

PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIO-CULTURAL MANAGEMENT

Socio-Cultural Management Journal

Volume 5 (2022), Number 2, pp. 80-102

doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2022.267526>

p-ISSN 2709-846X, e-ISSN 2709-9571

Original Research Article

© O. Boyko, S. Zuiev, T. Povalii,

L. Otroshchenko, 2022

UDC: 378.316

JEL Classification: M12, M14, M37, Z11

Received: 14/09/2022

**Olga Boyko, Serhii Zuiev, Tatiana Povalii,
Larysa Otroshchenko**

Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

Spatial Semiotics and Landscape Hermeneutics in the Professional Training of Managers of Socio-Cultural Activity

Abstract: *Introduction.* Socio-cultural activity managers' training involves students' mastering and fluent operating the concepts of "cultural landscape" and "semiosphere", which are used to carry out hermeneutic and semiotic analyses of regional and world culture phenomena. *Purpose and methods.* The article aims to reveal the main provisions of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics and determine their didactic potential in the context of socio-cultural activity managers' training. Research methods include analyzing cultural, art history, and philosophical literature, theoretical generalization, and synthesis. *Results.* When analyzing cultural space and cultural phenomena as texts, concepts and terms are used that characterize cultural space as a semiotic system: language, text, metatext, intertextuality, and communication. One of the essential shared objects of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics is the city, the high degree of semioticization determined by such essential features as "doneness" and "artificiality". *Conclusions.* Space and culture interact and influence each other. At the same time, spatial categories such as "center", and "periphery" appear as universal models for describing texts and phenomena of any branch of the cultural sphere. The analysis of landscape and cultural phenomena is carried out according to the parameters of the level of semiotic saturation of the environment; the level of significance of symbolic activity; the intensity of semiotic exchange; level of self-identification.

Keywords: semiosphere, cultural landscape, special semiotic, landscape hermeneutic, socio-cultural activity management.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. The process of managers of socio-cultural activity professional competence formation is connected with basic concepts and categories acquired during their training. These concepts of “cultural landscape” and “semiosphere” have become highly relevant today and are actively studied by domestic and foreign geographers, historians, cultural scientists, sociologists, and art critics. The attention of various fields of activity scientists and practitioners is due to the awareness of the fundamental role that its cultural landscapes (or semiospheres of loci of space) play, on the one hand, in the life and development of societies, on the other hand – in the preservation of cultural heritage. An equally important aspect of modern studies of the cultural space is their correlation with the goals of sustainable development, which were adopted at the UN Summit for the period from 2015 to 2030 and were included in the strategic development plans of the world's leading universities.

In the modern scientific paradigm, spatial concepts are used as a model for studying a wide range of cultural phenomena. Thus, the theory of the semiosphere and the theory of landscape hermeneutics have become universal methodologies that are successfully used for the analysis of culture, cultural space as a whole, as well as more local tests (for example, urban culture, a work of art, a festive event). This feature of spatial semiotics corresponds to the idea of the existence of physical and “conceptualized” space, the latter of which is endowed with the properties of a metaphor.

In the socio-cultural activity managers training curriculum of Sumy State University, the concepts of “cultural landscape” and “semiosphere” are “end-to-end” concepts that establish interdisciplinary connections. We can trace this during such courses as “Theory and History of Culture”, “History and Theory of Socio-Cultural Activity”, “Topography of Culture”, “Cartography of the socio-cultural space of the region”, and “Regional practices in socio-cultural activities”. Acquaintance with the terminological apparatus of modern cultural and spatial studies ensures the formation of future managers' professional language and the ability to distinguish texts/artifacts against the background of non-texts/ordinary things. It contributes to including objects of material/spiritual heritage in the axiological scale of culture to carry out a hermeneutic and semiotic analysis of regional cultures and take into account the peculiarities and potential of rural and urban landscapes in their professional activities.

State study of the problem. Based on the drawbacks analysis of the territorial-anthropological and philosophical concepts of the cultural space, O. Grytsenko (2019) suggests two cultural space models – polyspheric and topological. Thus, the topological model considers community culture as a collection (number) of various culture texts, embodied in material and non-

material forms, and society members – creators, distributors, and users of the various cultural product. All the elements belonging to this abstract space possess communicative characteristics (language or other communicative codes) and cultural identities (p. 6). Meanwhile, according to the author, the topological model of the national cultural space is inherently static; as a result, it does not reflect cultural process dynamics (movement from classical heritage to modern cultural products), and it does not show development perspectives (p. 65). Nevertheless, future managers of socio-cultural activity need knowledge of natural, cultural space topological model, namely understanding of definite community culture with its cultural identities. However, O. Grytsenko (2019) defines the polyspheric model of the cultural space as a spatially structured system. In it, the peripheral elements are organized around the central element, the primary function of which is the generation of cultural content within the discursive identity (the system of values, historical, ethical, and aesthetic ideas that have formed as dominant in a particular culture). Different institutions of public spheres can act as a system-generator centre: mass media with its audience, a cultural, scientific, or public center, an influential art collective with its audience, a popular Internet resource with its “community” (p. 66).

Thus, both polyspheric and topological models provide a particular representation of the socio-cultural sphere, contributing to the professional work of managers of socio-cultural activity.

O. Stepanova (2019) considers the national mentality with its components (Ukrainian mentality, national soul, mass psychology, national character, etc.) as a dynamic factor in the development of the national cultural space (p. 138). At the same time, freedom-loving has a particular weight and significance in the national mentality and character, as it determines the ability to the historical realization of the mythonarrative and also affects the nature of the historical unfolding and embodiment of the model of building a cultural space (p. 143). The researcher believes that it is important to recognize the category “cultural time”, understood in the dimension of mentality, as a fundamental dimension of the phenomenon of culture and to consider the parameters of the development and formation of the category “cultural space” inseparable from the category “cultural time” as an organic and integral ontological dimension (p. 151).

It is crucial for the socio-cultural activity managers to understand the concept of “landscape” and its socio-cultural practices. So, summarizing the theoretical interpretations of the concept of landscape, L. Martynenaite (2011) concludes that as a result of establishing a person in space, it becomes socially and culturally meaningful and historically conditioned. Thus, in the first half of the XX century, a flower garden is an integral part of the Lithuanian rural landscape as a part of the natural cultural complex as one of the cultural symbols of Lithuanian ethnic identity and national identity. Regarding the disa-

pearance of traditional flower gardens from Lithuanian villages and estates in the second half of the 20th century, the researcher emphasizes the importance of nurturing the Lithuanian village landscape, its originality, aesthetic quality, and spiritual and historical essence (p. 94-95).

O. Braichenko (2016), investigating the history of scientific research aimed at the phenomenon of the cultural landscape, defines the latter as the non-verbal communication of a man with nature. According to the author, the cultural landscape provides a flexible toolkit for scientists, particularly socio-cultural activity managers, to solve problem areas of humanitarian knowledge. Thus, through the study of the language of the cultural landscape, it becomes possible to investigate the organization of personal, shared space, the idea of nature, and cultural values (p. 95).

The article by O. Kopyevska (2020) is devoted to the problems of developing local cultural landscapes in the conditions of hybrid reality. The author notes that the interdisciplinary approach to the content, essence, and mechanisms of building and functioning cultural landscapes is characterized by ambivalence and ambiguity in the definition of the concept itself and its functional components in global and local contexts. According to the researcher, understanding the cultural landscape from its constructive and functional mechanisms is essential to create a unique cultural image. O. Kopyevska (2020) offers a specific sequence of these mechanisms: cumulation, divergence, cultural synthesis, selection, and convergence, which arise from each other and, accordingly, mutually condition each other, make up the architecture of practices, their potential, and define a unique, unique local cultural code (p. 183).

M. Rössler and R. Lin (2018) consider the concept of the cultural landscape in the context of the problem of preserving world cultural heritage. Cultural landscapes testify to a long and close relationship between people and their natural environment. Urban or rural landscapes result from various interactions between a man and nature and therefore serve as living evidence of the evolution of human societies (p. 3). Summarizing the principles of protection of the world's cultural landscapes, the authors highlight the following: people associated with the cultural landscape are the main stakeholders; successful governance is inclusive, transparent, and shaped through dialogue and agreement between key stakeholders; the value of the cultural landscape is based on the interaction between people and their environment, and management attention is focused on these relationships; management focuses on leading changes aimed at preserving the values of the cultural landscape; the management of cultural landscapes is included in the context of the larger landscape and territory; successful management contributes to the formation of a sustainable society (p. 5-6).

Today, the works of Ukrainian scientists dedicated to the problems of regional culture and the culture of provincial cities are gaining special importance. Among them are the works of L. Kyyanovska (2000) “Stylish evolution of Galician musical culture of the 19th-20th centuries”, dissertation “Historical-theoretical aspects of the relationship of geographical and socio-cultural factors in the phenomenon of regional musical culture on the example of the northern Azov region of the 19th-20th centuries” by T. Martyniuk (2004), “Musical life of Chernihiv Region in the 18th – 19th centuries (General patterns and regional features)” by O. Vasiuta (1998), “Musical culture of Poltava Oblast in the 19th – early 20th centuries in aspects of regional source studies” by A. Lytvynenko (2006), “Modern cultural space and semiotics of the music festival (based on materials from Kharkiv)” S. Zuiev (2007).

Unresolved issues. Amid the active study of the phenomenon of cultural space in world science, in particular, in Germany (priorities of scientific and state policy are the study of space and its organization, respectively Raumforschung and Raumordnung), the area of modern Ukrainian culture remains poorly studied. The most important aspect of the study of Ukraine's cultural landscape is that the formation of regional cultures is closely related to the peculiarities of the regional matrix. On the one hand, the “borderness” of Ukraine determines the specific differences between regional cultures; on the other hand, the cultural values produced by the regions form a motley curtain of Ukrainian culture. At the same time, the trend of neo-mythologizing of the modern cultural space actualizes the research of the ways of formation of new mythologies. This is related to the definition of the new urban myth features as compensation for the lack of factual historical information in the cultural space and as a factor in ensuring culture unity as a system.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The article aims to reveal the main provisions of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics and determine their didactic potential in the context of socio-cultural activity managers training.

To achieve the aim, the following tasks must be solved:

- to reveal the meaning of the concepts “semiosphere”, “city semiosphere”, “cultural landscape”, “region”, “center”, “periphery”, “border”, “marginality”;
- to define the main concepts that characterize the cultural space as a semiotic system: language, text, metatext, intertextuality, communication;
- to analyze the peculiarities of the functioning of the terms “cultural landscape” and “semiosphere” in the works of domestic and foreign scientists devoted to the study of the phenomenon of cultural space;

- to outline the field of specific knowledge belonging to semiotics through the prism of the formation of leading principles, the object of science, scientific schools;
- to highlight the main ideas of the theory of the semiosphere and the theory of landscape hermeneutics;
- to specify the peculiarities of the functioning of the city as a semiotic entity;
- to determine the methodical and didactic theories potential of the semiosphere and landscape hermeneutics in the context of the formation of professional competencies of socio-cultural activity managers.

Methodology and methods. The methodological guidelines of the study are aimed at the actual needs of Ukrainian cultural studies as an important component of the training of managers of socio-cultural activities. In its turn, the development of cultural studies in the history and theory of culture will allow us to approach this culture as an intentional phenomenon, discover the forces of its development from within, and hence enrich the “historiosophy of cultural self-organization” and cultural theory. Therefore, the research implements a combination of fundamental and applied directions of cultural knowledge, the expansion and qualitative transformation of the methodological foundations of cultural analysis thanks to the study of the city semiosphere as part of the cultural landscape, mastering the basics of the spatial model of knowledge and interpretation of culture, the discovery of new aspects from the position of regionalism in the integrative content of cultural studies as a science about the holistic phenomenon of culture in real historical time and the social space of its existence, which allows being used in the teaching of various disciplines of training managers of socio-cultural activities.

The study of the phenomena of the cultural space is carried out based on the broad application of the theory of spatial semiotics of Ju. Lotman (2010) when along with the historical research method, a hermeneutic-semiotic analysis is developed. The concept of the semiosphere of the city allows us to understand the meaning of the city (as opposed to the meaning of the place) as a carrier of status identification and a particular locus of the landscape, which directly affects the process of cultural meaning-making. Conceptual constructions, theoretical models formed on the border of semiotics, landscape hermeneutics, art studies, and cultural studies are empirically verified.

Methods of various disciplines in the research process, especially becoming a tool for analyzing cultural phenomena, are formed into new synthetic methodical formations, transformed and integrated, and used as approaches to the object of study.

In the process of research work, the complex of various methods of academic teaching was used. Theoretical methods are used (analysis of cultural, art history, philosophical literature, periodicals devoted to the problems of

cultural space, cultural landscape, semiosphere of the city; the method of theoretical generalization and synthesis (clarification of the main definitions of research, generalization of research results, formulation of conclusions).

Information base. The works of domestic and foreign scientists devoted to the phenomena of cultural space, cultural landscape, and spatial-semiotic studies, particularly the works of Ju. Lotman (2010), on the theory of the semiosphere, appeared as research material. The practical implementation of the research results was carried out based on the training of bachelors majoring in “Management of socio-cultural activity” at Sumy State University (Sumy, Ukraine) within the framework of lectures and practical classes in the disciplines “History and theory of socio-cultural activity”, “Cartography of the socio-cultural space of the region”, “Regional practices in socio-cultural activity”.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Conceptual and terminological apparatus of semiotics

Today, the sphere belonging to semiotics can be divided into two parts: the world of fiction with its unity in the form of literary and artistic intertextuality, intertext, and the world of science and technology with its unity in the form of national and transnational systems of scientific information, that is, the infosphere (Stepanov, 2001, p. 6). In the 1960s and 1970s, two approaches to interpreting semiotic objects were defined. Some researchers began to consider the object of semiotics to be one that serves the dynamic purposes of communication and information transfer, and the existence of an internal organization, by analogy with the language system, is a prerequisite for its functioning. Others defined the object of semiotics as any that carries a certain sense, meaning, information (clothing, fashion, furnishing of premises, architectural design of internal and external space), regardless of whether such a system is characterized by an internal organization similar to the organization of speech in speech. An important aspect of the problem of defining the object of semiotics was the relationship between the sign and the text. In contrast to traditional semiotics, which studies the sign and the system of signs as an object, research in Tartu included the concept of an object as well as a text, which can consist of separate signs and thus belongs to the secondary sign system.

Determining the field of semiotics at the end of the 20th century, *Yu. Lotman* (2010) singles out three aspects in it. The first is semiotics as a scientific discipline, the object of which is the sphere of symbolic communication (the idea of F. de Saussure). Studying language as a semiotic system becomes the basis of all social sciences. The second aspect is semiotics as a method of the humanities, which is transferred to various disciplines and determined not by the nature of the object but by the method of its analysis (p. 37).

In this sense, a scientific object can be studied by semiotic and non-semiotic methods. The third aspect is defined by *Yu. Lotman* (2010) as “the peculiarity of the researcher's scientific psychology, his knowing consciousness” (p. 153). Any object that attracts the attention of a semiotic researcher is semiotized in the analysis process. Thus, a two-way process takes place: on the one hand, the multidimensionality of the cultural space diversifies the forms and methodology of semiotics, and on the other hand, semiotics expands the framework of culture, including natural phenomena and studying them in terms of signs and texts.

Therefore, at the beginning of the 21st century, semiotics is defined as a science whose subject is “the information system, that is, the system that carries information, and the elementary core of such a system is the sign system” (Stepanov, 2001, p. 5). During the evolution of semiotic science, its main achievements were recorded in key concepts and terms. Reproducing the historical development of semiotic thought, *Yu. Stepanov* (2001) provides the following scheme: statement – text – discourse – intertext and infosphere, where the text is defined by expansion as a coherent set of statements, and the concept of discourse is characterized not only by linear expansion but also by paradigmatic aspect (p. 36).

The concepts of intertext and infosphere reflect the unity of the cultural space – literary and artistic on the one hand and scientific and technical – on the other. The infosphere, as known, has its evolutionary line, reaching back to the noosphere – a term introduced into scientific circulation in the 20s of the 20th century by P. Teilhard de Chardin and his student E. Leroy and at the same time and independently by V. Vernadsky. The noosphere – “sphere of mind” – is the result of the development of the biosphere – the sphere of organic life. Moreover, the transition of the biosphere to the noosphere is connected with the emergence of the semiosphere (a term introduced by Yu. Lotman), which becomes a necessary condition for realizing the noosphere.

The semiosphere theory of *Yu. Lotman* (2010) offers a particular culture model. It is an attempt to describe culture, on the one hand, as a grand system with its variety of structures and elements, on the other hand, as a space characterized by continuity and dynamism. The scientist introduces the term “semiosphere” by analogy with the biosphere of V. Vernadsky, investing in this concept of the ability of culture to create a social sphere around a person, “which, like the biosphere, makes life possible, although not organic, but social” (p. 487).

The sign of sphericity in the concept of “semiosphere” is interpreted as the limitation of space: “Culture is never a universal set, but only some subset organized in a certain way. It never includes everything, forming a sphere that is limited in a special way. Culture is understood only as a section, a closed branch against the background of non-culture” (Lotman, 2010, p. 485).

Culture and non-culture oppose each other as “made” – “natural”, “conditional” – “unconditional”. Concerning non-culture, culture is a symbolic system. Moreover, defining culture as a certain secondary language, *Yu. Lotman* (2010) introduces the concept of “text of culture”, “text in a given secondary language” (p. 511). The space outside the boundaries of culture (extra-cultural) is its reserve. Contact between them can occur only under the conditions of semiotization of the first because the semiosphere can only contact texts, that is, the product of semiosis. Therefore, the semiosphere appears as an “intersection, connection, incorporated embedding in each other of a huge number of monads, each of which is capable of meaning-making operations. This is a huge body of organisms” (Lotman, 2010, p. 644).

An essential feature of the semiotic space is the heterogeneity caused by language heterogeneity and hetero functionality. Languages functioning in the semiosphere differ in their nature and place in the hierarchy of semiotic structures. There are primary and secondary languages. The former include natural (natural) languages, and the latter – are artificial languages and languages of art. Concerning the primary languages, secondary languages appear either as superstructures (superlingual system of fiction) or as parallel forms (music or painting). *Yu. Lotman* (2010) puts forward two principles of language representation of reality: 1) the need for more than one (at least two) languages to represent reality; 2) the impossibility of avoiding the fact that the space of reality is not covered by a single language, but only by their totality (p. 13).

The functioning of languages in the semiosphere is subject to a certain hierarchy, the top of which is a metalanguage. Metalanguage (which is used to create metatexts – texts about texts) arises at a specific moment in the development of culture to form a metalevel on which self-description of culture is carried out. Creating a model of culture, its “ideal self-portrait”, self-description anew, more rigidly, structures culture. This process combines two trends: erasing non-structural elements from the memory of culture – “wrong texts” – and canonizing the remaining texts. In this regard, the metalanguage, the system's core, tries to impose its norms and rules on all other languages that are peripheral to it.

The functioning of the semiosphere is ensured by a unique mechanism – communication. The semiotic space can be imagined as “permeated” by communicative acts. The text, in the situation of a communicative act, is firstly actualized, and secondly, it becomes capable of generating new information. On the other hand, any process of reading (which is also a process of “translation”) acts as a communication act.

The fundamental question of cultural semiotics is the problem of meaning creation. First, it means the ability of semiotic systems to transform the

information that comes to them into new texts. To define the meaning-making structure, introduces the concept of a semiotic monad (as known, Leibniz called monads discrete initial units of description).

This concept covers both culture as a whole, any sufficiently complex text, and the reality (including the human personality) that is interpreted as a text. The following features characterize the invariant model of the semiotic monad: the presence of boundaries separating the monad from the semiotic space; self-sufficiency; availability of “input” and “output”; the structure of the monad includes: a binary structure consisting of at least two semiotic mechanisms (languages), which are in a relationship of mutual untranslatability and at the same time similar to each other; a block of conditional equivalences, a metaphorical device that allows translation in a situation of untranslatability; the functioning of the monad is possible under the condition of its inclusion in the semiosphere.

3.2. Spatial characteristics of the semiosphere

The semiosphere, as a product of culture, is characterized by definiteness in the categories of space. After all, a person's idea of the universe, its construction is based precisely on the concepts of space and spatiality: “One of the universal features of human culture, possibly related to the anthropological properties of human consciousness, is that the picture of the world inevitably acquires signs of spatial characteristics. The construction of the world system itself is inevitably interpreted based on a certain spatial structure that organizes all its other levels” (Lotman, 2010, p. 466). However, in this respect, the “spatiality” of the semiosphere is not only a result of culture. The semiotic space actively influences the process of creating a model of the universe by culture, acting as a sphere that “on the one hand, includes romantic ideas, semiotic models, and on the other – the reproductive activity of a person, since the world artificially created by people is agricultural, architectural, and technical – correlates with their semiotic models. The connection here is mutual: on the one hand, architectural structures copy the spatial image of the universe, and on the other hand, this image of the universe is built by analogy with the artificial world of artificial structures” (Lotman, 2010, p. 334).

Therefore, culture in the context of the theory of the semiosphere appears as a continuous space with a sign of sphericity, where the processes of semiosis take place (that is, something functions as a sign). The main concepts of culture as a semiosphere are the infosphere and intertextuality, from which the semiotic space is formed; primary and secondary languages, text; the concept of a semiotic monad as a meaning-making system that encompasses culture as a whole, and any sufficiently complex text, the reality that is interpreted as a text; space is physical and “conceptualized”.

The landscape space, including both the physical and the semantic spaces, covers not only the semiosphere but also part of the biosphere (that part, which, in terminology, belongs to the sphere of non-culture). In modern cultural studies, the boundaries of the concept of the landscape are expanding. Thus, *E. Shherbina-Jakovleva* (2000), emphasizing the inseparability of Logos from Melos, interprets the musical landscape as a part or mode of sound (musical) environment. By analogy, the author claims, one can study the world/color landscape (p. 5). Totalological studies are becoming extremely relevant today, which, summarizing traditional approaches to the study of the landscape, offer a qualitatively new interpretation of it: “Totalological landscape is heterogeneous organic integrity, which in its internal separation, inexhaustibility and dynamism cannot be described by traditional geometry. The entire logical landscape is correlated not only with geographical reality but also with any natural, social, and spiritual universe. Today, not only the metaphorical content is included in the concept of “social” or “political landscape”, “landscape of news”, “landscape of events” and “landscape of urban life” (Kizima, 2005, p. 205). Further, *V. Kizima* (2005) defines the concept of the cultural totality landscape of, which “is revealed through the spiritual landscape, the landscape of any cultural event that takes place in time and space, the scientific landscape, the landscape of political life that changes, and so on, up to landscapes local processes, for example, a theatrical performance, which is happening here and now” (p. 205). It is obvious that the landscape as a spatial model can be applied in any field of modern science.

Undoubtedly, human development and the use of space are necessarily connected with the process of centering. The center forms the framework of the developed territory, acting as a node of connections. Concentrating on the intellectual elite, whose activity determines constant anticipatory development, the center fulfills the role of a “showcase” and a symbol of its country. Affirmation of the center requires effort and takes place based on competition. At the same time, unjustified ambitions and temporary usurpations become means of rivalry – a vital sign of the “capital” status. Such cultural and psychological characteristics as arrogance and selfishness, on the one hand, and envy and hostility, on the other, are inseparable companions of the struggle for the status of the center.

Yu. Lotman (2010) gives the following interpretation of the concept of “center”: “The law-making center of cultures, genetically originating from the primordial mythological core, reconstructs the world as fully ordered, endowed with a single plot and the highest meaning. Although it is represented by a text or a group of texts, they act as a normalizing device in the general culture system, which concerns all other texts of this culture at the meta-level. All the texts of this group are organically interconnected, manifested in their ability to organically collapse into a certain single phrase” (p. 288).

Yu. Lotman (2010) defines the system of peripheral connections as the one that "reconstructs a picture of the world in which chance, disorganization reigns. This group of texts also turns out to be able to move to a certain meta-level, but it cannot be reduced to a single and organized text. Since the plot elements that make up this group of texts will be excesses, anomalies, the general picture of the world will turn out to be extremely disorganized ... chaotic and tragic" (p. 288).

Considering borders as "the most "hot" points of semiotic processes", *Yu. Lotman* (2010) endows them with the functions of the main mechanisms of semiotic individuality. Delineating a periodic form, the border divides the space into "ours" and "alien", "safe" and "dangerous", "cultural" and "chaotic". The border not only separates but also connects; it simultaneously belongs to the outside and the inside system spaces. In conditions of multilingualism, borders function as meaning-making subjects. "The border is a mechanism for translating texts of foreign semiotics into "our" language, a place of transformation of "external" into "internal" it is a filtering membrane that transforms foreign texts to such an extent that they fit into the internal semiotics of the semiosphere, remaining, however, foreign" (p. 262).

There are situations when the landscape object cannot be uniquely defined using the "Center-Periphery-Border" scheme. A situation of marginality arises. Closely related to the idea of marginality is *Yu. Lotman's* (2010) opinion that "a situation of indignation and rebellion arises when two methods of coding collide: when the social-semiotic structure describes a given individual as a part, and he is aware of himself as an autonomous unit, a semiotic a subject, not an object" (p. 264).

Conscious selection of a marginal position, for example, the status of peripherality, can be considered as such protest themes. Thus, during the times of communist Poland, according to *J. Jarzemski* (1999), a specific situation arose: "When the "ancient center", that is, the hierarchy of social and cultural values embodied in the structure of space, was destroyed, and to believe in a new center or, worse, to strive for it meant succumbing to an inauthentic, facade, ideological culture, "periphery" seemed to be the only form of existence of an intellectual or an artist. Let us take a closer look at the spatial features of culture and literature. We will notice that in those days, it was all based on a peculiarly realized experience of peripherality and the game of distance" (p. 16). Interestingly, the contradiction that arose in the described situation (the functioning of the intellectual elite as a subject of the periphery) by its marginal coloring does not in any way reduce the status of that elite. On the contrary, it receives additional "dividends" due to the complexity of functioning, which encourages intense intellectual play. At the same time, the periphery has turned into an active zone, and acquired the status of, so to speak, an "underground center".

Quite rightly, *I. Andrushchenko* (2000) points out: “One can mention more than one capital that cannot compete with recognized European centers, and therefore it has the importance, figuratively speaking, of a provincial city of European scale at most. Vienna allowed all passers-by to feel free on its streets, not least because in terms of the Old World, it was the same periphery as provincial Bordeaux was about the French core” (p. 18).

Having a specific “repertoire of roles”, fragments of the landscape fight to increase their positional level. In this way, there is a vertical movement of landscape fragments, their movement in the hierarchy of positions. Determining this phenomenon as the possibility of a “center-periphery” inversion, *Yu. Lotman* (2010) describes its mechanism as follows: “The following scheme can be distinguished: the relative inertia of one or another structure is brought out of a state of rest by the flow of texts coming from the side of related by certain relationships of structures that are in a state of excitement. The stage of passive saturation is underway. Language is learned, and texts are adapted. At the same time, the text generator is, as a rule, located in the nuclear structure of the semiosphere, and the recipient is on the periphery. When saturation reaches a certain level, the internal mechanisms of text formation of the receiving structure are set in motion. From a passive state, she passes into a state of excitement and begins violently releasing new texts, bombarding other structures with them, including her “exciter”. This process can be described as a change of center and periphery” (p. 269). Researching the musical culture of the Poltava region in the 19th and early 20th centuries, *A. Lytvynenko* (2006) notes: “The central geographical location contributed to the accumulation and preservation of immanent cultural features in the region, the slowness of the processes of their leveling in the conditions of provincial inertia, and at the same time readiness to perceive non-regional influences. In many cases, this made it possible for Poltava region to overcome the status of provincialism and acquire features of an all-Ukrainian character” (p. 16).

Therefore, summing up the semantic analysis of the cultural landscape phenomenon, it is possible to define the latter as a text interpreted by the “reader”. At the same time, the production of values and meanings is determined by the landscape's essential features: the indiscretion and differentiation of space. In the formation of the semantics of the cultural landscape, the following points play a unique role: each point (fragment) of the landscape is a point of view, a context, and a semantic position; the potential diversity of landscape loci generates new information; relations between fragments of the cultural space are subject to the hierarchy of the landscape, which is described using the “Center-Periphery-Border” scheme; the intermediate, dissonant position of the cultural subject in the hierarchy of the landscape causes the appearance of the effect of marginality.

3.3. The city as a semiotic entity

The city is one of the essential shared objects of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics. In the context of the center-periphery problem, cities act as subjects with appropriate roles within the system: Center, Periphery, and Border. The landscape places lead the struggle for status enhancement. However, at the level of the whole system, the cities, with certain exceptions, become the bearers of status identification. They are peculiar loci of the landscape, the points where culture has most interfered with nature. In addition, cities are more than all other formations associated with personality, and they seem to “personify” closed spaces within themselves (this feature is one of the reasons for mythologizing the city). Since the top of the hierarchy – the Center – is characterized by excellent semiotic saturation, the increase in the city's status is associated with activating its semiosphere, which is expressed in the new texts' production and meanings (including mythological ones).

The high degree of semiotization of the city is due to such essential features as “madness” and “artificiality”. It is precise as a semiotic formation that the city attracted many researchers in the 20th century who analyzed the “living organism” of the city as a complex system of signs. A current direction of cultural studies and art studies is the study of the phenomenon of the city in its relationship with the artist, when the cultural sphere of the city and the creative personality influence each other, changing. This approach is implemented in *Yu. Zilberman's* and *Ju. Smiljanskaja* monograph (2002) “Kyiv Symphony of Volodymyr Horovyts”. Considering the insufficiently researched influence of the cultural landscape of Kyiv at the beginning of the 19th century (a complex of social, natural, architectural, musical components) on the creative biography of V. Horovyts, the author analyzes the cultural environment of the city as a factor that formed personality, artistic priorities, musical professionalism, features of performing style of an outstanding performer. Kyiv appears as absolute genius loci that produces geniuses: “The birth of a genius is always a miracle. This miracle was repeated in Kyiv at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. It was in this period that I. Ehrenburg, M. Bulgakov, S. Lyfar, O. Vertynskyi, I. Sikorskyi were born, O. Schmidt, O. Lunacharskyi, K. Paustovskyi, M. Berdyaev spent their childhood and youth, wrote poems in the legendary “blue Kyiv notebook” by H. Akhmatov, M. Vrubel, O. Mandelstam and M. Gumilyov find their love in the “snake's den”. Fate will send Serzh Lyfar – to Paris, Volodymyr Horovyts – to New York, Maximilian Voloshin – to Koktebel, G. Akhmatov – to St. Petersburg, M. Bulgakov, K. Paustovsky, and many others – to Moscow. Nevertheless, inspired by the Kyiv air, they will forever retain the feeling of the transparent crystal clearness of Kyiv evenings, the limitlessness of the spring floods of the Dnipro, the warmth of sunspots on the yellow bricks of Volodymyrivska Hill, and the charm of Kyiv nights” (p. 8).

In the semiosphere, the city appears as an entity capable of meaning-generating processes. It is worth presenting a detailed quote from the work of *Yu. Lotman's* (2010) "Inside the Thinking Worlds", reveals the essence of the functioning of the city as a semiotic object: "The city, as a complex semiotic mechanism, a generator of culture, can perform this function only because due to a cauldron of texts and codes, differently arranged and heterogeneous, belonging to different languages and different levels. The fundamental semiotic polyglotism of each makes it a field of various and otherwise impossible semiotic collisions. Realizing the docking of various national, social, stylistic codes and texts, the city carries out various hybridizations, recording (recodings), and semiotic translations, which turn it into a powerful generator of new information. The source of such semiotic collisions is not only the synchronous juxtaposition of heterogeneous semiotic formations but also diachrony: architectural structures, urban rites and ceremonies, the city plan itself, street names, and thousands of other relics of previous eras act as code programs that constantly re-generate the texts of the historical past. The city is a mechanism that constantly re-births its past, which gets the opportunity to interact with the present as if synchronously. In this regard, the city, like culture, is a mechanism that resists time" (p. 325). Therefore, the city is a space where different semiotic layers interact, forming a multifunctional sphere.

Yu. Lotman (2010) distinguishes two types of cities, determined by their relationship to the surrounding Earth: concentric and eccentric. Concentric is such a city that "relates to the surrounding world as a temple located in the center of the city, to itself, that is, when it is an idealized model of the universe, it is usually located in the center of the Earth. More precisely, it is assigned a central position; it is considered the center" (p. 321). Such a city can simultaneously be a shrine for the surrounding lands and a prototype of the heavenly city, acting as an intermediary between earth and heaven. Concentric structures tend to stand out from the environment, and focus, resulting in closure. Myths of the genetic plan function in the semiotic space of the concentric city, which leads to the perception of it as "eternal", which has a beginning (in which, as a rule, the gods are involved), but has no end – "Eternal Rome".

M. Virolajnen (2003), examining the work of M. Gogol from the semiotic aspect, points to the particular importance of the city's image in his texts. For Gogol, the city is a specifically limited space, a closed world where catharsis should occur. In "Inspector General" Gogol constructs a model of a typically concentric city: "The city is like a world, with our Lord Jesus Christ himself, limited by a closed circle outlined by the aesthetic form of comedy and materially strengthened by the walls of the theater, which fenced off the stage and the auditorium from the rest of the space. Such a "city", which paradoxi-

cally contained even the transcendental source of the world, is entirely self-sufficient. It does not need any external connections. It is identical to the “whole world” (p. 363).

Polish researcher *J. Jarzembski* (1999) writes about a city with a centric structure as one that “is built ... around a holy place, the center of the world, around the axis of its rotation, which can be a totem pole, but no less successfully – a church tower. The distance from this center determines the social significance of unique places in space” (p. 14). Heterogeneity and hierarchy characterize the space of such a city, by which the territory is developed in a certain way. Thus, in Kraków, as notes, the oldest, wealthiest, and most respectable families occupied tenements near the primary market and its surroundings. In contrast, government and middle-income circles occupied the city's territory between the ring of old fortifications and the so-called Second District. The workers' premises, small artisans, or shopkeepers formed their circle, located further from the center.

In contrast to the concentric structure, where the “land/sky” opposition is actualized, in the eccentric city, the natural is opposed to the artificial. The evaluation of reality (existential code) increases sharply, as a result of which the existing in the present time, which has the characteristics of “own”, receives a negative evaluation, and the “alien”, which has yet to appear in the next, acquires a high degree of value. Eschatological myths, the idea of doom, and the triumph of the elements function in the semiosphere of the city. Such symbolism determines the status of the city, which occupies an eccentric position in the semiotic space – the status of “eternal Rome” (Constantinople). The eccentric city gravitates toward openness, openness, and cultural contacts. The two types of cities' physical (geographical) position in the landscape is an essential determining factor. Here the principle is visualized, according to which a change in the landscape leads to a change in symbolism. Thus, the city's location on a mountain (or on mountains) signifies a concentric structure. An eccentric city, on the contrary, will be located on the seashore, at the mouth of the river, i.e. “on the edge of the cultural space”.

3.4. The role of text and symbols in the functioning of the city

In the context of the meaning-making problem in the semiosphere of the city, the concept of text is essential. *Yu. Lotman* (2010) uses the antithesis “text – non-text” to determine its features. Therefore, a text, like a non-text, is also a message, but one that has signs of “some additional expression that has meaning in a given cultural system”. The text opposes the non-text as lasting/eternal to ephemeral, valuable to priceless, what is to be preserved to what is to be destroyed (pp. 434-435). The dynamics of culture determines the possibility

of inversion “text – non-text”. A text is a particular structural unit with a beginning and an end. It necessarily has a specific internal organization that distinguishes it from just an amorphous accumulation of signs. However, unlike the Saussurean interpretation of the text, that Yu. Lotman (2010) called “technical packaging”, in modern semiotics, the understanding of the text as a flexible, dynamic system that is subject to the invasion of various “random” elements from other texts’ functions: “The text is understood not as a specific stable object with constant characteristics, and as a function. A separate work, a part of it, a compositional group, a genre, and ultimately literature can act as a text” (p. 102).

Yu. Lotman (2010) singles out three functions of the text: transmission of messages, generation of new messages, and memory function. The first function is a minimal feature of the text. This is the usual transfer of constant information, information of a particular volume. The second and third functions are closely related and are the essential characteristic of the text. This is what differentiates it from just a message (or non-text). Moreover, the degree of perception of it as a “true text” directly depends on the degree of implementation of these text functions. The ability of a text to establish complex “relationships” with other texts – to “be overgrown” with contexts – is a condition for its existence. A text out of context becomes a “museum exhibit” (p. 676).

G. Cook (1995) defines the concept of context in a narrow sense as “a set of factors that are outside the text being interpreted” (p. 24). The issue of relationships between texts is solved using the concept of “intertextuality”, meaning textual interaction that occurs within a separate text. The concept of context in *Yu. Lotman* (2010) is closely related to the concept of “memory of a text”, which is defined as “the sum of contexts in which this text acquires meaning and which in a certain way seem to be incorporated into it” (p. 162). The principle of intertextuality makes text memory a mechanism of active and constantly new modeling. In this sense, *Yu. Lotman's* (2010) opinion that “more can be removed from cultural memory than is added to it” (p. 567), also corresponds to the meaning of the concept of “text memory”.

In addition to the above-mentioned functions, which is an immanent text feature, *Yu. Lotman* (2010) highlights the functions of the text in its relation to culture. Therefore, with culture, a text can play the role of 1) a carrier of sub-textual (universal) meanings (each text is a message in a specific language); 2) the carrier of textual meanings (in contrast to the first situation, the text has “additional meaning”). Finally, the text has a specific property: acting as a text in one cultural system, in another, it plays the role of a non-text or an anti-text (respectively, a statement that is not preserved and a statement that is subject to destruction) (p. 512).

Architecture is undoubtedly one of the most important mechanisms for producing city symbols. Created by man, architectural space reflects people's ideas about the universe and its construction. On the other hand, architecture becomes a model, which is extrapolated in the human mind to the universe as a whole (in this sense, K. Malevich's well-known expression "the architecture of the earth's surface" is indicative). Architecture as a text has specific properties literature, music, or painting, the memory of previous eras is preserved naturally – works of different times exist side by side and function in parallel. In architecture, as a result of the destruction of old buildings (even for purely utilitarian reasons), the situation of the "historical ensemble" becomes impossible and changes, according to *Yu. Lotman* (2010), to "exhibition" (p. 677). The contrast in the architectural space is even more effective – the juxtaposition of buildings located next to each other, different in time and style. Another important property of architecture is that its symbolic meaning consists not only of purely architectural signs: compositional structure, rhythm, proportion, etc. Each architectural system combines narrowly architectural design with extra-architectural semiotics of everyday life, ritual, religion, and mythology. Performing various functions in society, buildings occupy specific positions according to the axiological scale of culture. This determines that cult, sacred, and state buildings are built fundamentally differently than non-sacred, residential, etc. In its functional heterogeneity, the architectural space forms an ensemble – a system of elements with different meanings.

The struggle of two opposite tendencies is realized in the architectural space: historical and utopian. The pathos of a "monological" city – a product of utopia – lies in the victory of reason over Nature and History, the realization of rational human ideas, and the desire to surprise the whole world with anything. In this way, people realize their ambitions, which are based on the desire, leaving behind an eternal memory, to become on the same level as the gods.

An exciting example of the architectural utopia of the end of the 20th century was demonstrated by the competition for the best project for Kazakhstan's new capital (on N. Nazarbayev's initiative). The president of the country most liked the work of the Japanese architect Kurakawa, who proposed to build two hundred-story towers in the center of the capital designed by him. The president was asked why this is necessary because it is expensive and risky, to which he replied: "I want to be remembered in the twenty-first century" (Remizov, 2000, p. 41). Therefore, replacing the actual city with its ideal construction, architectural utopias create a new text and transform the previous context since they are oriented exclusively to the future.

The semiotics of the city – spatial semiotics – has an inherent vector character, which gives it directionality. It refers to the direction of the gaze, the point of view of a specific ideal viewer who is identified with the city itself.

Most of the ideal utopian projects of the Renaissance and subsequent eras involve looking at the city from the outside as a model. In the Middle Ages, the view from the central fortress (possibility of artillery shelling of the streets) became a decisive factor in the circular development of fortress cities. And the point of view of Paris during the time of Louis XIV was from the king's bed (Lotman, 2010, p. 681).

Mythology is an actively functioning element of city semiotics. Entering into complex relations with architecture and spatial organization, mythological formations become catalysts of the semiotization processes of the city. Streets, districts, and buildings becoming the object of mythologizing acquire new, more complex meanings. On the other hand, the nature of myths affects the formation of the city's image, in agreement with which the architecture and organization of space are determined. As mentioned above, the degree of mythologizing of the city to a certain extent depends on its age. More precisely, the city's important history is the volume of factual information accumulated over a certain period, which forms the general context of the city. Developed mythology eliminates the lack of historical context (or semiotic vacuum).

The concept of myth is closely related to human modeling of space. *Yu. Lotman* (2010) singles out its two levels: myth as a specific narrative text and myth as a phenomenon of consciousness. The second is characterized by a specific mythological interpretation of space, which “appears not as a continuum of signs, but as a collection of separate objects that have their names” (p. 530). Contrasting the myth with the historical reality that “emerges” due to the accumulation and processing of information, the scientist emphasizes the negative, regressive role of artificial mythologizing of the past. At the same time, the myth is a crucial metatextual tool that ensures the unity of culture as a system to a certain extent. It is symptomatic that precisely in the crisis and transitional moments of cultural history, there is an appeal to mythological thinking as an alternative to symbolic consciousness.

The problem of urban mythology, unfortunately, is hardly investigated in modern Ukrainian cultural studies. In his article “Mythologizing of Lviv”, the scientist *G. Grabovych* (2002) notes that urban folklore plays a notable role in forming the city's mythology – oral stories about incredible adventures, rumors, and anecdotes. Reflecting the peculiarities of the history of the city, its environment, architecture, and lifestyle, folklore captures the specifics of human perception of the city (p. 12-16). Thus, the “artificiality” of St. Petersburg as a city that is built in the air and has no foundation under it caused the appearance of numerous oral literature, where the city takes on the features of a phantasmagorical space – scary and fantastic stories, the mandatory features of which are faith in the authenticity of events, and also the functioning in the plots of ghosts, tragic prophecies, etc.

Thus, in the context of spatial semiotics, the city appears as an entity whose semiosphere consists of: real history; texts that the city “produces” by applying different language systems (architecture, literature, etc.); mythological texts as a specific reinterpretation of the history and culture of the city.

The degree of semiotic saturation of the city's cultural sphere, therefore, depends on the active functioning of these components and their significance level. These same factors collectively affect the positional level of the city in the landscape hierarchy. A semiotically saturated city function as a center, a city with a low level of semiotic processes is doomed to be a periphery. Therefore, the generation of new texts and meanings is necessary for the city to achieve the position of a cultural center.

4. Conclusions

The study of the cultural space is an important task in implementing the educational program “Management of socio-cultural activity” for future specialists to perform their primary managerial function. This is possible thanks to the disclosure of the main provisions of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics and the determination of their didactic potential in the content of the managers of socio-cultural activity training.

1. The work considered the interaction of space and culture and their influence on each other. At the same time, spatial categories such as “center”, “periphery”, etc., appear as universal models for describing texts and phenomena of any branch of the cultural sphere.

2. The definition of the main concepts characterizing cultural space as a semiotic system is given: semiosphere as a system of semiotic formations of a specific locus of space (Ukraine as a whole and Ukrainian cities); the text as a multi-level and multi-layered entity capable of generating new meanings; myth as a specific text and at the same time a phenomenon of consciousness that compensates for the lack of factual historical information in the cultural space; Center, Periphery, and Border as components of the cultural landscape/semiosphere hierarchy; the concept of marginality as a specific psychosocial phenomenon, with the help of which the intermediate, dissonant position of the subject of spatial identification between the actual position and the desired position is determined, etc.

3. The peculiarities of the city's functioning as a semiotic entity are specified. It is shown that the cultural sphere of the city and the creative personality (in particular, the manager of socio-cultural activity) influence each other.

4. The methodical and didactic potential of the theories of the semiosphere and landscape hermeneutics in the context of forming professional competences of managers of socio-cultural activities is determined.

The scientific novelty. The scientific novelty of the obtained results lies in the generalization of spatial semiotics and landscape hermeneutics ideas into a specific methodological system and the determination of its didactic potential for forming the professional competencies of managers of the socio-cultural sphere.

The significance of the study. The practical significance is revealed in the possibilities of applying the acquired experience in the training plan for managers of socio-cultural activity of Sumy State University, namely within the disciplines “Theory and history of culture”, “History and theory of socio-cultural activity”, “Topography of culture”, “Cartography of the socio-cultural space of the region”, “Regional practices in socio-cultural activity”.

Prospects for further research. Further research involves improving the educational components of forming the professional competencies of managers of socio-cultural activity, considering the involvement of semiotic and hermeneutic analysis of regional cultures and rural and urban landscapes.

Acknowledgement

This publication was made following the subject of the scientific research work of the Department of Psychology, Political Science and Sociocultural Technologies of Sumy State University within the framework of the topic: “Social, psychological, cultural phenomena and technologies of the transitive society”.

References:

- Andruschenko, I. (2000). Na Peryferiyi Vseliudskosti [On the Periphery of Humanity]. *Krytyka [Critics]*, 4, 10(36), 17-20 (in Ukr.).
- Braichenko, O. (2016). Kulturnyi Landshaft: Istoriiia Naukovoho Poshuku [The Cultural Landscape: a History of Scientific Research]. *Antropolohiia Prostoru. Kulturnyi Landshaft Kyieva ta Okolyts [Anthropology of Space. Cultural Landscape of Kyiv and its Surroundings]*, 1, 95-103 (in Ukr.).
- Cook, G. (1995). *Discourse and Literature: The Interplay of Form and Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.2.2.17stj>.
- Grabovych, G. (2002). Mitolohizatsii Lvova: Vidlunnia Prysutnosity ta Vidsutnosity [Mythology of Lviv: Echoes of Presence and Absence]. *Krytyka [Critics]*, 6, 7-8 (57-58), 11-17 (in Ukr.).
- Grytsenko, O. (2019). *Kulturnyi Prostir i Natsionalna Kultura: Teoretychne Osmyslennia ta Praktychne Formuvannia [Cultural Space and National Culture: Theoretical Understanding and Practical Formation]*. Kyiv: Instytut Kulturolohii NAM Ukrainy (in Ukr.).
- Jarzembski, J. (1999). Znyschennia Tsentru [Destruction of the Center]. *Krytyka [Critics]*, 4, 1-2 (27-28), 14-17 (in Ukr.).
- Kizima, V. V. (2005). *Totallogija (Filosofija Obnovlenija) [Totalology (Philosophy of Renewal)]*. Kyiv: Izdatel PARAPAN (in Ukr.).

- Kopiyevska, O. (2020). Lokalni Kulturni Landshafty Ukrainy v Umovakh Hibrydnoi Realnosti [Local Cultural Landscapes of Ukraine in the Conditions of Hybrid Reality]. *Totalitaryzm yak Systema Znyschennia Natsionalnoi Pamiati: Vseukrainska Naukovo-Praktychna Konferentsiia z Mizhnarodnoiu Uchastiu [Totalitarianism as a System of Destruction of National Memory: All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participation]*. Lviv: Drukarnia Lvivskoho Natsionalnogo Medychnoho Universytetu Imeni Danyla Halytskoho, 182-184 (in Ukr.).
- Kyyanovska, L. O. (2000). Stylova Evoliutsiia Halytskoi Muzychnoi Kultury XIX – XX st. [Style Evolution of Galician Musical Culture of 19th-20th Century]. *Doktorska Dsertatsiia [Doctoral Dissertation]*. Lviv: Lvivska Natsionalna Muzychna Akademiia im. M. V. Lysenka (in Ukr.).
- Lotman, Ju. M. (2010). *Semiosfera [Semiosphere]*. St. Peterburg: Iskusstvo-SPB (in Russ.).
- Lytvynenko, A. I. (2006). Muzychna Kultura Poltavshchyny XIX – Pochatku XX Stolittia v Aspektakh Rehionalnogo Dzhereleznavstva [Musical Culture of Poltava Oblast in XIX – Early XX Centuries Viewed Through Studies of Regional Sources]. *Avtoreferat Kandydatskoi Dysertatsii [Abstract of Thesis Candidate's Dissertation]*. Kyiv: Natsionalna Muzychna Akademiia Ukrainy (in Ukr.).
- Martynenaite, L. (2011). Landshaft i Yoho Teoretychni Interpretatsii [Landscape And Its Theoretical Interpretations]. *Narodna Tvorchist ta Etnolohiia [Folk Creativity and Ethnology]*, 3, 91-95 (in Ukr.).
- Martyniuk, T. V. (2004). Istoryko-Teoretychni Aspekty Vzaiemovidnoshen Geografichnogo ta Sotsiokulturnoho Chynnykiv u Yavvyshchi Rehionalnoi Muzychnoi Kultury na Prykladi Pivnichnogo Pryazovia 19-20 st. [Historical-Theoretical Aspects of the Relationship of Geographical and Socio-Cultural Factors in the Phenomenon of Regional Musical Culture on the Example of the Northern Azov Region of the 19 th-20th Centuries]. *Avtoreferat Doktorskoi Dysertatsii [Abstract of Thesis Doctoral Dissertation]*. Kyiv: Natsionalna Muzychna Akademiia Ukrainy (in Ukr.).
- Remizov, A. (2000). Arhitekturnaja Utopija. Megapolis i Okruzhajushhaja Sreda [Architectural Utopia. Megacity And The Environment]. *Svet [Light]*, 6, 40-41 (in Russ.).
- Rössler, M., & Lin, R. CH. (2018). Cultural Landscape in World Heritage Conservation and Cultural Landscape Conservation Challenges in Asia. *Built Heritage*, 2, 3-26, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/BF03545707>.
- Shherbina-Jakovleva, E. (2000). Muzykalnyj Landshaft kak Filosofsko-Antropologicheskaja i Kulturologicheskaja Kategorija [Musical Landscape as a Philosophical, Anthropological and Cultural Category]. *Muzychnyi Landshaft Ukrainy (Rehiony, Shkoly, Indyvidualnosti) [The Musical Landscape of Ukraine (Regions, Schools, Individuals)]*, 3-7 (in Ukr.).
- Stepanov, Ju. S. (2001). V Mire Semiotiki [In the World of Semiotics]. *Semiotika: Antologija [Semiotics: An Anthology]*. Moscow: Akademicheskij Proekt: Delovaja Kniga, 5-42 (in Russ.).

- Stepanova, O. A. (2019). Ukrainska Mentalnist u Konteksti Rozbudovy Natsionalnogo Kulturnoho Prostoru [Ukrainian Mentality in the Context of the Development of the National Cultural Space]. *Suchasna Kulturolohiia: Aktualizatsiia Teoretyko-Praktychnykh Vymiriv [Modern Cultural Studies: Actualization of Theoretical and Practical Dimensions]*. Kyiv: Lira-K, 138-163 (in Ukr.).
- Vasiuta, O. P. (1998). Muzychne Zhyttia Chernihivschyny XVIII–XIX Stolit (Zahalni Zakonomirnosti ta Rehionalni Osoblyvosti) [Musical life of Chernihiv Oblast in the 18th-19th Centuries (General Patterns and Regional Features)]. *Avtoferat Kandydatskoi Dysertatsii [Abstract of Thesis Candidate's Dissertation]*. Kyiv: Kyivskiy Derzhavnyi Universytet Kultury i Mystetstv (in Ukr.).
- Violajnen, M. (2003). *Rech i Molchanie: Sjuzhety i Mify Russkoj Slovesnosti [Speech and Silence: Stories and Myths of Russian Literature]*. St. Peterburg: Amfora (in Russ.).
- Zilberman, Ju., & Smiljanskaja, Ju. (2002). *Kievskaja Simfoniia Vladimira Gorovica [Kyiv Symphony of Vladimir Horovycs]*. Kyiv: Mezhdunarodnyj Blagotvritelnyj Fond Konkursa V. Gorovica (in Ukr.).
- Zuev, S. P. (2007). Suchasnyi Kulturnyi Prostir ta Semiotyka Muzychnoho Festyvaliu (na Materialakh Kharkova) [The Modern Cultural Space and the Semiotics of the Music Festival (on Material of Kharkov)]. *Avtoferat Kandydatskoi Dysertatsii [Abstract of Thesis Candidate's Dissertation]*. Kharkiv: Kharkivska Derzhavna Akademiia Kultury (in Ukr.).

Information about the Authors:

Olga Boyko, Professor, DSc, Sumy State University, 2, Rimsky-Korsakov St., Sumy 40007, Ukraine; e-mail: boykoolga0204@ukr.net; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8484-6625> (corresponding author)

Serhii Zuev, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine; e-mail: zuev_s@i.ua; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1879-2993>

Tatiana Povalii, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine; e-mail: tatianapovaliy@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5821-9775>

Larysa Otroshchenko, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine; e-mail: l.otroshchenko@uabs.sumdu.edu.ua; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2333-333X>