

Theoretical Perspectives on AI, Semiotics, and Cultural Heritage

Hatim EL FAROUKI & Karima BOUZIANE

ALCS, FLSH, Chouaib Doukkali University, Morocco

hatimelf96@gmail.com

bouziane.k@ucd.ac.ma

Abstract: *This theoretical article explores the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in the semiotic analysis of visual cultural heritage. The theoretical framework combines principles from cultural heritage, cultural semiotics, AI and Sign Theory to analyze how AI can facilitate a deeper understanding of cultural symbols. It reviews prior semiotic analyses of cultural artifacts to underscore the relevance of semiotics in cultural studies and discusses how AI can enhance visual semiotic analysis by providing new methods for data processing and interpretation. Through this approach, this theoretical paper addresses the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) with semiotic analysis in the study of visual cultural heritage, proposing a novel framework that utilizes AI to interpret complex cultural symbols. It establishes a detailed exposition on the principles of semiotics—the study of signs and their meanings within cultural contexts—and the functionalities of AI technologies, such as machine learning and image recognition. The framework is developed to enhance the depth and accuracy of interpreting cultural symbols, which are often dense with historical and contextual significance. Through this study, we aim to advance the understanding of AI's capacity to facilitate a deeper, more accessible engagement with cultural heritage, thereby promoting a broader appreciation of the world's cultural diversity. Thus, this paper not only contributes to academic discussions on cultural semiotics and AI but also proposes practical pathways for leveraging AI in the preservation and appreciation of global and regional cultural heritage.*

Keywords: *AI, cultural semiotics, preservation, accessibility, regional cultural heritage*

1. Introduction

Technology has always aided humans in preserving their cultural heritage. Cameras and advanced cinematic technology have made it possible for the documentation of oral cultural heritage (Yaco & Ramaprasad, 2018). Giuggioli & Pellegrini (2022) also stated that Artificial intelligence technology is being progressively introduced by a number of social businesses to provide them with new development momentum. This is precisely how artificial intelligence technology should be integrated with the cultural heritage preservation process. The intersection of Artificial Intelligence (AI) with the cultural heritage marks a frontier in the academic study of cognition and semiotics. The 1980s championed AI as a key player in understanding intelligence, an influence that persists in shaping research across various disciplines. Despite the expansive potential AI holds within semiotic theories, it remains an area yet to captivate semiotic scholars extensively. AI's venture into modeling cognitive processes in software, and the radical pursuit to craft surpassing artificial minds, aligns closely with the exploration of semiosis across human, animal, and mechanical domains. This integration of technology with the practice of semiotics opens up new opportunities for analyzing and preserving the cultural legacies that are the core of any societal identity and progression.

In light of these developments, this paper aims to provide certain theoretical perspectives on cultural heritage and it intertwines with semiotics. Further the paper explores the concept of cultural semiotics rounding up with AI's role in sign theory and the analysis of cultural heritage. This paper will delineate how AI can serve as an invaluable tool in the semiotic examination of cultural artifacts, contributing to a preservation of collective cultural memory. The premise is rooted in the non-uniqueness of human intelligence, a viewpoint synergizing with posthumanist and transhumanist philosophies that envision technology as the driving force for future human evolution, transcending traditional dichotomies. This philosophical backdrop sets the stage for AI as a means of 'human improvement', recalling the Cartesian ideal of a world governed by logic and mathematics.

2. Cultural heritage

The study of cultural heritage is deeply rooted in foundational theories that explore the interaction between past artifacts, traditions, and contemporary identities. A pivotal theory in this field is the "Cultural Capital Theory," introduced by Pierre Bourdieu in 1986. Bourdieu's theory posits that cultural goods and knowledge are forms of capital that individuals accumulate and that confer social advantages and prestige. According to Bourdieu, cultural capital exists in three forms: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized, each playing a critical role in social stratification and mobility (Bourdieu, 1986). Recent studies have expanded on Bourdieu's framework to apply it to the digital era's challenges and opportunities for cultural heritage preservation. For instance, the democratizing potential of digital platforms in the cultural heritage sector is increasingly acknowledged. Researchers like Baioni and colleagues (2021) discuss how digital social platforms are used to enhance participation and provide collaborative spaces for broader and often marginalized audiences. These platforms are scrutinized through various engagement strategies such as diffusion, accessibility, interactivity, and influence, emphasizing their role in fostering sustainable development through social innovations (Baioni M, Ceschel F, Demartini P, et al., 2021). Furthermore, Liang, Lu, and Martin (2021) identify social media platforms as crucial for promoting public participation in urban heritage conservation, thereby facilitating more inclusive and sustainable management of cultural heritage. They highlight the importance of these platforms in enabling a wider community to engage in the management processes, particularly in rapidly urbanizing areas (Liang X, Lu Y, Martin J., 2021). Both studies underline the transformative power of digital platforms in making cultural heritage more accessible and engaging for diverse global audiences. In discussing the effectiveness of investments in the digital transformation of cultural heritage, Srakar and Vecco (2020) employ a program evaluation approach. They explore this within the context of the broader digital shifts in the cultural and creative industries.

Critics of Bourdieu's theory, such as the perspectives discussed by Beel and Wallace (2018), argue that it overly emphasizes the stratifying effects of cultural capital and neglects how cultural heritage can unify and empower across different social strata. In their research, they explore the communal and inclusive aspects of cultural heritage, emphasizing how it fosters collective identity and resilience against globalization's homogenizing effects, through the lens of social and cultural capital in rural Scottish communities. Supporters of Bourdieu's model, like those referenced by Tzanakis (2011), emphasize its relevance in elucidating how cultural heritage sites and museums are instrumental in shaping educational outcomes and social status. Tzanakis critically reviews the empirical evidence supporting Bourdieu's theory, illustrating that engagement with cultural heritage is strongly linked to academic

performance and social mobility, thereby underscoring the pivotal role of cultural capital in educational contexts (Tzanakis, 2011). This perspective positions cultural heritage not merely as a static repository of the past but as a dynamic influencer of social dynamics and personal identities. Despite the strengths of Bourdieu's framework, Tzanakis (2011) also identifies significant gaps, particularly its limited applicability in non-Western contexts where alternative forms of cultural capital prevail. This critique points to the necessity for a more inclusive theoretical framework that can accommodate diverse cultural narratives and values, ensuring that cultural heritage preservation is both adaptive and reflective of global diversity.

3. Cultural heritage and semiotics

In the early 20th century, Ferdinand De Saussure (1916) introduced the concept of structural semiotics which centers around the idea that language operates as a system of signs, comprising 'signifiers' (the forms signs take) and 'signifieds' (the concepts they represent). This fundamental distinction is crucial for understanding how signs function within any cultural system, not limited to verbal language. Roland Barthes and the concept of Myth, in "Mythologies" (1957), expand on Saussure's ideas by exploring how myths act as cultural signs that convey implicit values and ideologies. His notion of the second-order semiological system reveals how signs themselves become layered signifiers within broader systems of meaning, offering a rich framework for analyzing cultural artifacts.

One of the primary figures in semiotics whose work has been applied to cultural heritage is Umberto Eco, who argued that cultural artifacts are "open works" capable of multiple interpretations, each shaped by the cultural and historical contexts of both the creator and the viewer (Eco, 1989). Eco's theory emphasizes the interpretative flexibility of artifacts, suggesting that each interaction with an artifact can yield new meanings depending on the interpretive strategies of the observer. Peirce (1955) and later Barthes (1977) also ground Eco's ideas expanding the discussion to how cultural artifacts function as symbols within systems of signs. Charles Sanders Peirce introduced concepts like icon, index, and symbol to differentiate how signs relate to their objects. In cultural heritage, an icon might be an artifact that physically resembles what it represents (like a statue), an index might show evidence of a historical fact (like a bullet hole in a wall), and a symbol holds meaning within a specific cultural context (like a cross in Christian communities). In modern research, the semiotic approach has been enriched by digital technology and theories from digital humanities. For instance, Berlanga-Fernández and Reyes (2022) explore the digital approach to semiotics, examining how digital tools and methodologies are applied to the study of signs and meanings within various texts and contexts. Their analysis highlights the evolving landscape of semiotic research in the digital era, emphasizing the integration of technological advancements with traditional theoretical frameworks. These studies consider not only the artifact itself but also the digital interface and metadata as part of the semiotic system, which shapes the user's interpretation. Furthermore, theories from cultural studies, such as those proposed by Stuart Hall, argue that cultural identities and meanings are continuously negotiated through cultural practices, including the creation, display, and interpretation of artifacts (Hall, 1997). This perspective is crucial in understanding how cultural heritage artifacts function as symbols within ongoing cultural dialogues and identity formations.

4. Cultural semiotics

Cultural semiotics initiates its exploration from the foundational processes of semiotics, focusing on analyzing the cultural universe's foundational principles and structures. This field employs theories and techniques from semiotics to scrutinize a broad spectrum of phenomena encompassing physical, mental, and behavioral dimensions. Such analyses extend across various domains including, but not limited to, popular culture, the arts, architecture, film, television, musicology, theater, advertising, and visual media. As a scholarly discipline within the humanities, semiotics distinctively intertwines with intellectual, cultural, and artistic spheres, showcasing unique cultural attributes since its origins. Lotman, a prominent figure in semiotic theory, introduced the notion of the *semiosphere*, the semiotic space within which various cultural processes play out (Lotman, 1984). He emphasized that culture itself functions as a semiotic mechanism, where every cultural artifact and practice can be seen as a text that communicates specific meanings. His theories shed light on the complexity and multidimensionality of interpreting culture, arguing that it is a dynamic, self-organizing system of signs or texts.

Many cultural semioticians agree that culture can be conceptualized as a system of texts. Prominent figures who support this idea include Lévi-Strauss (1958), Barthes (1964), Winner (1979), Galaty (1981), and Fine (1984). The structure of this textual system, however, remains a topic of scholarly debate. Juri Lotman also elaborates on this concept extensively, proposing that any artifact possessing a functional and coded message should be considered a text (Lotman, 1970, pp. 64-77; 1981, pp. 34-48). He observes that cultures do not regard all texts as equally important; rather, they select a subset of texts that are deemed vital for their cultural identity. Lotman asserts that the selection and valorization of certain texts over others reflect a culture's unique form of societal self-organization. Conversely, he warns that a scenario where all texts are valued equally signifies the dissolution of a distinct cultural identity. One of the most significant contributions in understanding the mechanisms of culture have predominantly come from Juri Lotman and his peers at the *Moscow-Tartu school of semiotics*. Their insights are concisely encapsulated in the "*Theses on the Semiotic Study of Culture (as Applied to Slavic Texts)*" which Lotman, Uspensky, Ivanov, Toporov, and Piatigorsky presented at the Moscow Congress of Slavists in 1973. According to Lotman and his team (1975, p. 73), culture can be envisioned as a hierarchy of distinct semiotic systems, as a collection of texts along with their associated functions, or as a specific mechanism that generates these texts.

Transitioning from Lotman's foundational insights, Umberto Eco's work shifted the focus towards the realm of visual culture and communication while integrating the advanced technology. Eco (1976) broadened the scope of visual communication to include formal systems, graphs, iconic signs, and informal art, among others. Eco's approach was to enhance the understanding of codes across different linguistic practices. In doing so, he moved past the traditional Peircean categorization. Eco also integrated concepts of logical analysis like 'dense' notations and semantics. Following the footsteps of Lindekens (1979), Eco further argued that exploring perception and intelligence is essential to a comprehensive semiological study (Eco, 1979). This perspective positioned semiology to intersect significantly with the developments in Artificial Intelligence, a connection highlighted by Saint-Martin (1987). Eco contributed to broadening the field of semiotics to embrace interdisciplinary methods that include insights from Artificial Intelligence, thereby enriching the analysis of sign systems and their applications across various domains. So, some questions that arise here are: To what extent can AI

accurately interpret symbols through semiotic analysis? How can we use AI to deepen and precisely refine our understanding of cultural symbols? Can this pave the way for AI-Enhanced methodologies to make local cultural heritage more globally accessible? Can Artificial Intelligence help bridging cultural gaps and contribute to a more comprehensive cross-cultural exchange? These are all important questions which have come to fruition and merit further exploration, especially in the context of rapidly evolving AI capabilities.

5. AI, sign theory and the analysis of cultural heritage

Marshall McLuhan, a leading communication theorist, argued that technologies enhance human faculties (McLuhan, 1968). This was further explained through the *Four Laws of Media*, expanded upon by McLuhan and his son, Eric McLuhan, in 1988. These laws - *amplification, obsolescence, reversal, and retrieval* - imply that new technologies initially enhance but can eventually lead to the neglect of other human aspects. Overpromotion may invert these effects, but they can be rekindled differently. McLuhan used the print medium to demonstrate this process: its advent fostered individualism but later mass production reestablished a sense of collective identity, although in a changed form. McLuhan also warned of the risks associated with new novel technologies such as AI, which could lead to a loss of personal faculties, making us passive recipients rather than active society members. However, he trusted human resilience and adaptability, emphasizing that a profound understanding of AI could help mitigate such losses.

The traditional conceptualization of Artificial intelligence typically associates it with engineering and informatics fields. Intelligent robots, expert systems, and automatic translators are seen as part of computer technology. However, the reality is more complex than what we wish to believe. Even a basic analysis reveals that AI is more about systematic science involving logic, language, rules, and algorithms—more abstract than tangible technology. Actually, this is not a recent idea. Various academic endeavors came to the conclusion that computers are far more than just machines operating on calculations, and most of them agreed on conceiving them as *symbol processing machines* (Newell, 1980) as well as *semiotic machines* (Nöth, 2002). Meunier (1989) predicted this and stated that AI closely relates to semiotics and could actually be an applied discipline within this abstract field. This leads us to investigate the potential correlation of AI and semiotics.

One of the distinctions Newell (1983) made relative to the apparently multiple other mathematical and computing disciplines is itself due to the fact that AI projects can be seen as dealing with a specific category of symbolic systems. Thus, the design of a project in AI is explicitly not fundamentally about processing numbers; it is ultimately about physical symbols. We take it for granted that AI projects appear mainly associated with computer technology that overlooks that the uniqueness of AI really resides in the elaboration of the semiotics system itself by which it functions. However, AI is nothing else than an applied semiotic (Meunier, 1989). It is thus clear that that in any theory of AI, one must simultaneously “assert” an implicit semiotic theory expressed by the triad “syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic.” A system that processes signs, or as it is formulated in the domain “symbols”, has at least rules of generation, transformation, and interpretation. Drawing on more recent applications of AI-powered tools in semiotic analysis, a paper titled *Image Analysis through the lens of ChatGPT-4*, Johnson et al. (2023) conducted an exploration of GPT-4's capabilities in processing visual elements. The latest

iteration of ChatGPT, GPT-4, has been rigorously tested against a range of visual content including images, pictures, flowcharts, plots, and diagrams. The study indicates that GPT-4 not only manages to interpret these visual elements with high accuracy but also surpasses human capabilities in terms of speed and error-free processing. Specifically, GPT-4 demonstrates superior performance in image analysis, object identification, and contextual understanding, areas traditionally dominated by human intuition (Johnson et al, 2023).

Within the literature on cultural heritage preservation, a 2018 study presented at the Digital Heritage International Congress, Li, Ch'ng, Cai, and See (2018) examined multiuser interactions with hybrid virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) systems, focusing on the enhancement of cultural heritage objects. This research emphasizes the potential for collaborative experiences in cultural heritage visualization and interaction (Li, Ch'ng, Cai, & See, 2018). This combination significantly enhances the preservation and presentation of cultural heritage, contributing to its vitality and the enriched portrayal of its inherent charm. The application of these technologies not only revitalizes heritage sites but also offers a more immersive and interactive experience that enhances the public's appreciation and understanding of cultural narratives. Such advancements underscore the evolving role of digital technologies in the safeguarding and accessibility of cultural heritage (Li, Ch'ng, Cai, & See, 2018). AI techniques have also been employed to digitally reconstruct damaged or eroded artifacts and architectural features. Fu and Angkawisittpan (2024) utilized deep learning algorithms to predict and simulate the original appearance of damaged sculptures and buildings, providing a digital means of preservation and public display. AI-powered tools have also been found useful in cultural artifact analysis and classification. Machine learning models have been developed to classify and analyze artifacts based on their style, origin, or age. For example, Gualandi, Gattiglia, and Anichini (2021) implemented convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to classify ancient pottery pieces with high accuracy, aiding in the understanding of archaeological sites' chronological and cultural contexts. Moving further to the potential of AI in not only preserving cultural heritage, but also monitoring the structural health of heritage sites and predict potential deterioration to prevent damage.

6. Concluding remarks

Perhaps it is clearly shown that the advancement and utility of AI in various disciplines are well-documented and its application within semiotics, particularly in the analysis of cultural heritage, aligns with the trajectory of technological evolution influencing human capabilities. Marshall McLuhan's insight into technology as an extension of human faculties sets a foundational perspective that technology, including AI, is an enhancement tool. His warnings about AI leading to a potential loss of personal faculties is an invitation to approach AI integration thoughtfully, ensuring these tools augment rather than supplant human engagement with cultural heritage. The systematic nature of AI, grounded in logic, language, and rules, makes it exceptionally suited for semiotical analysis. As demonstrated by Johnson et al. (2023), AI's capability to process visual elements with speed and accuracy presents a significant advantage in interpreting complex semiotic systems within cultural artifacts. The empirical successes cited, such as Li, Ch'ng, Cai, and See (2018) integration of AI to enhance cultural heritage appreciation, and the applications in predictive analytics for structural health monitoring provide compelling evidence of AI's value-add in preserving and analyzing cultural heritage.

Furthermore, the precedents of AI in semiotic machine roles and its close relationship with semiotics (Meunier, 1989) establish a scholarly basis for its inclusion in cultural heritage analysis. The AI's ability to process signs and symbols through rules of generation, transformation, and interpretation aligns seamlessly with semiotical principles. Therefore, it is not only logical but necessary to leverage AI for the semiotical analysis of cultural heritage to gain richer, more nuanced understandings that might remain opaque to unaided human analysis. Finally, the adoption of AI in this field is a rational progression of McLuhan's Laws of Media. AI as a new technology can amplify the scope of semiotic analysis, potentially obsolesce certain manual processes, retrieve lost or endangered aspects of culture, and create new forms of cultural engagement. As AI tools develop further, they will undoubtedly transform and be transformed by human interaction, ultimately leading to a recalibrated but enhanced cultural semiotic landscape.

This presents a valuable opportunity for a novel theoretical model which integrates Artificial Intelligence (AI) with semiotic and cultural studies to create a transformative approach to understanding and preserving visual cultural heritage. By leveraging visual semiotics, cultural semiotics, and recent advancements in AI, this model would aim to enhance the accessibility and interpretation of local heritage on a global scale. The foundation of this model is the synergy between computational semiotics and cultural semiotics, enriched by AI technologies. Computational semiotics provides the tools and methods to process and analyze vast amounts of cultural data, including visual symbols and artifacts. Cultural semiotics offers the theoretical framework necessary for interpreting these symbols within their cultural contexts. AI, particularly advancements in machine learning, deep learning, and generative models like GPT-4 and Dall-E, can be harnessed to automate and refine the analysis of semiotic data, making the process faster and more accurate. And so, in this unfolding epoch, we find ourselves the custodians of a new renaissance, a digital renaissance where we are set to unveil the narrative of our collective past with a clarity never seen before.

References

- Abgaz, Y., Rocha Souza, R., Methuku, J., Koch, G., & Dorn, A. (2021). A Methodology for Semantic Enrichment of Cultural Heritage Images Using Artificial Intelligence Technologies. *Journal of Imaging*, 7, 121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jimaging7080121>
- Baioni, M., Ceschel, F., Demartini, P., et al. (2021). Spread the Voice! Digital Social Platforms as Conveyors of Innovation of Cultural Heritage in Europe. *Sustainability*, 13(22), 12455. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212455>
- Barthes, R. (1967). *Eléments de sémiologie*. Paris: Seuil. (English translation: *Elements of Semiology*. London: Cape)
- Beel, D., & Wallace, C. (2020). Gathering together: social capital, cultural capital and the value of cultural heritage in a digital age. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 21(5), 697–717. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1500632>
- Berlanga-Fernández, I., & Reyes, E. (2022). The digital approach to semiotics: a systematic review. *Text & Talk*, 0. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2021-0073>.
- Bonshek, L., & Stepien, R. (2022). 3D technologies for intangible cultural heritage preservation— literature review for selected databases. *Heritage Science*, 10, 63.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital. (1986). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 1(81-93), 949.

- Costa, S. A., Danesi, M., & Martinovic, D. (2020). The Information Age, Mathematics, and Mathematics Education. In S. A. Costa, M. Danesi, & D. Martinovic (Eds.), *Mathematics (Education) in the Information Age. Mathematics in Mind*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59177-9_1
- Dondero, M. (2019). Visual semiotics and automatic analysis of images from the Cultural Analytics Lab: How can quantitative and qualitative analysis be combined?. *Semiotica*, 2019, 121 - 142. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2018-0104>.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fine, E. C. (1984). *The Folklore Text. From Performance to Print*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Fu, X., & Angkawisittpan, N. (2024). Detecting surface defects of heritage buildings based on deep learning. *Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 33(1), 20230048. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jisys-2023-0048>
- Fiorucci, M., Khoroshiltseva, M., Pontil, M., Traviglia, A., Buej, A. D., & James, S. (2020). Machine learning for cultural heritage: A survey. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 133, 102 – 108. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2020.02.017>.
- Galaty, J. G. (1981). Models and metaphors: On the semiotic explanation of segmentary systems. *The Structure of Folk Models*, 63-92.
- Giuggioli, G., & Pellegrini, M. M. (2022). Artificial intelligence as an enabler for entrepreneurs: a systematic literature review and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 29(4), 816-837.
- Gualandi, M. L., Gattiglia, G., & Anichini, F. (2021). An open system for collection and automatic recognition of pottery through neural network algorithms. *Heritage*, 4(1), 140-159.
- Johnson, D., Goodman, R., Patrinely, J., Stone, C., Zimmerman, E., Donald, R., & Wheless, L. (2023). Assessing the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated medical responses: an evaluation of the Chat-GPT model. *Research Square*.
- Johnson, O. V., Alyasiri, O. M., Akhtom, D., & Johnson, O. E. (2023). Image Analysis through the lens of ChatGPT-4. *Journal of Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 4(2).
- Liang, X., Lu, Y., & Martin, J. (2021). A Review of the Role of Social Media for the Cultural Heritage Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1055. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031055>.
- Li, Y., Ch'ng, E., Cai, S., & See, S. (2018). Multiuser interaction with hybrid VR and AR for cultural heritage objects. In 2018 3rd Digital Heritage International Congress (DigitalHERITAGE) held Jointly with 2018 24th International Conference on Virtual Systems & Multimedia (VSMM 2018) (pp. 1-8). IEEE.
- Ling, Z., Delnevo, G., & Mirri, S. (2023). Finding on Machine Learning Approaches for Classification of Ancient Ceramics-A Systematic Literature Review.
- Lotman, Y. M. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. A. Shukman. London: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd Publishers.
- Lotman, Y. M. (1984). On semiosphere. *Sign System Studies*, 17, 6-23.
- Lindekens, R. (1979). *Sémiotique de la photographie. A semiotic landscape/Panorama sémiotique*. Actes du premier congrès de l'Association internationale de sémiotique, Milan 1974, 139-146.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Anthropologie structurale*. Paris: Plon. (English translation: *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books)
- Manovich, L. (2016). The Science of Culture? *Social Computing, Digital Humanities and Cultural Analytics*. <https://doi.org/10.22148/16.004>

- Mendoza, M. A. A., De La Hoz Franco, E., & Gómez Gómez, J. E. (2023). Technologies for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage—A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Sustainability*, 15(2), 1059.
- Meunier, J. G. (1989). Artificial intelligence and the theory of Signs. *Semiotica*, September, 43 – 63.
- McLuhan, M. (1968). *Explorations in Communication, an Anthology*: Edited by E. Carpenter and M. McLuhan. Beacon Press.
- Noth, W. (2002). Semiotic machines. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing*, 9(1), 5-21.
- Newel, A. (1983). Intellectual Issues in the History of artificial Intelligence. In F. Machlup and U Manfrieds (Eds.), *The study of Information: Interdisciplinary Messages*. New York: John Wiley.
- Newell, A. (1980). Physical Symbol systems. *Cognitive Science*, 4(2), 135-183.
- O'Halloran, K., Podlasov, A., Chua, A., & K.L.E, M. (2012). Interactive software for multimodal analysis. *Visual Communication*, 11, 363 - 381.
- Pierce, J. R. (1980). *An introduction to information theory: symbols, signals & noise*. Courier Corporation.
- Saint-Martin, F. (1989). *From visible to visual language: Artificial intelligence and visual semiology*.
- Srakar, A., & Vecco, M. (2020). Are investments in the digital transformation of cultural heritage effective? A program evaluation approach. In *Digital Transformation in the Cultural and Creative Industries* (pp. 81-98). Routledge.
- Smith, B., Tan, S., Podlasov, A., & O'Halloran, K. (2011). Analysing multimodality in an interactive digital environment: software as a meta-semiotic tool. *Social Semiotics*, 21, 359 - 380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2011.564386>.
- Tzanakis, M.. (2011). Bourdieu's Social Reproduction Thesis and The Role of Cultural Capital in Educational Attainment: A Critical Review of Key Empirical Studies. *Educate*, 11. Available at: <http://www.educatejournal.org/index.php/educate/article/view/251>.
- Winner, T. G. (1979). Some fundamental concepts leading to a semiotics of culture: An historical overview.
- Yaco, S., & Ramaprasad, A. (2018). Cultural Heritage Semiotics. In *Digitisation of Culture: Namibian and International Perspectives* (pp. 49-64).