Tartu Summer School of Semiotics 2013

Autocommunication in Semiotic Systems

40th Anniversary of Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures

CONTENTS

AUTHORS TYLER B. ADKINS
OLEG BARABANOV
FEDERICO BELLENTANI
TARAS BOYKO
HAN-LIANG CHANG
PAUL COBLEY
REMO GRAMIGNA
JELENA MELNIKOVA-GRIGORJEVA
PETER GRZYBEK
LEI HAN
CARLOS ANDRÉS PÉREZ HERNÁNDEZ
BAREND VAN HEUSDEN
KATARZYNA KACZMARCZYK
EVANGELOS KOURDIS
KALEVI KULL
MARIA-KRISTIINA LOTMAN
MIHHAIL LOTMAN
ALEXANDROS PH. LAGOPOULOS
KARIN BOKLUND-LAGOPOULOU
MARI-LIIS MADISSON
RIIN MAGNUS
TIMO MARAN
ANTON MARKOŠ
SOPHIA M. MELANSON
TIINA PITKAJÄRVI
OTT PUUMEISTER
ÜLLE PÄRLI
ANTI RANDVIIR
TUULI RAUDLA
TIIT REMM
OLESJA ROTAR
DAN ROTAR
SILVI SALUPERE
ANN SHUKMAN
IRENE TALARICO
MAREK TAMM
DAINA TETERS
PEETER TOROP
ARLENE TUCKER
EKATERINA VELMEZOVA
ANDREAS VENTSEL
ELZBIETA MAGDALENA WASIK
ZDZISŁAW WASIK
LIA YOKA
SUREN ZOLYAN

EDITOR SILVER RATTASSEPP
DESIGN MEHMET EMIR USLU

WELCOME TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL OF 2013

Tartu Summer School of Semiotics is a new series of gatherings that brings together representatives from semiotics and other related disciplines, with the aim of providing an environment for conversing about core issues in semiotics wahich are of disciplinary as well as transdisciplinary relevance. It revives the tradition of Kääriku Summer Schools of Semiotics formerly organized by the Tartu–Moscow School of Semiotics. As its direct successor, the Tartu Summer School of Semiotics is a gathering that aspires to promote dialogue between scholars and syntheses between approaches.

This year's Summer School is dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the publication of the *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures*, which was first published in 1973. By taking the *Theses* as an example and reflecting over it and its influences across the times up to today, the semiotic circles might take up reflective autocommunication in order to set future steps in organizing both the paradigm of semiotics and to communicate the institution of semiotics to neighboring paradigms. To celebrate the 40th anniversary of *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures*, we call for reflections on the context and co-texts leading to and from that milestone in semiotic studies.

EVENT PROGRAMME

SUNDAY, AUGUST 18TH • ARRIVAL	
20:00	Coaches depart from Tartu University main building (Ülikooli 18)
21:00	Arrival at Kääriku/ Registration
21:30	Welcome!

MONDAY, AUGUST 19TH • THESES ON THE SEMIOTIC STUDY OF CULTURE			
08:00 - 09:00	Breakfast		
09:00 - 09:15	Opening		
09:15 - 10:30	Lecture	**Peter Grzybek**	Models in (Auto)-Communication and Models of (Auto)-Communication: From Channels, Construction Principles, and Mechanisms to Text Synergetics
10:30 - 10:45	break		
10:45 - 12:15	Session A	**Kalevi Kull & Ekaterina Velmezova**	(Still) promising
		Daina Teters	Reflecting the verbal framework of the Self-thematization of a theory. The case of the „Theses on the Semiotic Study of Culture"
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 - 15:15	Lecture	**Mihhail Lotman**	Frontiers in Cultural Semiotics
15:15 - 15:30	Break		
15:30 - 17:00	Session B	**Evangelos Kourdis & Lia Yoka**	Cultural untranslatability: the notion of informational loss in the translation of visual texts
		Ülle Pärli	On the question of the viewpoint by way of the concepts of boundary and horizon
		Zdzisław Wąsik	A Solipsistic Paradigm of Neosemiotics: Bridging the Heritage of Tartu School with "the Riches in the Old and Modern World".
17:00 - 17:15	Break		
17:15 - 19:00	Moderator: **Peter Grzybek**		Roundtable: Thesis - Past & Present
19:30	Dinner		
Evening session			

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20TH • SPACE / SYSTEM / MODEL			
08:00 - 09:00	breakfast		
09:00 - 10:15	Lecture	**Alexandros Lagopoulos & Karin Boklund-Lagopoulou**	Semiotics, Culture, and Space
10:15 - 10:30	Break		
10:30 - 12:00	Session C	**Tiit Remm**	Is semiosis spatial? The role of semiosis in models of sociocultural world
		Anti Randviir	Semiotics and Systems Theory: Autocommunication and Openness
		Elżbieta Magdalena Wąsik	The Polyglot Self in the Semiotic Spheres of Language and Culture
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 - 15:15	Lecture	**Paul Cobley**	What is the status of narrative in modelling?
15:15 - 15:30	Break		
15:30 - 17:00	Session D	**Silvi Salupere**	Art as a mechanism or urstrojstvo
		Remo Gramigna	The place of language among sign systems: J. Lotman and É. Benveniste
		Maria-Kristiina Lotman & Mihhail Lotman	Iconicity and autometadescription in Estonian poetry
17:00 - 17:15	Break		
17:15 - 19:00	Moderator: **Paul Cobley**	Roundtable : Model and modelling	
19:30	Dinner		
Evening session			

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21ST • CULTURE / ART / EDUCATION / ENVIRONMENT			
08:00 - 09:00	Breakfast		
09:00 - 10:15	Lecture	**Barend van Heusden**	Culture about culture. About the emergence of consciousness in semiotic cognition
10:15 - 10:30	Break		
10:30 - 12:30	Session E	**Lei Han**	An Experiment and Interpretation of Juri M. Lotman's Autocommunication Theory. As Applied to Roland Barthes' Representations of China and Japan
		Federico Bellentani	Prototypical imagines of Estonia in touristic communication
		Arlene Tucker	Translation is Dialogue: making the thought process
		Jelena Grigorjeva	Enhancing creativity as a pedagogic experiment. Autumn-Winter 2012-3 Academic Fall.
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 - 15:30	Session F	**Riin Magnus**	An ecosemiotic look at the meaning of cultural autocommunication
		Anton Markoš	Biosphere as a semiosphere
		Timo Maran	Biosemiotic criticism: zoosemiotic aspects of environmental modelling
15:30 - 16:00	Trip to Leigo tourist farm		
16:30 - 18:30	Moderator: **Kalevi Kull**	roundtable at Leigo : culture and environment	
19:00	Conference dinner at Leigo		
	Evening session and sauna at Leigo		
22:00	Departure for Kääriku		

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22ND • HISTORY / IDENTITY / SUBJECT			
08:00 - 09:00	Breakfast		
09:00 - 10:15	Lecture	**Marek Tamm**	Juri Lotman and the cultural memory studies
10:15 - 10:30	Break		
10:30 - 12:30	Session G	**Taras Boyko**	Descriptive Mechanisms in Culture: Tartu-Moscow School of Semiotics & "Historical Science"
		Tyler Adkins	Historical Anthropology and Cultural Semiotics: Opportunities for a Dialogue
		Han-liang Chang	Autocommunication, Negative Influence and Cross-Cultural Studies
		Tiina Pitkajärvi	From Earlier Social Campaigns in Sweden to Pink Commodification: Floating Signifiers – a (mainly) Semantic Perspective
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch		
14:30 - 16:30	Session H	**Mari-Liis Madisson & Andreas Ventsel**	Self-description in informational network of Estonian far right
		Sophia M. Melanson	The Semiosphere of Self Branding and the Implications of Self-Objectification Upon Personal Wellbeing: Explorations in how Semiotic Paradigms Support the Study of Culture
		Ott Puumeister	Biopolitics, biopower and autocommunication
		Oleg Barabanov	Applicability of semiotic methods to the studies of international relations and global governance
16:30 - 16:45	Break		
16:45 - 18:15	Session I	**Tuuli Raudla**	Vico, Uexküll, and Theses on semiotics of culture
		Katarzyna Kaczmarczyk	Emotions signified and expressed – change in semiotics of feelings in XVIIIth century landscape gardens. (Part of a project: Semiotics of XVIIIth century landscape garden – from emblem to auto-communication)
		Carlos Andrés Pérez Hernández	Tartu Semiotics and The Concept of Perceptual Semiosis
19:00	Dinner		
Evening Session			

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23RD • FINALE			
08:00 - 09:00	Breakfast		
09:00 - 10:15	Lecture	**Peeter Torop**	Futures of cultural semiotics
10:15 - 10:30	Break		
10:30 - 12:00	Moderator: **Marek Tamm**		Final session
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00	Departure		

ABSTRACTS

HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND CULTURAL SEMIOTICS: OPPORTUNITIES FOR A DIALOGUE

TYLER B. ADKINS
DUKE UNIVERSITY | tba2@duke.edu

Since its emergence as a distinct sub–field of anthropology, historical anthropology has occupied itself with human cultural categories – such as those of kinship, caste, or morality – as dynamic, historical objects of study. Historical anthropologists' focus on the diachronic *change* of cultural categories was, in part, a reaction to relative commitment to synchronic description which characterized the structural–functionalist paradigm in social anthropology in early and middle 20th century, and in this sense represented a productive introduction of historicity into the anthropological study. But while it has dedicated a great dealt the mechanisms through which categories have shifted semantic ground in history, historical anthropology has only occasionally addressed itself directly to questions involving the precise mechanisms

through which cultural categories acquire historical *continuity*. The relative stability of cultural categories is, however, a fundamental theoretical and methodological problem for historical anthropology as a sub-field – if indeed the changing meaning of certain categories can be studied historically, then the validity of these categories as objects of analysis presupposes a certain, minimum stability of these categories over time.

This paper attempts to address the problem of contiguity in historical anthropology by drawing on cultural semiotic frameworks of Juri M. Lotman and the Tartu–Moscow School of Semiotics. In particular, I examine self–description at the semiospheric level as a potentially useful model with which historical anthropology might expand its conception of cultural categories and their dynamics. Rather than treating cultural categories as labels or "containers" into which an ever shifting array of elements are placed, I propose that they may be fruitfully examined as complex arrangements of what are identified, in the 1973 *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures*, as metatexts, the "instructions, 'regulation,' and directions which represent a systematized myth created by culture about itself." Cultural categories from this perspective are engaged in the organization of the heterogeneous texts within a cultural space. Seen as this sort of collection of regulatory metatexts, the cultural category appears no longer as an inert label but as a mechanism for limiting the diversity and internal dynamism of the culture space. While these metatexts are relatively stable, they nonetheless posses their own dynamicity and may

even fall out of usage all together (as was the case, for example, with the social categories of feudal estate in Europe). As I argue, examining cultural categories as comprised of normative metatexts opens at least two avenues for historical anthropological research. First, an understanding of categories themselves as not just passively labeling existing, diverse cultural elements but also unifying and stabilizing these elements provides a model for providing detailed descriptions of the continuous dynamics of culture which have hitherto played only a secondary in historical anthropology. Second, a better understanding of the mechanisms which provide stability to cultural systems can in turn shed considerable light on the processes which disrupt this stability, the more readily apparent discontinuities typically examined in historical anthropological studies.

APPLICABILITY OF SEMIOTIC METHODS TO THE STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

OLEG BARABANOV
MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
drolegbarabanov@gmail.com

12

It is now more than 10 years from the conceptualization of the term 'global semiotics' by Thomas Sebeok (Sebeok 2001: §1). The recent World Congress in Semiotics, held in 2012 in Nanjing, was specially focused on the theme of "Global Semiotics. Bridging Different Civilizations". But if we check the problematics of the Congress' Round Tables (Program 2012), we'll see that only three of several dozens of Round Tables were indeed connected to the topic (RT4 Biosemiotics as Global Semiotics, RT17 Cross–Cultural Semiotics, RT27 Global Semiotics, Translation and Encounter among Peoples). An analysis of themes of papers and presentations of those Round Tables (Abstracts 2012) shows us the subject field of problems which are now in the focus of global semiotics. Among them there are semiotic aspects of Internet, problems of translation in the large inter–cultural sense of the word, presentation of

non–Western semiotic cases and their comparative analysis with similar cases from the Western culture, interactions between the semiotics of culture and the ecosemiotics at the global level. At the same time the semiotic aspects of international politics were at the very modest place there.

But it is also clear that nobody could oppose the presumption that the politics is a part of human culture (and the world politics – a part of global culture). The politics does correspond to Lotman's definition of culture as non–hereditary memory of various groups of the human society (Lotman 1967: 30). So it could be logical to analyze the applicability of semiotic methods to the studies of international relations and their sub–disciplines (world politics, global governance, international integration).

True, it should be said that the discipline of international relations is rather conservative *vis–à–vis* new methodological approaches. The 'structuralist revolution' has influenced the political philosophy. But the influence of new methods was visible first of all in the field of domestic (intra–state) politics: in analysis of political regimes, ideologies and power (a semiotic analysis of power and hegemony within empires was done, e.g. in: Ventsel 2009). But the international relations studies were usually at the margin of this process. Until now the key theories explaining the logics of international relations are still the 'old' theories – of realism, liberalism and (neo-)Marxism. In recent times we can see the growing interest to the constructivist approaches to the international relations, but here as well the international constructs are conceptualized mainly in a mechanicist sense (or as a maximum from the point

of view of social psychology), and without any semiotic (or hermeneutic) dimension. And it is reasonable taking into consideration a conservative practice of diplomacy and regulation of international relations, which were practically immutable for decades (if not for centuries). One could add to this a close connection between experts in international relations and official state foreign policy institutions, high level of secrecy and closeness in decision making process, and a visible non availability of foreign policy practitioners to any structuralist, post–modernist or other research 'fashion'.

At the same time both practitioners and experts in international relations start to understand and accept the wholeness and unity of the globalized world not only in economic, but in political sense as well. Starting from mid–1990–ies the new theories of global governance emerge as a necessary conceptualization of world regulation as a political whole (e.g. Barabanov, Golitsyn and Tereshchenko 2006). And it is exactly in this field that the semiotic methods could become rather effective.

Following exactly this logic, the recent Convention of the International Studies Association, held in San Francisco in April 2013, was focused on the problem of diffusion in international relations: a diffusion of norms, values, ideologies and political practices at the global level. One of the tools for such a diffusion became a mechanism of translation (The Politics of International Diffusion 2013: 199). This means that the international relations studies now could be directly linked to the semiotic methods and approaches.

Still in the early works of Juri Lotman and his colleagues

from the Tartu–Moscow School we can find some elements of understanding of the semiotic validity of the world as a whole. Juri Lotman has written in 1974 about the 'global culture of the Earth' (Lotman 1974: 105–107), and Dmitri Segal in 1964 – about a 'global model of the world' (Segal 1964: 12–14; Segal 1965: 60–62). Boris Egorov has mentioned in his letter to Lotman in 1964 that 'the world is structured' (Lotman, Mints, Egorov 2012: 390). In the famous *Theses on the Semiotic Studies of Cultures* (the 40th anniversary of which is celebrated now) is mentioned that all human activity in the sphere of culture and information has an immanent unity, and that any single sign systems could function only in a unity (Ivanov, Lotman et al. 1973: §1). Though the *Theses* authors did not use the term 'globalization' (it will be diffused in fact a decade later, in 1980–ies), but they have mentioned that in the 20th century all the geographic space of the Earth became 'cultural' (Ivanov, Lotman et al. 1973: §1.2.3).

After that, such an understanding was continuing to be developed in Juri Lotman's later works dedicated to the concept of semiosphere. In them he made a point that a "semiosphere of contemporary world ... has taken a global character", that single national cultures start to be included into a 'common cultural world' and constitute a 'global semiotic unity', that such a global semiosphere has its core and periphery (Lotman 1984). By them, the new conceptual base for the semiotic analysis of the globalized world was introduced.

But until now the formation of the global governance theory was done mainly in the framework of institutional or procedural approaches, of the network analysis, of theory of

organization, etc. At the same time, the conceptualization of global governance and its subjects as predominantly artificial/imaginary constructs reflecting reality (maybe not yet enough structured reality) makes purely logical to understand them as a pair of 'sign–denotate'. By this, we can analyze them in a pure semiotic way. Among such constructs (or mentifacts) we can mention e.g. 'global polity/πολιτεια', 'global values', 'global parliamentarism', 'global civil society', 'global justice', 'world government vs. governance without government', 'global leadership', etc. Another possibility is to analyze with semiotic tools an obvious plurality and heterogeneity, which characterizes the international relations and their regulation at the global level. Here we can reasonably use such semiotic approaches as 'recoding' and 'translation'. They are, *inter alia,* applicable to the analysis of the forming global values which start to influence the world politics significantly, and also to the visible competition between the Euro–Atlantic values, the islamist values (or counter–values), the developmentalist values (in the BRICS format, but not only), the global civil protest values ('Occupy Wall Street', Indignati, etc) and other values and ideologies for their representation and domination at the global level.

Such an evolution of a universally accepted set of global values from competing ideological approaches was in the focus of the semiotic analysis of globalization by Anti Randviir. He underlines that the developed in the 20th century contradicting nation state values are still predominant in the international relations until now, conceptualizing them through subjectivized binary oppositions of 'friend or foe', 'cultured vs. developing',

'good vs. evil' (Randviir 2004: 66).

In such a context of values (and the media competition for the global public opinion) we can find a base for a global–political dimension of the concept of semioethics, e.g. the link of 'sign/values' (Petrilli and Ponzio 2007; Petrilli and Ponzio 2012: 208). Also in connection with understanding globalization as a 'global communication', the semioethics start to became a key driver to promote an openness to the others (humans, cultures, societies), and to propose a dialogue with the others with the aim to elaborate together the new global political values (Petrilli 2003: 89, 95).

By the way, in the same context of global values it could be also methodologically effective to use the semiotic concept of 'hierarchy of values' as a 'hierarchy of texts', proposed first by Juri Lotman and Boris Uspenskij (Lotman and Uspenskij 1971: 147–149).

The next point is that such terms as 'organization' and 'governance/management' which are traditionally applied to the world politics as methodological tools of the system approach, are not in the central focus of semiotics, and are absent in the Dictionary of terms of the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School (Levchenko, Salupere 1999). Instead of them (to some extent) we can use once again the semiotic terms of 'recoding' and 'translation', and through them to find a new point of view to the functioning of the structure of international relations. Among the specific topics which could be analyzed with the concepts of 'recoding' and 'translation' there are the analysis of international conflicts, of crisis management, of peace–keeping, and, last but not least the diplomatic practice of international negotiations in general.

Further, one of the key elements of the international relations is an inter–state border. This physical and political border could be connected with the concept of semiotic threshold (e.g. Lotman 1969: 470–471). In the current situation of erosion of many inter–state borders as a part of globalization and integration, the problem of perception of border/threshold could be an interesting topic for studies combining both political and semiotic approaches.

In general, such a process of erosion of inter–state borders, the formation of a (somehow) unified global society, and as a result of this – an evolution of the holistic global polity/πολιτεια with universal values and regulating practices – all this to some extent could be represented as the political dimension of proposed by Lotman dynamics of evolution of a single centralizing culture from various divergent and 'mosaic' cultures. In Lotman's terms it would be the transition from a semantic type of cultural code to a syntactical one (Lotman 1970: 22–26). Much more than at the global level, the similar processes could be studied at the macro–regional level – of the European Union – in the frameworks of the forming single polity / πολιτεια of the EU now. Such processes could be analyzed using one more Lotman's concept: the 'triunional model of culture', when in the process of mutual translation of two different cultures the new integrating third one has to appear, not eliminating the previous differences, but connecting and transforming them into a new wholeness at a higher level (Lotman 1982: 5–8).

One more theme in the world politics, which can be conceptualized with the semiotic methods is the 'center–periphery' problem. In various formats (the North vs. the

South, the 'developed world' vs. the 'developing one', etc.) this problem is already for a long time is in the focus of the international relation theory (mainly of its neo-Marxist schools, e.g., Wallerstein 2004). This subject corresponds as well to the above–mentioned Lotman's focus on the core and periphery of semiosphere. At the mentioned Nanjing World Congress of Semiotics Eero Tarasti has made a point that the erosion or disappearing of the center in the contemporary globalized world of communication is a serious semiotic problem first of all (Tarasti 2012).

Further, it is becoming more and more obvious now the perception of primary significance of ecosemiotics for the analysis of global governance and international relations. These aspects have a growing importance because of ecological dimension of the world politics, of the evolution of the concept of 'global ecological governance', of the activities of the UN and many states for the climate change issue, and of other issues of environment and lack of resources. Almo Farina has mentioned the importance of ecosemiotics for elaboration of the global 'green' ideology and its diffusion as a part of the universally accepted global values (Farina 2012: 87). Kalevi Kull has outlined the biocentric approach to the problem of values formation, that the origin of values could be studied not only in the frameworks of the semiotic of culture, but in a more comprehensive framework of biosemiotics (Kull 2001: 355–356).

Following this logic, global natural disasters (such as tsunami in the Indian Ocean) were already represented as a specific object for a purely semiotic analysis (e.g. Chang 2006, Kim 2006). By this, the destructive influence of nature

on the human society (and its political consequences) has become a one more theme of conversion of international relations and semiotics.

The attention to ecosemiotics for the perspectives of international studies could be effective also in the analysis of the connection point (or the semiotic threshold) between the semiotics of culture and the semiotics of nature, because of its direct implementation into ecopolitical debates at the global level. E.g., Myrdene Anderson has written about the 'symphony' of nature and culture in the semiotic sense (Anderson 2012: 31), Timo Maran has characterized the concept of nature–text (Maran 2007), Guido Ipsen has mentioned that from the point of view of semiosis the nature is *a priori* a part of culture, because in its human perception the nature is transforming into a culturezed construct in the frameworks of everybody's umwelt (Ipsen 2006: 83, 97).

In conclusion we can see that the perspectives for applicability of semiotic approaches to some spheres of international relations seem really interesting. The result of such studies could be a perception of contemporary globalized world and an emerging global polity/πολιτεια as a wholeness and unity not only in the political sense, but in the semiotic one. As such, it could be possible to try to represent a global polity/πολιτεια as a holistic semiotic system as well. The reflection of converging the subject fields of two disciplines (when possible), some case studies in international relations with use of semiotic methods, all this would contribute to the effective interaction of two disciplines. As a result the international relations could became a new interesting object for semiotic analysis.

REFERENCES

Abstracts 2012. *Global Semiotics. Bridging Different Civilizations. The 11th World Congress of the International Association of Semiotic Studies. [Abstracts].* Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University.

Anderson, Myrdene 2012. Trolling and Strolling through Ecosemiotic Realms. *Semiotics in the Wild. Essays in Honour of Kalevi Kull on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Barabanov, Oleg; Golitsyn, Vitali; Tereshchenko, Viktor 2006. Глобальное управление. Москва: Издательство МГИМО–Университета.

Chang, Han–liang 2006. Disaster Semiotics: An Alternative 'Global Semiotics'. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 34.1.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Farina, Almo 2012. A Contribution to Theoretical Ecology: the Biosemiotic Perspective. *Semiotics in the Wild. Essays in Honour of Kalevi Kull on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Ivanov, Vjacheslav; Lotman, Juri; Pyatigorsky, Aleksandr; Toporov, Vladimir, Uspenskij, Boris 1973. Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур. (В применении к славянским текстам). *Semiotyka i struktura tekstu: Studia poświęcone VII Miçdzynarodowemu kongresowi slawistów. Warszawa, 1973.* Wroclaw.

Ipsen, Guido 2006. From Environment to Culture: Aspects of Continuity. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 34.1.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Kim, Sungdo 2006. Semiotics of Natural Disaster Discourse in Post–Tsunami World: A Theoretic Framework. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 34.1.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Kull, Kalevi 2001. Biosemiotics and the Problem of Intrinsic Value of Nature. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 29.1.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Levchenko, Jan; Salupere, Silvi (eds.) 1999. Материалы к словарю терминов Тартуско–Московской семиотической школы. Tartu: University of Tartu Press (Tartu Semiotics Library 2).

Lotman, Juri 1967. К проблеме типологии культуры. Труды по знаковым системам. III. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1969. О метаязыке типологических описаний культуры. Труды по знаковым системам. IV. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1970. Статьи по типологии культуры. I. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1974. О редукции и развертывании знаковых систем. Материалы Всесоюзного симпозиума по вторичным моделирующим системам. I(5). Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1982. От редакции: [О семиотическом подходе к проблеме межтекстовых отношений]. Труды по знаковым системам. *XV.* Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1984. О семиосфере. Труды по знаковым системам. *XVII.* Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

Lotman, Juri; Mints Zara; Egorov, Boris 2012. Переписка.

1954–1965. Таллинн: Издательство Таллиннского университета.
Lotman, Juri; Uspenskij, Boris 1971. О семиотическом механизме культуры. Труды по знаковым системам. *V.* Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.
Maran, Timo 2007. Towards an Integrated Methodology of Ecosemiotics: The Concept of Nature–Text. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 35.1/2.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
Monticelli, Daniele 2005. From Globality to Partiality: Semiotic Practices of Resistance to the Discourse of War. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 33.2.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
Petrilli, Susan 2003. Modeling, Dialogue and Globality: Biosemiotics and Semiotics of Self. 2. Biosemiotics, Semiotics of Self and Semioethics. *Sign Systems Studies. Vol. 31.1.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
Petrilli, Susan; Ponzio, Augusto 2007. *Semiotics Today. From Global Semiotics to Semioethics.* New York: Legas.
—2012. Morris, Sebeok and Beyond: From Biosemiotics to Semioethics. In: Rahtasepp, Silver and Bennett, Tyler (eds.) *Gatherings in Biosemiotics.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press (Tartu Semiotics Library 11).
Program 2012. *Global Semiotics. Bridging Different Civilizations. The 11th World Congress of the International Association of Semiotic Studies. [Program].* Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University.
Randviir, Anti 2004. *Mapping the World: Towards a Sociosemiotic approach to Culture.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press (Dissertationes Semioticae Universitatis Tartuensis 6)

Segal, Dmitri 1964. Заметки об одном типе семиотических моделирующих систем. Программа и тезисы докладов в летней школе по вторичным моделирующим системам. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

—1965. Заметки об одном типе семиотических моделирующих систем. Труды по знаковым системам. *II.* Тарту: Издательство Тартуского государственного университета.

Sebeok, Thomas 2001. *Global Semiotics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tarasti, Eero 2012. Semiotics as the Transcultural Metalanguage. *Global Semiotics. Bridging Different Civilizations. The 11th World Congress of the International Association of Semiotic Studies. [Abstracts].* Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University.

The Politics of International Diffusion 2013. *The Politics of International Diffusion: Regional and Global Dimensions. 54th ISA Annual Convention. [Program]*. San Francisco. 2013.

Ventsel, Andreas 2009. *Towards Semiotic Theory of Hegemony.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press (Dissertationes Semioticae Universitatis Tartuensis 12).

Wallerstein, Immanuel 2004. *World–Systems Analysis.* An Introduction. Durham: Duke University Press.

PROTOTYPICAL IMAGINES OF ESTONIA IN TOURISTIC COMMUNICATION

FEDERICO BELLENTANI
UNIVERSITY OF BOLOGNA | federico.bellentani@gmail.com

This research is a part of a larger work about *practices of cultural reinvention* in Estonia. This country has been selected also due to the fact that *identity and memory politics* have played a strategic and ideological role during the transition from Soviet domination (Tamm 2012). In this context, the touristic communication has been the manifestation of institutional strategies as well. These projects have – more or less explicitly – the result of shaping the mental representations of Estonia not only for an *external point of view*, but also in terms of reshaping the *internal point of view of national identity*.[1]

In this research, we will analyse a corpus of texts from the touristic–integrated communication "Welcome to Estonia", from where we will set up a *typology of imagines*

1 For the fundamental difference between internal and external point of view and their relationship in a culture, see Lotman et al, 1973.

of Estonia. Every element of this typology refers to different semantic fields that create different meanings, values, and imaginaries.

Along this line, the typology will show those imagines that are considered as *prototypical imagines* of Estonia, according to the concept of prototype from *cognitive phycology* (Rosch 1977), but also investigated by Italian semiotics (Eco 1975; Violi 1977). Proceeding from these theories, we will focus on the *strategic role of prototype* that builds a few sets of imaginaries that touristic communication refers to.

Based on the case of Estonia we want to show how touristic communication could focus on a narrow set of *themes and figures* (Greimas 1970, 1983), sometimes used in a strategic or ideological way. Here, in fact, any references to Soviet domination are strategically marginalized and removed from within the *typology of prototypical imagines* of touristic communication, which refers more to European or Western identity and imaginary.

We will thus show how touristic *auto–communication*[2] reinvents the *cultural and collective memory* (Assmann 1995), with different practices of conservation or removing of symbols that refer to different spheres of culture. Thus, these practices are a part of the institutional project able to shape the *collective memory and identity* and to maintain the hegemony (cf. analysis of Balkan cities in Mazzucchelli 2010). They are parts of an institutional

2 For the concept of autocommunication, see Lotman, 1990. In this case, we consider this concept as more pragmatic: autocommunication as a set of model-texts through which a subject (in our case, Estonian touristic communication) defines itself in order to create a determined image of itself.

project that has different effects and reactions on the *pragmatic, cognitive, timic and passionate dimensions* of the subjects, due to their idiosyncratic peculiarities. Moreover, we have to always consider the fact that subjects can activate different meanings and values so as to distort or change the predetermined projects.

This research is based on *semiotics of culture*, with particular reference to the topic of the internal/external points of view, already examined in the *Theses* (Lotman *et al* 1973). From this approach, it is possible to underline different specific fields that are useful for analysing specific matters on different levels:

- Semiotics of touristic communication, as a part of a wider semiotics of tourism (Brucculeri 2009);
- Semiotics of memory and identity;
- Semiotics of the city;
- Semiotics of text and Greimasian narratology.

This research will have a *transdisciplinarity method* (cf. Randviir 2011): here, for example, we will use the concept of prototype from *cognitive psychology* and the *analysis of marketing* linked to touristic communication.

REFERENCES

Assmann, Jan 1995. Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique* 65: 125–33.

Brucculeri, Claudia M. 2009. *Semiotica del turismo*. Roma: Carrocci.

Eco, Umberto 1975. *Trattato di semiotica generale*. Milano: Bompiani.

Greimas, Algirdas J. 1970. *Du sens*. Paris: Seuil (trad. it. *Del senso*, Milano, Bompiani, 1974).

—1983. *Du sens II: Essais Semiotiques*. Paris: Seuil.
Lotman, Jurij M.; Uspenskij, Boris A.; Ivanov, Vjacheslav V.; Toporov, Vladimir N.; Pjatigorskij, Aleksandr M. 1973. Tezisy k semiotičeskomu izučeniju kul'tur (v primenenii k slavjanskim tektstam). *Semiotyka i struktura tekstu. Studia święcone VII międz. kongresowi slawistów* (Mayenowa, M. R.): 9–36. Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy.
Mazzucchelli, Francesco 2010. *Urbicidio. Il senso dei luoghi tra distruzioni e ricostruzioni nella ex Jugoslavia*. Bologna: Bononia University Press.
Randviir, Anti 2011. Transdisciplinarity in objects: spatial signification from graffiti to hegemony. *Sign Systems Studies*, 39 [2/4]: 88–123.
Rosch, Eleanor 1977. Human categorization. *Advances in cross–cultural psychology* (N. Warren). London: Academic Press.
Tamm, Marek 2013. In search of lost time: Memory politics in Estonia, 1991–2011. *Nationalities Papers*, 40. Available athttp://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cnap. Accessed 15 January 2013.
Violi, Patrizia 1997. *Significato ed esperienza*. Milano: Bompiani.

DESCRIPTIVE MECHANISMS IN CULTURE: TARTU–MOSCOW SCHOOL OF SEMIOTICS & "HISTORICAL SCIENCE"

TARAS BOYKO
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | taras.boyko@ut.ee

The Soviet academic milieu in the field of historical studies (or "historical science", to use the term directly corresponding to the Soviet context) seemed to simultaneously resemble other similar cases, as well as unique. A certain level of resemblance might be noticed mainly in the standardized procedures of control over the type and content of historical narratives, while unique features were predominantly exposed in a sort of shift of roles between historians and other scholars working within the humanities (for instance, scholars commonly referred as representatives of the Tartu–Moscow School of Semiotics). In my opinion the latter case deserves some specific attention, and that will be the topic of this paper.

In general, it probably will not be an exaggeration to note that in the Soviet Union, as perhaps in any state with more or less strict control over the realm of historical knowledge,

being a historian meant to follow certain line(s) of thought (at least on paper), while any steps to the side were a rather risky path to take. The "correct treatment" of the past (including theory of historical process and philosophy of history) was an essential element of scholarly activity. As an indirect outcome most of the professional and institutionalized historians "turned blind" towards the problems/discussions that were on the shaky soils of the philosophy of history, the essence of historical writing, historiographical strategies, etc. However, at the same time other scholars (primarily philosophers and philologists), who dealt with less ideologically important topics and disciplines and thus having slightly more space for theoretical and even philosophical discussions, began to pay attention to the disregarded areas of philosophy and theory of history.

The purpose of the current paper is to focus on one such example of, if I may say, "transdisciplinarity" before transdicisplinarity. The paper will be about the approach of the Tartu–Moscow School to (or treatment of) 'history' and 'historical'. The topic of interest which becomes particularly visible in the various works of the Tartu–Moscow School since the late 70s, beginning with the famous article *Historia sub specie semioticae* by Boris Uspenskij, and especially "flourishing" during the 80s and early 90s, when, in addition to Uspenskij, Toporov and others, it was Juri Lotman who on numerous occasions tried to reflect on philosophical, and some would say quite universal, issues surrounding the very nature of historical process(es), 'historians craft', and history *per se*.

AUTOCOMMUNICATION AS A MECHANISM OF NEGATIVE INFLUENCE IN EARLY TWENTIETH–CENTURY CHINESE CULTURAL MOVEMENT

HAN–LIANG CHANG
FUDAN UNIVERSITY / NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY
changhl@ntu.edu.tw

From the inception of the Tartu School, the concept of 'autocommunication' has been closely related to another famous concept of Lotman's, namely, 'semiosphere' when applied to cross–cultural studies (Lotman 2001). Among the cultural mechanisms that construct semiosphere, dialogue and translation figure prominently not only between historical periods of one culture, but also between inter–cultural systems.

According to Lotman, dialogue is characterized by the discreteness of language and asymmetry in communication. Where the interlocutors alternate in give–and–take, each is capable of articulating only his discrete share of discourse, perhaps only one tiny fraction at a time. The discreteness is constituted not only by moments of articulation, but also by moments of silence because when one locutor speaks and sends information,

his partner has to remain silent and becomes temporarily an allocutor whose job is to decode the message he receives. Since natural language is by nature unstable and subject to the caprice of temporality, the information flow is often asymmetrical and perfect communication is thus impossible. Furthermore, as natural language is the primary modelling system, on top of which is the secondary modelling system of culture, the phenomenon of interpreting culture becomes all the more difficult. This is especially the case in cross–cultural communication because each of the two parties involved has its own definition of culture, its own boundaries of the legitimate texts that constitute culture as well as exclude the so–called non–culture.

As dialogue of cultures is inevitable in a culture's historical evolution, such dialogue serves, curiously, a special function of its own dialogue or, in Lotman's word, 'autocommunication'. Lotman projects the dialogic discreteness onto the history of a culture, where the interlocutors cease to be the indigenous versus the exogenous, because both have already been fused as historical products, but are displaced by two historical moments which engage each other in dialogue, or are charged with the semiotic task of infinite process of encoding and decoding. An example is the dialogue between a turbulent, productive moment and its relatively calm and inert–looking but fully saturated counterpart. In this sense, the autocommunication of a culture amounts to the perennial self–dialogue that characterizes cultural hermeneutics. This is perhaps an alternative solution to the thorny problem of cross–cultural dialogue. On the

basis of the aforesaid, this paper will examine a special case in East–West cross–cultural studies.

The May–Fourth Movement in China in the first decade of the twentieth–century has been of lasting influence on China's prolonged process of modernization. This movement has received extensive academic discussions from various perspectives. Chang (2000), for instance, has treated this movement that stages the keen fight between traditionalists and pro–Westernisation modernists as an example showing the paradoxical phenomenon of triangular 'negative influence', involving the interactions of three parties rather than two, namely, the conservatives, the reformers, and foreign models. Through critical elaboration in the 1960s and 1970s, the now obsolete term of 'negative influence' has obtained two distinct but related meanings. On the individual level, it refers to the phenomenon of a receiver's 'misreading' of his foreign sources; on a higher level, it also refers to the phenomenon of reception that involves the contact and interaction of two cultural systems. The receiver, who at the same time plays the role of a mediator, introduces into his own culture a foreign trend as a polemic strategy to debunk existing norms in his own tradition.

However, from the perspective of autocommunication, the whole issue, rather than an enactment of the conflict between domestic force and invading alien force, can be more aptly regarded as the inner dialogue of two indigenous voices of a relatively enclosed culture, but when extra–semiotic reality intrudes and transforms the bounded space (Lotman 2004, 115), an 'explosion' or 'catastrophe' of knowledge takes place.

REFERENCES

Chang, Han–liang 2000. Hu Shih and John Dewey: 'Scientific method' in the May Fourth era – China 1919 and after. *Comparative Criticism: An Annual Journal* 22: 91–104.

Lotman, Juri M. 2001. *Universe of the Mind: Semiotic Theory of Culture*. (Shukman, Ann, trans.) London: I.B. Tauris.

—2004. *Culture and Explosion*. (Grishakova, Marina, ed.; Clark, Wilma, trans.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

WHAT IS THE STATUS OF NARRATIVE IN MODELLING?

PAUL COBLEY
LONDON METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY | paullondonmet@aol.com

The last decade has seen convergences and divergences in narrative theory. On the one hand, there is the clique which is sometimes called 'postclassical narratology'. On the other hand, there are divergences within that clique between 'localised' approaches such as 'feminism' and more universalising or 'global' approaches borrowing from cognitive science (see Herman et al 2012). Both tend to agree on one thing, however: that narrative and identity are closely intertwined and that narrative is everywhere that humans are. Yet, in the light of attacks on this latter standpoint inspired by Strawson (2004) there is a lack of definition regarding the much–vaunted ubiquity of narrative that has been touted not just by 'postclassical narratologists' but also by those using narrative in social science.

This paper will focus on this seemingly crucial factor

in human autocommunication. It will show that the problem besetting the camps in the current conjuncture of narrative theory is an unwitting or witting refusal to operate with a broader theory of semiosis. Cognitive narratology in particular is fixated on the developed adult human's use of literary narratives and, often, invokes narrative to attempt to prove the evolutionary benefits of 'Art' and 'Literature'. In contrast, this paper will consider the status of narrative in modelling – not *as* modelling or as some kind of 'instinct' but, after Lotman and Sebeok, as part of a repertoire of phylogenetic and ontogenetic semiosic development. It will draw evidence from studies of parent–neonate interaction (e.g. Delafield–Butt and Trevarthen 2013), as well as published observations of antenatal development, to demonstrate the strong narrative bearing in human nonverbal semiosis. It will also suggest that narrative, when viewed in terms of its role in the development of the semiotic subject in culture, presents the kind of opportunities, threats and imperatives for culture outlined in Hutto's *Narrative Practice Thesis* (2011), and entails the negotiation between global and local which was adumbrated in the Tartu–Moscow *Theses* (Uspenskij et al 1973).

THE PLACE OF LANGUAGE AMONG SIGN SYSTEMS: J. LOTMAN AND É. BENVENISTE

REMO GRAMIGNA
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | gramigna@ut.ee

This paper seeks to shed light on an unwritten chapter of the history of Tartu semiotics, that is, to draw a parallel between Juri Lotman and Émile Benveniste on the status of (natural) language among other systems of signs.

Among the core principles of the Tartu–Moscow school (TMS), the functional correlation that natural language holds with other sign systems, was a lifelong concern of J. Lotman and a shared preoccupation between the members of the school. Undoubtedly, the tenet that language works as a 'primary modeling system' constitutes one of the trademarks of 'Soviet semiotics', since the publication, in 1973, of the TMS' manifesto, and even before.

Notably, a few years earlier the *Theses* were published, the proposals for the *Fourth Summer School on Secondary Modeling Systems*, held in Tartu during 17–19 August of 1970, included the following issue: putting under an

attentive scrutiny the assumption of the interrelatedness of primary and secondary languages (e.g. sign systems) in culture. In other words, the proposals for the *Fourth Summer School* of 1970 gave a clear indication towards questioning the existence of a double level of systems in culture – primariness and secondariness. The issue at stake here is not whether natural language is a primary or a secondary modeling system. This question can be disregarded for Thomas A. Sebeok has already demonstrated the relativity of such an ordering. More compelling, yet, is the question as to what properties a system must posses in order to be regarded as primary in respect to other systems of signs.

The abovementioned proposals of the 1970s, in fact, called attention to the following issues: is the existence of two levels of systems really a necessary requirement for the organization of culture? If so, in what consists of its functional necessity? Furthermore, one ought to inquire whether natural language only possesses suchlike prerogative of being regarded as 'primary'.

For Lotman, the primacy assigned to natural language in respect to other systems of signs lied in in the fact that the former functions as a 'model' for the latter, thus regarded as 'secondary modeling systems'. If one of the merits of J. Lotman and his school of semiotics was to point out what the role performed by natural language is, the task for future generations and for contemporary semioticians may consist of taking up the challenge of providing further elucidations as to *how* language carries out its function of being a model for other sign systems.

If second order sign systems are modelled on the

basis of natural language, the latter serves simultaneously two functions, namely, that of being the model on which other systems are constituted, and the basis for its own description and study.

This paper seeks to foster the abovementioned claim of the primacy of natural language and argues that this issue deserves a closer inspection.

In order to follow this route, the paper suggests a parallel between J. Lotman and É. Benveniste.

Yet, how to ground such a comparison?

As a matter of fact, in the co–authored article entitled *On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture* (1978) Juri Lotman and Boris Uspenskij, in passing, made a reference to the study on language carried out by the French linguist É. Benveniste. To be sure, the authors quoted Benveniste's article entitled *Semiologie de la langue*, published in 1969 in the first volume of the journal *Semiotica*.

In the abovementioned disquisition, Benveniste's point of departure is that the *conditio sine qua non* for signification as such, is the existence of a sign system in which each sign is part of. Signs do not belong to one and the same system, hence the necessity for the existence of a plurality of sign systems, on one hand, and, on the other, the call to make explicit the relationships between these systems.

Having said that, the French scholar poses a crucial question, that is, whether a system can interpret itself by itself, thus having the capability of self–description and self–interpretation. For Benveniste, language only possesses such a prerogative, thus being the 'interpreting system' in a society. This way, the French linguist spelled out that the semiotic relations between systems can be

reduced to those of 'interpreting system' (e.g. language) and 'interpreted system'. In virtue of such a prerogative, language is thought of as the system *par excellence*.

There are several points in common between Lotman and Benveniste that may lead to a convergence of positions between these two remarkable scholars. The paper will seek to explore such a possibility arguing that Lotman and Benveniste's positions may open up an interesting debate with specific reference to the relations laid down between language and other system of signs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benveniste, E. 1969. Sémiologie de la langue. *Semiotica* (1/1), 1–12.

—1981. The semiology of language. *Semiotica* (37/1), 5–24.

Birnbaum, H. 1990. Semiotic modeling systems, primary and secondary. *Language Sciences* 12 (1), 53–63.

Chang, H. 2003. Is language a primary modeling system? On Juri Lotman's concept of semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies* 31(2): 1–15.

Ferrari–Bravo, D. 1975. Sistemi secondary di modellizzazione. In: Lotman, M.J; Uspenskij, *Semiotica e Cultura*. Milano and Napoli: Ricciardi Editore, XIV–LXXIX.

Eco, U. 1969. Lezione e contraddizioni della semiotica sovietica. In: Eco, U.; Faccani, R. (eds), *I sistemi di segni e lo strutturalismo sovietico*. Bompiani: Milano, 13–31.

Eco, U.; Faccani, R. (eds), *I sistemi di segni e lo strutturalismo sovietico*. Bompiani: Milano,

Ivanov, V.V. 1977. The role of semiotics in the cybernetic study of man. In: Lucid, D. P. 1977. (ed) *Soviet Semiotics:*

An Anthology. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 27–37.
Lotman, J. M. 1977a. Primary and secondary communication modeling systems. In: Lucid, D. P. (ed) *Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology,* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 95–98.
—2001. The place of art among other modelling systems. *Sign Systems Studies*. 39 (2/4), 249,270.
—2002. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture,* London and New York: I.B. Tauris,
—1979. Proposte per il programma della "IV Scuola estiva sui sistemi modellizzanti secondary". In: Prevignano, C. (ed), *La semiotica nei Paesi slavi: Programmi, problemi, analisi*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 191–193.
Lotman, J. M.; Uspenskij, B. A. 1978. On the semiotic mechanism of culture. *New Literary History (9/2), Soviet Semiotics and Criticism: An Anthology,* 211–232.
Lucid, D. P. 1977. (ed) *Soviet Semiotics: An Anthology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Marzaduri, Mario. La semiotica dei sistemi modellizzanti in URSS. In: Prevignano, C. (ed), *La semiotica nei Paesi slavi: Programmi, problemi, analisi*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 343–381.
Prevignano, C. (ed), *La semiotica nei Paesi slavi: Programmi, problemi, analisi*. Milano: Feltrinelli
Randviir, A. 2007. On spatiality in Tartu–Moscow cultural semiotics: The semiotic subject. *Sign Systems Studies* 35 (1/2): 137–158.
Revzina, O. G. 1972. The fourth summer school on secondary modeling systems (Tartu, 17–24 August 1970), *Semiotica* 6: 222–243.

Rudy, S. 1986. Semiotics in the U.S.S.R. In: Sebeok, T. A. et al (eds), *The Semiotic Sphere*. New York: Plenum Press, 555–582.
Sebeok, T. A. 1991. In what sense is language a "primary modeling system"? In: Anderson, M.; Merrell, F. (eds), *On Semiotic Modeling*, Berlin and New York: Mouton, 327–339.
Theses 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Van Der Eng, J. (ed), *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. Mouton. Paris: The Hague, 1–28.

THREE YEARS OF "PLUG" (GROWING INFORMAL YOUTH SUBCULTURE SELF–IDENTITY)

JELENA MELNIKOVA– GRIGORJEVA
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | elena.grigorjeva@ut.ee
OLESJA ROTAR & DAN ROTAR
TALLINN UNIVERSITY | olesjab@tlu.ee

Youth "Plug" magazine (www.plug.ee) is a unique, 3–year old experiment on forming creative informal youth culture in the situation of the most unfavourable social, political and natural climate in Estonia. This is an organ that organises young, mostly Russian people for various creative activity: music, literature, poetry, illustration, publishing, expertise, management and organization of different events, promo companies, film–making, etc. Almost all of the participants in the project are non–professional musicians. Young people train in very diverse techniques of self–expression and self–presentation. In the beginning it was primarily a magazine of friends and for friends. In three years it gained certain acknowledgement not only in Estonia (in 2013, "Plug" was awarded an annual award in literature by the Cultural Endowment of Estonia), but also in Latvia and Russia. It is actively present in Russian–speaking

and even in Estonian media.[3] It is the only Russian youth magazine in Estonia.

The magazine formed its distinctive face (it can be seen in the documentary "1+1+1+", by Dan Rotar in cooperation with other PLUG members) and occupies a particular niche in local culture. It is recognisable and attracts adequate young people. The tone of "Plug" is positive but not boring: easy and elegant. It balances successfully in–between trash and glamour. The scale of their interests embraces art, literature, cinema, theatre, food, local events, personalia, analytics, and expertise. "Plug" is much wider than a paper magazine: the community is visible online (first of all in Facebook), they organise festivals ("Sputnik"), and play concerts (also in Cabaret format). Many of them confess that they have no time to waste at all. They live in a permanent creative drive.

During these 3 years 104 people have contributed their works to the magazine. It should be emphasized that participation is voluntary and gratuitous. The quality of the publications is considerably higher than in commercialised media that uses copy–paste methods to fill their content.

"Plug" can be considered to be a model example of how to heal a society, beginning with the most creative age. Young people are involved into creative activity. They simply have no time for destruction. Playing and listening to music harmonises the community and the magazine helps them to articulate their world picture in words and pictures.

3 Cf. project KesKus: www.facebook.com/pages/PLUG–in–KesKus/122372487812532

ENHANCING CREATIVITY AS A PEDAGOGIC EXPERIMENT. AUTUMN–WINTER 2012–3 ACADEMIC SEMESTER

JELENA MELNIKOVA-GRIGORJEVA
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | elena.grigorjeva@ut.ee

The activation of Facebook initiated a big progress in our brain studies. We extracted several viruses and anti–viruses, we formulated the basic matrix bifurcation – analogue and digital. At the moment it is already a common knowledge, due to my Facebook activity as well. I publish all my materials for more than 25 years, since 2010 – by seconds. Our Semiotic School is visible online, in Facebook as well.

I am generally satisfied with the results of this stage of the experiment in practical application of the DHS model. This is already the third generation of Z00Z00. I see the increasing growth of understanding of the basic principles of the Semiosphere in my students' reports. We built (reconstructed) the Navigator to the System. That means we started programming the future on a new level of access to the System.

To proceed in our perfection the growth of personal

responsibility for one's words is the most essential need. The power and might of our Method should be emphasized. Everyone who accepts this Method should be very attentive and responsible. So, it is about the feedback. At the moment we have a reversed situation – the teaching staff contributes knowledge and students go away and use this knowledge without any feedback to the School. To strengthen our School we must ask for more sensitive feedback. That means we must make evaluation of our future agents more sophisticated and intelligent.

To estimate things we always use two perspectives – formal and informal. Both are necessary. Formal is formal – yes, no, to what degree? Informal is about personal attitude, that should be also somehow motivated and formalised. I suggest to use this personal aspect for improving the work of our School.

MODELS IN (AUTO)–COMMUNICATION AND MODELS OF (AUTO)–COMMUNICATION: FROM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS TO TEXT SYNERGETICS?

PETER GRZYBEK
UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ | peter.grzybek@uni-graz.at

Auto–communication as part of cultural communication in general has been brought to the semiotic fore in the early 1970s, when Juri M. Lotman introduced this concept in his presentation to the *4th Summer School on Secondary Modeling Systems* (1970), published in extended form in volume VI of *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* in the same year, when the seminal *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* were formulated (1973).

An interpretation and (re)–evaluation of this concept, developed more than four decades ago, offers different analytical positions: after all, the introduction of this concept into the realm of cultural semiotics did not happen "all of a sudden" in a theoretical vacuum; rather, it was motivated by specific circumstances and embedded in a specific cultural situation.

In attempting to (historically and conceptually) re–

construct the rise of this concept, it may be helpful to distinguish different perspectives, related to different temporal perspectives:

- The (historical) re–construction of relevant "distant" ideas on auto–communication, to be found, among others, in writings by Charles S. Peirce, George H. Mead, Charles W. Morris, or Lev S. Vygotskij (in his discussions with Jean Piaget) and his followers;
- The analysis of concepts, which can be seen to have served as more or less "close" starting points and impetus for Lotman's ruminations, starting with the Shannon–Weaver model and Jakobson's extension of it;
- Parallel attempts in the 1970s to overcome the uni–directional implications of "orthodox" assumptions about communication and information processes (e.g., the re–invention of Bakhtin's concept of dialogicity in philosophy and semiotics, constructivist approaches in psycholinguistics, mental models in cognitive sciences, etc.).

These aspects (albeit from different perspectives and with different foci) may seem to be, at first sight, of rather historical than systematic conceptual relevance; in fact, however, they provide the necessary background to better understand the specifics of Lotman's approach, on the one hand, and to arrive at generalizations, from a modern theoretical point of view, on the other.

In this presentation, subsequent to some historical and conceptual embeddings concerning points (a)–(c) above, an attempt will be made to re–interpret Lotman's assumptions on auto–communication with regard to a

modern theory of communication. For this purpose, it seems reasonable to additionally integrate Lotman's ideas on the relation between structure of text and structure of the audience, developed almost simultaneously (1973). It will be suggested to not only distinguish between the recipient and the addressee of a message, but also to take into account models of both sender/producer and receiver/addressee as obligatory and integral components of any communicative process and, as a consequence, of any communication model. It will be discussed, in how far these instances and concepts can be interpreted in terms of a complex system of control cycles which, in their interaction, result in dynamic and synergetic processes of any act of text constitution, poetic texts being but special cases thereof. Based on the assumption that text structures are generally and principally influenced by the contrasting economic interests of producer and recipient and, by way of that, by the antagonism of diversification and unification, it will be asked in how far it is possible to go beyond Lotman's assumption that we are concerned with two types of channels, types, or modes of communication only, or if we can derive further implications as to concrete and specific text structures, including rhythmic elements and poetic texts.

AN EXPERIMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF JURI M. LOTMAN'S AUTOCOMMUNICATION THEORY AS APPLIED TO ROLAND BARTHES' REPRESENTATIONS OF CHINA AND JAPAN

LEI HAN
FUDAN UNIVERSITY | hanlei19870615@gmail.com

Applied to Roland Barthes' representations of China and Japan, this paper experiments and interprets Juri M. Lotman's autocommunication theory. Trying to reveal the potential readers (receivers) and value of Barthes' representation of China and Japan, rather than being merely an application of Lotman's theories, this paper also performs a meta–critical task of pointing out four aspects of extensions of Lotman's autocommunication: interpretation of the cultural spheres of a cultural individual, the paradoxical tension and position between potential readers and receivers of text, autocommunicative nature of imagological studies of the Otherness, and communication between a given culture and the non–culture with respect to the given culture.

TARTU SEMIOTICS AND THE CONCEPT OF PERCEPTUAL SEMIOSIS

CARLOS ANDRÉS PÉREZ HERNÁNDEZ
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | caperher@hotmail.com

Tartu semiotics can be understood through seven logically connected principles: (1) the principle of code plurality; (2) the principle of incompatibility or nontranslatability; (3) the principle of autocommunication; (4) the principle of semiotic inheritance; (5) the principle of the semiosphere; (6) the principle of punctuated evolution; and (7) the principle of modelling. Nevertheless, the concept of semiosis seems to be at the centre of all these principles in that it may provide the ground for understanding the aforementioned principles and their intwerconnectedness.

Among the various definitions of semiosis, this paper provides a theoretical reflection which aims to describe and analyse the concept of perceptual semiosis and its centrality to understanding Tartu–related semiotics. Although there is no rigid or fixed definition, the notion

of semiosis is crucial to the study of any semiotic phenomenon. This paper attempts to look at some of those definitions, with an emphasis on perceptual semiosis as explained by Umberto Eco. Although this scholar is located on the periphery of the centre/periphery dialogue, his work can be on great significance for understanding Tartu Semiotics and its principles.

According to Eco, "we speak of perceptual semiosis not when *something stands for something else* but when from something, by an inferential process, we come to pronounce a perceptual judgment *on that same something* and not on anything else [emphasis in the original]." (2009: 125). What Eco is attempting to point out here is that before we understand something "as a sign of something else and from a certain point of view", that something must be perceived first before we infer the meaning of a phenomenon (*ibid*, 126). For example, we perceive smoke and then infer that there is a fire. In this perceptual process, our attention is somehow fixed on the perceptible object, sign, or event. In Eco's view, this fixing or arousal of attention by "Something" is the condition of every semiosis because it is that "Something" which induces us to produce signs.[4]

Eco also emphasizes that the nature of knowledge is not linguistic, but rather semiosic (*ibid*, 71). This does not mean that the mere act of perception provides us with full knowledge of the object of experience, but according to Kant (cited in Eco, 1999: 76), we need the intellect – mind – to reflect upon what is being perceived. Here

4 Here we are talking about the terminus ad quo, or the starting point of sign generation.

perceptual judgments – "…an interpretation of sensible data that involves memory and culture and that ultimately results in the understanding of the nature of the object" – are necessary. For example, cognizing a stone as a stone is already a perceptual judgment (Eco, *ibid*, 76).

Eco's discussion on perceptual semiosis demonstrates that all of the senses are involved in perception (for instance, landscape forms, weather signs, temperature differences, humidity, body forms, colours, smells, and sounds trigger the participation of more than one sense), and that not all aspects of the perceptible object can be represented via one system of communication (e.g., verbal), but they can be represented in other systems (e.g., visual, auditory). He also helps us to understand better that recognition and identification of an object may be influenced by one of the senses more than the others; that is, we may perceive a given phenomenon more on the basis of visual, auditory, or other sensory features. In this respect, we can clearly understand the potentiality of an object to generate new meanings and why semiosis is dynamic (See also Valsiner 2007); for one can never perceive an object in its entirety, nor can signs represent the object in its entirety. Thus, a sign only represents one aspect of the object of which it is a sign.

For example, in the study of animal communication Eco's concept of perceptual semiosis accounts for why semiosis is related to specific senses, to the capacity for perception and interpretation, and to an animal's cognitive abilities to process information and recognize and categorize things. If one looks at the functional cycle of Jakob von Uexküll (2010), one can see that semiosis concerns

the capacity of the organism to convert sensory information into sign–based behaviour because it begins with perception and ends with effect, and it connects meaning carriers (object qualities or properties the animal is related to) with meaning utilizers (the perceiving animal).

All in all, the notion of perceptual semiosis can be further developed and included as part of the description of Tartu Semiotics.

REFERENCES

Eco, Umberto 2009. *Kant and the Platypus: Essays on Language and Cognition*. (McEwen, Alastair, trans.). London: Secker & Warburg.

Valsiner, Jaan 2007. *Culture in Minds and Societies: Foundatinos of Cultural Psychology*. Los Angeles, etc.: Sage.

von Uexküll, Jakob 2010. *A Foray Into the Worlds of Animals and Humans: With a Theory of Meaning*. (O'Neil, Joseph D., trans.). Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.

CULTURE ABOUT CULTURE: ABOUT THE EMERGENCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN SEMIOTIC COGNITION

BAREND VAN HEUSDEN
UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN | b.p.van.heusden@rug.nl

My argument about (self–) consciousness as a critical dimension of human cognition takes its point of departure in a general theory of cognition. Cognition is taken, very broadly, as the process that allows organisms equipped with a nervous system to interact with their environment in a specific way, through the development of *patterns of (inter) active behaviour* –patterns that constitute the *memory* of the organism. Most of the time, the patterns will result from random variation and blind selection (RVBS) processes. Sometimes, however, trial and error learning and learning trough copying behavior play a role as well. In humans, semiotic cognition adds another layer to this process.

Semiosis, or semiotic cognition, has a number of significant characteristics. First of all, it results from a *doubling* of the cognitive process: the environment is not only recognized in terms of existing patterns of action

(memory), it is also and simultaneously *not* recognized, and experienced as *different* from memory. Humans do not live *in* memory; they live *with* memories, and in reality. Our first task will be to elucidate how this double processing of the environment may have emerged in human evolution, that is, how the experience of a difference between memory and the 'here and now' of reality arose in human cognition.

Once the double processing was in place, human cultural evolution could take off. As human culture is nothing else but the process of dealing with difference, its evolutionary course is determined by the subsequent ways in which the difference in perception was dealt with. The number of available strategies is limited by the inherent characteristics of the (human) nervous system. I will discuss what can be considered as the four basic cognitive strategies constituting culture: the perception of similarities, the imagination of possibilities, the conceptualization of categories, and the analysis of structures. I will also relate these four strategies to the full use of basic types of media: the body, artifacts, language, and graphic symbols.

Thirdly, I will argue that a system that allows for the experience of difference between memory and the 'here and now' must necessarily be *recursive*. Such a system allows for cognition about cognition, or *metacognition*. As metacognition is another word for (self–) consciousness, I will argue that, in fact, semiotic cognition and (self) consciousness are two dimensions of the same human cognitive reality.

This theory of human semiotic cognition has a strong explanatory force. It explains (self–) consciousness without recourse to specific brain mechanisms ('strange loops' as

Douglas Hofstadter coined them), it explains the 'logic' of human cultural evolution and the presence, in human culture, of a substantial metacognitive dimension, which encompasses all forms of auto–communicative culture, or 'culture about culture'. In the context of contemporary culture one could think about such diverse cultural domains as the news, the arts, ideologies and religions, philosophy and … the science of cognition itself.

Finally, the theory of human semiotic cognition alows us to firmly ground arts and culture education as education in a variety of forms of personal and collective (self–) consciousness or metacognition.

EMOTIONS SIGNIFIED AND EXPRESSED – CHANGE IN SEMIOTICS OF FEELING IN 18TH CENTURY LANDSCAPE GARDENS

KATARZYNA KACZMARCZYK
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW | kasiakaczmarczyk@o2.pl

FROM EMBLEM TO AUTO–COMMUNICATION

The whole of the 18th century in gardening tradition could be described as a transition from baroque to landscape gardening, reaching its peak in neoclassical and romantic trends in the last quarter of the 18th century. It was a time of rebuilding the old style estates to fit the new style and creating new ones: straight became serpentine, symmetrical – asymmetrical, united – varied. These were the changes that occurred in the materiality of gardens. However, an equally (if not more) important change occurred in the understanding of the experience of an individual in the garden, especially the understanding of cognitive processes underlying the aesthetic experience of the garden. This (together with other factors) led to a transformation of the perception of gardens as semiotic structures and to a shift from their emblematic to auto–communicational character.

In my PhD thesis I trace the changes in understanding the experience of gardens in the 18th century, focusing on the role of altering notions of perception, and the emergence of a tentative notion of 'embodied cognition', as well as the connection between these transformations and the semiotics of gardens. In my view, auto–communication in late–18th century gardens was rooted in the newly emerged notion of perception that relies on elementary cognitive processes (closely resembling a modern notion of 'embodied cognition') and an affective response to landscape.

EMOTIONS SIGNIFIED AND EXPRESSED

As the topic of my thesis is wide, during the summer school I would like to focus on the way feelings are signified in the landscape garden in the course of the 18th century and how they impact the shift from communication to auto–communication.

Gardens as a whole and their different parts and objects within them signified not only religious, political and mythical notions and their various relations, but also pointed to specific emotions and feelings. They were often denotated by means of symbols (or more specifically: emblems). However, as the century progressed, more and more emphasis was put on the 'natural' expressive qualities of things and their immediate perception.

From roughly the middle of the century onwards two trends coexisted (on the one hand, conventionalization, on the other – naturalization of meaning of objects' qualities), but the strongest emphasis continually was put on immediate, embodied impression ('immediate impres-

sion' in Whately's terms) that the objects made on humans. In the aesthetic writings in the 18th century they were described as if acting as a stimulus on the level of elementary cognitive processes (in this way by–passing higher cognitive functions and conventionalized communication) and directly influencing the body. As Archibald Alison wrote: "The greatest beauty of inanimate matter arises from same resemblances we discover between particular qualities of it, and certain qualities or dispositions of mind (...) But the effect which such resemblances or analogies can produce, is feeble, in comparison of that which is produced by the immediate expression of such qualities or dispositions in the human frame."

On the one hand the type of signification Alison describes is iconic, resting on the form – meaning isomorphism (in this way we could also describe Whately's 'transitive images' in his theory of gardens), and on the other hand Alison suggests a possibility of non–mediated, direct perception.

A common feature of many theories of the gardens' signification during the second part of the 18th century (however conventional or natural it appeared) is the impression that signs and 'expressive qualities' make: one that is immediate, irresistible, 'not sought for, not labored' [Whately]. The garden therefore affects an individual without consuming all of his thoughts, enabling him to communicate with himself (but also guiding the process, for example through connotations). It provides an additional syntactic structure for the individuals' thoughts, but also what I would like to call 'affective structure' – both influencing a visitor's feelings and allowing him to project feelings upon space.

In my presentation I would like to show how 1. Changes in understanding feelings in the 18th century garden took part in the transition from communication to auto–communication and 2. How this change was partly provoked by the development of theories of perception (both perception in general and perception of gardens/art).

CULTURAL SEMIOTICS, TRANSLATABILITY AND INFORMATIONAL LOSS IN THE VISUAL TEXTS OF THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY

LIA YOKA
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI | liayoka@hotmail.com
EVANGELOS KOURDIS
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI | ekourdis@frl.auth.gr

Translatability is mostly understood as the capacity for some kind of meaning to be transferred from one language to another without undergoing radical change (Pym and Turk, 1999: 273). In this transfer of meaning, culture plays a prominent role, sometimes limiting the broadness of the translation process and urging certain semioticians to speak of untranslatability. The question of cultural untranslatability was treated also by Jakobson ([1959] 2004: 138) when he examined the translatability of the Russian cheese "syr". In this essay, Jakobson employed the notion of *equivalence* in the translation process in order to overcome cultural untranslatability or informational loss, and concluded that "[…] the richer the context of a message, the smaller the loss of information" (ibid: 141).

The contribution of the notion of equivalence in cultural translatability was underlined also by scholars of

the semiotics of culture. According to Uspenskij, Ivanov, Toporov, Pjatigorskij and Lotman ([1973] 2003: 311) in their collective *Theses*, "one of the fundamental problems of the studies of semiotics and the typology of cultures is the formulation of the question of the equivalence of structures, texts, functions". For the authors of the *Theses,* "translation from one system of text to another always includes a certain element of untranslatability". Others put it differently. Toury (1994: 1115), for example, remarks that "[…] the all too current notion of 'non–translatability' seems unjustified, and certainly infertile, for translating as well for translation studies". Toury continues that "[…] the media and/or channels through which the two systems – thus every entity pertaining to them – are transmitted, form further major constraints on translating between them, and, in cases of difference, reduce their initial inter–translatability". This is where Jakobson's notion of equivalence might come in. His notion of equivalence can be viewed as an attempt to remedy or avoid altogether cultural value–ridden limitations in translation, even though informational loss, due to untranslatability, might be inevitable.

In this paper we will study the case of informational loss in the translation of visual texts of advertisements of multinational products, services and development projects in the biotechnology industry. The biotech industrial complex addresses a relatively recent global market and has relied heavily on a new invented rhetoric to sell its products. Through an examination of their rhetoric as it is transposed from one context to another, e.g. from the European to African projects, we will question the

quality and degree of informational loss and the way this loss is realized. Thus, we will discuss the values of untranslatability (i.e cultural reasons that complicate translation) by posing questions like: Could informational loss be a result of cultural *silence* (what Toury would call the non–translatable) and dismiss it as unproductive? Does loss occur due to *repression* (i.e. the idea that this text is not an acceptable text), is it an act of *parody* (i.e. the expression of sarcasm, of irony, or of a value–critical statement), or is it merely due to incidental linguistic differences? How does the notion of equivalence help us understand existing power structures as expressed in cultural hierarchies?

(STILL) PROMISING

KALEVI KULL
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | kalevi.kull@ut.ee
EKATERINA VELMEZOVA
UNIVERSITY OF LAUSANNE | ekaterina.velmezova@unil.ch

Interviewing Vyach. Vs. Ivanov in 2010, among other questions we asked him the following one, concerning *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* (1973): "In this collective manifesto, central theoretical premises of a new discipline, semiotics of culture, are formulated. How do you rate this text today?"

Vyach. Vs. Ivanov answered as follows: "This text was composed on Juri Lotman's initiative. He insisted on creating one single conception, but his theory was not accepted by [...] A.M. Pjatigorskij (already at that time, Pjatigorskij was opposed to the idea of duality and refuted the importance of L.S. Vygotsky's and S.M. Eisenstein's views; in these questions among others, our opinions diverged categorically). B.A. Uspenskij found some contradictions in our text [...]. Besides, Lotman had intended to involve Roman Jakobson in the work on this

text […]. [Finally] it looks as though we did not manage, even at the start, to create a united text. Nevertheless, I *still consider as very promising* the basic direction of the study of multilevel texts that is outlined in our *Theses*. You can find similar ideas already in G.G. Shpet's *Aesthetic Fragments* […]".

Using unpublished materials, in our paper we shall analyse this point of view comparing it with other opinions of the protagonists of the of Tartu–Moscow school (in particular, B.A. Uspenskij, another co–author of the *Theses*). We shall pay particular attention not only to the historical and intellectual background of this manifesto, but also to its importance for current semiotic studies.

REFERENCES

Shpet, Gustav 1922–1923. *Esteticheskie fragmenty* [Aesthetic Fragments]. I–III. Peterburg: Kolos.

Uspenskij, B. A.; Ivanov, V. V.; Toporov, V. N.; Pjatigorskij, A. M.; Lotman, J. M. 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Eng, Jan van der; Grygar, Mojmír (eds.), *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1–28.

Velmezova, Ekaterina; Kull, Kalevi 2011. Interview with Vyacheslav V. Ivanov about semiotics, the languages of the brain and history of ideas. *Sign Systems Studies* 39(2/4): 290–313.

ICONICITY AND AUTOMETADESCRIPTION IN ESTONIAN POETRY

MARIA-KRISTIINA LOTMAN
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | mihhail@ehi.ee
MIHHAIL LOTMAN
TALLINN UNIVERSITY | maria.lotman@mail.ee

Iconicity in poetry plays more important and substantially different role as compared to prose and especially daily speech; especially significant is the subtype of iconicity which we call autometadescription. The term 'autometadescription' was first coined by Roman Timenchik (1975) to mark such phenomena in which the content of a text is reflected directly in the verse structure, while the content, on the other hand, formulates the qualities of the structure. As a result, so–to–say, a semantical short circuit appears. Autometadescription can occur on very different levels: visual structure, meter and rhythm, euphonics, syntax and so on.

Both the structure of text and its semantics are complex formations. We confine ourselves to three languages: first of them is a natural language (in our case the Estonian), the second is verse meter and the third is the visual structure of

text. The material of our study involves only written text: in the case of oral texts the similar role to visual structure can be played by intonation.

In poetry the mentioned languages are closely related to one another, but they have different semiotical mechanisms. The basis for the natural language is what we could call deriving from Peirce, symbolic system, while that of the visual structure is, first of all, iconicity. The question of the semantical status of verse meter and rhythm is more complex. Verse meter can occur mainly in two autometapoetical roles. First, text contains verbal information about the meter it is written in. In such case the verbal message of the text supports what was called the metrical emblem by John Hollander; accordingly, we will call this mechanism emblematic. It is autometadescription in the strict sense of the word: the meaning of a sign is a sign itself; it is an autonymic use of sign. Second, the meter in which the text is written is mentioned in a text in some other relation, hence it becomes a part of the thematic structure of the poem, as if it was not related to the versification of the text; in this case we speak of the thematic autometadescription.

SEMIOTICS, CULTURE, AND SPACE

ALEXANDROS PH. LAGOPOULOS
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI | phaidon@arch.auth.gr
KARIN BOKLUND–LAGOPOULOU
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI | boklund@enl.auth.gr

In the first section of our paper, we open the discussion on the epistemological definition of culture by referring to the *Theses* of the Moscow–Tartu School of semiotics. The *Theses* articulate a multiplicity of items characterising culture which taken together provide an integrated theoretical approach to human culture as a system of semiotic systems. The same ideas are integrated into Juri Lotman's later concept of the 'semiosphere', although they there acquire a biological and 'Gestaltic' character.

The domain of culture is not defined epistemologically in the *Theses,* but certain clues are given concerning its nature. The main clues are the theoretical division of semiotic systems into primary and secondary modelling systems, and the theoretical division between verbal and iconic signs. They are complemented by empirical clues on the nature of the cultural fields of research, such as natural–

language texts of all kinds, architecture, painting, sculpture, dance (and pantomime) and ballet, as well as audio–visual systems of mass communication (cinema and television).

In the second section of our paper, we attempt an epistemological definition of culture from the point of view of contemporary social science. This sociological approach clarifies the epistemological nature of material society, which is frequently ignored in semiotics because it is confused with the concept of culture. The same approach reveals the fundamental epistemological triad of the concepts of (material) society, culture (as distinct from but part of society), and the natural environment (nature, the ecosystemic ecosphere), as well as the relations and differences between them.

Space as a semiotic system is almost absent from the *Theses.* However, although the theoretical positions presented by the *Theses* were not generated by any interest in the semiotics of space, they include some suggestions. On the other hand, space holds a central position in Lotman's thought, displayed also in his views on the semiosphere.

We examine the position of space in semiotics according to two different axes of analysis. The first axis, discussed in our third section, is that of space as a semiotic system. It considers space as an object of semiotic inquiry and corresponds to a culture's internal point of view on space. Here, we briefly present three case studies of pre–capitalist societies: the urban semiotic model of ancient Greece and the spatial semiotic models of the traditional African cultures of Ethiopia and Tunisia. We will also briefly discuss the semiotics of geographical space as presented

in literary texts, on the basis of a case study on medieval courtly romances.

These case studies faithfully represent the semiotics of space of pre–capitalist societies and show among other things that:

- There is an organised cultural system (general or text–specific), as the *Theses* argue, of which space–as–text or space–in–text becomes the vehicle.
- The boundary, a key concept for Lotman, acquires meaning in pre–capitalist cultures in the context of the binary opposition *centre* vs. *periphery,* where the centre is the marked element.
- Semiotic analysis can only *describe* the structure and function of texts and semiotic systems. The explanation or *interpretation* of structures and functions lies outside semiotics, in its articulation with material society, that is, in social semiotics (well displayed in the Marxist sociological poetics of the Bakhtin circle).

We conclude our paper with the second axis on the position of space in semiotics, the importance of space for semiotic theory. Space is not only an object of semiotic enquiry, but also an instrument of semiotic theory – part of its metalanguage, to use the terminology of the *Theses*.

Space is a component of the theory of Algirdas Julien Greimas, where the 'generative process' – detected in an elementary form in the *Theses* –, which produces the surface 'discursive' structures of a text from its underlying semantic structure, includes 'spatialisation' together with 'actorialisation' and 'temporalisation'. Lotman also gives

space a privileged position among the tools of semiotic analysis, describing in terms of a spatial model the invariant world view of a culture underlying all of its texts.

In fact, in the late 1980s, a 'spatial turn' emerged in the social sciences which, starting from human geography, influenced the whole range of the social and human sciences. A characteristic example is Franco Moretti's work on space in literature, in which he gives special emphasis to boundaries and in this context refers to both Lotman and Vladimir Propp.

To conclude, semiotics matters for culture and space matters for semiotics.

SELF–DESCRIPTION IN INFORMATIONAL NETWORK OF ESTONIAN FAR RIGHT

MARI-LIIS MADISSON
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | ml.madisson@gmail.com
ANDREAS VENTSEL
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | andreas.ventsel@gmail.com

Our presentation focuses on processes of identification in hypermedia – the informational space that plays an increasingly significant role in articulating individual and collective identities. We would like to explicate the strategies of self–description that prevail in the websites of the activists of the Estonian far right. Roger Griffin has elaborated on the concept of *groupuscule* in order to explain diffuse far right movements of cyber–culture. Put briefly, we can characterize the groupuscular field by: 1) general discontent with contemporary world order, 2) the plurality and marginality of different groupuscular units, and 3) the rhizomic structure of intra–groupuscular communication. Although the concept of *groupuscule* is already a fruitful tool for understanding contemporary far right, there are several aspects that need more academic development. Even Griffin himself has emphasized that the concept mainly has heuristic value.

Our main contribution would be to complement the concept of *groupuscule* with the ideas of the Tartu–Moscow school of cultural semiotics (primarily, Lotman's) and the theory of hegemony (by Laclau). By applying the essential theoretical frameworks of cultural semiotics – continual/discrete coding – we would like to survey the way in which the self–descriptions of groupuscules are related with the content of mainstream media. Les Back has developed the concept of *liquid ideologies*, which explains how far right movements in hypermedia tend use generally accepted discourses for the purpose of legitimizing their own ethno–centric media practices. Far right nationalist ideas form an equivalence with concepts from the discourse of multiculturalism ("justice", "freedom", "democracy", "freedom of speech"), even though at first sight they seem incompatible. In order to explain this paradoxical situation we are using the concepts of hegemonic logic of signification and of empty signifier, elaborated by Laclau.

Our case–study is based on the extraordinarily forceful public feedback that followed after the Estonian government discussed the ratification–project of ACTA (Anti–Counterfeiting Trade Agreement). It led to numerous public demonstrations and to the formation of *Rahvakogu* (*The Panel of the People*). The topic of the freedom of information became an ambiguous core–signifier: it played an important part in the discussions of parliament but also in the self–descriptions of Estonian radical nationalists.

AN ECOSEMIOTIC LOOK AT THE MEANING OF CULTURAL AUTOCOMMUNICATION

RIIN MAGNUS
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | riin.magnus@ut.ee

Environmental historical narratives sometimes envisage human degradative effects on environment as a result of the ever–growing encapsulation of societies, accompanied by the acquired inability to read the signs stemming from systems beyond merely cultural ones (e.g. McKibben 2006). In other words, the growth of autocommunication within a culture simultaneously suppresses human attention towards other sign systems that exist on par with cultural ones.

Point 1.0.0. in the *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* states that "No sign system possesses a mechanism that would guarantee its functioning in isolation". Although the statement bears on inter- and intracultural processes, the same principle can be used to explain the interdependence and mutual conditioning of natural and cultural sign systems. As the environmental historical ac-

counts demonstrate, the exchange of signs between those systems and the ability to recognise and respond to the cues and signs stemming from the other system appears to be essential for the persistence of both of them.

Departing from the abovementioned principle of the functioning of cultures as well as certain other propositions of the *Theses,* this paper aims at asking if the same principles could be used if cultures are taken as embedded in ecosystems. Could the *Theses* help to supplement the largely dystopic environmentalist narratives of human autocommunication? What kind of supplements could be suggested to the *Theses* themselves if the semiosphere's borders are seen as overlapping with those of the biosphere?

REFERENCES

McKibben, Bill 2006. *The end of nature.* NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Uspenskij, B. A.; Ivanov, V. V.; Toporov, V. N.; Pjatigorskij, A. M.; Lotman, J. M. 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Eng, Jan van der; Grygar, Mojmir (eds.), *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1–28.

BIOSEMIOTIC CRITICISM: ZOOSEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL MODELLING

TIMO MARAN
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | timo.maran@ut.ee

The presentation brings the modelling systems theory of the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School closer to the contemporary biosemiotics and applies the synthesis to the analysis of nature writing. The development of biosemiotics in recent decades opens up a perspective of biosemiotic criticism, that is, studying literature with an understanding that besides human culture also ecological and environmental relations of other species as well as their inner organization have semiotic nature. From this perspective, every piece of nature writing can be considered as a model of human relationship with nature, both in its present state and as it is anticipated in the future. In a literary work as well as in the human perception of environment three levels of modelling are distinguished: zoosemiotic modelling, linguistic modelling and artistic modelling. In this presentation special attention is paid to

zoosemiotic modelling and for this the works of Thomas A. Sebeok, Michael Polanyi, James J. Gibson and others will be discussed. It appears that different modelling levels in a text do not exclude each other but can instead be complementary. This also means that there is no need to oppose literature's ability to represent nature to the complexity of its poetical structure. Instead, it might be beneficial to take into account the semiotic potential of both the text and the environment.

BIOSPHERE AS A SEMIOSPHERE

ANTON MARKOŠ
CHARLES UNIVERSITY PRAGUE | anton.markos@natur.cuni.cz

"In the center there is situated a certain normal 'we', to which other peoples are opposed as a paradigmatic set of anomalies", do we read in the 1973 *Theses* (Uspenskij *et al* 1973; part 1.2.4.). To what extent could this statement be broadened from "peoples" and their cultures to the whole realm of the living: is it allowed to replace "peoples" by concepts such as "species", "lineage", "community", "ecosystem", even "biosphere"? Do such formations exist in the world, or do they merely represent our abstractions? If they do exist, are they entitled to say "we"?

We have discussed the species – culture analogy previously (Markoš *et al* 2009), and have also drawn an analogy between the Lotmanian concept of *semiosphere* (Lotman 1996), and the biological concept of *biosphere*. Here I attempt to put both concepts (i.e. culture and semiosphere) into a nested hierarchy that contains the dialectics of the

cultural and the extracultural (as in Part 2.0.0. of *Theses*). Semiosphere/biosphere is an interplay (based in history, experience, tradition, etc.) between the cultures and non–cultures; the latter, however, constituted mostly by *other cultures.* I shall focus the attention on the *interface* between both realms, where meanings and understanding dwell, enabling in this way a fecund interplay between the realms. Case studies will be presented from contemporary biology.

REFERENCES

Uspenskij B. A., Ivanov V. V., Toporov V. N., Pjatigorskij A. M., Lotman Ju. M. 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Eng, Jan van der and Grygar, Mojmir (eds.), *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1–28.

Lotman, Juri M 1996. *Vnutri myslyashchich mirov.* Moskva: Yazyki russkoy kuľtury.

Markoš, Anton; Grygar, Filip; Hajnal, László; Kleisner, Karel; Kratochvíl, Zdeněk; Neubauer, Zdeněk 2009. Life as its own designer: Darwin's Origin and Western Thought. Springer.

THE SEMIOSPHERE OF SELF BRANDING AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF SELF–OBJECTIFICATION UPON PERSONAL WELLBEING: EXPLORATIONS IN HOW SEMIOTIC PARADIGMS SUPPORT THE STUDY OF CULTURE

SOPHIA M. MELANSON
NSCAD UNIVERSITY | sophia.melanson@utoronto.ca

Presently, at the onset of the twenty–first century, nuances of corporate culture have come to define personal success according to appearance–based knowledge and aptitude for self–branding. Social capital is, thus, contingent upon one's ability to grasp a lexicon of promotion and a grammar of commodification in order to communicates one's worth in relation to others. Such arrangements compels one to question: what are the cognitive implications of such reasoning upon one's sense of self and how does this impact interpersonal relationships in everyday life?

The sensibilities of corporate culture are presently transmitted to the public through mediating marketing mechanisms, which have come to promote collectively endorsed social constructs of self–branding and self–commodification (Lair, Sullivan and Cheney 2005). Traditionally, social knowledge was transmitted through

folkways that maintained the significance of particular values and norms between and among social agents within their respective communities. The collaborative and participatory quality of folkways contributed to the spontaneous and organic evolution of unique personalities and identities among a given community. Presently, the functional integrity of spontaneous folkways has ruptured under the pressure of marketing mechanisms that have come to prescribe the norms and values of corporate culture through television, film, radio, the Internet and other popular digital mediums. The arbitrariness of the norms and values promoted by corporate culture has resulted in ever–shifting sign systems that compete for precedence in daily life, displacing common sensibilities that had once held the fibres of communities and individual identities together. Liberal theorist Anthony Giddens attributes these displacing shifts to reflexive modernization, the impact of inconsistent and perpetually fluctuating knowledge upon the world as it unhinges itself from its traditions (Cherrier 2005: 601). At the same time, dominant mediating technologies have capitalized on the traditional relevance of folkways by projecting simulations of interpersonal transactions as though they were intuitively self–generated, independent of the mechanized digital mediums responsible for transmitting representations in the first place. The delineation of mediums as conduits for corporate culture are, thus, rendered illusory while projecting a stream of standardized social syntax that informs the quality of life and identity formation, overhauling the spontaneity of self–development. Studies performed within the discipline of social psychology are

revealing the harmful consequences of self–objectification upon mental health and general well–being, which have been found to predict unipolar depression, anxiety, lowered self–esteem and sense of self–worth, as well as eating disorders (Barbara L. Frederickson & Tomi–Ann Roberts; Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, and Twenge, 1998; Noll and Fredrickson, 1998; Roberts and Gettman, 2004; Tiggemann and Lynch, 2001). Deploying concepts from *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Culture* and Lotman's conception of the semiosphere, this paper proposes to closely examine how communicative nature of marketing mechanisms translate the norms and values of corporate culture into social constructs that promote self–commodifying cognitive activity, and the possibility that the present culture of self–branding might reside at the root of common mental health issues that are most prominent in Western culture. My central arguments posits that the culture of self–branding is central to cognitive activity that promotes self–objectification, which is deleterious to consequences for one's quality of life.

REFERENCES

Cherrier, Helène 2005. Becoming Sensitive to Ethical Consumption Behavior: Narratives of Survival in an Uncertain and Unpredictable World. *Advances in Consumer Research*. Vol 32: 600–604.

Frederickson, Barbara L.; Roberts, Tomi–Ann 1997. Objectification Theory: Toward Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol. 21: 173–206.

—1997. Objectification theory: Toward understanding

women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21: 173–206.
Lair, Daniel J.; Sullivan, Katie and Cheney, George 2005. Marketing and the Recasting of the Professional Self: The Rhetoric and Ethics of Personal Branding. *Management Communication Quarterly*. Vol. 18, No. 3: 307–343.
Lotman, Juri M. 1984. O semiosfere. *Sign Systems Studies* (*Trudy po znakovym sistemam*) vol. 17: 5–23.
Noll, S. M. and Fredrickson, B. L. 1998. A mediational model linking self–objectification, body shame, and disordered eating. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 22: 623–636.
Roberts, T. A. and Gettman, J. Y. 2004. Mere exposure: Gender differences in the negative effects of priming a state of self–objectification. *Sex Roles* 51: 17–27.

Tiggemann, M. And Lynch, J. 2001. Body image across the life span in adult women: The role of self–objectification. *Developmental Psychology* 37: 243–253.
Uspenskij, B. A., V. V. Ivanov, V. N. Toporov, A. M. Pjatigorskij, Ju. M. Lotman 1998 [1973]. Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (As Applied to Slavic Texts). In: Ülle Pärli (Ed.) *Theses on the semiotic study of cultures*. (Salupere, Silvi, trans.). Tartu: University of Tartu, 33–60.

CHARITY SYMBOLS AS (EMPTY) SIGNIFIERS: COMMUNICATION AND AUTOCOMMUNICATION IN EARLIER AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL CAMPAIGNS IN SWEDEN

TIINA PITKAJÄRVI
UPPSALA UNIVERSITY | tiina.pitkajarvi@nordiska.uu.se

Autocommunication can be understood as a way of theorizing how we tell stories to ourselves (Schonle 2006) and has also been compared to what in cultural studies is defined as hybridization, or "the process by which individuals or communities appropriate external cultural products by investing them with their own functions and meanings" (Schonle, 2006: 25). Personal and political badges, ribbons and brooches contain valuable information: the use of so called *awareness ribbons* is one example of where storytelling from "I to I" takes place, and poses important questions about the possibilities for manifesting collective and social messages in relation to individual expressions of compassion and engagement in contemporary society.

In Sweden, fundraising campaigns for specific social and welfare issues is based on a long tradition, and these

are sometimes seen as a complement to the welfare state (Schenk, 2012). Some social campaigns are traditionally manifested in objects, like the standard matchbox with the logotype of *Solstickan* – originally a fund for social causes – but also through object–accessories, like the *Majblomman* (the Mayflower) brooch. Campaigns that were implemented during the 90's are the ribbon campaigns, like the US–originated Red and Pink Ribbons (*Röda Bandet* and *Rosa Bandet*). In my paper I explore how the communication of social awareness becomes autocommunicational, while sketching out some important differences between the earlier campaigns (*Majblomman* has existed since 1907 and *Solstickan* since 1936) and contemporary international movements implemented in Sweden.

In her research regarding awareness ribbons in the UK, Moore (2008) makes evident that ribbons wore for expressing awareness and engagement in social causes can be conceptualized also in terms of identity construction. From a sociological stance Moore demonstrates that *showing* awareness can be a more common reason for wearing an awareness ribbon, than *spreading* awareness, and that wearing a ribbon involves both the dimensions of showing awareness to others as well as (creating) self–awareness.

Broms & Gahmberg point out that texts read in an autocommunicational way act "like mantras, they enhance" (1983: 482). Following and elaborating on the notion of autocommunicational reading as *enhancing* a text, the same can be expressed in oppositional terms as a *weakened* signifier–signified relation: treating autocommunication

as a process where a subject internalizes an extrinsic discourse, according to Lotman "the process of recoding weakens, if not entirely suspends, the referential force of language" (Schonle, 2006: 27). A signifier not pointing to any fixed or specific signified is often labelled an 'empty signifier', and can be used to grasp how a signifier creates effects without having meaning (Šumič, 2012). In my paper I explore as well the conceptualizations of these signifier–signified relations by using empirical examples from earlier and contemporary social campaigns in the Swedish context. I will especially dwell on *Rosa Bandet,* as a commodified and mainstream phenomenon built around a certain (empty) rhetoric in organizational texts, mass media and corporate advertisements, and view this against the backdrop of possibilities for using charity symbols and charity language as a means of autocommunication and empowerment, and as a way of intervening in semiotic systems.

OPERATIONAL LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY FORMATION IN SWEDISH SOCIAL CAMPAIGNS IN PAST AND PRESENT: FROM MAJBLOMMAN TO PINK COMMODIFICATION

TIINA PITKÄJÄRVI
UPPSALA UNIVERSITY | tiina.pitkajarvi@nordiska.uu.se

Fundraising campaigns for specific social and welfare issues are based on a long tradition in Sweden and the campaigns are sometimes regarded as a complement to the welfare state (Schenk 2012). In this paper I approach one newer fundraising campaign – the Pink Ribbon, in the Swedish context, Rosa Bandet – mainly semantically and partly by contrasting the campaign to two social campaigns with longer national histories, Majblomman[5] (the Mayflower) and Solstickan[6].

5 The Mayflower Charity Foundation is Sweden's largest children's aid organization and has the aim "to improve the situation for children in Sweden and to fight child poverty": www.majblomman.se/in-english/

6 The Solstickan matchbox has existed since 1936 and is presented verbally as being sold for the benefit of children and the elderly. Solstickan is the most sold match in Sweden today. "The foundation focuses primarily on assistance for disabled and chronically ill children and the elderly. This occurs through contributions to individuals, schools, associations and organizations. When the foundation was established, its objectives were to supplement direct shortcomings in community support activities. As welfare standards improved, support from Solstickan became increasingly more of a complement to social

Personal and political badges, ribbons and brooches are bearers of information and the use of so called awareness ribbons can be conceptualized as one instance where storytelling from "I to I" takes place. They also pose important questions about the possibilities for manifesting collective and social messages in relation to individual expressions of engagement in contemporary society. In this paper I am asking how the verbal advocacies for collective engagement reflect the construction of social identities (or societies) in the campaign(s). If, as I will suggest, Majblomman and Solstickan connote tradition or even nostalgia, aesthetical choices or only practical needs; they too convey a social message as contributing to a deserving cause (Solstickan) and present attitudes towards social engagement and society at large.

My main focus regarding Rosa Bandet will be the use of the concepts 'popular movement' (folkrörelse) and 'struggle' (kamp) employed in the campaign, which I will tentatively link to Barthes' thought of an operative language as something opposed to the concept of myth (Barthes 1991), where "language on the right" and "language of the left" can be separated as two different rhetorical languages. Although Barthes' language division might seem outdated when striving to understand consumer–targeted phenomena like market–oriented charity campaigns, it might also be useful for illustrating how the so–called operational language is employed strategically. Parallels to the language of New Labour

resources. For about 15 years, another goal has been to inspire and support new ideas and initiatives. Every year, a number of scholarships are granted to postgraduate students at universities and colleges."
http://www.swedishmatch.com/en/Sustainability/Social-responsibility/Societal-responsibility/The-Solstickan-Foundation/

(Fairclough 2000), or in a Swedish case, how the centre–right political party Moderaterna since a few years back call themselves the workers party of our time[7]), can be drawn. Barthes' distinction may possibly also be employed for grasping some conflicts or problems that arise when a so called operational and socially engaged language meets, intersects and blends with discourses motivated and created by commercial interests and market ideology.

REFERENCES

Barthes, Roland 1991 [1957]. Mythologies, New York: The Noonday Press – Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Fairclough, Norman 2000. New Labour, New Language? London: Routledge.

Schenk, Anett 2012. Rosa Bandet – mellan folkrörelse och identitetsmarkör, Sociologidagarna 2012, Stockholms universitet, 15-17 mars 2012

7 Translated from the Swedish Moderaterna är vår tids arbetarparti. http://www.moderat.se/politik

DISCOURSE OF SURVIVAL AS A MECHANISM OF SELF-DESCRIPTION

OTT PUUMEISTER
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | ott.puumeister@gmail.com

We are constantly told that we are threatened: Estonia is losing its nationality, its "Estonianness"; the population is becoming weaker because of growing emigration rates; our health is one of the worst in Europe; Estonian is influenced by bigger languages and losing its identity. And so are we, Estonians. The biggest problem, it seems, is our survival. In this paradigm of survival and security we can easily detect a discursive operation that Foucault called "the analytic of finitude": cultural, social, political identity is constituted through the experience of demise, degeneration, or simply put, death. This death, which gives us identity, is not an outside or external factor; it is a process immanent to life. It is said that death makes us all equal; but in this case, it turns us into individuals, into social subjects. The need to protect our language derives from the fact that the Estonian population is decreasing: it is our own activity

that is slowly eating away at our identity. I will offer a brief interpretation of this one aspect of Estonian self–description, in which the life of our social, cultural and political body is constantly related to its disappearance; in which survival does not so much depend on positive practices of life but on the protection against demise. The immanence of death to the processes of life also enables a more complex view on the dynamics of "us" and "them", "proper" and "improper": improper practices of life are inherent to *our own* (proper) culture.

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE VIEWPOINT BY WAY OF THE CONCEPTS OF BOUNDARY AND HORIZON

ÜLLE PÄRLI
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | ulle.parli@ut.ee

As is well recognized, the concept of horizon has wide application – from the mathematically calculable horizon, the cosmological horizon and the mythological boundary of the world to the metaphor of everyday language, which as such is one variation on the theme of the conceptual metaphor of seeing. The terminological usage to be surveyed herein falls to the domain of the philosophies of science, language and life, which retains the most general meaning of horizon as the visible, the appearing, that is, my own personal horizon, as it applies the concept to discuss the issues of the singular and the general, the individual and shared views of the world, perceptual experience and knowledge, the vertical and the horizontal dimension, the reification of the observable, and the reification of the situation of observing itself (e.g. cf. Husserl's numerous versions of this concept: subjective horizon, universal

horizon, empty horizon, horizon of life; the concept of the horizon in hermeneutics and receptive aesthetics, the significance of vertical horizon for Nietzsche, the pragmatist treatment of the position of the "self", Merleau–Ponty's criticism of the "bird's eye view" as compared to the experience of "touching"; but also Frege's philosophy of language that implicitly contains this concept; Popper's horizon of theory, etc.). The mobility, subjectivity, "clutter" of the horizon will be united in a comparative vein with the concept of the boundary as used by Juri Lotman in cultural semiotics as one of the more important aspects of the generation of meaning and structure, and the polemics about the position of the subject within this school.

SEMIOTICS AND SYSTEMS THEORY: AUTOCOMMUNICATION AND OPENNESS

ANTI RANDVIIR
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | anti.randviir@ut.ee

The presentation will deal with autocommunication as a defining feature for semiotic systems; autocommunication is not only a key for developing identity discourse, but helps to position systems as semiotic ones in their meaningful contexts. It is in this process of ecomapping that communication and autocommunication intersect, and we can exemplify the topic of the semiotic threshold. The latter is a notion for discerning between dissimilar types of systems as described in the systems theory in parallel with different semiotic systems characterised in semiotics by virtue of their given operational unit (signal, symbol, sign, and other alternatives). We shall treat parallels between semiotics and systems theory as possibilities for their complementary combination, trying to associate different types of systems (closed systems, open systems, open social systems) with dissimilar principles

of communication (communication and autocommunication, the so–called signal semiosis and sign semiosis). The determination of communicative peculiarities and individual differences in the feedback system of ecomapping helps in noticing the specific characteristics of a given semiotic system, and thereafter to make suggestions for its further developments.

In the Tartu–Moscow culturosemiotic ideas on autocommunication and communication we face Saussure's language at its individual and social level, connected through crystallisation, or more correctly – through crystallisation and arbitrariness. Hence: crystallisation, autocommunication and communication connect semiology through cultural semiotics with the systems theory again. The issue at hand has to do with understanding changes that occur in movement from closed systems to open social systems. A major difference between systems at each end of the axis has to do with the nature of feedback loops between the system and its environment. Closed systems (e.g. mechanical, geological, etc.) connect with their environment through such feedback loops in which referentiality lies in checking the system's reaction to certain stimuli in terms of preserving the physical existence of that system. In the case of closed systems, feedback can be analysed in terms of correctness: if a system responds to a certain stimulus in an inadequate manner, it simply would appear unsuccessful in its adaptation to the environment and would cease to exist. Obviously, the shortness of the timeline for such a reality check plays its role as well, also in logically a diverse trail – probabilities for 'correcting' response(s) to stimuli are extremely limited

for closed systems even in terms of mere physical survival. In other words – in the case of closed systems, we can only talk about communication and seeming referentiality that holds between a system and its environment. This logic concerning 'seeming referentiality' is directly connected with the quest for the semiotic threshold, and this is the moment of divergence of semiotics and systems theory at which cultural semiotics and the notion of autocommunication appears decisive for the determination of the level of openness of the given system.

VICO, UEXKÜLL, AND *THESES ON SEMIOTICS OF CULTURES*

TUULI RAUDLA
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | tuuliraudla@gmail.com

My discussion will take two principles from the 1973 *Theses* as its basis – first, the differentiation and communication between external and internal spheres of a semiotic system, and second, the principle according to which any description becomes a fact of the described sphere itself. I will illustrate these statements by outlining similar and complementary observations by Giambattista Vico and Jakob von Uexküll. Admittedly, both Vico and Uexküll focus their investigations on the individual, not culture as a whole; nevertheless, parallels can be drawn, since the Tartu–Moscow approach states that there is an isomorphism between semiotic systems on different levels. I will draw on Vico's arguments concerning the attribution of human body–based features to the environment by archaic men; and also his claim that any kind of scientific description should begin with

looking at the modifications of the human mind. Parallels will be drawn with Uexküll's conception of umwelt, with special attention paid to his description of the way meaning is attributed to external stimuli by the organism. My aim in analysing the theoretical implications of Uexküll's and Vico's work in relation to two very basic culture semiotic axioms is to put the 1973 *Theses* into a broader theoretical perspective. Explicating the congruities with past authors, I hope to take a step towards the integration of complementary theoretical standpoints to today's Tartu semiotics and thus contribute to the broadening of its theoretical basis.

IS SEMIOSIS SPATIAL? THE ROLE OF SEMIOSIS IN MODELS OF THE SOCIOCULTURAL WORLD

TIIT REMM
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | tiit.remm@ut.ee

Authors of the *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* emphasise the role of spatial descriptions and self–descriptions for semiotic studies of culture. In a wider perspective, spatial metalanguage has been a frequent tool for studying the sociocultural world. Spatial models of the sociocultural world suggest that this spatially represented world is a meaningful totality for the subject who conceives it as an environment from its inside. Spatial metalanguage connects the practical geographic space, theoretical conceptions of space and world image into a modelling sequence where spatial models can draw attention to particular semiotic aspects of the sociocultural world. This paper is based on examples drawn from the works by Juri Lotman, Pierre Bourdieu, and Pitirim Sorokin.

Models of the sociocultural world generally presume that this world is integrated, semiotic, and meaningful for

the subject. Semiotic processes in the world are supposedly numerous and various; nevertheless, the model can reduce this plurality and represent the world as dominantly characterised by one or a few kinds of semioses. Models of sociocultural space discussed here can be claimed to be targeted for representing the sociocultural world as essentially semiotic. However, the semiotic essence is projected variably. There are two main questions that assist in studying this variability – first, where is the semiotic aspect positioned in the sociocultural world and in its representation according to each model, and second, what is the specific semiotic mechanism that is underlined by each model.

Even though different ideas of *cultural space* can be found in Lotman's works, from the perspective of meaning generation they make up a dynamic and indivisible whole that involves certain cultural–semiotic relations and processes, relating these to the spatial environment and organising them conceptually in a particular "spatial" way. Similarly, also for Bourdieu, social space is both a meaningful world for the subject and a tool for mapping the meaningful reality by the acting subject as well as by the reflective subject. Even though, Sorokin hints at a similar two–sidedness of sociocultural space, it being the "closest environment for a man" and a referential principle for the integralistic social science, his main emphasis with the model of sociocultural space lies on representing the meaningful world and a double position of meanings (in *cultural mentality* and *meaningful interaction*).

It could be presumed that spatial models propose an understanding of semiotic relations that is rather static. If

a concept of space, being a modelling device, is set into a relation of analogy with its represented object field, then it could be presumed that the semiotic sociocultural relations are presented through the characteristic spatial relations in the model – for example, distance, adjacency, positions, dimensionality, inclusion–exclusion, spatial oppositions, etc. However, a closer look at examples of spatial conception reveals that the proposed significance of the world is essentially characterised by spatial dynamics and in contrast, the so–called binary oppositions (up vs. down, inside vs. outside, etc.) in their static form would instead be indifferent and insignificant from the perspective of these models – at least as long as they are not involved in dynamic realisation.

ART AS MECHANISM OR AS USTROJSTVO

SILVI SALUPERE
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | silvi.salupere@ut.ee

The presentation will provide a survey of the historical evolution of Juri Lotman's famous formulation that "art is a model of life", from its inception in the 1962 paper "The Problem of Similarity of Art and Life from the Point of View of the Structural Approach" to the 1992 paper "The Unpredictable Mechanisms of Culture", which culminates with the following: "The artistic work is a thinking structure, a generation of new information. Art is one of the hemispheres of the collective brain of mankind". The focus will be on two important concepts in Lotman's metalanguage: "mechanism" and "ustrojstvo".

MOSCOW–TARTU SEMIOTICS AND THE FALL OF IDEOLOGY

ANN SHUKMAN
ann.shkuman@virgin.net

It is fifty years since the start of the Summer Schools and over twenty years since the fall of Soviet communism. This paper considers some of the ways in which Moscow–Tartu semiotics may be said to have contributed to the end of ideology and the renewal of free intellectual life in Russia. It argues that among the great names who contributed to the end of Soviet ideology, besides those of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Fr Alexander Men, we should include that of Juri Mikhailovich Lotman. His was not the way of moral protest, historical revelation, spiritual values, – though all these things by implication came into his work, but of new thinking done honestly, with clarity and rationality: creativity founded on logic and reason, added to scrupulous scholarship, and respect for the complexity of the human individual.

This paper considers Juri Mikhailovich's study of the

Decembrists ('Dekabrist v povsednevnoi zhizni (Bytovoe povedenie ka istoriko–psikhologicheskaya kategoriya)' in *Literaturnoe nasledie dekabristov*, Leningrad, 1975) as a source in which to find clues for the understanding of groups who demarcate themselves from their political and ideological milieu. It considers the themes of language and behaviour, leisure, friendship, and historical significance.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE IDEAS OF LOTMAN DEVELOPED BY UMBERTO ECO

IRENE TALARICO
UNIVERSITY OF CALABRIA | irenetalarico3@gmail.com

This paper argues that the influence that the *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures*, developed by the semiologist J. M. Lotman, influenced the philosophy Umberto Eco and the Italian semiotics system.

The semiotic system developed by Lotman has been studied and analysed by Umberto Eco since 1975. In fact, Eco, reading the *Theses* of Lotman, was influenced especially in writing his work *Trattato di semiotica generale* (1975). The introduction of the work is titled "Verso una logica della cultura", a tribute precisely to the semiologist from Tartu. These were the years of structuralism and many scholars were influenced by the linguist from Geneva, Ferdinand de Saussure.

The system of natural language is the key to the *Theses*. Eco studies the *Theses* and incorporates aspects and themes into his project of general semiotics, such as se-

miotics being defined as 'imperialist' and the nature of the semiotics defined as the 'theory of lying'.

Over time, Eco turns to more philosophical thematics and in particular to the study and in–depth analysis of the philosophy of language. The Italian academic deepens his studies of the semiologist C. S. Peirce but "the system of culture" is always present in his path, especially in his texts on semiotics and in the method of translation developed in *Lector in Fabula* and other works.

The *Study of Cultures* were always present in the Italian semiotics, both directly and indirectly, both implicitly and explicitly, and the *Cultural Studies* were in a certain way baptized by the Italian semiologist. What this paper wants to demonstrate is the influence that the *Study of Cultures* provided for Italian semiotics and its relationship with Umberto Eco.

The *Theses* and the thought of Tartu semiotics have been long appreciated by Italian and European scholars; and over the course of forty years this cultural system has developed further. The thought and ideas of the 'genius of Tartu' have spread around the world and today many are the theories and studies that bear the name of University of Tartu.

JURI LOTMAN AND THE CULTURAL MEMORY STUDIES

MAREK TAMM
TALLINN UNIVERSITY | marek.tamm@tlu.ee

The intellectual heritage of the Tartu–Moscow School contains still a number of important ideas that have not yet received the attention they deserve in contemporary cultural theory. One of these ideas concern the conceptualisation of culture as a nonhereditary collective memory. *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* (1973) give us a convenient starting point: "If we regard the collective as a more complexly organized individual, culture may be understood by analogy with the individual mechanism of memory as a certain collective mechanism for the storage and processing of information. The semiotic structure of culture and the semiotic structure of memory are functionally uniform phenomena situated on different levels." Some years later, Juri Lotman explains in his article "Memory from Culturological Perspective" (1985) that memory is not for the culture a passive depository, but

part of its mechanism of textual creation. Cultural memory is *panchronic* and defies the division of time into past, present, and future; because memory plays an active role in creation of new texts, "the past" in culture has not really passed, but it is "always there."

As it is well known, collective memory studies are rooted in sociology, particularly the works of Maurice Halbwachs, the (re)discovery, (re)publication and (re) reading of which became the main source of inspiration and legitimation for the new discipline in the 1980s and 1990s. Yet regardless of the continuing presence of the social dimension, it seems that over the last decade, memory studies have been dominated by a "cultural turn", with the more innovative and attractive ideas originating from cultural theorists and cultural historians. In this new scholarly context, Juri Lotman and his Russian colleagues are definitely the authors whose work abounds with yet undiscovered openings for furthering contemporary memory studies. I hope to offer in my paper a few clues how to integrate Lotman's ideas into the blooming field of cultural memory research.

REFLECTING THE VERBAL FRAMEWORK OF THE SELF–THEMATIZATION OF A THEORY: THE CASE OF THE *THESES ON THE SEMIOTIC STUDY OF CULTURE*

DAINA TETERS
LATVIAN ACADEMY OF CULTURE | teters@metamind.lv

As it is well known, after its appearance, each new theoretical paradigm offers an organizing framework of concepts and procedures, which for a time provides model examples and available procedures for researchers in this field. That was the case of Cultural Semiotics, too. It has been less frequently noted, though, that each new theoretical paradigm also starts its own biography – always a unique self–thematization, different from the others.

I would like to devote my paper not primarily to the "disciplinary matrix" of Cultural Semiotics, but rather to the way in which the origins and development of a theory are reflected and described. By using this approach, one might succeed at mapping the potential barriers in the newly formed paradigmatic space, at modelling its reconceptualization and cutting new paths, as far as possible avoiding epistemological relativism.

In the case of "Theses", moreover, if we remember their positioning (see the meaning of the notion "these") relevant to nature, standing for that which nature is not – for culture, then the physicalization of their origin (materialisation of their beginning) not only causes a special thickening of energy, which is characteristic of all beginnings, but also makes this act both to be interpreted in cognitively–theatrical metaphors (such as: "first appearance", "the theoretical boundaries of cultural limitation", "methodological start up") and is anthropologized (such as "birth", "gave birth", "over it together with its influences across times to today" (where we stay and reflect)). Since the mentioned paradigm from 'zero ground' has started a new life of its own, it can influence, i.e. talk to the co–creatures of its generation – the seemingly stably consistent neighbouring paradigms. (But what to do if...What if those paradigms are "incommensurable"? In this case it makes the communication between them impossible).

The purpose of my paper is to show that with *Theses*, a new theoretical space of observation has emerged, or to put it more precisely, has been created, which enables us to organize the creative biography of Cultural Semiotics in an increasingly homogenous way, as well as to thematize things that are classic/ancient or new/ modern within it and to trace the topological properties manifested by the videological terms of this space.

THE FUTURES OF CULTURAL SEMIOTICS

PEETER TOROP
UNIVERSITY OF TARTU | peeter.torop@ut.ee

The publication of the *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures* in 1973 by the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School enacted the possibility of disciplinary identity for the semiotics of culture. Now, 40 years later, it is very difficult to synthesize the development of the field of cultural semiotics due to the simultaneous existence of complementary conceptions of disciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and transdisciplinarity of cultural semiotics. In such a case it is important to describe aspects of past self-reflections in semiotics in general and in semiotics of culture in particular. Future perspectives, future as a category, and analysis of future – all these questions are important for understanding the status and nature of cultural semiotics today.
1 The future of semiotics. In the 1960–1970s semiotics of culture was a new discipline and had different perspectives: a) semiotics as a future of structural poetics, b) se-

miotics as a scientific project of structuralism (cf. post-structuralism as nonscientific project), c) semiotics as the basis for artistics – a future discipline for studying artistic constructions, d) semiotics as the basis for artonics – cybernetics of artistic text, e) semiotics as an innovative source (future as actualization of the past) and a tool for understanding the past, e) semiotics as a methodology of the humanities (integrative culture studies, reflexivity, thick description, etc.), f) semiotics as a deeper understanding of human language and generation of metalanguages of culture.

2 The future in semiotics. Grammatical, cultural and historical systems of time form the basis for a temporal and dynamic understanding of culture: a) past–present–future and cultural (auto)communication, b) temporal aspects of semiotics of culture, from the binarity of synchrony and diachrony (and criticism of F. de Saussure) to semiosphere as a tool for understanding the past (Ivanov), c) text, cultural memory, and dynamics of culture, d) text and audience, the role of the reader, e) semiotics of dialogue.

3 Semiotics of the future. Specificity of the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School as an orientation towards studying cultural and historical complexity and unpredictability: a) predictability and unpredictability in culture, culture and explosion, art as explosion, b) the possible paths of history and the problem of generating flexible systems of metalanguages, c) synthesis of artistic and scientific knowledge, heterogeneity and diversity of (meta)languages of culture, d) diagnosis of the cultural situation from a perspective based on the nature and quality of existing metalanguages and languages of culture.

TRANSLATION IS DIALOGUE: MAKING THE THOUGHT PROCESS

ARLENE TUCKER
HELSINKI ART MUSEUM | arlenehtucker@yahoo.com

Translation is dialogue and it allows transcendence of oneself to another. Regardless of the situation happening organically or consciously it is bound to the subjective state of the translator, yet it is through such discourse where truth or realization is found. In order to understand the boundaries of text whilst creating a text within a text an art teacher can better explain the process of interpretation, multi–medial and installation art through practice and group activities. This paper uses the framework of the ongoing art installation, Translation is Dialogue (TID, see below), made by the author, Arlene Tucker, to create a classroom curriculum for students to understand semiotically what happens in the communication and creative process from translation studies and biosemiotics perspective. TID will facilitate the introduction of the theories of translation. Tucker will offer a series of dynamic exercises; movement, verbal, visual,

performative, linguistic and semiotic, to help understand the process of interpretation. The aim of the workshop is to create collaborative artistic outputs. Examples of previous TID artistic contributions/interpretations will be used to support the theories and activities.

There are several different ways one can teach the concepts of translation and biosemiotics through interactive art activities. For example, if one were to better understand the comparable transfer operations Hendrik von Gorp offers, the students could physically, literally or artistically represent the translation by either expanding upon or reducing the adaptation. These elements could be shown through acting or even the literal reduction of lines on a painting, for example. Applying von Uexküll's, Jakobson's and Lotman's theories on translation and art builds a platform for better problem solving for creative issues. The artists are translators who create their own boundaries of artistic expression, language, culture, and society. "An idea in art is always a model, for it reconstructs an image of reality (Lotman 1977: 12)." With that said, art is in a constant state of evolution traveling from one semiosphere of reality to another, perhaps in unreality.

This project takes the notion of translating, communicating through language and transferring ideas intentionally and unintentionally. Juri Lotman's thoughts on the artistic text and Roman Jakobson's intersemiotic translation, or transmutation, define how motivated artistic expression can be made. Jakobson defines intersemiotic translation as "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of the signs of a non –verbal system (Jakobson 1984: 68–9)." Jakob von Uexküll's umwelt theory plays an

important aspect when developing interactive installations due to perspectives on artist and audience. In this case, awareness of the author and audience is an activity in itself that can also seguay into Jakobson's dominant theory. The installations follow the form of these translations produced in a range of mediums such as video, colored pencils and sculpture. From thought to matter the continuity of mind is forever transforming as the viewers reinterpret their surroundings. These are proposed activities that allow one to analyze what is translation, conceptually and physically, and its process of how it evolves and filters information in a shared environment.

The concept of identity, culture, and language are increasingly getting more complicated as our world is gaining more international interaction. Integration and sharing of these elements is a beautiful thing and the meaning is progressively evolving with the change. By creating a school curriculum that understands awareness of the transformation process more compassion for different cultures can be made. TID, at large, is a project that continually aspires to encourage thought and action through immediate interaction. The proposed paper *Translation is Dialogue: Making the Thought Process* takes that concept and extends it to include and explore the analysis and documentation of creative theory, process and production in the act of making art; as its main goal is to build a platform for within the community at schools across the world can create.

ABOUT THE PROJECT *TRANSLATION IS DIALOGUE*

The interactive art project, Translation is Dialogue (TID)

is based on the continuity the nature of translation offers. Tucker picked a song and gave it to Alejandra Pineda, a dancer and semiotician. Pineda then choreographed a dance performance on the basis of this song. Space, dancers, materials and anything that is needed to make this performance as she wishes is available because it was constructed in her imagination. Recordings of Pineda describing her envisioned dance were sent to artists from Estonia, Columbia and the USA, to name a few. The artists' participation in the next stage of translation is to create something on the basis of Alejandra's description. Now, not only is there the translation of the musician's intent to sound, sound to recording, recording to ears, Pineda's ears to thoughts, thoughts to voice, voice to MP3, these selected artists have created an extension of melody, meaning, and purpose from their interpretation.

TID is an art exhibition that generates a new project every time it is presented. This is due to the fact that every showing, the participation of new people, the medium they choose to express themselves with, the context of their creation, and how art inspires them changes. TID was first presented in Reykjavik, Iceland, in 2010 and has been installed in Tartu, Estonia, Helsinki, Finland and New York City, USA. Contributing artists have come from the Americas, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, as well as Eastern, Central and Western Europe, and Scandinavia. Each show centers around the inspiration drawn from a verbal description of a dance performance, which the artists or participants then reinterpret and create for the installation. To date TID has enabled over 100 art pieces to be realized and shared in a multitude of mediums

ranging from visual, video, and textiles, to sculptural, sound and performance arts. This project focuses not only on the art that is produced but the theoretic and productive process of creating.

TID has continually evolved. TID originated as an academic paper and presentation at the Art in Translation conference in Iceland. It has expanded to exhibitions and performances, as well as formal and informal educational workshops and in correlation with the installations and artworks and artists involved. Each step of the TID series strives to challenge existing accessibility, dialogue, and participation in multidisciplinary art and the multiple languages in which we ingest and conceive; translate and share them. So far there have been already five phases/ installations/workshops of the TID project spanning across four different countries.

REFERENCES

Jakobson, Roman 1984. On the linguistic aspects of translation. *Essays on General Linguistics*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Lotman, Juri 1977. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.

THE POLYGLOT SELF IN THE SEMIOTIC SPHERES OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

ELZBIETA MAGDALENA WASIK
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY IN POZNAN | wasik@wa.amu.edu.pl

The point of departure in this paper is the notion of a "humanistic turn" of 1960s having marked the post–structuralist area, which is considered in opposition to the "linguistic turn" of the first half of the 20th century, where the attention of researchers was shifted from language as a tool of communication to the linguistic properties of speaking and/or hearing individuals as members of speech communities and widely understood communicative collectivities. Accordingly, the focus of this paper is on the study of human individuals as signifying and communicating selves whose properties can be detected or assumed on the basis of the textual products and text–processing activities. Exposed is the distinction between the observable self, engaged as a person in the process of sending and receiving linguistic signs, and the inferable self–occupied as a mental subject with sign–production

and sign–comprehension activities. As the object of both hard sciences (physics, chemistry, and biology) and soft sciences (psychology, sociology, logic, and philosophy), the linguistic and/or semiotic properties of signifying and communicating selves will be respectively found either in the physical domain of investigation or the logical domain of implication. For this reason, it will be emphasized that in the everyday reality of humans constructed as resultant from the typical contents of social communication, speakers and hearers of a given language generally form two types of collectivities; on the one hand, there are interpersonal communities of those individuals who send and receive sensible bearers of linguistic meaning and, on the other, intersubjective communities of those who process and interpret the intelligible meaning bearers as referring to an extra–linguistic reality. According to the tenets of human–centered cognitive linguistics, concrete texts have been thus treated as extensions of mental abilities of signifying and communicating individuals. The subject–matter of empirical studies conducted by the author of this paper constitutes a typology of various selves deduced from a number of excerpted texts characterizing their social roles and pragmatic goals as participants of communication in various domains of human life–world. In consequence, her presentation will expose polyglotism as one of the heteronomous dependences of the self. With regard to its etymological meaning, the term *polyglot* (derived from the Greek *polyglottos* meaning 'many–tongued', where poly– is a Greek combining form – a stem of *polys* with the meaning of 'much' or 'many' and the Greek (Attic) *glottos* with the meaning of 'tongued' – an adnominal adjective

of *glôtta* 'tongue') is referred to a human individual who speaks, writes, or reads several languages. The heteronomy vs. autonomy distinction, in turn, has been taken from linguistics and culturology concerning the status of language and culture in relation to the disciplinary division of investigative labor. In view of that, language and culture as system of texts are to be seen as possessing a relative autonomy from the members of a society who use them or who function within them. That means, firstly, that the users of linguistic and/or cultural texts cannot change their features individually and, secondly, that the existence of a given language or a given culture, as "living" systems, depends on their users functioning in the role of perceptible senders and receivers and presumable authors and addressees. What is relevant here is also the division between a "modular" view of language embedded into the semiotic spheres of culture or a "holistic" view of culture including language among the other sign systems of human semiotics. With the idea of polyglotism applied to culture as a whole in mind, the communicating individual will be considered at this point as a "cultural polyglot" who is able to cope with texts coming from different cultures, who knows how to communicate in and understand "multiplicity of cultural languages'. Hence, he might be investigated as possessing the so–called intercultural competence and/or as becoming a member of different communities who belong to different cultures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davies, Bronwyn, and Rom Harré. 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of*

Social Behaviour, 20 (1): 44–63.
Favareau, Donald 2002. Beyond self and other: On the neurosemiotic emergence of intersubjectivity. *Sign Systems Studies* 30 (1): 57–100.
Gallagher, Shaun (ed.). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of the Self*. New York: Oxford University Press (Oxford Handbooks in Philosophy).
Hermans, Hubert 2001. The dialogical self: Toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology* 7: 243–281.
Hermans, Hubert, Agnieszka Hermans–Konopka 2010. *Dialogical Self Theory. Positioning and Counter–Positioning in a Globalizing Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
James, William 1890. *The Principles of Psychology*. Vol. I, II. New York: H. Holt.
—2001 [1892]. *Psychology. The Briefer Course*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
Kull, Kalevi 1998. On semiosis, Umwelt, and Semiosphere. *Semiotica* 120 (3/4): 299–310.
—1998. Semiotic ecology: Different natures in the semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies* 26: 344–371.
—1999. Towards biosemiotics with Juri Lotman. *Semiotica* 127 (1/4): 115–131.
—2005. Semiosphere and a dual ecology: Paradoxes of communication. *Sign Systems Studies* 33 (1): 175–189.
—2010. Ecosystems are made of semiosic bonds: Consortia, umwelten, biophony and ecological codes. *Biosemiotics* 3 (3): 347–357.
—2011. Juri Lotman in English: Bibliography. *Sign Systems Studies* 39 (2/4): 346–356.

Kull, Kalevi, Silvi Salupere, Peeter Torop, Mihhail Lotman 2011. The institution of semiotics in Estonia. *Sign Systems Studies* 39 (2/4): 314–342.
Leaf, Murray, J. 1979. *Man, Mind, and Science*. New York: Columbia University Press.
—1989. Singer, Kant and the semiotic self. In: Benjamin Lee, Greg Urban (eds.) 1989. *Semiotics, Self, and Society*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter (Approaches to Semiotics 84): 171–172.
Lotman, Jurij Mihailovič, Boris Andreevič Uspenskij, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov, Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov, and Aleksandr Moiseevič Pjatigorskij 1975. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Sebeok Thomas Albert (ed.) 1975. *The Tell–Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*. Lisse (Netherlands): Peter de Ridder, 57–84.
Lotman, Juri M. [Jurij Mihailovič] 1974. The sign mechanism of culture. *Semiotica* 12 (4): 301–305.
—1988 [1981]. The semiotics of culture and the concept of a text. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* 26 (3), 52–58 [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1981. Семиотика культуры и понятие текста. *Труды по знаковым системам* 12 (Тарту): 3–7].
—1994 [1981]. The text within the text. *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 109 (3), 377–384 [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1981. Текст в тексте. *Труды по знаковым системам* 14 (Тарту): 3–19.
—2005 [1984]: On the semiosphere. Trans. Wilma Clark. *Sign Systems Studies*, 33 (1), 205–229. [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1984. О семиосфере. *Труды по знаковым системам* 17 (Тарту): 5–23].

Maran, Timo 2007. Towards an integrated methodology of ecosemiotics: The concept of nature–text. *Sign Systems Studies* 35 (1/2): 269–274.
—2010. An ecosemiotic approach to nature writing. *PAN: Philosophy, Activism, Nature* 7: 79 – 87.
—2010. Why was Thomas A. Sebeok not a cognitive ethologist? From "animal mind" to "semiotic self". *Biosemiotics* 3 (3): 315–329.
Pickering, John 1999 [1999]. The self is a semiotic process, In: Shaun Gallagher, Jonathan Shear (eds.) 1999. Models of the Self. Exeter: Imprint Academic, 63–130 [*Journal of Consciousness Studies* 6 (4): 31–47].
Pobojewska, Aldona (Teresa) 1996. Biologia i poznanie. Biologiczne "a priori" człowieka a realizm teoriopoznawczy [Biology and cognition: Biological "a priori" of man and the theoretical–cognitive realism]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
Sebeok, Thomas A. 1991 [1977]. The semiotic self. In: Thomas A. Sebeok 1991. *A Sign is Just a Sign*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press (Advances in Semiotics), 36–40.
—2001 [1998]. The cognitive self and the virtual self. In: Thomas A. Sebeok 2001 *Global Semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 128–134.
—1991 [1989]. The semiotic self revisited. In: Thomas A. Sebeok. *A Sign is Just a Sign*. Bloomington, Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 41–48.
Sebeok, Thomas A., Jean Umiker–Sebeok (eds.) 1986. *The Semiotic Sphere*. New York: Plenum Press.
Singer, Milton 1984. *Man's Glassy Essence: Explorations in Semiotic Anthropology*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana

University Press.
—1989. Pronouns, persons and the semiotic self. In: Benjamin Lee, Greg Urban (eds.) 1989. *Semiotics, Self, and Society*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter (Approaches to Semiotics 84): 229–296.
Tarasti, Eero 2000. *Existential Semiotics*. Bloomington, Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
—2007. What is semiotics? ISI, International Semiotics Institute at Imatra. Semiotiikan verkostoyliopisto – Finnish Network University of Semiotics [June 2, 2007] In: www.semiotics.fi/en/content/01_semiotiikka/01_index?C:D=158041&C:selres=158041
—2009. What is existential semiotics? From theory to application, In: Eero Tarasti (ed.). 2009. *Communication: Understanding / Misunderstanding. Proceedings of the 9th Congress of the IASS/AIS–Helsinki–Imatra: 11–17 June, 2007*. Imatra: International Semiotics Institute at Imatra and Helsinki: Semiotic Society of Finland (Acta Semiotica Fennica XXXIV), 1755–1772.
—2011. Existential semiotics and cultural psychology. In: Jaan Valsiner (ed.) 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Culture and Psychology*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press (Oxford Library of Psychology), Part. III, 15, 316–343.
—2012. *Semiotics of Classical Music*: *How Mozart, Brahms and Wagner Talk to Us*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (Semiotics, Communication and Cognition).
Torop, Peeter 1999. Cultural semiotics and culture. *Sign Systems Studies* 27, 9–23.
—2004. Locations in intersemiotic space. *KOHT ja PAIK / PLACE and LOCATION. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics IV*. Editor: Virve Sarapik.

Tallinn: The Research Group of Cultural and Literary Theory (Estonian Literary Museum). Institute of Art History (Estonian Academy of Arts). Estonian Semiotics Association, 59–68.

—2005. Semiosphere and/as the research object of semiotics of culture. *Sign Systems Studies* 33 (1): 159–173.

Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov, Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov, Aleksandr Moiseevič Pjatigorskij, Jurij Mihailovič Lotman. 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Jan van der Eng and Grygar, Mojmir (eds.). 1973. *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1–28.

Успенский, Борис Андреевич, Вячеслав Всеволодович Иванов, Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Александр Моисеевич Пятигорский, Юрий Михайлович Лотман. 1973. Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур (в применении к славянским текстам). In: Maria Renata Mayenowa (ed.) 1973. *Semiotyka i struktura tekstu: Studia poświęcone VII Międzynarodowemu Kongresowi Slawistów*. Warszawa 1973, Wrocław et al.: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich (Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Instytut Badań Literackich): 9–32.

Waldstein, Maxim 2008. *The Soviet Empire of Signs: A History of the Tartu School of Semiotics*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Wąsik, Elżbieta Magdalena 2007. *Język – narzędzie czy właściwość człowieka? Założenia gramatyki ekologicznej lingwistycznych związków międzyludzkich* [Language – a tool or property of man?: Towards an idea of ecological grammar of human linkages]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo

Naukowe im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu (Seria Filologia Angielska 28).
—2010. *Coping with an Idea of Ecological Grammar*. Peter Lang. Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften: Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien (Philologica Wratislaviensia: From Grammar to Discourse 2).
Wiley, Norbert 1994. *The Semiotic Self*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

A SOLIPSISTIC PARADIGM OF NEOSEMIOTICS: BRIDGING THE HERITAGE OF TARTU SCHOOL WITH "THE RICHES IN THE OLD AND MODERN WORLD"

ZDZISŁAW WASIK
PHILOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN WROCŁAW
zdzis.wasik@gmail.com

The idea of "neosemiotics", meant as a unified science of the 21st century, in which the role of the "signifying subject" is emphasized as an individual citizen and member of various national and regional communities and groups who are aware of their identities in everyday life, was launched by Eero Tarasti in 2007, the author of *Existential Semiotics* (2001). However, one has to bear in mind that semiotics has many schools of scientific thought, and it has gone through many subsequent and parallel developmental phases, breaks and continuations in their epistemological foundations. What is more, the so called "turn to subject" does in reality mean the "turn to man" if one considers that human individuals appear in two existence modes as real persons with sensible qualities and rational subjects with intelligible qualities (while confronting the existential phenomenology of Martin Heidegger, the author of *Being*

and Time [*Sein und Zeit*, 1927], with its understanding by Jean–Paul Sartre, the author of *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology* [*L'Être et le néant : Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*, 1943], and Maurice Merlau Ponty, the author of *Phenomenology of Perception* [*Phénoménologie de la perception*, 1944].

The principal target of the investigative interest in this paper will be the appreciation of *Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School* inaugurated in 1964 and led by Juri Lotman, which has been replaced by *Tartu Semiotics School*, on the basis of the Department of Semiotics of the University of Tartu, led by Kalevi Kull since 1990s. What is mostly relevant is that this internationally recognized School after the publication (and translation into several languages) of famous *Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts)* [*Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур (в применении к славянским текстам*, 1973] was brought into life as a third institutional body subsequent to the Department of Logical Semiotics in the Institute of Philosophy at the University of Warsaw, 1951, founded by Jerzy Pelc and the Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies at the Indiana University founded by Thomas Albert Sebeok in 1956. Considering the coexistence of conceptual and methodological frameworks in the research activity and educational program of the present Tartu School, it will of crucial importance to evaluate them from two (metaphorically defined) perspectives, namely, "the riches in the old world of semiotic thought" and "the riches in the new world of institutionalized semiotics". To begin with, the term *Old World Semiotics* pertains to the resources which the practitioners of sign–and–

meaning–related studies have inherited from the periods of Antiquity, Middle Ages, Renaissance, Enlightenment, Romanticism and Positivism, including the movements of Phenomenology, Functionalism, Structuralism, especially from Plato, Aristotle, Stoics, St. Augustine, René Descartes (Lat. Renatus Cartesius), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, John Locke, Immanuel Kant, Edmund Husserl, Karl Ludwig Bühler, Maurice Merleau–Ponty, Martin Heidegger, Alfred Schutz; Charles Sanders Peirce, Charles William Morris, Ferdinand de Saussure, Louis Hjelmslev, Jakob Johann von Uexküll, and others. In turn, the second query is related to the scope of the *Modern World Semiotics* that has been given its widely accepted shape by three main representatives who proposed their own paradigms of philosophical thinking, above all, Thomas Albert Sebeok (the originator of zoosemiotics and biosemiotics, Jurij Mihailovič Lotman (the promoter of a textual view of culture as a semiosphere), Algirdas Julien Greimas (the originator of the semiotic square as an analytical tool for semantic analyses), and Eero Tarasti (the founder of existential semiotics placing the human being with its modalities in the center of investigative domain). To be added is that the epistemological background of semiotics of our times have been formed by postmodern and poststructuralist philosophers, sociologists, and anthropologists, who came to the foreground of 1960s and 1970s, such as, *inter alia*, Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Pierre–Félix Bourdieu, Jean Baudrillard, Claude Lévi–Strauss, Julia Kristeva. Not to be omitted are also the phenomenological philosophers of earlier times, such as, mentioned above, Martin Heidegger Jean–Paul

Sartre, Maurice Merleau–Ponty, as well as Aldred Schütz. In this regard, worth of mentioning are scholars who have contributed to the fact that the knowledge about theoretical and applied aspects of semiotic objects is widely known, are, in particular, Roman Jakobson, Émile Benveniste, André Martinet, Roland Barthes, Umberto Eco, Roland Posner, Winfried Nöth, John Deely, Göran Sonesson, Kalevi Kull, Peeter Torop, and others. Within the scope of inherited riches, separately discussed and evaluated will be the international world of publications, encyclopedias, anthologies, monographs and journals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Deely, John 2005 [1990]. [*Basic of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press / *Semiotica Basica*. Trans Júlio César Machado Pinto. Sao Paulo: Editora Atica]. *Basic Semiotic*. Fifth edition (expanded and revised in the fourth bilingual English–Estonian edition of 2004 and printed simultaneously with a reprinting of the Estonian version), Tartu: Tartu University Press.

—2009. Postmodernity and the unmasking of objectivity. *Plenary Lecture presented Sunday 7, June 2009. International Summer School for Semiotic Studies. Imatra, Finland, June 5–9, 2009* (Tartu University Program in Semiotics. Univerisity of St. Thomas, Houston, pg. 73).

Eco, Umberto 1976. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington, IN, London, UK: Indiana University Press.

Hoffmeyer, Jesper 2008. *Biosemiotics. An Examination into the Signs of Life and the Life of Signs*. Scranton and London: University of Scranton Press.

Jakobson, Roman 1975. *Coup d'oeil sur le développement*

de la sémiotique. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (Studies in Semiotics 3).
Kull, Kalevi (ed.) 2001. Jakob von von Uexküll: A paradigm for biology and semiotics. Semiotica. Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies. Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotiqe. 134 (1/4, Special Issue).
Kull, Kalevi 1999. Towards biosemiotics with Juri Lotman. *Semiotica* 127 (1/4): 115–131.
Kull, Kalevi, Silvi Salupere, Peeter Torop 2005. Semiotics has no beginning. In: John Deely 2005. *Basic Semiotics*. Fifth edition. Tartu University Press, xxi–xxv.
Kull, Kalevi, Silvi Salupere, Peeter Torop, Mihhail Lotman 2011. The institution of semiotics in Estonia. *Sign Systems Studies* 39 (2/4): 314–342.

Lanigan, Richard L(eo) 1992. *The Human Science of Communicology: A Phenomenology of Discourse in Foucault and Merleau–Ponty*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
Lotman, Jurij Mihailovič, Boris Andreevič Uspenskij, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov, Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov, and Aleksandr Moiseevič Pjatigorskij 1975. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Sebeok Thomas Albert (ed.) 1975. *The Tell–Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*. Lisse (Netherlands): Peter de Ridder: 57–84.
Lotman, Mikhail [Лотман, Михаил Юрьевич] 2001. The paradoxes of semiosphere. *Sun Yat–sen Journal of Humanities* 12 (2001): 97–106.
Lotman, Juri M. [Jurij Mihailovič] 1974. The sign mechanism of culture. *Semiotica* 12 (4): 301–305.

—1988 [1981]. The semiotics of culture and the concept of a text. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* 26 (3), 52–58 [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1981. Семиотика культуры и понятие текста. *Труды по знаковым системам* 12 (Тарту): 3–7].
—1994 [1981]. The text within the text. *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 109 (3), 377–384 [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1981. Текст в тексте. *Труды по знаковым системам* 14 (Тарту): 3–19.
—2005 [1984]: On the semiosphere. Trans. Wilma Clark. *Sign Systems Studies*, 33 (1), 205–229. [Лотман, Юрий Михайлович 1984. О семиосфере. *Труды по знаковым системам* 17 (Тарту): 5–23].
Pânzarui, Olga 2011. School of semiotics from Tartu: Genesis of semiotics of culture and semiotics of nature. *Lucrări ştiinţifice* (Seria Agronomie, Universitatea de Ştiinţe Agricole şi Medicină Veterinară Iaşi) 54, (2): 433–436.
Posner, Roland 1995. Inaugural Address of the IASS–AIS President. IASS–AIS Bulletin–Newsletter 15(1): 13–15 (available also as: Tasks for the future. http://iassais.wordpress.com/presentation–2/tasks–for–the–future/).
Rüting, Torsten 2004. History and significance of Jakob von Uexküll and of his institute in Hamburg. *Sign Systems Studies* 32 (1/2): 35–72.
Sonesson, Göran 1998. The concept of text in cultural semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies* 26, 83–114.
Tarasti, Eero (Aarne Pekka) 2007. What is semiotics? ISI, International Semiotics Institute at Imatra. Semiotiikan verkostoyliopisto – Finnish Network University of

Semiotics [June 2, 2007] In: www.semiotics.fi/en/content/01_semiotiikka/01_index?C:D=158041&C:selres=158041
—2012. *Semiotics of Classical Music*: *How Mozart, Brahms and Wagner Talk to Us*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (Semiotics, Communication and Cognition 10).
Torop, Peeter 2005. Semiosphere and/as the research object of semiotics of culture. *Sign Systems Studies* 33 (1): 159–173.
Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov, Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov, Aleksandr Moiseevič Pjatigorskij, Jurij Mihailovič Lotman. 1973. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Jan van der Eng and Grygar, Mojmir (eds.). 1973. *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1–28.

Успенский, Борис Андреевич, Вячеслав Всеволодович Иванов, Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Александр Моисеевич Пятигорский, Юрий Михайлович Лотман. 1973. Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур (в применении к славянским текстам). In: Maria Renata Mayenowa (ed.) 1973. *Semiotyka i struktura tekstu: Studia poświęcone VII Międzynarodowemu Kongresowi Slawistów*. Warszawa 1973, Wrocław et al.: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich (Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Instytut Badań Literackich), 9–32.
Waldstein, Maxim 2008. *The Soviet Empire of Signs: A History of the Tartu School of Semiotics*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
Żyłko, Bogusław 2009. Semiotyka kultury: Szkoła tartusko–moskiewska [Semiotics of Culture: The Tartu–Moscow School]. Gdańsk: slowo/obraz terytoria.

—2011. Kultura i znaki: Semiotyka stosowana w szkole tartusko–moskiewskiej {Culture and signs: Applied semiotics in the Tartu–Moscov School]. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

WORLD, LANGUAGE, TEXT: MORPHOLOGY AND SEMIOTICS OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL ISOMORPHISM

SUREN ZOLYAN
surenzolyan@gmail.com

1. Goethe's doctrine of the morphology, following whom this term was coined, was focused on the description of natural objects, primarily biological. However, it has had a great impact on the humanities, albeit indirectly (primarily through linguistics) and often ignoring its source.

2. First of all, it was linguistics. The romantic idea to consider language as a living organism caused the emergence of morphology – as a doctrine of formal features of words. But very soon Goethe's inspiring idea was forgotten, and morphology was preserved only as a name, turning rather to the classification of externally observable static forms.

3. During the twentieth century Goethe's idea has been revived in text linguistics and cultural anthropology, becoming one of the cornerstones of structuralism. This

was accomplished by V. Propp's *Morphology of the Folktale* (1928). Propp describes the formal structure of the model that underlies all the texts belonging to this genre (fairy tale). Each fairy tale is considered to be a particular transformation of that deep structure. "Proppian" morphology, in contrast to the "linguistic" morphology of the time, is dynamic and revives Goethe's primary idea: "the doctrine of the forms is the doctrine of transformation." In fact, V. Propp introduced concepts such as structure, its deep and surface manifestations, and transformations. Later, V. Propp suggested a diachronic approach for the transformation, by revealing the genesis of the structural elements of a fairy tale. The introduction of diachronic dimension made the concept of Propp's morphology closer to the morphology in Goethe's sense. The idea of isomorphism was crucial for V. Propp, as it allowed him to abandon the static understanding of morphology as a catalogue of items and relationships, and suggest something that is similar to the concept of a generative model. It was due to V. Propp that a new semiotic object – text – was discovered. Accordingly, in conjunction with the traditional morphology of isolated linguistic items, a new discipline – morphology of the text – appeared.

4. V. Propp's work was far ahead of its time and has been studied only since the 50s, despite the fact that the term "morphology" was replaced with "structure." C. Levi–Strauss regarded V. Propp as a predecessor of structuralism, but at the same him he considered *Morphology of the Folktale* as an instance of formalism, and his own research – as proper structuralism. Levi–Strauss was capable of

expanding methodological foundations of Propp's theory. His description of the myth is not a mere description of certain kinds of text, but rather an elaboration of the cognitive structures determining social communication, as well as patterns of the world. Using mythology as an empiric substance, Levi–Strauss denies the linear nature of the text and considers it to be a multiple, multi–dimensional and multilingual entity.

5. How is it possible to transfer the concept of a living organism to language and text? – The fact that they are isomorphic to each other. This idea is expressed in numerous myths and metaphors; they represent world as text (book), and language – as a way of comprehension and control over the world. Language is a reflection of the world, and at the same time the world is a product of language ("in the beginning was the Word"). L. Wittgenstein in his *Tractatus* gave a precise logical form to the idea of isomorphism between different semiotic manifestations: "The gramophone record, the musical thought, the score, the waves of sound, all stand to one another in that pictorial internal relation, which holds between language and the world. To all of them the logical structure is common." (4.014). Categories of language act as a forms of meaning. Propositions (texts) of language are not merely descriptions, but isomorphic images of the world (states of affairs): "The proposition is a picture of reality [...] as we think it is." (4.01). Here the sign is obviously a likeness of the signified. (4.012). However, such isomorphic relations are not established between externally isomorphic phenomena, but between inner struc-

tures. "*Colloquial language is a part of the human organism and is not less complicated than it." (4.002).*

6. Isomorphism between world, text, and language.
a) One can consider language to be an abbreviated and formalized representation of world and text. Language provides the formal categorization of the world and its entities, as well as a mechanism for calculating, generating and recognizing the possible states of affairs (worlds).
b) Text can be considered as 1) a multilingual and multidimensional structure; 2) the structure of language in the process of multi–level representation; 3) language in operation; 4) pattern of the world; 5) the organism that has a memory and the ability to generate meanings (J.M. Lotman).

7. On the other hand, characteristics of language and text are attributed to the world. It emerges as a result of language activity, it has a beginning and an end, it consists of signs and meanings, it is possible to understand and modify it, etc. Modal semantics develops and refines this identity: that is S. Kripke's model (sets of possible worlds, interconnected through different relations of transworld accessibility). S. Kripke's model can be extended by means of linguistic textualization. And the opposite – a formalization of the semantics of text also leads to a Kripkean model: the text signifies a certain modal configuration of worlds (stratified domains of interpretation). As a next step one can consider the ways in which the systems of world are generated (mapped onto) within different types of discourse (poetry, political, poetic, etc.). Some config-

urations of relations, structures and meanings can be considered to be a deep template for certain global models (civilization, culture, age, formation, metanarrative, etc.). This semantic model is an image of the world (a set of basic semantic objects and relationships which are reproduced in different ways in various semiotic systems and texts). The same semantic model appears as a deep structure in the texts of various genres (narrative, poem, political pamphlet, legal act, painting, etc.). All of them can be considered to be the same text written in different languages or as different texts written in the same language.


TARTU ÜLIKOOL
1632
UNIVERSITAS TARTUENSIS

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES