and focus on how representation impacts on the represented. I conclude by arguing that a human society considerably modelled by digital media is more akin than societies modelled by historically previous media (alphabet, printing, broadcasting) to understand landscape as the critical ground for media products necessary for the survival of all species which populate it.

**Keywords:** modelling, affordance, environment, media, landscape
The concept of dispositive was proposed by Michel Foucault in the mid-1970s in order to analyse how social configurations of power transform individuals into subjects. The dispositive signified, for him, a network of heterogeneous elements deployed to some strategic ends. A dispositive is thus, firstly, defined by the logic of association of these elements, and secondly, by its ends, by what it produces. As a most famous example: the Panopticon produces docile subjects by way of a specific distribution of light in space. Gilles Deleuze and Giorgio Agamben, developing and reinterpreting Foucault’s concept, expand the concept of dispositive into a socially omnipresent category – almost any kind of device, object, set of statements, and association of elements can be called a dispositive. As such, the dispositive becomes an ontological concept through which it becomes possible to reconceptualise the notion of society itself. The purpose of the talk is to explore what are the consequences of the concept of the dispositive for an image of society, and furthermore, for the figure of the social subject.

**Keywords:** dispositive, subjectivity, power, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, Giorgio Agamben
LITERACY AND COMPETENCE IN THE AGE OF VIRTUALITY

Anti Randviir
University of Tartu, Estonia

The intrinsic connection between space and culture is a long noticed and accepted truth. It also goes by common sense that in order for people to be successful in their operations in and with both space and culture, they must possess certain knowledge of both. Consequently, spatial and cultural literacy must go hand in hand. Orientation in physical-geographical space and in cultural space are thus bound together, and the cognitive mapping of space and culture are thereby linked methodologically as well. It has been acknowledged that the culture of *Homo sapiens* is organised into versatile cultural spaces – cultural and spatial diversity go hand in hand. The methodological understanding of the realm of mankind as composed of different culture areas has nowadays been supplemented by the multiplication of principally new types of culture, concerning primarily virtual culture(s). The same can be said about space, which has likewise virtualised. When talking about the variety of man’s environment in terms of the diverse dimensions of culture and space (e.g. physical, social, linguistic, political, etc.), we could still connect those spheres with either brute or institutional facts and factuality. The virtualisation of space and culture have brought along a new situation in which the “ground” for sign creation, indexicality and referentiality of the semiotic reality have distanced themselves from eventually any substantiality in ontological terms. We witness the looming of the so-called internet communities and cultures in virtual spaces, and we can see how not only certain subcultures, but also (aspects) of mass culture have become virtual. The lack of an ontological reality check on the creation of those virtualities has led to pretty extreme conditionality in the organisation of virtual semiotic spaces. Eventually the semiotic units by which they are operated are not any more connected even with the “cultural tradition” of those virtual communities and cultures. This means that, rather than being literate agents of those cultures, it is important to be able to competently swim in quite novel information flows. Thus there arises a completely new methodological puzzle: are “competence” and “literacy” connected any more, and how are cultures and spaces to be defined in the era (or situations) in which the ability to communicate on the basis and in the environment of common sociocultural luggage has been replaced by the ability to use operational techniques of manipulating with individual semiotic units of that sociocultural luggage?
Boundary is a central concept and mechanism in semiotics (of culture). Resulting from the appearance of discreteness, it is present already at the elementary level of semiosis. The boundary can be defined as a spatializing distinction. As such, it is a structural feature of spatial modelling – for example, a central feature in Juri Lotman’s models of “text”, “cultural space” and “semiosphere”, but in contrast curiously not present in others, e.g. in Pierre Bourdieu’s “social space” as focused on social-cultural distinctions. It is also present in the sociocultural semiosis itself. Identifying empirical semiotic boundaries can however be problematic – rather than being structural features, they exist in the process of distinction making and by application of distinctions. Therefore, I aim to relate the notion of boundary, including its elementary and theoretical nature, to “boundary signs” and their modalities as manifestations and evidence of semiotic boundaries, and to the objectivation process of boundaries whereby specific and particular distinctions become widely shared, institutionalised and comprehensible across cultural differences and over history. Explication of the process of objectivation and modalities of “boundary signs” enables the shift of “boundary” from theoretical semiotic notion to a methodological tool for the semiotic analysis of traces of cultural change and of interrelations of semiotic systems.

**Keywords:** boundary, semiotics of space
Digital storytelling is widely used as a tool that can help empower marginalized social groups and better their sense of belonging in a society. Digital space enables the accommodation of the voices of those whose narratives are not represented in mainstream culture and thus opens a possibility for everyone to tell their story and to be heard. Telling a digital story combines various artistic traditions and narrative practices, with digital technology creating a new hybrid form of self-expression. In the context of social projects this type of storytelling is seen as an effective means of establishing a positive self-image for people who live in societies that do not reflect their own cultural experience, leaving them often disconnected from their everyday environment.

Whilst the aspect of identity formation has been studied extensively in connection with these types of projects, what is yet to be explored is the potential of these digital stories to reshape the way we connect to our living environment. In this presentation we would like to explore this idea further in the context of an educational project currently under development, which addresses the Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic countries as a unique mnemonic community that dwells on the border of various contradicting narratives, most of which do not manage to include the perspective of this particular group. The project consists of three parts: (I) students collecting stories of their grandparents’ (most of whom arrived in the Baltic region after World War II) first impressions and memories of these borderlands of the Soviet Union; (II) retelling those stories themselves using digital media tools and (III) establishing a coherent educational environment for publishing these stories as learning material.

Our main interest lies in researching how retellings of these familial memories can shape the students’ comprehension of these cultural spaces. However, as we are talking about a work in progress, it is too early to state how exactly this type of learning process will affect the sense of belonging of the Russian-speaking students in present day Estonia and Latvia. That is why we will focus instead on introducing the main frameworks that guide the development of this project.
A FRAMEWORK FOR (SOCIAL) RESEMANTIZATION

Claudio J. Rodríguez H.
Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic

When certain conditions are met, everyday objects become much more than objects in our environments, because it allows for a model of analysis of that. Generally speaking, environments do not give us one-to-one semantic correspondences, with a variety of potential and active meanings within our perception. In studying what constitutes the semanticity of these objects, there are some things to take into account for this presentation: their discreteness and mereological constitution, the rigidity of their designation and possibility of their sudden resemantization. This last point is an interesting one to explore in light of the discreteness and rigidity of the reference to the objects in our environment because it allows us to develop analytic models for semiotic interaction with specific environmental objects in contexts where these abandon their day to day currency.

The focus of this presentation will rest in the cognitive tenets of Uexküllian semiotics as a way to establish a model of resemantization of objects within social interactions. We will explore the process of rapid change in reference and the way objects in perception are divided via resemantization within a non-experimental framework, with the aim of encouraging a dialogue with cognitive semiotics at large from a Tartu-theoretical perspective.

Keywords: Uexküll, resemantization, cognitive semiotics
ARTICULATING THE BORDER, REDEFINING THE LANGUAGE OF SPACE

Franciscu Sedda
Università di Cagliari, Italy

In 1992, Lotman explicitly posits the existence and the fundamental role of two deeply interconnected primary modelling systems: the natural language and the language of space. Yet, the reflection on space as a modelling system is present throughout the entirety of Lotman’s work: for example, in the essay “On the metalanguage of a typological description of culture” (1969), in the famous essay “On the semiosphere” (1984) and last but not least in various parts of “Culture and Explosion” (1993).

What we would like to argue is that at the moment we fully assume space as a primary modelling system, the distinction between inside and outside – or inside/border/outside – appears as just one of the possible tools and levels of description and explanation of the powerful structuring agency of space.

Then, our aim is to deepen the reflection on the nexus of continuity/discontinuity represented by the Lotmanian idea of border. Drawing examples from various languages and discourses we would like to show that the paradoxical notion of border can be more widely articulated: from a discontinuous categorization of space – like in the idea of “edge” – to a continuous one – like in the idea of “frontier” – passing through non-continuous and non-discontinuous ones – as in the idea of “limit” and “threshold”. This new articulation of the concept of border will lead us to individuate four macromodels of space that organize meaning and structure our experience of reality.
The paper outlines some reflections on the role of Nostalgia in the regenerating process that is now taking place in Veronetta, a wide neighbourhood located in Verona, Italy. Despite the way Veronetta was considered in the past, it is now attracting widespread interest due to the significant rise in cultural practices. Previous works have only focused on the innovative sides of the regeneration. My study takes into account the boundaries between the present and the past. The research aims to show how the sense of Nostalgia is acting as a catalyst in the regenerating process.

The work first gives an overview of the historical background and the birth of the neighbourhood. Then, it discusses the shift in the way Veronetta is narrated by the media sphere and analyses sites and cultural practices in which the past is somehow present and shared by different people.

After a brief analysis on the concept of Nostalgia through a semiotic perspective, the paper considers nostalgic places, objects and practices of this neighbourhood. In all of these spaces and practices, Nostalgia does not play a restorative role. Rather, it is inextricably linked to the regeneration of Veronetta and to the progress of the whole community. This effect on future realities is what has been already registered during the recent years in Veronetta, as many social groups joined together in living the neighbourhood, mostly people coming from a different city or a different country.

To conclude, the sense of Nostalgia has been valuable in Veronetta, instead of being a sheer reflection, since this passion is able to combine the past with the present and to let people living on a border between what is belonging to them and what is not. In this way, Nostalgia has allowed Veronetta to experience a rise in terms of different languages. It is this plurality which guarantees the regeneration process of the neighbourhood, hence allowing the city to grow in its cultural, social and political aspects.
Dreams have always intrigued humankind, arousing questions concerning the nature of existence, realness of reality, stability of identity, origin of thought and the like. The dream is a highly individual space analogous to real space and practically indistinguishable from everyday reality so long as one is asleep, and to tell the difference, one needs language. Sleep and dreaming in humans are far more archaic than primary language, and by the same token, dream is the oldest structural model of space, albeit unconsciously developed. Dreaming itself is an important function of the brain as regards its plasticity, individual memory and by extension the persona and identity – “I” – of the subject. The individual's world, along with the subject, is duplicated every night, often more than once.

The prerequisite for dream is sleep and for sleep a body conscious of itself, its boundaries and separateness from the world by way of language, the signifying processes of which consist of two heterogeneous levels within the mind – the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic is the ordering of the symbolic and the symbolic designates the material which determines what can be articulated in a given sign system. The semiotic as part of the signifying process has its origins in the body or chora, a non-expressive, pre-verbal functional state, whereas the symbolic designates language in its normative use and by extension all modelling systems based on natural language.

Indistinguishable from real space, dream has the dimensions of height and width ultimately reproduced from our bodily experience i.e. from the chora. In light of the analogous structure and function of three classes of intellectual objects – the human intellect, text, and culture – the question then arises: how to define the chora of culture?

The aim of this presentation is to shed light on this matter and to propose that what the chora is to the human subject, its analogue in culture is the cultural model based on the fragmentation of space; what the semiotic and the symbolic are to the conscious mind, their analogue in culture are the syntactic and the semantic, respectively; and what the dream is to the mind’s eye, their analogue in culture are cultural texts and myths.
In addition, by way of conjoining the four-dimensional sign with types of traditional thinking, a proposal will be made towards the possibility of merging cultural typology with modal semiotics, in order to further the general field of sign theory as well as that of cultural semiotics.

**Keywords:** consciousness, dream, culture, analogy, cultural typology
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Cultural experience is directly related to how cultural languages are cultivated in a given society during a given historical period, as the richness of cultural languages correlates positively with the amount of multiplicity and richness in the culture’s self-descriptive processes. Cultural experience exists in a cultural space, and the cultural processes in this space are the main research objects of disciplines that study culture: “Genetically speaking, culture is built upon two primary languages. One of these is the natural language used by humans in everyday communication. [...] The nature of the second primary language is not so obvious. What is under discussion is the structural model of space” (Lotman 1992: 142).

Cultural experience occurs in a cultural space, which exists in balance between immediate and mediated culture. The dynamics of cultural mediation makes it is increasingly essential to discuss both the plurality of sociocultural processes and the plurality of sources. Elementary communication turns into intercommunication, the sharing of sources. Text can exist in the cultural space as an intersemiotic whole, in forms that are not only readable, but also watchable, audible and perceptible in different forms. These intersemiotic, intermedial versions of the same text are available both in the web and on other digital platforms that form the transmedia world. Transmediality as a new reality of culture is one of the reasons why textual and cultural analysis need new tools for developing analysability. Transmediality and crossmediality currently appear as the two main directions of communicative processes, whereas heterogeneity of texts and new ontological features of the text in the new media environment necessitate theoretical, economical and educational conceptualization of digital texts and digital reading.

Habits of reading and interpretation, skills of textual analysis, strategies of keeping texts in cultural memory and texts as mediators of (historical, mythological, psychological) time and space are the basis of cultural literacy. Cultural literacy can be understood as the ability to perform an analysis of culture on metalevels and in the context of interdiscursivity. Theoretically it is also important to see continuity in cultural processes and to analyse the mechanisms of the sustainability of cultures
through the development of new types of communicating not only with contemporary culture but also with cultural heritage.

According to the programmatic text, semiotics of culture is “…the study of the functional correlation of different sign systems. From this point of view, particular importance is attached to questions of the hierarchical structure of the languages of culture…” (Lotman a.o. 2013: 53). The methodological program formulated in this text is still actual, innovative, and applicable for the analysis of changed cultural experience in transmedial cultural space.
From the late 1920s to the early 1950s, N. Ya. Marr’s theories were very popular in Soviet academic circles. The popularity of these theories cannot be explained only by political or opportunistic reasons: among Marr’s followers, there were many honest scholars who sincerely considered his doctrine remarkable and important for the development of several academic disciplines at once. One of the reasons for the academic success of Marr’s theories was the fact that his “New Theory of Language” claimed the status of a particular holistic discipline, a kind of interdisciplinary umbrella, which, by its methodology in particular, would cover several academic fields at once, thus going beyond Marr’s primary area of interest, linguistics. From this point of view, Marr can be partially considered a forerunner of semiotic research in the Soviet Union, which may explain the positive attitude that a number of Soviet specialists in semiotics maintained in regards to Marr in the 1970s–1990s, including some scholars from the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school.

Among the active and sincere adherents of the “New Theory of Language” was the zoologist and geographer Lev Berg (1876–1950), the author of many important works on ichthyology, geography and theory of biological evolution. Berg’s works on ichthyology and the theory of evolution exerted a strong influence on the very formation of the Marrist “New Theory of Language” back in the 1920s: Marr himself considered the borrowing of models from one discipline to be put to use in another to be an important feature of his teaching; in order to prove his theories, he appealed to specialists in other academic fields, including Berg.

After the severe criticism of Marr’s theories by Stalin in 1950, Berg was one of the very few Soviet scholars who dared to contradict the dictator. In Berg’s opinion, while (partly) erroneous in terms of their linguistic component, Marr’s works were important for the development of other areas of knowledge – including geography, the discipline in which Berg, President of the Geographical Society of the USSR (1940–1950), was an undoubted authority at the time.
The arguments employed by Berg in defence of Marr’s theories were associated with the interdisciplinary nature of research based on the methodology of the “New Theory of Language”: the geographical space was therefore largely understood by Berg in a semiotic sense (semiotics to be conceived here as a holistic discipline, rather than the science of signs and sign process).

In the paper, we will analyse the methodological arguments provided by Berg that concern the semiotic dimension of geographic space, and which make it possible to consider Berg as a forerunner of semiotic studies, those of the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school in particular.
The principal focus of my paper will be on lifeworld existentials of the dialogical self, faced with multi-textual narratives and multi-voiced judgements in an age of civilizational arguments and disputes. In particular, I am interested in learning how the participants of wide-world communication are able to cope with interlingual and intercultural differences in apprehensions and enactments of commonalties of meanings and beliefs through linguistic pragmatics and rhetoric. The object of my investigation concentrates on the human self who is aware of its public situatedness and private responsibility in relation to others. Putting the selfhood-otherness relationality among primordial lifeworld existentials such as corporeality, spatiality, and temporality, I will exhibit the consequences of dialogical rhetoric in achieving common sense which satisfies the goods shared by interacting agents in communication. What I should detach in pragmatic terms are, on the one hand, the virtue-oriented issues of public precepts in the interlingual and intercultural competence of communicators, and on the other, private conducts in the linguistic and cultural performance of their communicative actions. Correspondingly, I will examine the human selves, how they coexist at the turn of times, the recent past, and the present future. In relation to this turn, I will confront the belief that there is only one truth, towards which humans publicly strive, to the ascertainment that what exists in reality are only differences between various understandings of culture-relative truths, which they have privately to learn in order to achieve the protected or promoted commonality of meanings. I will argue that communicating individuals can only assume or approximate this semantic ground for understanding based on common sense through appropriate conversational strategies of interpersonal rhetoric. Thus, the subject matter of my investigation, pertaining to the counterpoised rhetorical turn of ages from locality to globality, will be a typology of changes in terms of attitudes or positions, from selfish individualism to responsible communitarianism, rationalist criticism to empiriocriticism, emotivist prejudice to unmarked tolerance, etc. As expected
outcomes, I shall be interested in contributing to my planned research project under the title *The Dialogical Self at the Communicative Turn from Locality to Globality*. Accordingly, the scope of my investigations will be divided into three areas: (1) transdisciplinary understandings of selfhood, personhood, and subjectivity, (2) concepts of dialogue and dialogical turn in philosophical, psychological, sociological, and literary studies, (3) modelling interpersonal and intersubjective transactions from pragmatism to applied phenomenology. My conceptual frame of reference will involve several theoretical distinctions: communication ethics literacy, dialogical rhetoric, applied existential phenomenology, and communicological signs of the human self. The operative methods in my work are (1) qualitative, meaning the use of text-based discourse evidence (sufficient condition judgment for reliability), (2) logic-based, meaning the use of inductive interpretation (necessary condition judgment for validity), and (3) applied, meaning testable by practical implementation (utility condition judgment for accuracy). To deal with the dialogical self embedded in public polyglotic or poly-traditional discourses, I will use a qualitative methodology based on rhetoric exposing community values, a narrative approach to identity construction of self-other relationships in multilingual/multicultural settings.
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This paper merges the two kinds of discourses which inquire, firstly, how measurable space is used as a culturally determined medium of social interaction and, secondly, how spatiality is perceived as an experiential phenomenon of lived-world constituents. At the outset, the descriptive material of my research will comprise some of hitherto existing classifications of interpersonal distances in terms of semiotic behaviour of human selves engaged in observable interpersonal communication and assumable intersubjective understanding. And for interpretive purposes, I have chosen the conceptual and methodological framework of the phenomenology of practice tentatively defined as a set of texts created in the first person for communicating about individually experienced reality of everyday life. The descriptive basis of my subject matter will form the personal space specified within the scope of the discipline called proxemics, the study of spatial proximity, or nearness in interpersonal contacts. This space, varying in size and range – according to contexts, or situations – forming an invisible bubble, which surrounds communicating individuals, will be evaluated in relation to interpersonal distances, intimate versus formal, private – public, or individual – collective. Bearing in mind the unlimitedness of space in objective reality, I will call attention to subjectively established boundaries of space in personal dimensions of interpersonal encounters, defined as territories, zones, localities, or places.

Correspondingly, I will notify that the researchers of spatial distances have only selected descriptions of nonverbal proxemics and territoriality at their disposal. There are no appropriate studies devoted to verbal proximity expressed in human communication. This lack may be satisfied by taxonomies of communicational styles or registers, such as, e.g., frozen (public oratorical speeches), formal (legal and bureaucratic writings or address forms), consultative (dialogical transactions), casual (sociable or recreational exchanges), intimate (affective expressions among family members, or long-term friends). Another kind of investigative material for measuring
verbally expressed distance among communication participants might be found in the domain of linguistic pragmatics where the strategies of politeness principles, or the scales of indirectness in speech acts, used in conversations, are examined.

Regarding the investigative perspective of my research, I will analyse proxemics through the lens of practicing phenomenologists, who develop the ideas of “lived world”, using hermeneutic distinctions such as “lived life”, “lived meaning”, or “lived experience”. Thus, the topic of my detailed discussion will pertain to one of the so-called “lifeworld existentials”, known worldwide as lived body (corporeality), lived human relation or lived self-other (relationality or communality), lived space (spatiality), and lived time (temporality). For my purposes, it would be enough to ask how human beings share their interpersonal space with others in lived experiences of places. A space around a person, in which he/she moves and find himself/herself at home, is a territory, or an area that he/she treats as his/her own, constituting a lived extension of his/her body. Each person takes stand to his/her own personal space, which includes the area existing around his/her territorial property, such as his/her home, sometimes delimited by fences or walls, the interior of his/her room, his/her own locus of living or lived privacy.
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This symposium will address how Peirce’s semiotic contributes to the following inquiries: how many modeling systems exist, the status of the primary modeling system, and the place of the lower semiotic threshold. These constitute points of contention between structural semiology and Peircean semiotics. Attention will be given to how Peirce’s semiotic addresses Juri Lotman’s suggestion that, in addition to verbal language-as-primary modeling system, there is another primary modeling system that may even precede natural verbal language. This alternate primary modeling system is shared by humans and other living systems (Krampen 1981; Sebeok 1990) and constitutes the universal first mental object concept in human ontogeny (Leslie 2007, West 2013). This universal system is spatial in nature. Although this possibility is only mentioned in passing (by Lotman), Peircean semiotics lends itself directly to the character and function of this “primary” spatial modeling system, particularly its treatment of regenerative Thirdness (Deely 2015; 1905: 8.338) as provenated (Deely 2009: 29; Deely 2012: 156) in attention to qualia and in the more conscious individuation of qualia via gestural indexes. This demonstrates the relevance of the dynamic object, energetic interpretants, and underscores how Peirce “widened” interpretants of icons and indexes (1906: 4.538). Abundant methodological and theoretic consequences of this possibility need to be teased out. In structural semiology, verbal language is maintained as the primary modeling system for the principal reason that all semiotic analysis takes place in words, whether written or spoken. This provision is imposed with consideration of the inevitable problem of reification and
hypostatization – in principle, qualia, deictics, and affects exist, but once studied they are always already conventionalized within the system of verbal language. To what extent are semiotic systems that typologize pre-verbal signs simply guilty of this kind of pre-Kantian naïve realism? Does the spatial modeling system have its own sort of double articulation, or rather is it that double articulation is no requirement of sign action? How does the postulation of a non-verbal spatial modeling system bear upon the relation of semiosis to consciousness? That is, the presence of spatial “primary” modeling implies that many early sign processes are unconscious, even joint action schemas. This symposium will explore whether simple directional signs, unarticulated through verbal language/other symbolic systems, can possess sufficient meaning to qualify as signs, in the structural semiological sense. This special session of the Summer School will take up these critical questions; and the theme of primary and secondary modeling systems will be examined through the lens of Peirce’s semiotic. This inquiry will go far to uncover what Lotman really meant by “secondary,” namely, a system working behind the scenes – underlying, sustaining, and augmenting verbal modeling systems.

**Keywords:** Peirce, consciousness, modelling systems, language, space
The vogue in Peircean semiotics today is to associate his thinking with the realism of Duns Scotus and John Poinsot and to downplay the influence of German idealism for example. By this reading, not only the latter, but all of modern philosophy from Descartes to Derrida can be well enough ignored (Deely 2009), and Peirce’s pragmaticism is incompatible with all forms subject-critical theory. According to Umberto Eco (The Role of the Reader, 1984[1979]) one should not overstate this realism against the pronounced element of dialectical idealism in Peirce. For Eco, there is room in Peirce’s semiotics for both subject-critical theory and for cognitive realism but, according to for instance Stjernfelt (2007) and T.L. Short (2007), Eco has Peirce all wrong. The first argument of the presentation refutes this trendy condemnation of Eco’s unlimited semiosis, in defense of Eco’s hybrid semiotic model. Unlimited semiosis obtains alongside the ultimate interpretant and its discourse-independent cognitive semiotic referent, which model laid out in its embryonic form as early as Eco’s A Theory of Semiotics (1979[1975]), but comes to fruition in Kant and the Platypus (2000[1997]). The cognitive realism of Eco’s hybrid model is fleshed out with reference to the work of Donna E. West (2014; 2018). The second argument of the presentation draws the connection between unlimited semiosis and the Lacanian-Kristeva notion of self as subject-in-process, as this connection is elaborated by Brigit Nordtug (2007), John P. Muller (1996), and Vincent Colapietro (1988, 2016). Kristeva’s subject-in-process, as it is described in the interaction of the semiotic and the symbolic, is already articulated in a quasi-Peircean register (Kristeva 1984[1974]). Twenty-first century Peirce as expounded by West, Short, and Stjernfelt has manifold ramifications for Kristeva’s interrogation of subjectivity in both its literary-analytic and clinical-psychoanalytic applications. One might argue that the Hegelian basis of Lacan and Kristeva’s subject-in-process renders it incompatible with the semiotics of Peirce. The third argument of the presentation considers the relation of Hegel to Peirce, emphasizing against the grain the abundant similarities over the admitted differences, as noted principally by Robert Stern (2013a, 2013b). To what end? The difference between pragmatism and pragmaticism is frequently noted, however few put it so well as Eco in his various works, when he stresses that Peirce’s semiotic realism is a far cry from any unproblematic take on discourse independent reality and how we get at it.
The founding gesture of subject-critical theory – alienation – is not quite so inimical to Peircean pragmaticism as some would have it. The central argument of Eco’s unlimited semiosis is that, with it, Peirce reached the highest form of his realism. Unlimited semiosis as subject-in-process is reconsidered in the context of the doctrine of habit as habit change, presented by Nöth, Colapietro, and others in *Consensus on Peirce’s Concept of Habit* (2016). The hard wedge between subject-critical theory and Peircean pragmaticism is challenged on these grounds.
In contrast with the unidirectional thermodynamics of physical time, the phenomenology of subjective time is modelled by the bidirectional notions of self, memory and meaning. In this regard experimental evidence points to Mental Time Travel (MTT), the neurocognitive ability of performing retrospective and prospective thinking, according to a sequence of mental scenes (Nyberg et al, 2010).

This presentation will explore the hypothesis that MTT is a semiotic modelling system, one that is integrated by increasingly complex, and progressively dependent memory spheres or frameworks. More particularly, I will explore the double articulation between semantic memory (SeM) and episodic memory (EpM).

SeM allows mentally travelling in space, and is a prerequisite for EpM (Tulving 2005: 6). In turn, EpM allows projecting into past and futures scenarios “in a phenomenologically rich manner” (Michaelian, Klein and Szpuna 2016: 7).

Also, research on patients with hippocampal amnesia – or the inability to recall past experiences and imagine their personal future – provides evidence for claiming that SeM is primary, and EpM is secondary (Klein, Loftus and Kihlstrom 2002).

Against this background, the presentation will ponder the idea that SeM is an indexical or relational stage that precedes different forms of prospective thinking, such as simulation, prediction, intention, and planning (Szpunar, Spreng and Schacter 2014). Because of its factual information, I will argue, SeM essentially deals with dicisigns or propositions (CP. 2.250), which have an indexical logic, and are not necessarily verbal nor human-specific (Stjernfelt 2014; 2015: 1021).

This would be in consonance with the biosemiotic hypotheses that, as their shared set of functions suggests, EpM may have evolved from SeM (Tulving 1983); and prospective thinking seems to be neurocognitively inseparable from retrospective thinking (Perrin 2016: 45).

From a pragmatic stance, we may further attribute this to the facts that symbolicity is logically preceded by indexicality (Deacon 2012: 74). It would follow, then, that inferring a past event may essentially require an inductive semiosis or poneception (De Tienne 2015: 41). This implies a mental act of spatially going from
the particular to the general, because the index is past-oriented (Stjernfelt 2007: 29). Finally, anticipating a future event may mainly require deductive semiosis or anteception (De Tienne 2015: 38). This implies a conative act of going from the abstract to the particular, because symbols are future-oriented (Stjernfelt 2007: 30).

If episodic images stand to the autonoetic interpretant for non-present spatiotemporal scenarios, in some inferential respect or neurocognitive capacity, we may further speculate on the connection between MTT studies and consciousness, space and time: three formal intuitions or continua according to Peirce.

In order to do so, I will interpret experimental findings in MTT studies – such as Nyberg’s (2010), and Miles’ (2010) – recurring to the work of Kull (2018), West (2019), and De Tienne (2015), who have tackled the phenomenology of time perception from a Peircean perspective.
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BEFORE A THOUGHT APPEARS
(THED NOTION OF THE “GROUND” IN PEIRCE’S THOUGHT)

Ivan Mladenov
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria

My paper has the main objective to shape a new, fresh strategy for the study of the thought process as related to the ground. I would like to show the usage and function of the notion of the *ground* in Charles Peirce’s thought. Peirce presented the concept of the ground early, in his first widely appreciated essay *On a New List of Categories* (1867), and only barely mentioned it thereafter. Instead, he replaced it with the sign, immediate interpretant, Firstness, hypostatic abstraction. Yet, even in the earliest definition of the ground, Peirce used relation as its main characteristic. He describes it as “a pure abstraction, reference to which constitutes a quality or general attribute”. However, it stands to such pure abstraction “in certain respect” only, “in that sense in which we say that one man catches another man’s idea”. This is how Peirce defines the ground – a mysterious sign, which exists “for a tenth of a second”, while the spark of understanding makes a leap from the pole of the representamen to the pole of the object. It is general but it evokes familiar ideas in the mind, it is abstract but it refers to a specific thing, it is “thing-ness”. It relates to both: Aristotle’s *substance* and Duns Scotus’ *haecceitas* hinting to a more developed view of what the moving power behind any act of cognition could be. Although Peirce renamed the term soon after he introduced it, the notion of the ground continues to influence his phaneroscopy, sign-classification and logical graphs. The characteristics of the “ground” could easily be trace back to Aristotle, or they could allude to contemporary theories, say to Wittgenstein’s representational thinking. In trying to reveal these processes, we apply the “non/cognate approaches” – a group of methods which investigate the phenomena as they originate. These approaches are cognate and non-cognate at the same time due to their common root. However, they branch in art, philosophy and literature, following the traces of relativity among them. Does the first appearance of a thought overlap with the emergence of a “shadow sign” – the ground? What is it the ground of a sign? Before a thought, there must be something out of which it appears. For Charles Peirce, that “something” is a potentiality which he calls “a mere feeling”, or “a quality of feeling”. This is the beginning of a thought process. But which beginning is this? Is it an absolute beginning? A beginning in the middle of semiosis? Is it an unidentifiable beginning? Indeed, what can be said that constitutes the beginning of a thought? Does thought even have a beginning?
To reveal his concept of the beginning of cognition, Peirce used a spatial experiment, in which an inverted triangle is dipped into water. The appearance of meaning follow the points made by the water on the sectional lines of the triangle upward. For Peirce, knowing a thing would be within “semiosis”, the process of sign building, which is accompanied by an understanding and interpretation that would add endless nuances of meaning on to the side of the interpretants, and equally so regressively move towards the object’s essence. To integrate the approaches for revealing a ground, we suggest the neologism “abdaction”, which describes the first act of knowing. Next to guessing, it signifies the need of dynamic change in order for cognition to start.

Keywords: Peirce, ground, Aristotle, relation, representation.
With Sketches of a semiotic architecture I’d like to share ongoing work that delves into the elusive object of space. Connecting insights from both the Peircean and structuralist/post-structuralist traditions. Touching upon work by Peirce, Deely, Deacon, Eco, Kristeva, Derrida, Lefebvre… In all these traditions “space” remains the main enabler of semiosis, but is often not recognized as such. By connecting a number of formulas that try to capture insights of semiosis – I=f(O) (identity is a function of alterity), ∞ {I/O} ∞ (how the space of differentiation works as a stepping stone to go from identity formation to umwelt and beyond), 0=1/∞ (how unity can only be known through fragmentation), … – it is possible to close in on the “generator” character of space. Furthermore, the hypostatic abstraction of space confronts us with an object that actually belongs in a category of its own. Taking inspiration from mathematics, I propose the label of an “irrational object” which does not check off the clear check boxes of denotatum and designatum, but instead confronts every semiotic organism with the conundrum that it is not space that permits literacy, it’s the species specific capabilities of literacy that define the “irrational object” of space as an object of absence – for the specific species at hand.
Peirce’s pragmatism is a statement of the scientific method: it is to define “what the purpose is a purpose to bring about” (MS 478). This does not leave much room for non-intentional phenomena, as those pertain to the category of firstness. Appearances, sensations and feelings and the more qualified ones such as (i) “immediate consciousness of quality” (and so not just any quality as such) and “single non-compound sensations” (and so not just any sensation), as well as (ii) the sign-theoretic “tones and qualsigns”, “icons and images” and “rhemas”, and (iii) the phaneroscopic, logical and diagrammatic “logically indecomposable elements of thought”, “spots and potentials”, “substantive possibilities”, and “sheets of consciousness”. These are not only “undifferentiated quales”. As pragmaticism is to find out the meaning and purpose of signs that are of the nature of “thoughts, intellectual concepts and generalities”, they belong to the category of thirdness, not firstness. Yet a deeper analysis of (i)-(iii) reveals a theoretical structure within which signs are embedded. Even though conscious experience was hardly a household notion in Peirce’s works, it is the logic of consciousness that characterizes the meaning of qualia: Interpreters have their “signs of graphs” placed on the “special area of consciousness”, which is similar to the “sheet of consciousness” that represents the “mental experiences”. Moreover, “Objects of Consciousness”, such as “the feelings a symphony inspires or that which is in the soul of a furiously angry man in [the] presence of his enemy” can be “perfectly well be expressed in [logical/tinctured] Graphs”. Finally, interpreted graphs take place in “dyadic consciousness”, showing the idea of shared signs. Such remarks (from MSS S-28, 464, 300, 478, 680, L 477) testify not only how logic is founded on phaneroscopy, but that Peirce’s desire was that consciousness become a logical subject, perhaps by hypostatic abstraction. I analyse the senses in which a logical study of consciousness connects to pragmaticism.

**Keywords:** consciousness, Peirce, pragmaticism, logic, graphs, dyadic consciousness
According to Peirce’s philosophy of evolution, signs grow, coming “into being by development out of other signs, particularly from icons, or from mixed signs partaking of the nature of icons and symbols” (CP 2.302). This evolutionary growth happens by means of a tendency to take and incorporate habits. For him, reality is based upon chance, unpredictability and spontaneity as well as upon continuities and regularities of experience: “the continuous flow of experience is what characterizes the connections among ideas so that experience is intelligible” (Hausman 1997: 141). While chance is of the nature of Firstness, regularities are of the nature of Thirdness. For that reason, in order for habits to be continuously taken, there must be a process of transformation of information from Firstness (where it remains as a possibility, a chance) to Thirdness (where the information behaves as a regularity, a rule), “in which laws and habits become destabilized by disturbances, which give rise to new regularities and habits” (Nöth 2014: 174). Such disturbances are characterized as phases in which new and/or unexpected information (in relation to a given habit) are introduced into a habit and the signs governed by the given habit. This information is first made available, as Firstness, through its representation by a specific class of iconic signs: diagrams. When talking about diagrams, Peirce says that “the purpose of a Diagram is to represent certain relations in such a form that it can be transformed into another form representing other relations involved in those first represented and this transformed icon can be interpreted in a symbolic statement” (MS [R] 339:286r, our emphasis). Therefore, diagrams are the class of signs responsible for making information available by triggering such phases of disturbance, responsible for new habits to arise – and consequently, signs to grow in an evolutionary way. The introduction of new and unexpected information (surprising information) is put is terms of conflict between former meaning and the latter ones, being introduced into a certain reality. This conflictual negotiation of meaning is described by Peirce as a specific mode of consciousness, namely double-consciousness: “The phenomenon of surprise in itself is highly instructive in reference to this category because of the emphasis it puts upon a mode of consciousness which can be detected in all perception, namely, a double
consciousness at once of an ego and a non-ego, directly acting upon each other” (EP2:154).

In this paper, I intend to propose a tentative dialogue between Peirce and Lotman, focusing on the former’s aforementioned philosophy of evolution of signs, and the latter’s descriptions of the functioning of what he calls “semiosphere”. Semiosphere is the space in which semiosis occurs. Semiosis can only be realized in a given Semiosphere. By being described in terms of space and spatial relations, one important feature of a semiosphere is its border. It does not only serve the function of delimitating where one semiosphere ends and where another begins: it is a functional feature that works as some sort of a filter, which translates and exchanges a given information coded in the habits at the core of a given “semiosphere n”, to the habits that code the “semiosphere n+1” in its core, and vice-versa. Thus, the border is the mechanism that allows communication, translation and exchange between two or more semiospheres.

It will be presented here how Lotman’s concept of semiosphere, and his account of the dynamic semiotic processes that happen in it (especially the relation border-core, in which “border” is the conceptual space responsible for the introduction of diagrammatic information into a given semiosphere; and “core” is the stable set of habits that govern the regularities of a given semiosphere), allow us to contemplate clearly the seminal epistemic function of what Peirce calls “diagrams”: they are the semiotic entities responsible for triggering the process through which new habits can be incorporated into the ways by which an organism relates to the reality around itself, and how the phenomenon of double-consciousness partakes in it. It also highlights how the change in the habits of something is not an instant transformation. It does not happen abruptly, but must take into consideration the relations between what is consciously known and familiar to a system, and what is not. It is an ongoing evolutionary process that involves several steps of experimentation, open to failure and doubt, since the information might or might not be incorporated into the habits in the core of the semiosphere. This process potentially leads to a reconfiguration of the habits and the ontological categories of each semiosphere themselves, as well as to the discovery of new habits and ontological categories – or even of new semiospheres.
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The primacy of Peirce’s double consciousness (apprehension of clashes between new and old facts) in generating inferential thoughts and in determining their abductive potential is paramount (1903: 7.643; Short 2007: 319). Double consciousness showcases the sources which promote recognition of meaning conflict—where external facts tip the balance toward asserting new interpretations/hypotheses (alterity). The upshot is integration of the surprising phenomena into the inner world (1903: EP 2: 195).

Peirce privileges external influences en route to double consciousness, as “externisensations” (1905: MS 339: 245r). The primacy of externality resides when “the active element is volitionally external while the passive element is volitionally internal.” Dynamic objects qualify as the “active element,” forcing attention to facts inconsonant with those in the mind, which Peirce characterizes as “perceptuation,” (1905: MS339). External influences on the mind, although active, are, at the same time, involuntary. Accordingly, dynamic objects command agents to apprehend their uniqueness (by operation of Secondness); and in the perceptuation process, they clash with internal facts/feelings, which are passive, and voluntary, and have a secondary purpose. Because the vividness accorded to objects is an internal, secondary phenomenon (Atkins 2018), it is governed by unreliable, internal aspects in Firstness. When conflict arises, it “riles the limpidity of our thoughts” (1903: R298), highlighting affect and belief-instability. The influence of external upon internal sources ultimately resolves the conflict between ego (old interpretations) and other (new) ones when the dynamic object and its relations “intrude” as “strangers” (1904: 8.330; 1903: 8.266; 1905: MS 339: 245).

Because linguistic signs depend upon external representamen to measure internal ones, they are ripe to promote two-sided consciousness. Hearing the unexpected argument, while comparing its viability with stored facts/feelings, supports its efficacy. This integration of external and internal promotes increased reflective skills
(synthesis, deliberation, metacognition), which make salient the substance of arguments, heightening consideration of the rightness of new ones. Articulating each step in the argument makes explicit predicates which were once implied in percepts and actions. Language constitutes an expression of full arguments through private and collaborative speech (akin to Vygotskii’s paradigm), illuminating new dialogic meanings by synthesizing past with present and future determinations. Nonetheless, we would be remiss not to recognize the impact of other external factors (diagrammatic representations: gestures and pictures, where predicates are merely implied, because they (without language) compel attention to different perspectival frames, despite failure to rise beyond propositional status. Their value in implying meanings is still formidable in uncovering opposing perspectives. Peirce’s emphasis on inferencing from diagrammatic signs caused him to substantially rework his semiotic: “widening” their interpretants to encompass arguments (1906: MS 295; 4.538).

Another factor militating in favor of privileging “externisensations” (implicit and explicit) is the intensity of dynamic objects, because they circumscribe themselves upon the consciousness. The clash entails the double-headed interplay of insistence and persistence orchestrated by dynamic objects. Notice of their inherent hew/brightness/loudness, e.g., a trumpet’s blare, the red of fire trucks, can hardly be ignored (Atkins 2018: 197). The upshot is how objects communicate their epitomizing qualities, illustrating meaning-exchange to internal venues (consonant with Peirce’s continuum). Exchange from external sources to internal ones makes salient a novel form of collaborative Thirdness.

This cooperative exercise encourages exploitation of a pregenerative kind of Thirdness (“provenation”) in which meanings/effects present from the sign’s inception resurface in anticipation of future applications (Deely 2012, 2015). This ever-present promise to recruit new meanings from external agents convinces us of the indispensability of dynamic objects to open the road of inquiry for novel lines of scrutiny.

**Keywords:** Peirce, double consciousness, abductive inferencing, vividness, conflict
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