

A. Tasbolatuly^{1*}, Z.N. Ismagambetova¹, S. Hejazi²

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Roma Tre University, Rome, Italia

*e-mail: alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru

SEMIOTIC CONCEPTS OF CULTURE AND CINEMA LANGUAGE

In this article, the authors consider one of the little-studied but pressing problems in the philosophy of culture. The purpose of this article is to study the problem of film language in the context of semiotic cultural studies. The novelty of this article topic lies in the fact that the authors analyze the place and role of signs in the formation of the language of cinema in the context of semiotic research. The theoretical and methodological basis for the study of this problem is the work of foreign, Russian, and Kazakh scientists. In the study of this problem, the authors also relied on semiotic research and also tried to apply the constructivist paradigm. While writing the article, the authors used semiotic, the method of cultural analysis and cultural-relativism, as well as such general scientific methods as analysis and generalization. This study was based on the methods of historical and cultural approach. We thought that these methods would reveal our scientific article well. As a result, the work of the director, screenwriter, sound director, and finally the game, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the audience, construct the events taking place in the cinema and are closely associated with the world that is associated with his internal expectations, experiences, which they recreate in itself and with the world that is recreated and constructed in a certain representation of the film's characters, and is also closely intertwined with those representations and the fictional reality created by the work of filmmakers. Every component of a film, from cultural code, sound design and acting to narrative structure and visual imagery, contributes to a semiotic fabric that reflects and refracts the complexity of human society.

Key words: philosophy of culture, semiotics of culture, theory and semiotics of cinema, language, language of cinema, sign, sign-image, design features, cultural code, sound, perspective.

А. Тасболатұлы^{1*}, З.Н. Исмагамбетова¹, С. Хиджази²

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан

²Фондазоин Бруно Кесслер, Рома Тре университеті, Рим қ., Италия

*e-mail: alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru

Мәдениет бойынша семиотикалық концепциялары және кино тілі

Фильм мәдени ұғымдарды, идеалдарды және иконографияны зерттеуге және таратуға ықпал ететін қуатты құрал болып табылады. Фильм сюжеттерінде жасырылған мағынаның күрделі қабаттарын семиотика объективі, белгілер мен белгілерді зерттеу арқылы ашуға болады. Семиотикалық принциптерді мұқият зерттей отырып, бұл мақала белгілердің, белгілердің және кодтардың мәдениет пен кино туралы білімімізге қалай әсер ететінін зерттейді. Фильмнің дыбыстық дизайн мен актерлік өнерден бастап баяндау құрылымы мен көрнекі бейнелерге дейінгі әрбір құрамдас бөлігі адамзат қоғамының күрделілігін көрсететін және сындыратын семиотикалық құрылымға ықпал етеді. Бұл мақалада фильмдердегі семиотикалық идеяларды олардың бейнелеу мен мәдени дискурсқа қалай әсер ететінін қарастыра отырып, мұқият зерттеу ұсынылады.

Бұл мақалада авторлар мәдениет философиясындағы аз зерттелген, бірақ өзекті мәселелердің бірін қарастырады. Бұл мақаланың мақсаты мәдениеттің семиотикалық зерттеулері аясында кино тілінің мәселесін зерттеу болып табылады. Мақаланың осы тақырыбының жаңалығы – авторлар семиотикалық зерттеулер аясында кино тілін қалыптастырудағы белгілердің орны мен рөлін талдайды. Авторлар бұл мәселені түсінудегі әртүрлі тәсілдердің дискурсивті сипатын түсінеді, бірақ дискурсқа қарамастан, ұлттық қазақстандық кино тілін брендтеу және оның жас ұрпақ үшін мағынасын түсіну мақсатында осы мәселені зерттеу қажеттілігіне назар аударуға тырысады. Бұл мәселені зерттеудің теориялық және әдіснамалық негізі шетелдік, ресейлік, қазақстандық ғалымдардың жұмыстары болып табылады. Бұл мәселені зерттеуде авторлар да негізделді семиотикалық зерттеулер, сонымен қатар конструктивтік парадигманы қолдануға тырысты. Мақаланы жазу барысында авторлар семиотикалық, мәдени талдау әдісін

данды. Бұл зерттеу тарихи-мәдени тәсіл әдістеріне негізделген. Біз бұл әдістер біздің ғылыми мақаламызды жақсы ашады деп ойладық. Осы әдістемелік тәсілдердің арқасында авторлар кино тілі арқылы жасалған иллюзиялық шындық әлемі тек бастапқы мәдениетпен анықталған интерпретациялармен, мағыналармен, мағыналармен тығыз байланысты екенін көрсетуге тырысты. Нәтижесінде режиссердің, жазушының, дыбыстық режиссердің жұмысы, сайып келгенде ойын, бір жағынан, ал екінші жағынан, көрермендер кинода болып жатқан оқиғаларды құрастырады оның ішкі үміттерімен, тәжірибелерімен байланысты әлеммен тығыз байланысты олар өздерінде және қайта құратын әлеммен және ол фильм кейіпкерлерінің белгілі бір көрінісінде құрастырылған, сонымен қатар кинорежиссерлар жасаған сол идеялармен және ойдан шығарылған шындықпен тығыз байланысты. Мәдени кодтан, дыбыстық дизайннан және актерлік өнерден бастап баяндау құрылымы мен көрнекі бейнелерге дейінгі фильмнің әрбір құрамдас бөлігі адамзат қоғамының күрделілігін көрсететін және сынаттын семиотикалық тінге үлес қосады.

Түйін сөздер: мәдениет философиясы, мәдениет семиотикасы, кино теориясы мен семиотикасы, тіл, кино тілі, белгі, белгі-образ, конструктивтік ерекшеліктер, мәдени код, дыбыс, бұрыш.

Тасболатұлы^{1*}, З.Н. Исмагамбетова¹, С. Хиджази²

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан

²Фондазоин Бруно Кесслер, Университет Рома Тре, г. Рим, Италия

*e-mail: alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru

Семиотические концепции культуры и язык кино

В данной статье авторы рассматривают одну из мало исследованных, но актуальных проблем в философии культуры. Целью данной статьи является исследование проблемы языка кино в контексте семиотических исследований культуры. Новизна данной темы статьи заключается в том, что авторы проводят анализ места и роли знаков в формировании языка кино в контексте семиотических исследований. Авторы понимают дискурсивный характер различных подходов в понимании этой проблемы, но несмотря на дискурс, тем не менее пытаются обратить внимание на необходимость исследования этой проблемы в целях брендинга языка национального казахстанского кино и понимания его смыслов для молодого поколения. Теоретико-методологической основой исследования данной проблемы являются работы зарубежных, российских, казахстанских ученых. В исследовании данной проблемы авторы также основывались на семиотические исследования, а также попытались применить конструктивистскую парадигму. В ходе написания статьи авторы использовали семиотический, метод культурного анализа и культур-релятивизма, а также и такие общенаучные методы, как: анализ и обобщение. Это исследование было основано на методах историко-культурного подхода. Мы подумали, что эти методы хорошо раскроют нашу научную статью. Благодаря этим методологическим подходам авторы пытались показать, что создаваемый языком кино, мир иллюзорной реальности, конструируется и тесно связан исключительно с теми интерпретациями, смыслами, значениями, которые детерминированы исходной культурой. В результате работа режиссера, сценариста, звукорежиссера, наконец игра, с одной стороны, а, с другой стороны, зрители, конструируют события, происходящие в кино тесно сопряжены с тем миром, который ассоциируется с его внутренними ожиданиями, переживаниями, который они воссоздают в себе и с тем миром, который воссоздается и конструируется в некоем представлении героев фильма, а также тесно переплетен с теми представлениями и выдуманной реальностью созданной работой кинематографистов. Каждый компонент фильма, от культурного кода, звукового дизайна и актерской игры до повествовательной структуры, и визуальных образов, вносит свой вклад в семиотическую ткань, отражающую и преломляющую сложность человеческого общества.

Ключевые слова: философия культуры, семиотика культуры, теория и семиотика кино, язык, язык кино, знак, знак-образ, конструктивные особенности, культурный код, звук, ракурс.

Introduction

One of the pressing problems in the context of semiotic research is the problem of defining the language of cinema. The study of this problem dates back to the 20s of the 20th century, when cinema appeared in Western culture, representing a complex system of visual and sound elements, with the help of which a completely new visual world with

its images, symbols, and signs was reconstructed for the first time. As Jean-Luc Godard noted, cinema creates a completely new world, characterized by pure fiction, filled with new meanings, and meanings, constituting the illusion of reality. It should be noted that the reading of symbols, signs, meanings, and meanings presented in the language of cinema is closely related to the basic culture, which determines the reading and understanding of the con-

tained symbolism or sign meanings presented in the language of cinema.

Quite a lot of interesting and extraordinary research in the context of philosophy has been devoted to the problem of language. These are studies in the phenomenology of Husserl, Anglo-American analytical philosophy, linguistic philosophy of Wittgenstein, the Vienna Circle, American pragmatism, hermeneutics of Dilthey and Gadamer, in the philosophy of existentialism of Heidegger, the French school of structuralism and post-structuralism and postmodernism.

Important contributions to the construction of the language of cinema have been made by cultural studies, as well as semiotic studies of culture. Among them, we should note the works of Pearce, and Morris, the interesting studies of Ferdinand Saussure, who first defined language as a complex system of signs, thereby making a revolution in the field of research on the problem of language. These works greatly influenced the development of research in the fields of semiotics and film theory.

Justification for the choice of topic, purpose and objectives of the study. Theorists of semiotic and cultural studies for the first time drew attention to the development of not only the foundations of semiotic and cultural studies of cultural phenomena and culture itself but also to the need to study film theory. The merit of the representative of the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies S. Hall, who drew attention to the problem film language coding.

It is known that cinema has enormous potential in representing illusory, virtual reality, and in this, a significant role is played by semiotic language, which is capable of conveying various existential and psychological experiences of the heroes of an imaginary reality, the system of its value orientations, and reproducing it using sound, color, body, facial expressions, clothing, behavior, features of cultural and social communications of participants in a certain event, their inner spiritual world, their attitude and attitude. The study of this aspect of the problem led to the formation of a theoretical and cultural-philosophical analysis of the problem of film language. Despite a certain contribution to the development and research of this problem in the field of film theory, there are not enough special works devoted to the study of the problem of the influence of semiotic concepts of culture on the formation and construction of the language of cinema. This article is one of the cultural and philosophical attempts to fill this aspect.

The object of the study is the semiotic concepts of culture.

The subject of the study is determined by the discourse around the problem of the influence of these cultural studies on the formation and construction of the language of cinema.

The purpose of this article is to study the problem of film language in the context of semiotic cultural studies. To achieve this goal, the authors set several tasks:

- determine the place and role of signs in the context of semiotic studies of culture;
- identify those constructs that will subsequently be used in the development of film language.

The novelty of this article's topic lies in the fact that the authors analyze the place and role of signs in the formation of the language of cinema in the context of semiotic research. The authors understand the discursive nature of various approaches to understanding this problem, but despite the discourse, they nevertheless try to draw attention to the need to study this problem to brand the language of national Kazakh cinema and understand its meaning for the younger generation.

Methodology and research methods

The theoretical and methodological basis for the study of this problem is the work of foreign, Russian, and Kazakh scientists. In the study of this problem, the authors also relied on semiotic, and also tried to apply the constructivist paradigm. Thanks to these methodological approaches, the authors tried to show that the world of illusory reality created by the language of cinema is constructed and is closely connected exclusively with those interpretations, meanings, and meanings that are determined by the original culture. As a result, the work of the director, screenwriter, sound director, and finally the game, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the audience, construct the events taking place in the cinema and are closely associated with the world that is associated with his internal expectations, experiences, which they recreate in itself and with the world that is recreated and constructed in a certain representation of the film's characters and is also closely intertwined with those representations and the fictional reality created by the work of filmmakers.

While writing the article, the authors utilized semiotics, a method of cultural analysis, and cultural relativism, as well as general scientific methods such as analysis and generalization. This study was grounded in historical and cultural approaches. We believed that employing these methods would effectively showcase the scientific nature of our article.

Discussion: Semiotics and Culture

The historical and cultural genesis of cinema are certain arts that, depending on the development of the culture of a particular people and the state of technology, most fully reflected the values, world-views, and needs of their historical time. So, in the era of antiquity, it was theatre, in the Asian cultural space it was a shadow theater, in the Middle Ages it was architecture, in the Renaissance culture it was painting, in the 19th century it was literature, and in the 20th and 21st centuries it was media, screen reality. In the modern cultural world, screen arts are becoming increasingly popular and relevant, which, on the one hand, have pushed all others to the margins of culture and come to the fore, and, on the other hand, screen culture has, in turn, qualitatively changed sociocultural communication. In modern conditions, a new cultural situation has emerged: the need to master a new type of literacy, that is, audiovisual literacy, is coming to the forefront of culture, which is becoming an increasingly necessary need, just as book literacy was once necessary.

In modern sociocultural reality, there is a need to master the ability to understand a new image – a film image, an image of screen culture, and the question of the ability to “read” a film narrative is urgent; the question of critical perception of screen culture, the ability to distinguish not only true and false, but also to distinguish between the real from surrogate, work of screen art from commercial production. M. McLuhan draws attention to this, in his book “The Medium of Communication is the Message Itself” and writes about the change of cultural eras, about the exhaustion of the era of “book (written, type) culture.” If in the era of book culture the main carrier, keeper, and transmitter of cultural information was the book, then with the advent of “screen culture”, the screen became the main carrier, keeper, and transmitter of cultural information (McLuhan, 2003). Such qualitative changes that are taking place in modern cultural reality increasingly bring to the fore the need to study a new language of screen culture, and, of course, first of all, the study of the language of cinema in the context of culture.

The theoretical forerunner of the study of film language is semiotic studies of culture. It is known that the American scientist Charles Sander Peirce made a significant contribution to the development of semiotics. Peirce’s most important scientific achievement is the classification of signs based on the typology of the relationship between content and form. Based on this, Peirce divided the signs into three groups:

1. Iconic signs are characterized by the fact that the form and content are similar both qualitatively and structurally. These include a portrait, photograph, and plan of something, which are signs-icons.

2. Conventional signs, are characterized by establishing a connection between form and content in any form, by agreement, regarding a given sign. These include most words in any language. For example, the word “dog” does not look like a dog, but the image of a dog does.

3. Index signs are characterized by the fact that here form and content are related by contiguity in space or time). For example, traffic signals, footprints in the sand, smoke suggesting the presence of fire, and symptoms of a disease suggesting the disease itself – all these are index signs (Peirce, 1958).

Peirce’s theoretical contribution to the development of semiotic research is the definition of the interpretant as the main component of the sign that connects the model and the modeled object into a single whole. Any material object can become a sign since it has a material and an ideal component, and the way it is perceived and interpreted depends on the person. In this case, a sign can be a thought that reflects situations and objects, since the essence of a person is his ability to think, perceive, and put new meaning, and new knowledge into the content of the perceived object (Peirce, 1958).

Saussure, unlike Peirce, put forward and substantiated the position that language is a complex system of signs expressing an idea similar to the alphabet of the deaf and dumb, or symbolic rituals with very complex bodily movements, or military signals. Unlike his predecessors, who understood language as a means of human communication, Saussure, defining language as a system of signs, introduces the idea that language is freed from dependence on man, language as a system of signs precedes and exists, functions before any specific individual, human communities, acting concerning them as a “superhuman formation”, language imposes its norms and rules of the game on a person, giving him a certain language paradigm (Saussure, 1999). An important contribution of Saussure to the development of the problem of language as a system of signs is the study of the problem of the sign, the signifier, the signified, the idea of arbitrariness, the lack of motivation of the sign, as well as the identity of thinking and language (Saussure, 2011).

Thus, semiotic studies, which emerged in the early 20th century, were influenced by literary theory, linguistics, and philosophy. This is when the historical perspectives on semiotic analysis in film began. Research by Ferdinand de Saussure and

Charles Sanders Peirce, who created a more thorough theory of signs, laid the foundation for semiotic analysis in film. In our opinion, semiotic research also allowed us to look at many cultural phenomena in a completely different way and influenced the formation of a completely new reality like cinema. The study of signs in the new paradigm of cinema has expanded the possibilities in the study and application of signs about cinema, thereby contributing to the formation of semiotic research in the field of cinema and contributed to the creation of the theory of semiotics in cinema.

The study of sign processes, or semiosis, or any action, behavior, or process involving signs – including the creation of meaning – as these signs relate to moving pictures is known as film semiotics. A lot of art styles, especially abstract art, are interpreted using film semiotics. When structuralism began to be criticized by post-structuralist intellectuals in the 1960s, the idea of the film language was investigated in further detail. Semiotics gained popularity in academics as well. “Comparing arbitrary signs of natural language with the motivated, iconic signs of the cinema” was the focus of early work on this topic.

In the contemporary film, storytelling strives for a stunning visual presentation of color, sets, attire, and other elements. These few items of clothing, decor, or props typically have deeper connotations or “symbols.” Modern film has progressed from only narrating stories to using additional objects (clothes, props, scenery, etc.) to lend symbolic meaning to the story and/or to contemporary times as a result of a deeper grasp of semiotics. Semiotics may be a fantastic tool for drawing the audience into a story and revealing a lot more of the narrative through these little objects.

Semiotics emerges as a kind of master science that is useful in all fields of knowledge, particularly in the humanities, arts, and social sciences, because it deals with everything that can be interpreted as a sign, and since almost anything can be interpreted as a sign (that is, a substitute for something else). As previously mentioned, it has been applied to a wide range of fields, including medicine, architecture, fashion, analysis of facial expression, literature, film, and criticism of the fine arts, as well as interpretation of architecture, advertisements, and radio and television commercials. Let’s take a closer look at signs now, concentrating on their operation.

The goal of this article is to analyze the influence of semiotics on films and culture in general, and how it affects our reality and perception of art. The main objectives of the article are to determine

the theoretical contribution of scientists to the semiotics in film and culture and to show their influence on the formation of the semiotics concepts of cinema. The novelty of the study lies in determining the role of semiotic concepts of culture and cinema (Mitry, 1997).

For the first time, the attention of the famous Italian writer Ricciotto Canudo paid attention to the problems of the language of cinema, who first drew attention to the need for a careful study of the problems of the language of cinema. Canudo believes that cinema is a high level of language. It is a language of images that dates to the ideographic and hieroglyphic writing of antiquity. According to Canudo, the language of film is learned by conveying images of a universal language and conveying expressive capabilities through images. The dishes are plastic and flexible, with the help of which you can enhance the artistic expressiveness of the image. Canudo’s important contribution to the development of semiotic studies of the language of cinema lies in the analysis of body language, as he founded the development of a new figurative language of cinema (From the History of French Film Thought, 1988; Metz C., 1977).

Canudo’s research on this issue influenced subsequent developments in theoretical-semiotic research in the field of film language. One of the pioneers in the study of film language in the context of the semiotic approach is the Italian director P.P. Pasolini, based on the achievements of semiotic studies of culture. Drawing on the interesting studies of Saussure, Pearce, and Canudo, Pasolini draws attention to the need to explore how the language of cinema can express not only emotions but also convey meanings. Pasolini believes that it is important in this aspect to pay attention to the image-sign. Pasolini includes as signs not only everything that contains meaning, which means that it cannot only be interpreted, but it can also include facial signs, which can be isolated by the director. In this case, in the cinema it will be possible to have such images-signs as: faces and facial expressions of people, their gestures, and actions; signs can be pointers, round-about signs, etc.

If these types of signs can be classified as external non-verbal signs, then in addition to them we can distinguish another group of signs that Pasolini attributes to the world of internal images, such as dreams, memories, and fantasies. As the theorist of film semiotics notes, these two groups of signs can be used in the construction of film frames, which, constitute the instrumental basis of film language (Pasolini, 2000; Nasedkina, 2022). At the same

time, as Pasolini notes, all signs in cinema are closely associated with the basic culture, which includes both the director, screenwriter, and the viewer, since all signs are designed per the basic rules of cultural communication, the bearers of which they are.

Analyzing Pasolini's research, it can be noted that cinematic language is created by the director, not society, the signs themselves do not reflect the meaning of the subject (that), but rather the style of the director, that is, this sign reconstructs the subject depicted by the director's work (that is: how), and finally, film language is distinguished by objectivity, that is, image-signs are always concrete, perceived visually, and they convey symbolic or metaphorical images, since cinema is an art, and as an art it is characterized by figurative, artistic, its language can be allegorical, metaphorical (Pasolini, 2000).

Research in the field of cultural semiotics has influenced the work of such film theorists as: Louis Delluc, Vanessa Lindsay, Bela Balazs, and the work of K. Metz. Semiotic cinema theory was pioneered by Christian Metz, a well-known figure of this era, who used structuralist concepts to analyze the language and narrative structures of films. An important contribution of K. Metz to semiotic studies of the language of cinema is that he drew attention to the problem of code. As an analysis of Metz's works and creative contribution to the development of this problem shows, it consists in determining such properties of the code as denotativity, motivation of the code's meaning, as well as in justifying two large types of film codes (Metz, 1990; Metz, 1993/1994). He includes cultural and special codes among them. The distinctive features of special codes, according to Metz, are editing, camera movements, optical effects, and interaction of sound and image, that is purely technical methods of cinematic representation of reality or a form of film language. In contrast, cultural codes constitute content. The cultural code, according to Metz, always represents the familiar realities of a particular culture. Cultural codes are the unconscious meanings of a particular phenomenon, which are deciphered in the context of the culture in which a person was raised (Metz, 1977; Marks, L. U., 2002).

Thus, Christian Metz aims to organize the various levels of cinematic expression or language to construct a general system of cinematic language. For the then-young and undeveloped discipline of cinema, the prospect of a universal approach to film analysis seemed alluring. However, the task of organizing the cinematic language turned out to be trickier and more intricate than anticipated. In Christian Metz's work, this challenge of accounting for the

intricacy of the mechanisms of cinematic expression was quite evident. In fact, Metz was unable to find the "cinematic code" he so desperately searched for (Metz, 1991).

Research by Russian scientists played an important role in the discussion of the symbolic and semiotic components in cinema. As an analysis of their work shows, Russian scientists believed that each sign system in culture can be considered as part of an integral mechanism of interactions, which at times can be completely different from each other both in their organization of languages and codes. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Lotman draws attention to the sign system, which, in his opinion, maybe a prerequisite for linguistic communication. It is known that communication between the addresser and the addressee is very necessary, and, as Lotman emphasizes, they must have the necessary experience in mastering the codes of a given culture: fashion, etiquette, the language of a certain social country in society, that is, they must have a certain semiotic-cultural experience (Lotman,1973).

According to Lotman, cinema is connected in various ways with culture, with various aspects of life, therefore it is important to always consider the film in the context of interaction and always take into account the discrete elements that form the semantic connections of the film text, as well as various systems of prejudice, corruption, violations of the normal and expected repeatability (designation) of system elements (Lotman, 1973).

Russian filmmakers and theorists like Sergei Eisenstein investigated the use of editing and editing techniques to express meaning in the field of cinema theory. Their studies of cinematic language established the groundwork for subsequent semiotic study by emphasizing the role that editing and visual composition play in generating meaning in the moving picture (Eisenstein, 1986).

Results

Based on the analysis of semiotic studies of culture, we conclude that these studies became the basic basis for the formation and development of semiotic studies of cinema, including the language of cinema. The analysis allows us to substantiate the following results:

1. The language of cinema is a sign-image: One of the characteristics of film language is the sign-image. As follows from the analysis, the semantic content of a sign can convey various aspects of the audio-visual image. The semiotic approach allows

you to pay attention to color, behavior, clothing, sounds, words, gestures, body movements, camera movement and angle, scenery, etc. All these signs are cinematic languages that allow the viewer to pay attention to the various connotations of audio-visual images, representing ideology, morality, and various kinds of meanings. The director, using various channels of image transmission (visual, auditory, psychomotor) act as a signifier, and the concept conveys to us what they want to convey, and in this case, it acts as a signified.

A vital component of human understanding and communication are various signs and symbols. They can be pictures, gestures, sounds, written or printed characters, and more. They are used to communicate meaning without the need of words. The following are some main justifications for the significance of signs and symbols:

- **Communication:** Signs and symbols offer a universal language and culturally inclusive way of communication. They make it possible for people to communicate ideas clearly and concisely without giving long explanations.

- **Interpretation:** Signs and symbols can make difficult thoughts and concepts simple to understand. They can aid in information simplification and aid in the retention of crucial knowledge.

- **Identification:** People, places, objects, and concepts can all be identified using signs and symbols. A stop sign, for instance, can be used to indicate a place where drivers must stop their cars swiftly and clearly.

2. Cultural code as an important element of cinema language.

Cultural codes are frequently used to express the relationships between the levels and, thus, the comprehension of culture. "A secret system of words, symbols, or behaviors" is what codes are, and they are used to communicate contextually restricted messages. Although codes are typically presented in an obvious way through both verbal and nonverbal means, they are also the outcome of interactions and effects with other levels of culture. This indicates that the outsider frequently does not understand what is viewed. Only the insider group – the authors and inventors – knows the codes. Such a group can use them as shorthand to communicate quickly or to be concise. This is not unique to intelligence analysts and masons; in our research, we also utilize codes for this purpose.

Codes are always hard to understand and can be used both intentionally and unintentionally. Similar

to a mysterious crossword, to piece the puzzle together, you must decipher the rules that reveal the underlying themes. But in the absence of a crack in the codes, we are thrown adrift in an environment of conjecture, assumption, and false premises. It means that we have much less ability to affect change through appraisal and other comparable procedures. We run the risk of acting based on misunderstandings, which implies that our attempts to effect change will probably be misguided.

There are different kinds of symbolism not only in culture but in our everyday lives and its components, like films and literature. Signs have been employed in writing for ages. They provide readers with a sensory experience while enabling writers to convey complicated ideas in straightforward ways. This research wants to concentrate on different examples of vivid symbolism examples.

The symbolism of Bong Joon-ho's Oscar-winning film **Parasite** is thick. The stone is one of the most prominent symbols and a prime illustration of the law of duality. A friend gave the Kim family the stone, which is said to bring wealth and prosperity. This family succeeds in obtaining employment at the Parks' residence shortly after obtaining the stone. The stone now represents the Kim family's increasing good fortune and luck. But as the narrative progresses, the stone's meaning rapidly shifts. The Kim family quickly has several events while working at the Parks' home that highlight the stark differences in class between the two households. As a result, the stone represents Kim's wish to share the Parks' richness and independence. Their collapse is caused by their longing for a better life. They rescue the stone from their flooded house, to start with. This represents their desperate search for a better life. In addition, the stone is eventually utilized as a violent weapon by the spouse of the former housekeeper.

3. Semiotics in Visual Imagery.

A visual metaphor is a noun that is represented by a picture that conveys a certain connection or resemblance. Visual metaphors are frequently used in movies, TV series, still photos, and even in advertising. These items' symbolic meanings might develop a subject, connect with a reader or audience, or advance a narrative.

Although they are most used as literary devices, metaphors can also be visual and are an essential component of writing. A visual metaphor: what is it? A visual metaphor is defined as an image that stands in for or symbolizes another item. A visual metaphor employs imagery to elicit an association

between the image and something else from the viewer, while written metaphors, such as “her expression was set in steel,” utilize figurative language to compare two things. Visual metaphors are frequently used in movies, TV shows, artwork, political cartoons, commercials, and a variety of other visual media because they can convey significant concepts and highlight the significance of the symbol. Visual metaphors’ purposes vary widely depending on their context. For instance, the purpose of an advertisement is to convince a customer, whereas the purpose of a movie could be to amuse viewers. But both depend on the audience’s participation. To effectively engage an audience, a filmmaker needs to communicate efficiently and effectively. This is why visual analogies are ideal. By simply having a visual, they aid in meaningful communication.

It’s critical to comprehend metaphors’ overall efficacy to appreciate the significance of visual metaphors.

The same significant role is played by color composition too. Picasso famously said that an artwork would “sing” when the colors were employed in unison. A multitude of messages can be sent by colors, including depth and illumination, indicating the time of day, and creating an emotional response. Some pieces of art might not be able to express their full depth of meaning without color. Let’s examine the significance that color plays in the meaning of communication in the artwork.

Here are case studies that analyze visual imagery in select films. Stanley Kubrick’s 1968 film “2001: A Space Odyssey”:

Visualization: Famous for its visually arresting and painstakingly created images, the movie has simple settings, avant-garde special effects, and memorable compositions. Every image in the *Stargate* series, from the monolithic black slab to the swirling tornado of colors, has a deep symbolic meaning that is up for interpretation. Examination of Semiotics: “2001: A Space Odyssey” uses visual images to communicate deep existential and philosophical ideas. One cryptic and mysterious symbol of growth and technological advancement is the monolith. The contrast between the immaculate interiors of spacecraft and the barren lunar environment symbolizes humanity’s ongoing drive for exploration and knowledge.

Jean-Pierre Jeunet, director of “*Amélie*” (2001):

Visuals: “*Amélie*” has received praise for its fanciful and whimsical visuals, which include bright colors, oddball camera angles, and humorous production design. A greater sense of wonder and en-

chantment is created by the film’s employment of hyper-realistic and surreal aspects, which immerse spectators in the protagonist’s imaginary world. Semiotic Analysis: The quirky and peculiar narrative universe of “*Amélie*” is reflected in the film’s visuals. Jean-Pierre Jeunet depicts the humor and beauty of Parisian everyday life using visual elements including elaborate montages, wacky animations, and exaggerated facial expressions.

The 2014 Wes Anderson film “*The Grand Budapest Hotel*”:

Visual Imagery: In “*The Grand Budapest Hotel*,” Wes Anderson’s recognizable aesthetic is fully exhibited. It is distinguished by well-planned frames, symmetrical compositions, and a unique color scheme. With the use of stylish production design, realistic effects, and miniatures, the movie has a whimsical, nostalgic look that transports viewers to a bygone period. Semiotic Analysis: The film “*The Grand Budapest Hotel*” explores themes of time passing, longing, and nostalgia through its visual images. Wes Anderson evokes nostalgia for a bygone era of grace and refinement through the employment of visual elements like lavish costumes, complex set decorations, and painstaking prop creation.

4. Foreshortening, proportions of light and shadow as an expressive, artistic, figurative language that has an aesthetic impact on the viewer’s perception.

Scientists believe that one of the important means of plastic expressiveness of a frame is the perspective, which acts as the language of cinema and allows one to represent the inner self-perception of the film hero. An example of how perspective can convey the internal state of a character is a frame from J. Tarich’s film “*Until Tomorrow*”, it shows the humiliation and defenselessness of the film’s heroine Lisa Malevich when she is expelled from the gymnasium – she is left homeless and without funds, at the expense of high angle as the camera pans down her small figure. An image of humiliation, loneliness, and abandonment is created by showing her fragile figure from the back, resulting in the impression that she is at the very bottom of the social hierarchy, which is symbolized by the image of a ladder.

Another important element of film language is the proportion of light and shadow. Light conveys information about the shape, volume, and texture of objects, and their location in space, and also characterizes the atmosphere of the action. With the help

of light, you can convey not only the modeling of space and the location of objects, but also convey information about the hero. The shadow also plays an important role, with its help to convey the spatial coordinates of an object and to identify or indicate its connections with surrounding objects. This technique was wonderfully developed by S. Eisenstein in his film "Ivan the Terrible".

5. Semiotics in Sound Design.

Sound was considered, among other things, to be a specific kind of "expression substance" and a component of "syncretic" semiotics in the Semiology of Cinema tradition. According to this viewpoint, films are closed texts composed of codes that viewers can decipher (Metz, 1971, 1974; Tsykun N. A., 2010), one of which is the sound code.

There are several sound case studies in films that should be discovered. The T-Rex Attack Scene is a case study from the 1993 film *Jurassic Park*.

The famous T-Rex roar was produced by combining the sounds of many creatures, including tigers, elephants, and alligators, to produce an enormous but realistic sound. The sound of rain, thunder, and rustling trees heightens the suspense and sense of approaching peril for the viewer. The suspense and action are punctuated by John Williams' score, which intensifies the scene's emotional impact. Spielberg creates a dramatic contrast to the turmoil that follows by purposefully using quiet intervals to build suspense before the T-Rex makes its big arrival. This scene's painstaking sound design intensifies the tension and anxiety, drawing the viewer into the terrifying experience of being pursued by a ferocious animal.

The War Rig Chase Sequence is used in *Fury Road* (2015) as a case study.

The spectator is inundated with the sound of tires screeching, motors roaring at full volume, and metal-on-metal accidents, which heightens the suspense of the chase. The post-apocalyptic backdrop is emphasized by the frequent radio talk between characters and the clanking of weapons, which add layers to the chaotic atmosphere. To express emotion and story, director George Miller mostly uses sound design, letting the visceral soundscapes do the talking. Depending on the visual focus, the sound mix dynamically switches focus between various parts, directing the audience's attention and elevating the entire cinematic experience. This scene's unrelenting sound design amplifies the physical energy of the movie by drawing viewers into the intense action and allowing them to experience every bump, crash, and explosion.

Conclusion

Summarizing the analysis of the tasks posed in this article, we conclude that studies of the semiotic concepts' impact on films and culture, in general, have influenced the understanding that semiosis has a special place and significance in human life, signs represent different facets of our every day and traditional ethnic cultures. They are frequently employed in cinematic art and have also impacted the development of cinematic language. Empathy for different cultures, ideologies, and institutions is heightened by semiotics. One becomes aware of how much of human behavior is predicated on arbitrary symbolism and is subject to mockery or mistrust from those who adhere to a different set of symbols when they comprehend the processes by which meaning is formed and conveyed (as well as the frequent absurdities of this). No matter how enlightened or in touch with the truth we may think we are, semiotic awareness reveals how we are all just swimming in an unstable soup of meaning and attempting to find our way to a shore.

The representation and construction of identity, race, gender, and other social categories in films are clarified by semiotics. Semiotic analysis reveals how stereotypes, archetypes, and tropes influence our perception of identity and the power dynamics ingrained in these representations by dissecting visual and narrative codes. The employment of recurrent themes, narrative archetypes, and storytelling conventions, as well as the structure and organization of cinematic narratives, are all explained by semiotics. Filmmakers can successfully influence audience expectations, build tension, and communicate themes by having a solid understanding of these storytelling elements. Critical analyses of the ideological foundations of cinematic texts, including how films support or subvert prevailing ideologies, are made possible by semiotic analysis. Through the process of revealing the implicit messages and meanings present in films, semiotic analysis prompts audiences to consider and scrutinize the social, political, and cultural factors.

Films are cultural artifacts that facilitate the exchange of ideas and viewpoints amongst people in various situations and societies by bridging language and cultural divides. Through the identification of universal symbols and themes that appeal to audiences everywhere, semiotic analysis contributes to the development of greater empathy and cross-cultural understanding, thereby bridging these cultural differences. And we say with full confidence that the benefits of these signs in our lives are enormous.

References

- Eisenstein, S. Film form: Essays in film theory // A Harvest Book, 1986. – 297 p.
Из истории французской киномысли. Немое кино (1911–1933) // М. Ямпольский. Пер. с фр. /Предисл. С. Юткевича. – М.: Искусство, 1988. – 317 с.
Лотман Ю. М. Семиотика кино и проблемы киноэстетики. Таллин: ЭэсгиРаамат, 1973. – 140 с.
Маклюэн М. Галактика Гутенберга: Сотворение человека печатной культуры. – Киев: Ника Центр, 2004.- 432 с.
Marks, L. U. (). The skin of the film: Intercultural cinema, embodiment, and the senses. Duke University Press, 2002. – 298 p.
Метц К. Кино: язык или речь? / пер. с фр. М. Б. Ямпольский // Киноведческие записки: историко-теоретический журнал. 1993/1994. – №20. С. 54–90.
Metz, C. Film language: A semiotics of the cinema. University of Chicago Press, 1991. – 268 p.
Metz C. Le signifiant imaginaire. *Psychanalyse et cinema* // *Union générale d'éditions*, 1977. – 23, 3-55 [in French]. -370 p.
Metz, C. Film Language: A semiotics of the cinema. // Transl. by Michael Taylor. – New York: Oxford univ. Press, / University of Chicago, 1990. – 268 с.
Mitry, J. The Aesthetics and Psychology of Cinema. Indiana University Press, 1997. – 428 p.
Наседкина В.) Пьер Паоло Пазолини: Поэтическое Кино. -2022 // : <http://www.kinovoid.com/2015/05/poeticheskoe-kinopraz..>
Пазолини П. Избранное. Пер. с итал. / сост. Н.В. Котрелев. – М.: Молодая Гвардия. 1984. – 62 с.
Пазолини П.П. Теорема (сборник). Пер. А. Гришанова, В. Полева). – Москва: Ладомир, 2000. – 666 с.
Saussure, F. de. Course in general linguistics (W. Baskin, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1916), 2011. – 277 p.
Соссюр Ф. Курс Общей лингвистики / Фердинанд де Соссюр; [Коммент. Туллио де Мауро]. – Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1999. – 425 с.
Сичилиано Э. Жизнь Пазолини. / Пер. с ит. И. Соболевой. -СПб.: Лимбус Пресс; Издательство К. Тублина, 2012. – 715 с.
Пазолини П.П. Поэтическое кино / пер. с ит. Н. Нусинова // Стрoение фильма. Некоторые проблемы анализа произведений экрана: сборник статей. М.: Радуга, 1984. С. 45–66.
Peirce, Ch. S. Values in a Universe of Chance // Selected Writings of Charles S. Peirce, New York, 1958. – 391 p.
Ф.Фуртай Пьер Паоло Пазолини и его миф: «Трилогия жизни» полвека спустя // Вестник СПбГУ. Искусствoведение. 2022. – Т. 12. Вып. 1, стр. 50–68.
Цыркун Н. А. Раненый зверь Пазолини и его фильмы. – М.: ООО «Кармен Фильм», 2010. – 168 с.

Information about authors:

Tasbolat uly Alimgan. – doctoral student of the Department of Religious Studies and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Kazakh National University. Al-Farabi, e-mail: Alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru

Ismagambetova Zuhra Nurlanovna – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Religious Studies and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Kazakh National University. Al-Farabi, e-mail:zuchra+50@mail.ru

Hijazi Sara – PhD, Professor at the University of Trento Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Roma Trento University, Italy, e-mail: hejazi@fbk.eu.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Тасболатұлы Алижан – Қазақ ұлттық университетінің Философия және саясаттану факультетінің дінтану және мәдениеттану кафедрасының докторанты. Әл-Фараби, e-mail: Alimjan_tasbolat@mail.ru

Исмагамбетова Зухра Нұрланқызы – философия ғылымдарының докторы, Қазақ ұлттық университетінің Философия және саясаттану факультетінің дінтану және мәдениеттану кафедрасының профессоры. Әл-Фараби, e-mail:zuchra+50@mail.ru

Хиджази Сара – доктор PhD, Тренто университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры, Тренто Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Roma Trento University, Italia, e-mail: hejazi@fbk.eu

Received: September 20, 2024

Accepted: October 20, 2024