

PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES

AUTOCOMMUNICATION AS A MODE OF ARTISTIC SEMIOSIS: THE PAINTING AS A PERFORMATIVE MODEL

Skovronskyi B.

*PhD in Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Department of Design and Fine Arts,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University
Kyiv, Ukraine*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5413-6630>
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21105831>

Abstract

The article investigates the phenomenon of autocommunication as a specific mode of artistic semiosis and examines its role in the constitution of aesthetic experience. Drawing upon the semiotic theory of Yuri Lotman, the hermeneutic philosophy of Hans-Georg Gadamer, and phenomenological analyses of image consciousness developed by Edmund Husserl and Roman Ingarden, the study proposes an interpretation of painting as a performative communicative event rather than a static visual object.

The research argues that artistic communication differs fundamentally from ordinary informational communication because its purpose is not the transmission of ready-made meanings but the generation of meaning through the active participation of the recipient. In this process, the viewer simultaneously occupies the positions of sender and receiver, transforming the act of perception into a form of autocommunication. Particular attention is devoted to the concept of presentation as a mediating structure through which visual signs acquire meaning. It is demonstrated that the constitution of pictorial meaning follows a logic analogous to Gadamer's concept of play, where the participant alternates between the roles of player and spectator and thereby contributes to the realization of the artwork itself.

The study concludes that a painting functions as a specific type of performance whose existence is inseparable from the interpretative activity of the viewer. Artistic experience emerges through the interaction of presentation, play, and autocommunication, resulting in the transformation of consciousness rather than the simple reception of information. This approach allows for a reconsideration of artistic semiosis as a dynamic process of meaning production and offers a new perspective on the communicative nature of visual art.

Keywords: autocommunication, artistic semiosis, painting, play, presentation, visual art, aesthetics.

Introduction

Communication remains one of the central categories of contemporary philosophy, semiotics, and cultural theory. Human existence unfolds within complex networks of communicative relations that structure individual experience and collective forms of life. Traditionally, communication has been understood as the transmission of information between different subjects. However, twentieth-century semiotics demonstrated that communicative processes frequently exceed the simple exchange of messages and often involve reflexive mechanisms through which consciousness communicates with itself [6].

This reflexive dimension becomes particularly important in the sphere of artistic experience. Unlike scientific discourse or everyday communication, works of art do not merely transfer information from an author to a recipient. Their significance depends on the active participation of the observer, who must reconstruct and actualize meaning through interpretation. Consequently, the artwork cannot be reduced to a passive container of information. Instead, it constitutes a communicative situation within which meaning emerges through interaction between the structure of the work and the interpretative activity of the viewer [1; 3].

Among the various approaches to this problem, Yuri Lotman's theory of autocommunication offers a

particularly productive framework. Lotman distinguished between communication directed toward another subject ("I-Other") and communication directed toward oneself ("I-I"). In the latter case, the communicative act does not primarily serve the transmission of new information but functions as a mechanism for restructuring consciousness [6]. Such a conception appears especially relevant for understanding aesthetic experience, where the recipient often encounters meanings that cannot be reduced to explicit informational content.

The relevance of this perspective increases when considered alongside Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutic account of art. Gadamer characterizes play as the mode of being of the artwork and argues that aesthetic experience emerges through participation in a dynamic event rather than through passive observation [1]. This understanding opens the possibility of interpreting artistic perception as a specific communicative process in which the spectator becomes an active participant in the realization of the work itself.

The present study develops this possibility by examining the relationship between artistic semiosis, autocommunication, and play. It proposes that the perception of painting can be understood as a performative process analogous to theatrical performance, in which

the viewer simultaneously occupies the positions of actor and spectator. Through this process, the artwork becomes not merely an object of contemplation but an event of meaning production.

Problem Statement

The communicative nature of artistic experience remains one of the most debated questions in aesthetics and semiotics. Although artistic works are commonly described as communicative structures, it remains unclear how communication operates in situations where meaning is not explicitly transmitted but must instead be actively produced by the recipient.

Traditional models of communication assume a distinction between sender and receiver. In such models, the sender encodes information and the receiver decodes it. However, artistic perception often appears to function differently. The observer does not merely decode a pre-existing message but actively participates in constructing the meaning of the work. This raises a number of theoretical questions.

First, what distinguishes artistic semiosis from ordinary forms of signification? Second, how can meaning emerge in situations where the artwork itself does not possess intentional consciousness? Third, in what sense can aesthetic experience be understood as a form of autocommunication? Finally, how does Gadamer's conception of play contribute to understanding the structure of artistic perception?

Existing studies have examined these issues from different perspectives. Semiotic approaches emphasize the self-referential character of artistic signs [7], while phenomenological analyses focus on the constitution of meaning within consciousness [3; 4]. Hermeneutic theories, in turn, stress the participatory nature of aesthetic experience [1]. Yet these perspectives have rarely been integrated into a unified account capable of explaining how artistic meaning is generated through the interaction of presentation, interpretation, and self-communication.

The purpose of this article is therefore to investigate the structure of artistic perception as a form of autocommunication and to demonstrate that the process of pictorial presentation functions according to a logic analogous to Gadamerian play. By combining semiotic, phenomenological, and hermeneutic approaches, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive account of the communicative mechanisms underlying aesthetic experience.

Methodology and Source Base

The present study employs an interdisciplinary methodological framework that combines semiotic, phenomenological, and hermeneutic approaches to investigate the communicative structure of artistic experience. Such a combination is necessary because the phenomenon of autocommunication in art cannot be adequately explained within the boundaries of a single theoretical tradition. Artistic perception simultaneously involves the functioning of signs, the constitution of meaning within consciousness, and the interpretative processes through which the artwork becomes actualized in experience. Consequently, the analysis requires a methodological synthesis capable of addressing these interconnected dimensions.

The primary methodological foundation of the study is semiotic analysis. Within this framework, the artwork is examined as a sign structure whose meaning emerges through processes of interpretation rather than through the simple transmission of information. The research relies particularly on the semiotic theories developed by Roman Jakobson, Yuri Lotman, and John Deely [2;6;7]. Jakobson's concept of the self-referential or introversive function of artistic signs provides an important starting point for understanding how aesthetic communication differs from ordinary informational communication [7]. In artistic discourse, the sign does not merely refer to an external object but directs attention toward its own mode of presentation, thereby transforming the communicative process itself.

Special importance is assigned to Yuri Lotman's theory of autocommunication [6]. Lotman's distinction between communication directed toward another subject ("I-Other") and communication directed toward oneself ("I-I") serves as the conceptual basis for interpreting artistic perception as a reflexive communicative process. The study adopts Lotman's argument that autocommunication functions not primarily as a mechanism for transmitting information but as a means of restructuring consciousness through the transformation of interpretative codes. This theoretical perspective makes it possible to analyze the artwork not simply as a message but as a communicative event that alters the recipient's relationship to meaning.

John Deely's semiotic philosophy further contributes to the investigation by clarifying the mediating role of signs in the constitution of reality [2]. His understanding of semiosis as a process that connects sensory data with conceptual structures provides a useful framework for examining how visual representations acquire meaning within artistic experience. Through this perspective, signs are viewed not as passive substitutes for external objects but as active mediators that participate in the formation of a meaningful world.

The second methodological component of the study is phenomenological analysis. Phenomenology offers conceptual tools for investigating the relationship between perception, consciousness, and meaning. The research draws primarily on the works of Edmund Husserl, Roman Ingarden, and Vakhtang Kebuladze [3;4;5]. Husserl's theory of intentionality serves as a foundation for understanding how consciousness constitutes objects through acts of perception and interpretation [4]. Within this framework, the meaning of an artwork cannot be regarded as an objective property inherent in the material artifact itself. Rather, meaning emerges through intentional acts that organize sensory data into coherent structures of experience.

Roman Ingarden's analyses of pictorial representation are particularly significant for the present study [3]. Ingarden demonstrated that the perception of an image involves multiple ontological layers, ranging from material elements such as colors and lines to represented objects and ideal meanings. This stratified conception of the artwork provides a theoretical basis for explaining how visual signs can function simultaneously as physical marks, representational forms, and

carriers of aesthetic significance. The distinction between these levels is essential for understanding the process through which artistic presentation generates meaning.

The phenomenological dimension is further supplemented by the work of Vakhtang Kebuladze [5], whose interpretation of phenomenology emphasizes the constitution of the lifeworld through intentional experience. His analyses contribute to understanding how the viewer constructs a meaningful experiential horizon while engaging with artistic representations. From this perspective, the artwork does not merely depict reality but participates in the formation of a particular mode of experiencing reality.

The third methodological foundation of the research is philosophical hermeneutics, particularly the theory of play developed by Hans-Georg Gadamer [1]. Gadamer's conception of play as the mode of being of the artwork provides the central interpretative framework of the study. Unlike traditional aesthetic theories that regard the artwork as a static object, Gadamer understands art as an event that occurs through participation. The present research adopts this perspective in order to investigate the dynamic and performative dimensions of artistic perception.

Particular attention is devoted to Gadamer's claim that the true subject of play is not the player but the play itself [1]. This insight allows for a reinterpretation of artistic experience as a process in which the observer becomes integrated into a larger structure of meaning production. The concept of play thus serves as a bridge between semiotic and phenomenological approaches by explaining how signs, perception, and interpretation become unified within a single experiential event.

In addition to these primary methodological approaches, the study employs conceptual analysis and theoretical reconstruction. Conceptual analysis is used to clarify the meanings of key categories such as auto-communication, semiosis, presentation, image, and play. Since these concepts originate from different philosophical traditions, their systematic comparison is necessary to establish a coherent theoretical framework. Theoretical reconstruction is employed to identify structural similarities between artistic presentation and Gadamerian play, allowing for the development of a unified model of artistic communication.

The source base of the research consists primarily of classical works in semiotics, phenomenology, and hermeneutics. Particular attention is given to Lotman's writings on autocommunication and semiosphere theory, Jakobson's studies of poetic language and artistic signification, Deely's semiotic investigations, Husserl's phenomenological analyses of intentionality, Ingarden's theory of the artwork, Kebuladze's phenomenology of experience, and Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics. These texts provide the conceptual foundations necessary for understanding the communicative and interpretative dimensions of artistic experience.

At the same time, the study engages with contemporary discussions in aesthetics, visual studies, and reception theory. Modern approaches increasingly emphasize the active role of the recipient in the production of meaning and the performative character of aesthetic

experience. By integrating these perspectives with classical theories of semiotics and hermeneutics, the present research seeks to develop a comprehensive account of artistic perception as a form of autocommunication.

The methodological synthesis proposed here allows the artwork to be examined simultaneously as a sign structure, a phenomenological object, and a hermeneutic event. Such an approach makes it possible to reveal the mechanisms through which artistic meaning is generated and to demonstrate that the perception of painting functions as a communicative process structurally analogous to play. Through this framework, the study contributes to contemporary debates concerning the nature of aesthetic experience, the role of interpretation in art, and the communicative foundations of artistic semiosis.

Research Findings

The phenomenon of autocommunication acquires particular significance in the sphere of artistic experience because art represents a unique form of communication in which the transmission of information is inseparable from the transformation of consciousness. Unlike ordinary communication, where the primary purpose is the exchange of information between different subjects, artistic communication operates according to a fundamentally different logic. The artwork does not merely convey a message from an author to a recipient; rather, it creates conditions under which the recipient becomes an active participant in the production of meaning. Consequently, the communicative process in art cannot be reduced to the conventional sender–message–receiver model. Instead, it involves a reflexive structure in which the recipient participates in the construction of meaning through a process of self-directed interpretation.

This characteristic becomes especially evident in visual art. A painting, for example, does not function as a simple informational medium. If the value of a painting consisted exclusively in communicating visual information about an object, photography or direct observation would fulfill this task more efficiently. The artistic significance of a painting therefore cannot be explained by its ability to represent external reality alone. Rather, its significance lies in the particular way reality is presented and experienced through the act of perception.

From a semiotic perspective, artistic communication differs from ordinary signification because the sign in art becomes self-referential. Roman Jakobson described this tendency as the introversive orientation of the artistic sign [7]. In such cases, attention shifts from what is represented to the manner of representation itself. The artwork directs perception toward its own presentation and thereby transforms the communicative act into an event of interpretation. Meaning is no longer transmitted as a ready-made content but emerges through the recipient's engagement with the structure of presentation.

This shift from representation to presentation constitutes one of the defining features of artistic semiosis. The represented object remains present, yet it ceases to

be the sole focus of attention. Instead, the recipient becomes aware of the relationship between the represented object and the expressive means through which it appears. The painting no longer functions merely as a substitute for reality but as a field in which reality is reconstructed through interpretative activity. Consequently, artistic meaning emerges neither from the depicted object alone nor from the material elements of the artwork, but from the dynamic interaction between them.

The communicative specificity of art becomes particularly apparent when examined through Lotman's concept of autocommunication [6]. According to Lotman, autocommunication occurs when the sender and the receiver of a message coincide within the same subject [6]. In such situations, the communicative act is not directed toward transmitting unknown information but toward restructuring the internal organization of consciousness. The message functions as a catalyst for self-transformation rather than as a vehicle for information exchange.

Artistic perception demonstrates precisely this structure. When a person encounters a painting, the informational content of the image is often already known. A landscape, portrait, still life, or seascape usually presents objects that are familiar and immediately recognizable. Yet recognition alone does not explain the aesthetic experience generated by the artwork. The significance of artistic perception lies in the fact that the viewer engages in a process of meaning construction that exceeds the mere identification of represented objects.

The viewer repeatedly interprets visual elements, correlates them with previous experiences, activates cultural associations, and organizes sensory impressions into coherent structures of significance. This activity is directed not toward discovering new information about the depicted object but toward generating a new mode of experiencing that object. The communicative process therefore becomes reflexive. The viewer effectively communicates with oneself through the medium of the artwork, using the image as a stimulus for internal transformation.

This process can be clarified through an analysis of pictorial representation. At the material level, every painting consists merely of pigments, lines, textures, and spatial arrangements distributed across a two-dimensional surface. These physical elements possess no intrinsic resemblance to the objects they represent. Nevertheless, viewers do not ordinarily perceive isolated marks on a canvas. Instead, they perceive landscapes, human figures, architectural structures, or symbolic forms.

The transition from material marks to meaningful objects requires a process of interpretation. Consciousness synthesizes visual data and organizes them into recognizable structures. This process involves at least two interconnected semiotic relationships. First, visual elements function as signs that refer to represented objects. Second, the resulting representation becomes meaningful within the horizon of the viewer's consciousness. Artistic experience therefore contains both a representational and an interpretative dimension.

Phenomenologically, these dimensions correspond to different levels of constitution [3;4]. On one level, consciousness organizes sensory impressions into coherent perceptual forms. On another level, it attributes significance to those forms by integrating them into broader structures of experience. The artwork thus functions as a mediating mechanism between sensory data and conceptual meaning.

The concept of presentation becomes crucial at this point. Presentation should not be understood merely as the display of an object. Rather, it denotes the process through which meaning is constituted in perception [3;4]. Presentation creates a situation in which the viewer must actively participate in the formation of significance. The artwork does not simply provide meaning; it requires meaning to be produced through interpretative engagement.

This characteristic explains why aesthetic experience cannot be reduced to passive observation. The viewer does not receive a finished meaning from the artwork. Instead, the viewer constructs meaning through participation in the process of presentation. Artistic communication therefore becomes inseparable from creative interpretation.

The dynamics of this process can be further illuminated through Hans-Georg Gadamer's concept of play [1]. Gadamer argues that play constitutes the fundamental mode of being of the artwork [1]. Unlike instrumental activities that pursue external goals, play possesses its purpose within itself. Its significance lies in participation rather than in the achievement of a predetermined outcome.

Several characteristics of play are particularly relevant for understanding artistic communication. First, play establishes a distinct experiential space governed by its own internal logic. Second, participants become absorbed into the movement of play itself. Third, play generates meaning through enactment rather than through external explanation. Finally, play achieves completion only when it is experienced by a participant capable of recognizing and actualizing its significance.

These characteristics closely resemble the structure of artistic perception. The artwork creates an experiential field within which ordinary modes of perception are temporarily suspended and replaced by the logic of aesthetic engagement. The viewer enters a specific interpretative situation governed by the internal organization of the artwork. Meaning emerges not through passive reception but through participation in this process.

Gadamer's most important insight concerns the relationship between player and spectator. In ordinary understanding, these roles appear distinct. The player performs actions, while the spectator merely observes them. However, Gadamer demonstrates that genuine participation in play requires the spectator to become internally involved in the unfolding of the game. The spectator does not remain external to the event but becomes integrated into its movement.

A similar structure can be identified in artistic perception. The viewer initially appears to occupy the position of an external observer. Yet meaningful engagement with the artwork requires active participation in

the process of interpretation. The viewer becomes simultaneously observer and participant. One perceives the image while simultaneously constructing its significance. The distinction between spectator and player therefore becomes blurred.

This convergence reveals the autocommunicative structure underlying artistic experience. The viewer continuously alternates between different interpretative positions. On one level, one observes the visual elements presented by the artwork. On another level, one actively organizes these elements into meaningful configurations. The viewer therefore becomes both sender and receiver within a single communicative process.

The communicative act unfolds as a movement between sensory perception and conceptual interpretation. Visual elements function as messages that consciousness directs toward itself. Meaning emerges through the recursive interaction between perception and interpretation. The artwork mediates this process without determining its outcome in advance.

Claude Monet's *Impression, Sunrise* provides an illustrative example of this mechanism. The painting depicts a harbor scene that is, in itself, relatively ordinary. Yet the artistic significance of the work does not derive primarily from the represented objects. Rather, it emerges from the particular manner in which light, atmosphere, color, and visual perception are presented. The viewer is not simply informed about the existence of a harbor. Instead, one is invited to participate in the experience of perceiving that harbor under specific atmospheric conditions.

The painting thus generates a communicative situation in which meaning is created rather than transmitted. The visual presentation functions as a code that must be interpreted. Different viewers may produce different meanings, yet all participate in the same process of autocommunicative engagement. The artwork provides the conditions for meaning formation without prescribing a single definitive interpretation.

From this perspective, the painting may be understood as a form of performance. Although no physical actor appears before the viewer, the image itself performs the represented reality. Colors, lines, textures, and compositional relations collectively enact the appearance of the depicted world. The viewer participates in this performance by reconstructing the represented reality through acts of interpretation.

The analogy with theatrical performance becomes particularly productive when considering the role of presentation. In theatre, actors do not merely exist on stage; they present characters through performance. Similarly, visual elements in a painting do not simply occupy space; they present a world through representation. The spectator recognizes this presentation and thereby transforms material signs into meaningful experience.

This process reveals the fundamentally performative nature of artistic semiosis. Meaning emerges not as a static property of the artwork but as an event occurring through interaction between artwork and recipient. The artwork becomes actual only through participation. Its significance exists neither exclusively in the object

nor exclusively in the subject but within the communicative process that unites them.

The transformative consequences of this process explain why autocommunication occupies such a central position in artistic experience. By engaging in aesthetic interpretation, individuals reorganize their perceptual and conceptual structures. The artwork provides a framework within which consciousness encounters itself in a new configuration. What changes is not merely the understanding of a particular image but the interpretative horizon through which reality itself is experienced.

This transformation corresponds closely to Lotman's description of autocommunication as a mechanism of internal restructuring [6]. Artistic experience modifies the codes through which meaning is generated. The viewer leaves the communicative encounter not because new information has been acquired but because the structure of interpretation itself has been altered.

Consequently, the aesthetic value of art cannot be reduced to informational content. Its significance lies in its ability to generate situations of autocommunication that reorganize consciousness through participation in presentation. Artistic meaning emerges through the interaction of signification, perception, interpretation, and play. The artwork functions as a communicative environment within which individuals become simultaneously creators and recipients of meaning.

The analysis conducted in this study therefore supports the conclusion that the semiotic structure of visual art is fundamentally autocommunicative. Presentation functions as a performative process analogous to Gadamerian play, while artistic perception represents a reflexive communicative event through which consciousness constitutes and transforms its own experiential world. In this sense, the artwork may be understood not simply as an object of representation but as a communicative performance that enables the continuous recreation of meaning through aesthetic experience.

Discussion

The interpretation of artistic perception proposed in this study contributes to several contemporary discussions in aesthetics, semiotics, and philosophy of communication. Most notably, it offers an alternative to informational models of communication that continue to dominate both classical communication theory and many contemporary approaches to media studies. While traditional models emphasize the transmission of messages between distinct subjects, the present analysis demonstrates that artistic communication operates according to a fundamentally different principle. The artwork does not merely serve as a vehicle through which information passes from an author to a recipient. Rather, it establishes a communicative environment within which meaning is actively constituted by the recipient through processes of interpretation and self-reflection.

This conclusion aligns with broader developments in twentieth-century philosophy, particularly within phenomenology and hermeneutics. Husserl's conception of intentionality [4], Ingarden's theory of the lay-

ered structure of the artwork [3], and Gadamer's understanding of art as an event of truth [1] all challenge the notion that meaning exists independently of experience. The present study extends these perspectives by emphasizing the communicative dimension of aesthetic experience and by demonstrating that the constitution of meaning in art possesses an autocommunicative structure. In this regard, artistic perception may be understood not only as interpretation but also as a form of self-directed communication through which consciousness reorganizes its own structures of understanding.

The analysis also contributes to ongoing discussions concerning the active role of the recipient in artistic meaning production. Reception aesthetics and reader-response theories have long argued that meaning emerges through interaction between artwork and audience. However, these approaches often focus on the plurality of interpretations without fully explaining the communicative mechanism through which such interpretations are generated. By incorporating Lotman's concept of autocommunication [6], the present research provides a more precise account of this mechanism. Meaning does not arise simply because different viewers possess different cultural backgrounds or subjective preferences. Rather, it emerges because the artwork initiates a communicative process in which the recipient simultaneously occupies the positions of sender and receiver, thereby transforming interpretation into an act of self-construction.

The proposed model also sheds new light on the relationship between representation and presentation in visual art. Conventional theories of representation frequently concentrate on the correspondence between an image and its referent. Within such frameworks, artistic value is often evaluated according to the degree of realism, symbolic complexity, or conceptual content exhibited by the artwork. The findings of the present study suggest that these criteria alone are insufficient for explaining aesthetic experience. The decisive factor is not what is represented but how representation becomes an event of presentation. Artistic significance emerges through the viewer's participation in the process by which visual elements are transformed into meaningful objects of experience.

This perspective allows for a reconsideration of Gadamer's theory of play [1]. In philosophical hermeneutics, play functions primarily as an ontological model describing the mode of being of the artwork. The present analysis extends this understanding by revealing the communicative implications of Gadamer's concept. The structure of play closely resembles the structure of autocommunication [1; 6]. Both involve the temporary suspension of ordinary subject-object relations, the creation of a distinct experiential space, and the transformation of participants through involvement in a self-contained process. Consequently, artistic play may be interpreted as a specific communicative configuration in which meaning emerges through participation rather than transmission.

At the same time, the comparison between artistic presentation and play raises important questions concerning the nature of aesthetic agency. The analysis suggests that neither the artist nor the viewer functions

as the sole source of meaning. Instead, meaning arises within the dynamic interaction established by the artwork itself. This conclusion corresponds closely to Gadamer's claim that the true subject of play is not the player but the play itself. Similarly, the present study indicates that artistic communication cannot be fully attributed to either the creator or the recipient. The artwork establishes conditions under which meaning becomes possible, while its actual realization depends upon the participatory engagement of consciousness.

An important implication of this argument concerns the status of artistic interpretation. Contemporary debates often oscillate between two opposing positions. On one side, meaning is regarded as fixed by authorial intention; on the other, meaning is considered entirely dependent upon the subjective responses of recipients. The model developed in this study offers a mediating alternative. Meaning is neither completely predetermined nor entirely arbitrary. The artwork constrains interpretation through its formal organization, yet it remains open because the realization of meaning requires active participation by the viewer. Autocommunication thus explains how artistic experience can simultaneously possess structure and interpretative plurality.

The findings may also contribute to contemporary discussions surrounding immersive media, digital art, and interactive technologies. Many recent artistic practices seek to increase audience participation and blur the distinction between creator and recipient. Interactive installations, virtual environments, and algorithmically generated artworks frequently position viewers as active participants in the production of aesthetic experience. The theoretical framework developed here suggests that such developments do not represent a radical break from traditional artistic communication. Rather, they intensify a communicative structure that has always been present in art. Even in the case of traditional painting, the viewer participates in the construction of meaning through autocommunicative processes. Digital and interactive media merely make this participatory dimension more explicit.

Despite its theoretical contributions, the present study also possesses several limitations. First, the analysis remains primarily conceptual and philosophical. Although numerous examples from visual art support the proposed framework, the research does not include empirical investigations of audience reception. Future studies could examine how viewers actually experience autocommunicative processes during encounters with artworks and whether such experiences vary across cultural or educational contexts.

Second, the discussion focuses predominantly on painting and visual representation. While the concepts of autocommunication and play appear applicable to other artistic media, their specific manifestations may differ considerably. Music, architecture, literature, theatre, and digital media each possess unique formal characteristics that influence the production of meaning. Further research is therefore required to determine how the proposed model functions within different artistic domains.

Third, the present study concentrates primarily on the individual recipient. However, artistic experience

frequently occurs within collective contexts, including museums, exhibitions, performances, and cultural rituals. The relationship between individual autocommunication and collective meaning formation remains an important topic for future investigation. Such research could potentially establish connections between Lotman's theory of the semiosphere [6] and contemporary theories of social communication.

Overall, the findings support the view that artistic perception should be understood as a dynamic communicative process rather than as a passive reception of aesthetic information. By integrating semiotic, phenomenological, and hermeneutic perspectives, the present study demonstrates that the artwork functions as a medium through which consciousness enters into communication with itself. This process unfolds through presentation, interpretation, and play, resulting in the continual reconstruction of meaning and the transformation of experience. The concept of autocommunication therefore provides a productive framework for understanding not only the semiotic structure of artworks but also the broader role of art in shaping human consciousness and cultural experience.

Conclusions

The present study has examined the phenomenon of autocommunication as a fundamental dimension of artistic semiosis [6] and has demonstrated its significance for understanding the communicative structure of aesthetic experience. Through a synthesis of semiotic, phenomenological, and hermeneutic approaches [1–7], the research has proposed a theoretical model in which the perception of an artwork is interpreted not as the passive reception of information but as an active process of meaning generation. Within this framework, artistic communication differs substantially from conventional models of information transfer because it operates through the reflexive involvement of the recipient in the constitution of meaning.

The analysis has shown that the artwork cannot be adequately understood as a simple medium for transmitting a predetermined message from an author to an audience. Instead, it functions as a communicative environment that initiates and sustains interpretative activity. Meaning emerges through the interaction between visual signs, perceptual processes, and conceptual structures of consciousness. Consequently, the recipient becomes an active participant in the production of meaning rather than a passive decoder of information. This participatory character of aesthetic experience reveals the autocommunicative nature of artistic perception, in which the recipient simultaneously occupies the positions of sender and receiver within a reflexive communicative process.

Particular attention has been devoted to the role of presentation in artistic semiosis. The study has argued that the aesthetic significance of an artwork lies not primarily in what is represented but in how representation is presented and experienced. Visual signs do not merely refer to external objects; they create conditions under which consciousness actively reconstructs and interprets reality. Artistic presentation therefore functions as a process of mediation between sensory per-

ception and conceptual meaning. Through this mediation, the artwork becomes a site where new experiential configurations can emerge.

The research has further demonstrated that Gadamer's concept of play provides a productive framework for understanding the dynamics of artistic communication [1]. The structure of play reveals important similarities with the structure of autocommunication. In both cases, meaning is not transmitted as a finished content but arises through participation in a self-sustaining process. The participant enters a distinct experiential space governed by its own internal logic and becomes involved in the unfolding of meaning. The study has therefore proposed that artistic presentation may be interpreted as a performative event analogous to play, where the recipient alternates between the roles of observer and participant while actively contributing to the constitution of aesthetic significance.

An important theoretical contribution of the study lies in the identification of structural parallels between visual representation and theatrical performance. The artwork has been interpreted as a form of presentation in which visual elements perform the represented reality rather than merely depict it. Through the act of perception, the viewer reconstructs the presented world and thereby participates in a communicative process that resembles a performance or spectacle. This perspective highlights the dynamic and event-like character of artistic meaning, emphasizing that the artwork becomes fully actualized only through interpretative engagement.

The findings also contribute to contemporary discussions concerning the role of the recipient in aesthetic experience. While many modern theories recognize the active participation of audiences in meaning production, the concept of autocommunication provides a more precise explanation of the mechanism through which such participation occurs [6]. Artistic experience transforms consciousness not because it communicates new information but because it reorganizes the interpretative structures through which reality is understood. The aesthetic encounter thus functions as a process of self-transformation mediated by signs, images, and symbolic forms.

At a broader level, the study suggests that art performs an essential cultural function by creating spaces in which individuals can engage in reflective communication with themselves. Through participation in artistic presentation, consciousness acquires the capacity to reorganize its own experiential horizons and generate new forms of understanding. In this sense, the value of art extends beyond representation, expression, or entertainment. Art becomes a medium through which human beings continually recreate the meanings that structure their experience of the world.

The proposed theoretical framework opens several directions for future research. Further studies may investigate how autocommunicative processes operate in other artistic media, including music, architecture, literature, theatre, and digital art. Additionally, empirical research could explore the ways in which different audiences engage in autocommunicative meaning pro-

duction and how such processes are influenced by cultural, historical, or technological contexts. Such investigations would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of artistic semiosis and the role of aesthetic experience in contemporary culture.

In conclusion, the study has demonstrated that autocommunication constitutes a central mechanism of artistic perception [6]. By interpreting the artwork as a form of play and presentation [1; 3], it becomes possible to understand aesthetic experience as a communicative event through which meaning is continually created, negotiated, and transformed. The artwork therefore appears not simply as an object of representation but as a dynamic process that enables consciousness to encounter and recreate itself through the medium of artistic form.

References:

1. Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and Method* / Hans-Georg Gadamer ; translated and revised by J. Weinsheimer, D. G. Marshall. 2nd revised ed. New York : Continuum, 2004. 601 p.
2. Deely J. *Basics of Semiotics*. 4th ed. Tartu : Tartu University Press, 2005. 175 p.
3. Ingarden R. *Ontology of the Work of Art: The Musical Work, the Picture, the Architectural Work, the Film* / translated by R. Meyer, J. T. Goldthwait. Athens, Ohio : Ohio University Press, 1989. 344 p.
4. Husserl E. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book*. Translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1983. 448 p.
5. Кебуладзе В. *Феноменологія досвіду* / Вахтанг Кебуладзе ; відп. ред. А. Лой. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2011. 280 с.
6. Лотман Ю. М. *Внутри мыслящих миров: Человек – текст – семиосфера – история*. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1996. 464 с.
7. Jakobson R. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague : Mouton, 1971. 752 p.