

Legal Semiotics

Vladimir Valentinovich Kozhevnikov

Department of Theory and History of State and Law, Omsk State University Dostoevsky, Omsk, Russia,
kta6973@rambler.ru

Abstract: *The article reveals the concept of semiotics and the stages of its formation, as well as the semiotics of law; some concepts of semiotic-legal researches are analyzed; a forecast is given from the point of view of the application of semiotics of law in the future.*

Keywords: *semiotics; semiotics of law; digital law; communicative theory of law; methodology of law*

I. Introduction

It seems that among the many topical problems of the general theory of law, one should pay attention to its methodology and methods, especially non-traditional ones - hermeneutics, synergetics, etc., including semiotics, to which domestic scientists are very skeptical, although at present it has the prospect of application in the study of legal phenomena, due to the digitalization of law.

II. Research Methods

When preparing a scientific article, the following methods were used:

1. General philosophical (dialectical-materialistic), which is used in all social sciences;
2. General scientific (analysis and synthesis, logical and historical, comparisons, abstractions, etc.), which are used not only by the theory of state and law, but also by other social sciences;
3. Special methods (philological, cybernetic, psychological, etc.), developed by special sciences and widely used for the knowledge of state and legal phenomena;
4. Private scientific (formal legal, interpretation of law, etc.), which are developed by the theory of state and law.

III. Result and Discussion

3.1 On the Concept of Semiotics

The method of semiotics is the science of sign systems. The philosophical encyclopedic dictionary states that semiotics (from the Greek sema-sign) is the doctrine of (graphic) signs and the series of sign forms; every sign is a significant, that is, it means something, but it is not necessary to be used as a detonation, that is, it does not necessarily have to correspond to any meaning. There are signs that draw attention to certain content (for example, timetables), communicate properties (for example, "fireproof"), promote choice (for example, a price list), etc. There are also signs that do not correspond to any meaning, for example, logical-mathematical, which express the relationship between the signs themselves [1].

What do we know about semiotics, and what methods can we classify as semiotic? Semiotics is usually called the science that studies signs, sign systems (languages) and integral sets of signs (texts). At the same time, the concepts of sign

and text are considered in the broadest possible sense. Texts are by no means only fragments of oral or written speech in natural languages, but in general any results of meaningful activity. Semiotics, therefore, turns out to be the fundamental tool with which we can describe not reality, but reality [2]. Semiotics, or semiology (Greek - sign; sign) is a general theory that studies the properties of signs and sign systems. According to Yuri Mikhailovich Lotman, semiotics should be understood as the science of communication systems and signs used in the process of communication [3].

3.2 History of Semiotics

Problems of the relationship of name, meaning (semantics) and symbol are found even in Plato's dialogue *Cratylus* and in Aristotle's treatise "On Interpretation". Biblical exegesis had a semiotic aspect. In particular, the Alexandrian school developed the Anagogic interpretation. Medieval disputes between nominalists and realists were also devoted to semiotic problems. Ideas about semiotics as one of the foundations of all human cognition can be found already among the classics of modern science and philosophy. So, for example, John Locke in his "An Essay on Human Understanding" (1690) wrote that semiotics - as "the study of signs" - is one of the three branches of knowledge as such, along with physics - "knowledge of things" and practice - "the ability to correctly apply our forces and actions to achieve good and useful things. About semiotics, John Locke says the following: "And since the most common signs are words, semiotics is also quite aptly called 'logic'. The task of logic is to consider the nature of the signs that the mind uses to comprehend things or to convey its knowledge to others. John Locke draws attention to the connection between signs, words and knowledge. If in Russian signs have something in common with knowledge, then in Greek the word - logos - has something in common with logic, the ability to reason.

Semiotics has its own stages of development, which are associated with the names of the greatest scientists. Another brilliant thinker, Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), took the next step - he developed a large-scale systematics of human cognition and behavior, in which semiotics also occupied a central position. Pierce in his various works gives different versions of the allocation of varieties of sciences. Like Locke, these classifications have a triadic structure. For example, in his early work *Teleological Logic* (1865), Peirce speaks of 1) positive science (the study of things), 2) semiotics (the study of representations), 3) and formal science (the study of forms) [5]. Like Locke, Peirce equates logic and semiotics, speaking of them as different names for the "formal doctrine of signs"[6]. Charles Sander Pierce also considers the signs themselves trichotomously.

Firstly, he divides the signs by their very essence into: 1) primary quality signs (for example: the feeling of black), 2) the embodiment of qualities, i.e. single really existing objects or events - signs-things (for example .: the word "table" written in black ink), 3) signs-laws that appear in things (for example, the rules for using the word table). Secondly (and this is Peirce's most famous triad), from the point of view of the relationship between the sign and the object to which the sign points, there are: 1) icons (signs due to similarity), 2) indices (signs due to adjacency) and 3) symbols (signs by convention). Thirdly, Peirce distinguishes from the point of view of relation to its meaning: 1) signs-possibilities (rhemes), 2) signs-facts (judgments) and 3) signs-inferences, which corresponds to the classical logical triad of a term, a sentence and a conclusion [6].

Charles Sander Peirce tried to characterize a number of important semiotic concepts: sign (sign), meaning (meaning) and sign relation. He clearly recognized the need for a special science - semiotics, which he defined as the doctrine of the nature and main varieties of sign processes. Peirce's publications cover the period from 1867 to the end of his life, but they were small in volume, infrequent and usually inaccessible, Peirce did not manage to complete any of the large books he conceived, and his ideas were widely disseminated only in the 1930s. when his archives were published.

In addition, Peirce singled out three semiotic elements: the sign, the object, and the interpretant. He owns the authorship of the term semiosis. Gottlob Frege (1848-1925) did not create a detailed concept, but several of his articles ("On Sense and Meaning" (1892), "Thought: A Logical Investigation") devoted to semiotics are classics. Among Frege's ideas, the most significant for semiotics are his concepts of the meaning and meaning of a sign.

Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), German philosopher, founder of phenomenology, was one of the first researchers of the problems of semiotics; the theory of the sign, within the framework of phenomenology, was developed by him in I and II "Logical Investigations" Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) in the Course of General Linguistics defines the semiology he created as "the science that studies the life of signs within the framework of society." One of the main provisions of F. de Saussure's theory is the distinction between language and speech. Language (*la langue*) Saussure called a set of means common to all speakers used in constructing phrases in a given language; speech (*la parole*) - specific statements of individual native speakers.

A linguistic sign consists of a signifier (acoustic image) and a signified (concept).

Thus, Saussure's idea of the sign and his conception as a whole are based on the signifier-signified dichotomy. There are two kinds of meanings based on two kinds of relationships and differences between the elements of a language system. These are syntagmatic and associative relations. Speech in this dichotomy is a specific result of the use of language a semiotic product deployed in time and space. A language is understood as a system of signs (code) that virtually exists in the minds of every individual who speaks the language, but which, at the same time, is never completely located in his mind and never completely belongs to the individual. Language is not created and does not change by an individual alone, since it is an external social aspect of speech activity in relation to him, which exists in full only in a team [7].

Charles William Morris (1903-1979), developing Peirce's ideas, systematized semiotics and introduced its division into syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. In 1938, he published a small book, Fundamentals of the Theory of Signs, which is a brief outline of the new science. The most complete attempt at an exposition of the main problems of semiotics can be found in his book Signs, Language and Behavior, published in New York in 1946. Jakob von Uexkull (1864-1944), formulated the concept of Umwelt, later adopted by Thomas Sebeok. He laid the foundations for specific sections of semiotics, such as zoosemiotics and biosemiotics, which gave rise to the semiotic approach in biology. It should be noted that this scientist has always stood apart from the researchers of semiotics and is still little known, since he dealt more with biological and natural science issues than with humanitarian issues.

However, recently there has been a tendency to increase attention to his works.

At the same time, there is a lack of unity and certainty, characteristic of most of its areas, starting from the concept of the founders of semiotics - Peirce and Saussure. Thus, Peirce saw semiotics as a "universal algebra of relations", that is, rather, as a branch of mathematical logic. And Saussure understood semiology as a

generalizing part of the humanities, the main section of which is linguistics. These interpretations were further complicated by the fact that neither the first nor the second created a systematic presentation of the foundations of this science [8].

3.3 Semiotics in the Soviet Union

In the USSR, semiotics developed within the framework of the Moscow-Tartu semiotic school headed by Yuri Mikhailovich Lotman. In 1964, the First Summer School for the Study of Sign Systems was organized in Kääriku (Estonia) under the direction of Lotman. These schools then met every two years until 1970. Soviet semioticians published Proceedings on sign systems. Significance, that is, the ability of one object to replace another object in the mind of the interpreter, is declared to be the main property of a sign. In the process of this substitution, one object becomes a sign, and the other its meaning.

Soviet semiotics traced its beginnings to Peirce and, following him, divided signs into three types: iconic, indexical, and symbolic. The difference between the signs lies in the sign connection. In the first case it is based on likeness, in the second it is real, and in the third it is conventional. The Moscow-Tartu semiotic school makes the subject of its study no longer language, but culture manifested as a text (semantic universe, a complex of information). In the process of communication, the text is transformed, which reveals many contexts. At the same time, the addressee is also transformed (for example, he receives knowledge). Therefore, semiotics can be called the semiotics of culture, which is identical with cultural studies. The main practice of interaction with signs is deciphering (semiotic analysis, interpretation). The Tartu School argues with French semiology, opposing text to discourse. The specificity of the text is localization and composition. The text is surrounded by “extra-textual reality”, and the totality of text-cultures forms a semiosphere [9].

Alexander Ivanovich Demidov, seeing the prospect of using the method of semiotics in the study of law, other legal phenomena, draws attention to the fact that legal reality in many of its manifestations - procedures, procedural form, style of legal documents, organization of legal relations is precisely a sign, symbolic system that represents objects and actions that carry a certain conditional meaning, depending on the understanding of the interacting subjects. The author draws attention to the fact that the interpretation of the meaning, the disclosure of the symbol may be different depending on the mindset, level of education, political orientations, but it almost always occurs, as a result of which it is necessary to understand the principles and mechanisms on the basis of which it is carried out [10].

3.4 Scientific Directions of Semiotics of Law: Persian and Structuralist

The formation of the semiotics of law began in the 1970s-1990s. and followed the two indicated directions of general semiotics. With a certain degree of conventionality, the scientific directions that have arisen in the field of semiotics of law can be called Peircean and structuralist.

a. Persian Direction

Particular merit in the development of the Piercean direction belongs to its founder, Professor of the University of Pennsylvania Roberta Kevelzon (1931-1998), from whose position law is seen as a complex and dynamic conglomerate of signs of sign systems, existing in parallel with other sign systems. (language, economics, politics, etc.) that are born in the process of communication between people and the development of various social institutions. Applying Peirce's semiotic methodology to

the study of law, Robert Kevelson proceeded not only from the semiotic nature and dynamism of legal communication, but from the fact that both the legal argument and the entire legal discourse function almost universally and are the prototypes of any other arguments and dialogic development of thought [11], which emphasizes that, “just as there is not one ideal legal system, but rather, a legal system as an actual network of competing and conflicting legal subsystems”, so there is “not one type of legal discourse, but conflicting models legal reasoning” that interact and coexist in the same society in the same historical period. For example, “the model of deductive legal reasoning has a different purpose than the model of inductive legal reasoning, which is the main one in the process of making judicial decisions”[11].

The paradigm of the semiotics of law is seen by Robert Kevelson and her followers, first of all, as an application to the analysis of speech acts of legal discourses of a number of different logics: 1) “critical”, or formal logic, analyzing abductive, deductive and inductive reasoning” 2) deontic logic; 3) erotic logic of questions and answers [11]. Erotic logic is especially significant for the analysis of the process of making legal decisions and other open legal procedures, “of which the interrogative construction and interpretive process are the most pronounced and the pragmatic aspect of the semiotic methodology is the most obvious and useful”[11].

Natalia Frantsevna Kovkel points out that, following Peirce, Robert Kevelson considered legal communication as a translation of signs of one level into signs of another level, and defines its main problem as the problem of a sign relationship between certain (based on the norms of law or practice) and indefinite elements of the legal system. She uses the concept of the paradoxical structure of Peirce’s thinking, asserting on its basis the inevitability of conflict between legal actors, and considers law as an open innovative system in which there is not and cannot be one, initially given type of understanding [8].

b. The Structuralist Direction

The structuralist direction of the semiotics of law, unlike the Piercean one, arose on the basis of French structuralism, and therefore is closely connected not so much with the logic and analysis of legal thinking, but with linguistic and psychology, the analysis of speech and psychological meaning-generating processes in legal discourse. According to Natalya Frantsevna Kovkel, “the paradigm of the semiotics of law, built within the framework of the structuralist direction ... focuses more on the sign analysis of legal communication and especially the interpretation of various legal signs and sign systems, rather than on a pragmatic study of legal reasoning in various discursive practices”[8].

One of the founders of this school, professor of law at the University of Liverpool Bernard Jackson (b. 1985), defines the semiotics of law as a science, the subject of which should be the features of the emergence, transformation and loss of meanings in the field of law[12]. According to Jackson’s position, in the methodology of the semiotics of law, approaches of any sciences specializing in the construction and change of meaning can be used. For the analysis of any legal text, there are three levels of significance: 1) advanced, or the level of manifestation, corresponding to the primary perception of the text; 2) the thematic level, which includes a stock of narratives acquired in the process of socialization and used to understand primary perception; 3) the level of basic, deep structures of the signifier, which is postulated as universal and acquired from discursive experience [12].

3.5 Semiotics of Law in the Post-Soviet Space

As for the jurisprudence of the post-Soviet space, it should be noted that the number of semiotic-legal studies is extremely small. The first Russian dissertation research devoted exclusively to the problems of the semiotics of law was the work of Andrei Konstantinovich Sarkisov “Semiotics of law (historical and legal study of legal sign constructions”)), in which the author defines the semiotics of law as a category of the general theory of state and law, manifested at the intersection of the theory of law, theory thinking and theory of language, and reflecting the typology of legal understanding and the level of legal culture of this community.

From the position of the author, at the present stage of social development, which is characterized by large-scale informatization processes aimed at creating an international information network, fixing and transmitting information are carried out using information models of sign systems; when studying this process in the theoretical and legal aspect, it becomes necessary to identify the features of the formation of information models in the field of legal awareness, lawmaking and law enforcement, primarily in the environment of the modern information economy.

Semiotics as a science that studies the general in the constitution and functioning of any sign systems that store and transmit information, contributes to the most complete disclosure of legal information and sign issues and the study of the general legal sign field as a sign system of law of a particular community. According to Andrei Konstantinovich Sarkisov, the category of semiotics of law is revealed through the correspondence and interconnection of legal concepts and symbols expressing them, legal facts and propositions defining them; this category takes legal research beyond the limits of the textual and terminological level to the semantic level and illustrates the process of formation at one level or another of the legal sign field of stable groups of legal concepts from the initial socio-legal, moral-legal, religious-legal ideas and ideas that are unstable in the structural relation [13]. However, it should be noted that in Andrei Konstantinovich Sarkisov’s dissertation, semiotics and legal problems are analyzed mainly through the prism of signs of bill of exchange law, and not as having independent significance.

In a separate group, it is necessary to single out works that consider the features of legal symbols - the most studied legal signs [14; fifteen]. Finally, it should be noted that some legal problems are analyzed with an indication of the symbolic nature of law or by using the semiotic method [16; 17]. This was embodied in the dissertation of Natalia Ivanovna Khabibulina [18]. It seems that Andrei Vasilievich

Polyakov should also be included in this group of authors [19]. In particular, the scientist defines legal communication as a legal interaction of subjects that arises on the basis of the social interpretation of legal texts that provide them with correlative powers and legal obligations that are implemented in legal behavior. Legal communication, in his opinion, is mediated by legal texts. At the same time, the scientist considers the legal text as a system of signs, the interpretation of which creates a certain legal meaning aimed at regulating the behavior of subjects through the establishment of their legal rights and obligations. The legal text, according to the ideas of Andrei Vasilievich Polyakov, must be distinguished from the legal norm: “The legal norm is not in the text, but in the psycho-socio-cultural reality, existing as an ideal material phenomenon, it is “constituted not by one legal text, but by the entire set of texts of a given culture (intertext)” [20].

3.6 Semiotics of Law and Digital Law

Recently, Russian semiotics of law has been considered in connection with the problems of digital law [21; 22; 23; 24], i.e., the sphere of law, which includes several branches of law at once and regulates relations related to IT. There are no separate sections in Russian legislation related only to the regulation of the digital environment, and these norms are dispersed under different laws. Digital law includes the regulation of relations in the field of IT projects, the publication of information on the network, blockchain, the processing of personal data, big data, artificial intelligence and other areas. They intersect and complement each other, and ultimately the scope of digital law expands as digitalization enters new areas of our lives.

So, Taliya Yarullova Khabrieva, believing that “the development of information and communication technologies has given a new impetus to scientific and technological progress and led to the transition of society to the information, post-industrial (based on the generation of knowledge) stage of socio-economic development, forming a new reality”, emphasized that “in this reality, the action and image of many social institutions and regulators are refracted, including law, which becomes not only a means, a tool that ensures the introduction of digital technologies and their use in various areas of public life - the economy, management and other segments of social life, but also the object of the impact of digitalization. The content, form, mechanism of action of law are changing”[23].

From the author’s point of view, “digitalization has a significant impact on the law not only as a system of generally binding rules of conduct established by the state, but also as a process and result of its activities, a legal order with real legal relations, actions of subjects of law and types of legal activity. It becomes an important factor that determines the dynamics of law”; “Digitalization primarily affects the sphere of legal regulation. It involves new social relations that either did not exist before, or did not require legal regulation, or objectively could not be regulated by law”[23]. Yulia Alexandrovna Gavrilova believes that modern legal reality in a digital society can be referred to as “augmented reality”. In the proposed aspect, augmented legal reality is a special kind of complex reality in which we are included, which is a convergence of the real (genuine) existence of law and virtual, including its fictional existence. In the latter case, it means that even objects artificially created by man can have a materialized embodiment, and in this sense they can be identified as physical or biological objects that fall within the scope of potential legal regulation [25].

The author emphasizes that in the period of development of digital technologies, the role of semiotic components of the meaning of law increases significantly. Strictly speaking, the iconic nature of law has always been recognized or at least implied by scholars in doctrinal studies. At the same time, I would like to note that the direct introduction of the ideas of general semiotics into law (in some works) without taking into account certain specifics of legal reality is unlikely to be useful for an updated understanding of the meaning of law in the digital environment. This applies to such fundamental concepts for legal semiotics as types of sign systems, horizontal and vertical sign structure of law, links between basic and derived legal signs, etc. [25].

3.7 Semiotic-Legal Researches of Scientists of the Former Soviet Republics

Some attention is paid to semiotics and legal research by scientists of the states of the post-Soviet space. Thus, the Ukrainian scientist Olga Mikhailovna Balinska devoted her monograph[26] and her doctoral dissertation on the topic “Semiotics of

law as a philosophical and legal paradigm”[27] to the problem of the semiotics of rights, in which such semiotic forms of the existence of law as a signal of legal reality, a semiotic code law, legal sign. We should also note the attempt of the Estonian scientist Vadim Verenich and other researchers of the Tartu school of semiotics to formulate a special concept of the semiotics of law.

Based on the traditions of the Tartu school, Vadim Verenich, in his doctoral dissertation research “Semiotic Models of Legal Argumentation”, considers legal argumentation through the concept of conflict, which manifests itself “as an inevitable product of semiocultural processes within the legal system”. Legal argumentation is defined by the author as “the tension between understanding and misunderstanding, and the conflict of interpretations is generated by the difference in the requirements of legal actors”[28].

Of particular interest is the idea of Vadim Verevich to formulate a semiotic approach to law in the context of postmodernism, which is characterized by a multi-tiered idea of law: “In the eyes of a postmodernist, the modernist model of law as a hierarchical pyramid is losing its value, giving way to a complex, multi-level, but far from hierarchical, model of law which, rather, could be likened to cells inside the Tower of Babel, inside which different styles, strategies, views, objects, texts and far from identical readings of these texts are mixed”[29].

3.8 The Concept of Semiotics of Law by Natalia Frantsevna Kovkel

It seems that the most preferred and justified concept of the semiotics of law is the position of the Belarusian scientist Natalya Frantsevna Kovkel, according to which, for the further development and certainty of the semiotics of law, it is necessary to introduce the following basic concepts: legal sign, legal sign system, basic sign of the legal sign system, legal semiosphere and legal semiosis.

The author, agreeing with the definition of a sign by Abram Bentsianovich Solomonik, according to which a legal sign is defined as something that designates or encodes objects of legal reality (material or ideal) in order to describe them, find them, or process and obtain new legal information [30], notes that the majority of verbal legal signs denote not material, but ideal [8].

Focusing on the classification proposed by Abram Bentsianovich Solominik, who classified sign legal systems according to the criterion of the basic signs that form them into such basic types as natural, figurative, linguistic, recording systems and code sign systems [30], Natalya Frantsova Kovkel believes that these types sign systems are located in the hierarchy in which they appeared in the phylogeny of mankind and the ontogeny of each individual person, as well as according to the degree of abstraction of their basic sign. Moreover, according to the author, this classification of basic signs and sign systems based on them allows us to explore various types of signs and sign systems represented in law, supplementing the first with signs and sign systems of action that are between figurative and linguistic sign systems.

What does a scientist understand by a legal sign system and its basic sign? From the point of view of Natalya Frantsevna Kovkel, a legal sign system should be understood as a set of legal signs functioning in accordance with the rules attached to or immanently inherent in this system; under the basic sign of a legal sign system - a sign that prevails in this system and determines the level of its abstraction and sign transformations [8].

Further, the author, speaking about natural signs and sign systems, claims that they function in various types of legal discourse, as signs acting as parts (or elements) of certain objects, phenomena, processes. The study of these signs follows the

following path: any type or subtype of legal activity is singled out and the most common natural signs inherent in it are analyzed (for example, a wide variety of traces are widely studied in forensic science).

Figurative signs and their systems are represented in legal communication by a wide variety of types: 1) subject signs (flag, uniform, state awards, etc.); 2) figurative signs (coat of arms, trademark, road signs, etc.); 3) sound (hymns, marches, etc.) and light (signals for traffic control, etc.). Action signs and corresponding sign systems are widely represented in law in the form of a wide variety of procedures and processes.

The word and linguistic sign systems are expressed in all types of legal speech, and are also fixed by means of hieroglyphic signs in various legal texts. Legal language systems, the basic sign of which is a word, and systems of their recording are presented in the following types of legal texts and legal speech: 1) texts of sources of law; 2) law enforcement, and above all law enforcement, legal texts; 3) legal speech of law-making, law-interpreting and law-release processes (both professional and everyday); 4) scientific and educational legal texts; 5) scientific legal and legal speech of the educational process.

Finally, even the most formalized of signs and sign systems - code systems - can be represented in law, for example, in cases of formalization of legal texts, i.e., their translation into the language of formal logic. According to Natalya Frantsevna Kovkel, "the relevance of translating a wide variety of legal texts into the language of logical symbols in our computer age is obvious, since only such a translation allows the development and effective use of computer technologies in both law-making and law enforcement processes"[8]. For the development of pragmatic analysis, the concepts of legal semiosphere and legal semiosis are of particular importance. From the position of Natalia Frantsevna Kovkel, the first is defined as a continuum in which legal signs and sign systems function, legal communication processes are implemented and legal information is created, and which has the following features: 2) uneven organization (presence of nuclear structures and periphery); 3) non-synchronous development of different sites; 4) discreteness in the transfer of information; 5) the dialogue mechanism as the main mechanism of its functioning; 6) spatial symmetry-asymmetry in the organization. The author emphasizes that "... the study of these features of the legal semiosphere will enrich the semiotics of law and jurisprudence as a whole with new knowledge about the structural organization, functioning and dynamics of law as a special continuum of signs and sign systems" [8].

For the development of pragmatic analysis, the concepts of legal semiosphere and legal semiosis are of particular importance. From the position of Natalia Frantsevna Kovkel, the first is defined as a continuum in which legal signs and sign systems function, legal communication processes are implemented and legal information is created, and which has the following features: 2) uneven organization (presence of nuclear structures and periphery); 3) non-synchronous development of different sites; 4) discreteness in the transfer of information; 5) the dialogue mechanism as the main mechanism of its functioning; 6) spatial symmetry-asymmetry in the organization. The author emphasizes that "... the study of these features of the legal semiosphere will enrich the semiotics of law and jurisprudence as a whole with new knowledge about the structural organization, functioning and dynamics of law as a special continuum of signs and sign systems" [8].

The concept of legal semiosis in its most general form can be defined as an activity associated with the creation and functioning of legal signs and sign systems. This concept covers all types of legal activity: from law-making to law enforcement. At the same time, their analysis should proceed from a special semiotic model of legal

communication, the elements of which are: 1) the addresser (sender) of the legal sign; 2) the addressee (recipient) of the legal mark; 3) legal sign (set of legal signs); 4) codes (languages) of the addresser and addressee; 5) the contexts in which a legal sign (a set of legal signs) is created and interpreted; 6) communication channel; 7) thematic field; 8) communicative competence of the sender and addressee [31].

3.9 Result

Noting that Soviet theoretical scientists did not show interest in the semiotics of law, at present in Russian legal science there is a tendency to update the latter when conducting research on law.

IV. Conclusion

. In conclusion, we note that modern jurisprudence, when conducting research in the legal sphere, should use both traditional methods: general philosophical (dialectical-materialistic), general scientific (induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, etc.), special (methods of specific sociological research, cybernetic and etc.), private-scientific (formal-legal, methods of interpretation, comparative-legal, etc.), and non-traditional methods: hermeneutic, synergistic, etc.), including the method of semiotics. Only under this condition will legal science develop, finding new aspects of law and other legal phenomena.

References

- [1]. Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary / editorial staff: Evgeny Fedorovich Gubsky and others. Moscow: INFRA-M, 2000. P. 408.
- [2]. Ilyin Mikhail Vasilievich. Are there general principles of evolution? // Political studies. 2009. No. 2. Pp.188-189.
- [3]. Lotman Yuri Mikhailovich. People and signs//Lotman Yu.M. Semiosphere. St. Petersburg: Art-St. Petersburg, 2010.P.6.
- [4]. Locke, John. Op. in 3 volumes. Moscow: Thought, 1985. Vol.2. Pp.200, 201-202.
- [5]. Piers Charles Sanders. The Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition. Volume. 1: 1857-1866. Bloomington: Indiana University. press, 1982. Pp.303-304.
- [6]. Pierce Charles Sanders. Philosophical writings of Pierce. Dover Publications. New York, 2012. pP.98, 101-104.
- [7]. Saussure Ferdinand de. Course of general linguistics//Proceedings on linguistics/per. fr.: ed. Alexander Alekseevich Kholodovich. Moscow: Progress, 1977. Pp.13-273.
- [8]. Kovkel Natalya Frantsevna. Semiotics of law: problems of defining the main concepts and choosing a paradigm // Jurisprudence. 2017. No. 4. Pp. 40, 42. 48-50,52.
- [9]. Semiotics - Wikipedia //https://ru.wikipedia.org › wiki › Semiotics (date of access: 05/06/2022).
- [10]. Demidov Alexander Ivanovich. On the methodological situation in jurisprudence //Jurisprudence. 2001.No.4. P.20.
- [11]. Robert Kevelson. Law as a system of signs. New York, London: Springer, 1988. Pp.4, 6-7, 10.
- [12]. Bernard. Jackson. Understanding Law: Linguistic, Psychological and Semiotic Aspects. Liverpool: Deborah Charles Publications, 1995. Pp. 15-16, 314- 336.
- [13]. Andrey Konstantinovich Sarkisov. Semiotics of law (historical and legal study of legal symbolic structures: dissertation candidate of legal sciences. Moscow: Kolomna State Ped. Institute, 2002. Pp. 8-14.

- [14]. Nikitin Alexander Vsevolodovich. Legal symbols: dis.... cand. Legal Sciences. Nizhny Novgorod: Nizhny Novgorod Legal Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation, 1999.
- [15]. Shalaginov Petr Dmitrievich. Functions of legal symbols: autoref. cand. yuri. Sciences. N. Novgorod: Nizhny Novgorod State University, 2007.
- [16]. Rakhimov Rinat Ashrafovich, Khabibulin Alik Galimzyanovich. Political power and law: problems of semiotic analysis // Jurisprudence. 2000. No. 2. Pp.52-59.
- [17]. Chestnov Ilya Lvovich. Postclassical theory of law: monograph. St. Petersburg: Publishing House "Alef-Press", 2012. Pp.78-87. [eighteen]. Khabibulina Natalya Ivanovna Political and legal problems of the semiotic analysis of the language of law: theoretical and methodological study: thesis.... Doctor of Law Sciences. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State. University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 2012.
- [19]. Polyakov Andrey Vasilievich. Communicative legal understanding: fav. works. St. Petersburg: ID Alef-Press, 2014. Pp.11-12, 156-166 [twenty]. Polyakov Andrey Vasilievich. The communicative concept of law (genesis and theoretical and legal substantiation): thesis Dr. jurid. bunch in the form of a scientific report. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State. un-t, 2002. Pp.9-10.
- [21]. Lomakin A. Digitalization of law // Housing law. 2017. №9. pp.103-111.
- [22]. Khabrieva Taliya Yarullova, Chernogor Nikolai Nikolaevich. Law in the conditions of digital reality // Journal of Russian law. 2018. №1. Pp.85-102.
- [23]. Khabrieva Taliya Yarullova. Law before the challenges of digital reality // Journal of Russian Law. 2018. No. 9. Pp.5-16.
- [24]. Pavel Khlebnikov. Digitalization of law as a consequence of the digitalization of life // Housing Law. 2017. No.9. Pp. 93-101.
- [25]. Gavrilova Yulia Alexandrovna. The problem of the meaning of law in a digital society // Bulletin of RUDN University. Series: Legal Sciences. 2020 T. 24. No. 3. Pp. 608-628.
- [26]. Balinskaya Olga Mikhailovna. Semiotics of law: monograph. Lvov: Lvov State University of Internal Affairs, 2013.
- [27]. Balinskaya Olga Mikhailovna. Semiotics of Law as a Philosophical and Legal Paradigm: Diss.... Dr. jurid. Sciences. Lvov: Lvov state. University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine, 2013.
- [28]. Verevich Vadim. Semiotic models of legal argumentation: dissertation.... Dr. jurid. Sciences. Tartu: University of Tartu, 2014.
- [29]. Verevich Vadim. Semiotic studies of law in the context of postmodernism // law.wikireading.ru/59920 (date of access: 05/09/2022)
- [30]. Solomonik Abram Bentsianovich. Positive semiotics (about signs, sign systems and semiotic activity) / ed. Grigory Efimovich Kreidlin. Minsk: MET, 2004. Pp.14, 18.
- [31]. Kovkel Natalya Frantsevna. Problems of legitimation of law in the context of semiotic analysis // Recognition of law and the principle of formal equality: Sat.tr. / resp. ed. Vladislav Valerievich Denisenko. Moscow: Modern Economics and Law, 2015. Pp.216-232.