THE SEMIOTIC WEB: A CHRONICLE OF PREJUDICES*

Thomas A. Sebeok

Indiana University

O. PROLOGUE. Four years ago, Eric Hamp graciously invited me to review for the International Journal of American Linguistics Pierre Guiraud's latest contribution to the "Que sais-je" series, La sémiologie (1971). Then, a few months ago, the editor of Language Sciences asked me to review the English translation of the same work for our own periodical. I resisted both temptations, for two principal reasons: precisely four years ago, I had myself completed a monograph-sized account (Sebeok 1974a)--to be sure, I view it as a first approximation--of the field as it appeared to me then, and I did not feel that, within the brief confines of a review, I could immediately add anything useful to my friend's argument or, what seemed much more important, say anything about semiotics in general that would usefully amplify my observations that had just gone off to be recorded in print. Secondly, there was the matter of potential conflict of interest: I am now about a year away from submitting a new handbook dealing with the theory of signs, recontracted for by Penguin some months back (Sebeok, to appear). Although Guiraud's treatment and mine differ substantially in scope as well as point of view, and both are, in fact, dissimilar in virtually every detail, even stemming from two discrepant traditions--neatly epitomized by our respective titles, Semiotics vs. Semiology (explained in Sebeok 1973)--I thought that it would be indelicate for me to indulge in public discussions, let alone excoriations, of comparable efforts by respected colleagues in a heat in which Guiraud's and mine are but two of several entrants, with yet other finalists lined up at the gate (see 3., below).

Nevertheless, I was stimulated to respond by compiling the record that follows--a highly personal, and hence selective, chronicle of publications and other major events, including especially curricular developments and news of pivotal meetings that have recently occurred or are about to take place--of the field of semiotics. There is a considerable, pressing demand

*An index of names mentioned in this article will appear in BLS III.

for an accounting of this sort, getting more insistent as this province of knowledge, variously cultivated in Antiquity, thoughtfully reexamined in the Middle Ages, scrutinized afresh during the Renaissance, elaborated into something like its contemporary forms under the impetus of the model of Saussure (1857-1913) and, above all, that of Peirce (1839-1914), begins to spread like wildfire, penetrating national borders and, at the same time, invading, like an infection, a range of human endeavor from anthropophagy (Clerk 1975) to more respectable culinary practices (Barthes 1967a:27f.), or from geomancy (Jaulin 1970) and fortunetelling by tarot (Corti 1973) to abstract ideology (e.g., Veron 1971, Rastier 1972), many of the crafts, such as those of the comic strip (Fresnault-Deruelle) and the animated cartoon (Horányi and Pléh), all of the arts, a host of traditional academic disciplines, and not only a wide array of the nomothetic sciences of man (in the usage of Huxley [1963: 7f.]) but, though to a lesser extent so far, certain natural sciences (notably, ethology and genetics) as well. As written contributions and conferences multiply at a bewildering rate, we may well ask: Is the amount of semiotic information increasing, or is entropy about to engulf us? Will the wildfire, perhaps a consequence of the tempo and impact of modern communications, and our fascination with the underlying mechanisms, prove luminous, or a mere will-o'-the-wisp? And when Kristeva (1969:31) tells us that "la sémiotique ne peut se faire que comme une critique de la sémiotique," is she not teetering on the edge of paralipsis?

1. TOWARD A HISTORY OF SEMIOTICS. As I had previously remarked, at the outset of my diachronic delineation of semiotics (Sebeok 1974a: 213-231; see fn. 8), "A full history of this field is yet to be written." Nonetheless, some progress in that direction is being made (see also Walther 1974: 9-43), notably instigated by a well-conceived and serviceable biennial Polish periodical (Studia 1971, 1973) entirely devoted to the publication of primary text materials supplemented by secondary studies, with bibliographic guides bearing on historical matters. Although Vol. 1 was entirely in Polish, and is, moreover, out of print, Vol. 2 contains an English or French abstract of each of the six articles included, thus increasing its usefulness abroad; (Vol. 3 is announced for 1976).

Prominent mention should be made here of a truly outstanding, even indispensable, collection of readings (Rey 1973), distilling a panorama of breathtaking reach and dazzling amplitude of semiotic ruminations throughout the ages, held

together by the erudite compiler's always accurate, revealing, and insightful running commentary on the textlets featured. This first volume is divided into two quantitatively and qualitatively unequal parts, with the initial three-fourths emphasizing the philosophical tradition of the West, from Plato to Comte (cf. Rey 1971), with a valuable excursus to India, and an imaginative indulgence drawing on the marvellous Cahiers of Valéry; and three less satisfactory concluding chapters devoted to semiotics in universal grammars, extracts from Humboldt, Whitney, and John Stuart Mill, with a wrapup from Bréal and the inevitable Saussure. A particularly welcome feature of Rey's book is its thorough index of forms and concepts. Anyone wishing to dig around seriously among the roots or later divarications of semiotics could do no better than to begin with this vade mecum, the second volume of which will cover the busy decades of 20th century semiotics that "really" began with Peirce. (Vol. 2 of Rey's book should be out by 1976. Very well conceived, it is, in fact, divided into two major sections, the first on foundations, the second dealing with epistemological considerations.)

As Charles Morris implied in his cursory note on "The history of semiotic" (Morris 1971:335-337), would-be historians ought to launch their searches either via the best pertinent secondary sources, such as standard histories of logic (e.g., Bocheński 1956, or Schenk 1973), or of other particular disciplines, such as linguistics (Sebeok 1975b) or medicine (Garrison 1929:884f.); but if their intentions are truly honorable, they must, of course, revert directly to the primary sources themselves, as elegantly exemplified by the "lost" Epicurean treatise of Philodemus (De Lacy 1941). A most remarkable piece of historical reconstitution, which is certain to decisively affect our over-all perspective of semiotic development, is the heroic labor of love Deely lavished on the Treatise on Signs by Jean Poinsot (1589-1644), which "occupies a virtually independent and entirely privileged position" in this Iberian cleric's huge Cursus Philosophicus (Deely 1974:850; Poinsot, to appear). Poinsot, commonly known as Joannis a Sancto Thoma (Maritain 1943, Herculano de Carvalho 1969, Coseriu 1969:135f.), appears, in retrospect, to have forged the most solid, lasting link between the Scholastic semioticians--an intellectual milieu in which this keen thinker was still profoundly at home--and the emergent doctrine of signs envisaged, labelled, and foreshadowed by John Locke half a century later, in 1690 (Land 1974:15, Parret 1975, Kelemen, to appear).

An important essay, intended to highlight the achievement of Locke and several milestones in the subsequent development of semiotics, has appeared by Roman Jakobson (1975), who, more than anyone else, has attempted to reconcile competing semiotic traditions, all the while insisting that variations be also clearly and critically recognized within what is enduring and invariant. His review touches on the semiotic activities of Jean Henri Lambert (in connection with which Karl Söder's dissertation, available on microfilm, should also be consulted--see the reference in Sebeok 1973: 53), Joseph Marie Hoene-Wroński, Bernard Bolzano, Edmund Husserl, Charles Sanders Peirce, and Ferdinand de Saussure. It is precisely in the writings of Jakobson that the two principal modern semiotic traditions--what I referred to elsewhere (Sebeok 1973), in shorthand fashion, as the "Locke-Peirce-Morris pattern" vs. the "Saussure pattern"--have creatively coalesced. By contrast, the astonishing insights of the Greeks (Weltring 1910) and of the Scholastics are perceived by us but dimly (cf. Kretzmann 1967), as a disjointed mosaic with occasional tantalizing flashes of brilliant color (for the medieval period, see, e.g., Bursill-Hall 1971, Pinborg 1972); and even the attainments of such Olympian figures as St. Augustine (354-430) (Simone 1972), or Leibniz (1646-1716), rightly identified as "one of the major figures in the history of semiotic, and of syntactics in particular" (Morris 1971:336; Dascal 1972), have barely begun to be assessed for their own sake, let alone in relation to their intellectual predecessors (on Augustinian dialectic in relation to Stoic semiotics, see, however, Pinborg 1962), contemporaries, or successors in the long unfolding tapestry of the theory of signs.

Perversely, however, a veritable orgy of Saussurean exegesis continues to inundate us. Considering that, compared, for instance, with that of Peirce, "La contribution apportée par Ferdinand de Saussure au progrès des études sémiotiques est évidemment plus modeste et plus restreinte" (Jakobson 1975:VII), this thickening chorus of adulation is not only embarrassing but a downright distortion of true historical equilibrium (cf. de Mauro's notes 73 and 139, in Saussure 1972). My guess is that the great Swiss linguist would have been astonished to find himself thrust into the role "d'initiateur et du précurseur" of semiology (Mounin 1968:33), and utterly disconcerted by the gaffe, locked into a major French reference work, claiming that "Le premier à concevoir cette science semble avoir été F. de Saussure..." (Prieto 1968:93). Benveniste (1969) knew better, and it is to be hoped that the

that the book of Culler (to appear) will redress the balance of historical judgment.

Ogden and Richards were perhaps the earliest (1923) to note that "By far the most elaborate and determined attempt to give an account of signs and their meaning is that of... C.S. Peirce" (Ogden and Richards 1938:279). About Peirce's work in semiotics Morris later (1946) observed that "His classification of signs, his refusal to separate completely animal and human sign-processes, his often penetrating remarks on linguistic categories, his application of semiotic to the problems of logic and philosophy, and the general acumen of his observations and distinctions, make his work in semiotic a source of stimulation that has few equals in the history of this field" (Morris 1971:340). Peirce, a thinker of visionary penetration, remains thus far the most genial force in the history of semiotics. There is, moreoever, a growing consensus the world over, among historians of ideas in general, "that no thinker since Leibniz in the 17th century has exhibited Peirce's mastery over so many diverse disciplines, or possessed his wealth of seminal ideas for cultivating them" (Nagel 1959:185; on ranking with Leibniz, cf. Fisch 1972). However, because of the misfortunes of his biographical circumstances (intimated in various standard notices [e.g., Nagel 1959]), partly grounded in problems arising from his nature, register, life-style, his name and accomplishments are still relatively unknown and, incredibly, only about one half of his copious written legacy, endowed with a density that may be unique in the modern context, has hitherto been published (Peirce 1965-1966). Largely on the basis of the misleadingly titled Collected Papers, a secondary literature of some fifty scholarly books--a few of them specifically concerned with his semiotic (e.g., Greenlee 1973)--and of perhaps a thousand or more articles has been produced, a fair number of such items appearing in the first decade's run of the Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society.

This chronicle is hardly the place to expatiate on the entangled story of Peirce and his philosophical bequeathments, save to report that their scandalous neglect is, happily, about to be set aright within the framework of the newly established Center for American Studies of Indiana University in Indianapolis; (the Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism, which has been active at Texas Tech University for several years, will, no doubt, continue to contribute to the advancement of knowledge of Peirce, by collaboration with the Indiana University

Center in several concrete ways). Foremost on the Center's program is the preparation of a comprehensive fifteen-volume chronological edition, fully annotated and indexed, of Peirce's writings, the entire opus then to be published, including his biography with other secondary literature, under the imprint of the Indiana University Press. Max H. Fisch, Peirce's uniquely qualified biographer, will be Editor-in-Chief, and Edward C. Moore, a distinguished specialist on Pragmatism, will be Associate Editor. The prospectus is explicit in its commitment to semiotics: "The new edition will make available still unpublished work of his in that field, from the beginning to the end of his lifelong devotion to it." A national disgrace will thus slowly begin to be atoned for in the guise of a major contribution of ours to the Bicentennial celebration, soon to be punctuated by other diverse ceremonies of respect--and, it is to be hoped, the advancement of semiotic learning--at the Johns Hopkins University (where Peirce had been an instructor for five years), followed next year by a different kind of international happening being organized by the University of Stuttgart.

If Peirce was the fountainhead of today's semiotics, its most globally influential and revered living giant--yet one whose achievements are already integrated as a peerless episode in the history of the subject--is Charles Morris. His pertinent writings are all at last readily available in a single volume (Morris 1971), and a veritable multinational industry has sprung up laboring to produce critical explication or analysis of his theory of signs (e.g., Apel 1973, beside Rossi-Landi's latest [1975] article, and a spate of dissertations, among which I found Eakins 1972 and Fiordo 1976 the most useful). Interesting problems waiting to be tackled will certainly focus upon the profound involvement of Morris with George Herbert Mead (1863-1931) (Miller 1973, Kang, to appear), whose social psychology itself had a manifestly semiotic orientation, palpably resonant in, for example, Erving Goffman's masterful books; and, to the contrary, Morris' surprising intellective independence from, although eventual terminological and otherwise surface reconciliation with, Peirce (cf. Dewey 1946, and Morris' 1971:444-448 rebuttal).

This being a very personal reckoning, I would like to seize this occasion to publicly avow my good fortune at having first encountered semiotic notions in a University of Chicago seminar of Morris' in the early 1940's--precisely midway, that is, between his Foundations of the Theory of

Signs (1938) and Signs, Language, and Behavior (1946). I have thus had the singular, and very likely unique, privilege of having studied with both Morris and, not long afterwards, Jakobson, the two having cross-pollinated in the intervening years.

It is obvious that the semiotic tidal wave that has washed over the several arts and sciences in the past decade affected them unevenly, each to a different degree. I have heard it said, for instance, that the potential for applying the theory of signs to the cinema (Sebeok 1974a, fn.61; Bellour and Metz 1971, Metz 1974) is already exhausted; (indeed, the vacuousness of Michelangelo Antonioni's latest film, The Passenger, has even been partly--but, as the facts bear out, because of an absurd misunderstanding of the true sequence of events--blamed on a scriptwriter "crazed with semeiology, the science of signs" [cf. Simon 1975:16]). On the other hand, Kowzan has noted in his prize-winning book (1975:173) that "Le seul genre de spectacle qui...a été abordé scientifiquement du point de vue sémiologique, est l'art du cinéma," which confirms "en même temps le besoin d'une ouverture sémiologique sur l'art théâtral, la nécessité de considérer le spectacle du point de vue de la sémiologie." Although Kowzan's assumption exaggerates--he is evidently unaware of Bouissac's pioneering studies (1976) of an altogether different spectacle--and even the semiotics of the theater is far from virgin territory (Todorov 1971, Helbo 1974 [nota bene the asterisked fn. on p. 359], 1975; and of a work that will be of incalculable consequence when translated, Osolsobě 1974), his point is a telling one. What it means to me is that "historical" judgments about the success or failure of semiotic praxis in most branches of conduct and learning are altogether premature. How do physicians appraise a fellow M.D.'s contention for "the necessity to Medicine of a Theory of Signs" (Crookshank 1923:354; cf. Lewis 1970)? How do social scientists react when one of the world's most sober and esteemed anthropologists announces that the concept of culture he espouses and whose utility he attempts to demonstrate "is essentially a semiotic one" (Geertz 1973:5), and when one of its giants classifies anthropology as "the bona fide occupant of the domain of semiotics" (Levi-Strauss 1973:18)? What do logicians make of Carnap's uncompromising assertion (1942: 250) that "the task of philosophy is semiotical analysis?" How are ethologists affected by the urgent plea of a great animal psychologist that crucial experiments be repeated "unter dem Gesichtspunkt moderner Kommunikationslehren, besonders auch der Semiotik" (Hediger 1970:178; cf. 1974:29, 37), or

arguments that their object of study is, in the end, hardly more than a special case of diachronic semiotics (Sebeok 1975a:85-95)? And, finally, do linguists appreciate the truth and devastating implications for the future of the language sciences of Nida's strategic remarks (1975:13) about the importance "that language be viewed in the broader perspective of semiotics, since only as language could be seen as a symbolic system could the role of meaning within language be fully appreciated," and that "the fundamental insights of Peirce" be more fully cherished, since some of his concepts are "basic to the understanding of language as a semiotic system capable of explicating its own symbolization"? Such questions are intended to give a foretaste of the shape of debates to come within semiotics, as well as when considering the logical filiation of the subject and its placement in the hierarchical order prevailing among the sciences of man. Movement towards the definition of semiotic thinking in the biological and the anthropological framework of a theory of evolution represents, however, at least in my view, the only genuinely novel and significantly holistic trend in the 20th century development in this field; by far the greatest forward steps in this direction have come from the awesome imagination of the French topologist, René Thom (1974, esp. Ch. XI), but will require much detailed elaboration and implementation, along several fronts, as I have adumbrated elsewhere (Sebeok 1976).

2. OF THE RECTIFICATION OF TERMS. Semiotics must surely be one of the rare provinces of knowledge the very practitioners of which have failed to reach a consensus even about what to call their own discipline.[1] That there are sound historical reasons for this state of affairs, which I have attempted to trace and, in some measure, to explain (Sebeok 1973; cf. Arrive 1974:28), is cold comfort to the uninitiated and perplexing even to the professional. The problem, however, neither begins nor ends there. In Jakobson's scheme of things, as in many others (Sebeok 1974:212, Prieto 1975:125-141, etc.), semiotics is wholly or at least partially assigned a place "within the total science of communication" (Jakobson 1974:36)--but then "communication" usually stays an undefined prime. This, in turn, leads to further grave difficulties, which have upset both some psychologists (e.g., Burghardt 1970) and some zoologists (e.g., Tavolga 1974), working in the subfield of "zoosemiotics" (itself a relatively recent coinage, for which see Sebeok 1972:178-181). For this reason, several recent efforts have been made to clarify what counts as "communication,"

and it is no accident that the two most productive analyses that I know of appeared in the context of animal behavior studies (MacKay 1972, Glasersfeld 1974).

The terminological confusion deepens the closer one looks at the customary divisions and subdivisions of semiotics. For instance, as regards the once familiar and seemingly well-defined Syntactics-Semantics-Pragmatics trichotomy (Carnap 1942:8-11, Morris 1971:23-54), what emerged in the course of an International Symposium on Pragmatics of Natural Languages (Jerusalem, June 22-27, 1970) was the very elusiveness of pragmatics and the fact that the participants could come to no agreement about the nature of this beast, real or mythical; Max Black's canny proposal "to save at least one allegedly tangible feature of pragmatics, viz., 'contextics'" came to naught (Staal 1971:29). In Montague grammar, pragmatics is hardly distinguishable from semantics, or, at least, the borderline appears, for the present, gossamer-thin (Montague 1974:64, 96, 120).

Let me make a stab at exploring, at some length but not exhaustively, just one other example, the wide ramifications of which obtruded upon me as I sat down to prepare the plenary address on the topic assigned to me by the organizers of the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (eventually delivered, in Milan, on June 6, 1974): "Nonverbal communication" (Nelson 1975:315f.). It soon dawned on me that this deceptively simple phrase, widely bandied about and incorporated in a large miscellany of book titles (among others, Bosmajian 1971, Davis 1971, Eisenberg and Smith 1971, Hinde 1972, Knapp 1972, Mehrabian 1972, Ruesch and Kees 1956, Scherer 1970, Weitz 1974; see also the entries under MacKay 1972 and Tavolga 1974), is well-nigh devoid of meaning or, at best, susceptible to so many interpretations as to be nearly useless. Mehrabian (1972:1f.) naively distinguishes a "narrow and more accurate sense," declared to refer "to actions as distinct from speech," i.e., "hand and arm gestures, postures, positions, and various movements of the body or the legs and feet," from a broader but supposedly traditional sense, by which he seems to mean what Crystal (1969:293) had once labelled "content-free speech," intended to cover, among kindred phenomena, those called by some investigators paralinguistic events. When we next ask what paralinguistics may possibly comprehend, Crystal relates that all of the following were suggested in response to an inquiry of his: "animal vocalization (or some aspect of it), memory re-

strictions on language, recall ability for language, utterance length, literary analysis, environmental restrictions on language use..., glossolalia, and emotional expression in general language disturbance--in effect, a fair proportion of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics" (1974:269).

Supposing, however, for the sake of simplicity, that we return to Mehrabian's first, and evidently preferred, sense of "nonverbal": we are at once confronted by a further morass of nomenclature--a host of terms that "themselves offer variety without clear distinction" (Stokoe 1974:118), to wit:

a) The term "nonverbal," or "non-verbal," is objectionable because it includes far too much, and, moreover, what it does comprehend varies according to each investigator's whim (Harrison, et al., 1972). Also, it wrongly implies the independence, indeed, usually the primacy, in some implicit synchronic way, of the verbal component in humans. The formula, "communication minus language = nonverbal communication" is clumsily negative, simplistic, and obscurantist.[2] In other words, "It makes no sense to speak of 'verbal communication' and 'nonverbal communication'. There is only communication, a system of behavior patterns by which people are related to one another" (Kendon 1972b:443), in brief, the subject of the holistic field of interaction ethology (alias semiotics), adumbrated in a conference (Amsterdam, August 31 - September 4, 1970), organized by Goffman and me for the Wenner-Gren Foundation (Sherzer 1971). Yet another hare, which I don't care to run with here, lurks in the careless way in which "communication" is confounded with "behavior," especially in the context of the nonverbal. This confidently assumes that all behavior (Scheflen 1972, 1974; Hinde 1974) neatly bifurcates into a kind that communicates and a kind that does not communicate--which is, in fact, a matter of controvery even among animal behaviorists, and hardly helped by the introduction of qualifying weasel words such as "social," "goal-directed," or the like.

b) The term "pantomime," to be sure, denotes significant gesture without speech, or dumb show, but has a heavy overlay connoting Roman and English dramatic entertainment, sometimes designated as a prose ballet (see the OED). For most, the associations are bound to be less semiotic than histrionic.

c) Gesture, "the most familiar term, begs the question we want to ask. Why should facial and corporeal movement

take on a unique quality if being performed by our species and not by any other" (Stokoe 1974:118)? One could, of course, as I have done (Sebeok 1972:163ff.), set apart "anthroposemiotic" gestures, i.e., such as are species-specific in man (Efron's category of arbitrarily-coded, hence culture bound, emblems comes immediately to mind; see Ekman and Friesen 1969:63-68), and "zoosemiotic" gestures found in humans, i.e., such devices that we demonstrably share with some other form of animal life (a very nice example being the evolution of laughter and smiling; see Hooff 1972). This distinction is, however, both awkward and hard to maintain in practice. Another difficulty with this term is that its extension fluctuates widely according to the user's predilection; thus, for Ruesch, for example, in his sensitive classificatory scheme, gestures (Ruesch and Kees 1956:37) belong with the numerous "varieties of nonverbal language," one subdivision of which he names "action languages," among which gestures are singled out as only one category in about a dozen. Furthermore, Ruesch follows Critchley (1939) in closely tying gestures to speech.

d) Kendon, on the other hand, prefers to reserve "gesticulation" for "those complex movements of the hands and arm and head" (1972a:178f.) that actually accompany the flow of speech. This, however, would require another term, or set of terms, unspecified (also by others, e.g., Jakobson 1974:31), for movements which do not co-occur with, or are disjointed from, speech.

e) Stokoe (1974:118) cites "motor signs" as "Jakobson's term... and it is characteristically exact." I think that it is neither. Franz Boas, in his 1941 introduction to Efron's book (1972:19), carried over the word "motor" into this context (although he coupled it with "habits" instead of "signs"), but, to most linguists, the phrase will rather evoke an expression especially propagated by Stetson, "motor phonetics," which he defined as "the study of the skilled movements involved in the process of handling articulatory signals" (1951:6). It is not at all uncommon to find statements to the effect that "In Phonetics, the motor processes are the center of consideration" (Meader and Muyskens 1962:20). What all this means is that "motor signs" can be equally of a verbal and a nonverbal character, unless one distinctly specifies what part of the body is at play, viz., the so-called organs of speech, or, as in the Jakobson piece (1972) referred to by Stokoe (but which, in any case, was a translation from a Russian article of 1970), the whole head as a Gestalt, plus, as the author explicitly

enumerates, the pupils (cf. now Hess 1975), eyeballs, eyebrows, and the facial musculature separately as well as in concert (for research on facial expressions in general, cf. Ekman and Friesen 1975).

f) The expression "body language," perhaps suited for use in Sunday supplements (Davis 1970), became popular in this country through the title of a best seller (Fast 1970) with a conception of unmatched vulgarity, and yet it also recurs as the operative part of the title of a book with, presumably, earnest intentions (Scheflen 1972); (for an early, sophisticated use, in an unmistakably semiotic context, see Latif [1934:76f]). Such kindred labels as "body talk" (Poiret 1970), or "face language" (Whiteside 1974; cf. Mar. 1974) are also found, but more sporadically. These terms clearly imply a phenomenal dualism, postulating a body language opposed to--what? A "mind language"? (I really doubt that this view is in good conformity with the ideas about language as a direct "mirror of mind" that Chomsky imagined in his 1967 Beekman lectures [Chomsky 1972]!)

g) When all else fails, semioticians revert to their ancestral source in searching for more or less exact terms with a safely antique vibrancy, as I myself have done (Sebeok 1972). The splendid periodical of our colleagues in Russia was, with great deliberation, entitled Semeiotikè (1965-1973), after which the title of Kristeva's collection of papers (1969) acquired a doubly sympathetic Graeco-Soviet resonance (Coquet and Kristeva 1972:324). In the field under scrutiny here, there is also a plenitude of quasi-classical coinages: "kinesics" (Birdwhistell 1970), "coenetics," with a superabundance of subsidiary terms like "haptics," "geustics," and "strepitistics" (Wescott 1966:350), "proxemics" (Hall 1968, Watson 1970), "tacesics" (Kauffman 1971), and so forth and so on. Lexical innovations of this ilk may conceivably be of heuristic value; unfortunately, they also tend to map out crazy quilts of territory which then compact into exclusive feeding grounds for budding students, as well as fiercely defended fortalices against strange intruders, bristling with aggression and escallating counter-aggression. The recent history of "kinesics" can be looked at as a case study in territorial behavior or misbehavior, spoiling whatever utility the label may once have enjoyed. Wescott's pullulating vocabulary has totally misfired. "Proxemics," despite the well-deserved popularity of Hall's two main books (in the second, 1966, the key word is introduced and defined in the second sentence), has hardly become a by-

word, and is not even mentioned by the "other" leading student of spatial behavior, Sommer (1969). Kauffman's portmanteau, approximately blended from "tactile proxemics," just missed a chance to be picked up in the, up to now, chief book on human tactile communication (Montagu 1971).

h) The latest, and in some ways the most attractive, proposal, introduced and, in some measure, developed by Stokoe (1974:118), is "gSign," where g stands for any "gestural manifestation," and sign for "sign-vehicle in a semiotic system." I can think of all sorts of ways of integrating "gSign" into semiotic theory and practice. Stokoe, who, more than anyone in America, has clearly perceived the place of sign languages in semiotics (cf. his 1972 book), and who is the founding editor of Sign Language Studies (1972-), is in an excellent position to vigorously promote it.

The foregoing sample exercise, which could be replicated from almost any corner of the field, was merely intended to demonstrate the urgent need for a concerted effort to regulate semiotic terminology in reasonably orderly fashion. Solo attempts are not altogether lacking since Maldonado's innovative venture in "Präzisierung der Terminologie" (1961). His unpublished lemmata are, however, reported to outnumber by far those that appeared in his diminutive but trailblazing booklet, which was even partially multilingual. Another modest mini-dictionary of high quality, in five languages including Russian, was published in Israel (Hrushovski and Even-Zohar 1972), and, quite recently, a monolingual (Portuguese) glossary has appeared, this one in Brazil (Rector 1974). The most ambitious printed work of this sort thus far is also the most disappointing, for several reasons, some of them detailed in Ketner and Kloesel's searching review article in Semiotica (Bense and Walther 1973).

On June 3, 1974, I proposed, during the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, to a convocation of over fifty interested scholars from many countries, a plan--subsequently ratified by the General Assembly--for an Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics. This EDS would contain three categories of entries:

I. Articles tracing the history of all terms used in semiotics, with suggestions for standardizing current usage, for, as noted by Nelson (1975:317f.), the editors "will succeed at their task most surely if they clarify all the seemingly exotic equivalences among languages in technical terms, estab-

lish primacy or origin within the original context and system and simply list even the hapax legomena or nonce terms."

II. Evaluative biographies of leading figures in semiotic studies. Each author would be required to relate his subject to his intellectual antecedents, show wherein lies his unique contribution to the advancement of semiotics, and trace his influence on later semioticians and his role in intellectual history in general. An example might be Gottlob Frege (1848-1925), who both vastly extended the early semiotics of the Stoics and their successors through the ages, and initiated the modern period in the study of logic in the form in which it is able to give an account of sentences involving multiple generality (cf. Dummett 1973).

III. Detailed descriptions of the impact of semiotics on other fields of inquiry, say, at random, anthropology (Firth 1973, Geertz 1973, Sperber 1974), economics (Fedorenko 1970 or 1972; Rossi-Landi 1974: 1915-1919), psychiatry (Bär 1975) and psychoanalysis (Verdiglione 1975), still photography (Lindekens 1971), visual art (Schapiro 1969); and upon certain delimited, objective copora, such as prayerful gestures in and outside of Christianity (Ohm 1948), Nevada cattle brands (Watt 1967), American cigarette advertisements (Sparti 1975), Slovakian popular costumes (Bogatyrev 1971), or verbal transforms of Parisian fashions (Barthes 1967b).

The EDS would be published in a single volume, in English, but matching glossaries in other languages would also be supplied. An exhaustive bibliography would be incorporated, keyed to the entries. The number, scope, and relative length of the entries and the names of the scholars who would be invited to contribute them will be determined by an international editorial board to be appointed by the IASS. I envisage a manual of up to 500,000 words, and estimate two years for its preparation. The project can commence as soon as full funding has been secured.

Simultaneously, a Canadian project, overlapping coverage with that of our first category, but with a further extension into esthetics, is also in the planning stage. It differs, too, in that it would be produced mainly, so to speak, in-house, that is, by the principal investigators themselves.

It is heartening to note that so many colleagues feel the need for taking steps to dispel the clouds of obfuscation which

have threatened to permanently befog semiotics. We, of all people, must be ever mindful of Peirce's "Ethics of Terminology" (II, 219-226), where he teaches "that the woof and warp of all thought and science is the life inherent in symbols... Yet the scientific and philosophical worlds are infested with pedants and pedagogues who are continually endeavoring to set up a sort of magistrature over thoughts and other symbols. It thus becomes one of the first duties of one who sees what the situation is, energetically to resist everything like arbitrary dictation in scientific affairs, and above all, as to the use of terms and notations. At the same time, a general agreement concerning the use of terms and of notations--not too rigid, yet prevailing, with most of the co-workers in regard to most of the symbols, to such a degree that there shall be some small number of different systems of expression that have to be mastered--is indispensable" (II, 220).

3. INTRODUCING SEMIOTICS. In my biased judgment, there were two--and only two--general semiotic treatises written during the interwar period, one produced on each side of the Atlantic, that deserve the appellation of miniature classics: Morris' Foundations of the Theory of Signs (1938 = 1971: 13-71), in the generation following Peirce, "whose work," Morris remarked there (1971:44) "is second to none in the history of semiotic"; and Buyssens' Les langages et le discours (1943 = 1967:9-74), in the generation following Saussure, whose "voeu" he intended to carry out in this essay (1943:6, §6). These two slender masterpieces had rather dissimilar fates. The Morris monograph achieved well-deserved international recognition and influence (cf. Rossi-Landi 1953, 1975, Eakins 1972, Fiordo 1976), which continue to flourish. On the contrary, the Buyssens pamphlet, perhaps because of the ill-starred date of its first publication in Belgium (Sebeok 1974a:225), received hardly any attention, although Hjelmslev did once refer to it as "A comprehensive attempt at a general semiology" (1953:69, fn. 1). It has eventually had a limited, though plainly salutary, effect on scattered Francophone writings in the field (e.g., Pohl 1968). Whenever I am asked by neophytes desirous of entry how to gain immediate access to semiotics, I direct them to these indispensable twin keys--Morris and Buyssens, each marked by a simplicty of approach, limpidity of style, critical discernment, and captivating devotion to their subject matter.

Apart from Morris's own Signs, Language and Behavior

(1946 = 1971:73-397), neither an introductory nor an advanced synthesis has yet been produced by any single American or other Anglophone semiotician in the postwar era to date. Restraints on the semiotic floodgates began at first to be lifted, with the onset of the 1960's, both here and abroad, less by dint of the creative efforts of individual scholars than through the common academic collaborative instrumentality of a host of colloquia, conferences, seminars, and all sorts of other meetings, many of them international and multidisciplinary, initially culminating in the 1974 Congress, but continuing beyond, seemingly into eternity (see 6., below).

In the West, Roland Barthes' extended, fascinating essay (1964, 1967a), perceptive as it was radical, set in motion a new inquiry and debate in a personal idiom, or, if you will, reopened Pandora's box of semiotic tricks. Barthes, after he read Saussure in 1956, launched on what he has since denominated "L'aventure sémiologique" (1974:28), not in a loose metaphoric sense but in full etymological awareness of adventure, and for explicitly "political" reasons (cf. Calvet 1973, 1974), namely, as an ideological maneuver. Although Calvet claims (1973:116) that the manual was intended to be an "ouvrage pratique, ouvrage d'initiation, clefs en quelque sorte," it obviously goes much further than that. The author rightly wants to know why the science of signs has made so little headway since Saussure. The search for an answer leads him to his notorious paradoxical inversion of Saussure's formula, and to the conclusion that semiotics is a part of linguistics, to be specific, "that part covering the great signifying unities of discourse" (Barthes 1967a:11). By this reversal of the customary hierarchy of entities, Barthes gains an instrument--the concept of signification--for bringing to light the unity of the research being carried out in a number of disciplines, an aim he shares, inter alia, with Morris (1971: 17f.). Traditional Saussureans have variously condemned Barthes' inferences and conclusions (e.g., Buyssens 1967:13f., Mounin 1970:12f., Prieto 1975:132-141), though I happen to think on trivial grounds; my own objections continue to derive from his absolute exclusion of sign processes among the speechless creatures from the semiotic universe, an anthropocentrism that, for me, detracts seriously from the brilliance of his book (Sebeok 1974a:220, 1975a:86).

The 1960's also witnessed the rise of a self-designated "Marxist semiotics," an uneasy synthesis the most curious aspect of which was its well-nigh complete rout by other

schools within the Soviet Union,[3] and its silent treatment throughout most of Eastern Europe, with the notable exception of the German Democratic Republic. The most popular books in this vein, with an announced epistemological goal, were written by Klaus (1963), Resnikow (1964 in Russian, 1968 in German), and Albrecht (1967). Klaus was also widely acclaimed by radical students of that decade in the German Federal Republic, and Resnikow was even translated for Italian consumption (1967). Generally speaking, conflations such as these are bound to be flawed, and burdened by their understandably requisite but still irritating quota of slogans. However, I have always derived consolation, not to say vast amusement, from a claim Klaus made, in the opening paragraph of his Foreward, according to which semiotics became, after World War II, "in breiten Schichten der Bürgertums der USA, vor allem aber bei der Intelligenz," a "Modewort," or fashionable catchword. Let me hereby solemnly assure Herr Klaus that my experience has been precisely the opposite: to this day, in the ruling circles of America, throughout our bourgeoisie, sadly inclusive of our intelligentsia, semiotics is emphatically still not a word to conjure with.

From the end of the last decade onwards, Continental textbooks of semiotics, or collections intended to serve as such, began to appear in profusion, and I would single out from this period the following works that all tyros should be acquainted with:

In English--Eco (1976), Guiraud (1975), and the two Sebeok anthologies (1974b:209-626, and 1975a);

In French--Prieto (1966), the Mounin collection (1970), Guiraud (1971), and Martinet (1973);

In German--Bense (1967), Eco (1972), and Walther (1974);

In Italian--Eco (1968, 1973, 1975);

In Russian--Stepanov (1971);

In Spanish--Gutiérrez López (1975);

In Swedish--Malmberg (1973).

Some of the works cited were also published in other languages or, as Malmberg's very readable and ingeniously illustrated paperback, are about to be. These references are, of course, intended to supplement other basic works already mentioned, especially in 3., and ought further to be rounded out by a welter of treatments of the subject, or of aspects of it, in a recent outpouring of relevant encyclopedias and handbooks of a similar character, and certain special collections. A sampling from this kind of literature will be found in the following chronological listing: 1968--Martinet, Prieto, Weinreich; 1969--Meetham/Hudson; 1971--Kristeva/Rey-Debove/

Umiker, Moles; 1972--Ducrot/Todorov; 1973--Dubois, Pottier; 1974--Koch; 1975--Stammerjohann.[4]

Of all the aforementioned, I have a decided preference for Eco 1976. To my taste, this book of his is the most sophisticated, comprehensive, readable account of semiotics now on the market, with a proper historical perspective as well as a critical but entirely fair regard for contemporary scholarship. In the jargon of the Italian left, the author has been identified as an "idealist"; if so, I admire the company he keeps. (Incidentally, Eco's elegant little book on signs [1973] is altogether splendid too; regrettably, it is, so far, available in Italian only.)

4. CATALOGUING SEMIOTICS. Bibliographies bore me, but I am prepared to concede their limited utility, if carried out well. The trouble is that, in general, they are not: often, they are a farrago of unread chunks of redundant learning churned out in amorphous lumps by dilettantes rather than experts properly trained in bibliographic methodology.[5] I have, myself, amateurishly dabbled at the art, applying it to the subfield of zoosemiotics, although I did insist on at least one absolute criterion for the inclusion of any items in my annotated guides: first-hand acquaintanceship with each entry (Sebeok 1968, 1972: 134-161, 1975d). (In my editorial capacity, I have, furthermore, encouraged the publication of such unique tools as Hewes' multidisciplinary bibliography of some 11,000 items that deal with the origins of language [1975].)

I know of only one bibliography that purports to cover semiotics as a whole: Eschbach 1974; (a follow-up volume has been announced). As such, it is perhaps commendable for its ambitiousness, or, at any rate, as a first approximation to a synthesis. However, it attempts too much while it achieves too little; in the end, it leaves one limp, with a chaotic impression of the scope and content of semiotics. Too, the compiler was seriously mistaken to try to incorporate the unedited lists of publications of fifteen quite arbitrarily chosen individual scholars, some alive and, presumably, still productive, others deceased yet far from exhaustively catalogued (the coverage of Peirce is, e.g., particularly dreadful). One also wonders, among similar reservations, why on earth 126 of John Dewey's publications, most of them not even marginally relevant to the subject, were allotted space?

There exist, of course, numberless bibliographies--annotated or otherwise, frankly select or declared to aim to-

wards comprehensiveness--of this or that aspect or branch of semiotics. Thus Lotz (1972) is typically idiosyncratic, containing merely what he considered "the most significant contributions in Western scholarship dealing with the problem of script"--only fourteen items in all. By contrast, it is hard to fathom the principles of selection that governed the make-up of Huggins and Entwisle (1974), an annotated bibliography of iconic communication, neatly prepared by a computer according to a uniform plan; (as it happens, I am concurrently writing a speech on "Iconicity" [Sebeok 1975e], but, unaccountably, have failed thus far to locate, among the approximately 350 entries listed in this book, even a single reference I needed to look up by way of documentation).

Let me drive my aversion to bibliographies home, reverting, by way of documentation, to the field of "nonverbal communication," some terminological predicaments of which I mentioned above, in section 2. A respectable scholarly working bibliography, usefully annotated in part, was published by Hayes (1957) although in a hardly accessible regional journal. Over the ensuing decades, several serious efforts of a similar nature followed, the most carefully wrought among them being Davis' annotated and indexed listing of some 931 titles (1972) (claiming [88] not to duplicate most of the references included by Hayes). The compiler explains the purpose, scope, and criteria for selecting her entries. Yet she nowhere alludes to the fact--which I find shocking--that solely English-language items are to be found in her book. Again, Davis does explicitly tell her readers: "Books and articles on...expressive movement...are cited" (vii). This notwithstanding, one searches in vain for mention of the most important book of the century on this subject, Bühler 1968--or references to the works of Johann Jakob Engel, Th. Piderit, Guillaume Benjamin Duchenne, Louis Pierre Gratiolet, Wilhelm Wundt (cf. 1973), Ludwig Klages, to name only some contributors to the topic discussed by Bühler. How can any such bibliography omit naming Kleinpaul, whose book (1888^1, 1972^2) has, to this day, no peer? Or the Canon Andrea de Jorio's magnificent study (1832) of gesture in ancient art and literature compared with gestures in common use in the Naples of his time? Or Brilliant's examination (1963) of postures found in Roman statuary by reference to the known use of gesture as a code system, as set out in the ancient manuals of rhetoric? Understandably, she could hardly have known Bouissac's penetrating 1973 treatise on the measurement of gestures; but his sources--Arcange Tuccaro, P.J. Barthez,

G. Strehly, Eadweard Muybridge (sometimes dubbed "the father of the motion picture," cf. Hendricks 1975), E.J. Marey, N. Oseretzky, and others--are ignored as well. The coverage of the so-called "natural" sign language systems--i.e., those used by Indians of the Great Plains and surrounding regions, and by many Australian aborigines--is shamefully spotty (cf. Mallery 1972, Sebeok and Umiker-Sebeok, to appear), to say nothing of monastic gestural systems (cf. e.g., van Rijnberk 1953, Buyssens 1956).

After these censures, I do apologize to Miss Davis for venting my spleen on her book and making it my scapegoat, especially since I regard her bibliography as the best of its kind. Later checklists (Key 1974, Ciolek 1975) are not nearly up to her standards of accuracy, and have an even woollier definition of their focal topic. (Labeling one's bibliography as "provisional" is, to me, merely a cop-out.)

Umberto Eco has recently observed that "a bibliography of works which may be defined as 'semiotic' is still missing." Because of this felt need, he decided to allocate a good deal of space in his journal, Versus, to remedy this situation. Accordingly, last year, a double issue of it (Nos. 8/9) was wholly devoted to the publication of nineteen bibliographies, with eight others announced for issues to come soon. Some of these center on a country or region, say Poland or Scandinavia, others on a topic, say zoosemiotics, still others on works in a specific language, say Spanish, while some, of course, are a medley. "Although we are perfectly aware of the inevitable limits of this work," Eco remarks in his Foreword to the series, "we think in any case that this repertory may be considered as one of the most complete at present and we sincerely trust that it may be of some help to many scholars" (Nos. 8/9.5). The quality of these bibliographies ranges from truly excellent to absolutely wretched, but even these are (I think) better than none, and I see no harm in bringing all of them to the attention of students who might find them serviceable, if used with caution. Accordingly, I list them in what follows, in appropriate categories (with fascicle numbers given if published in Versus No. 8/9):

Semiotic studies in Belgium (2), Brazil (3), Bulgaria, Canada (4), Czechoslovakia (5), France (parochially limited, 7), Germany, Great Britain (8), Greece, Hungary, Israel (10), Italy (with a supplementary section on the semiotics of the cinema, 11), Poland (12), Romania, Scandinavia (13), Soviet Union (15), Switzerland (14), United States (very restricted,

but varied, 16). Semiotic studies in Spanish (6). "On the meaning of the built environment" (English only, 9). Zoosemiotics (Sebeok 1975d); semiotics of the theater; architectural semiotics (in Spanish).

Bibliographies tend to reflect their compilers' cultural myopia in subtle ways. Those dedicated to nonverbal communication (like most recent general monographic accounts of the subject, including, surprisingly enough, the few--like Scherer 1970--published abroad) seem tacitly to assume that this is a strictly American game (or, sometimes, perhaps an Anglo-Saxon one, with Charles Darwin as its ritually cited godhead). Others suffer from a generation gap: they cannot see back beyond the early 1950's. Moreover, there is now a hazy but uneasy association of nonverbal communication studies with the clinical or social trend known as sensitivity training or encounter movements, and their off-shoots (Back 1972), embarrassing skeletons seldom paraded by scientific researchers in public, though obtrusive enough in their bibliographic closets. If examined with care, each of the Eco-located country bibliographies displays national chauvinism to a degree, which may, indeed, be unavoidable at this stage. But I personally care little whether a piece on, say, architectural semiotics, came out in Buenos Aires or London: what matters is how that fragment fits into the semiotic tapestry as a whole. Partial knowledge misleads us, as St. Paul (the great apostle to the Gentiles who was so preoccupied with perennial semiotic questions of code-switching) cautioned in one of his Epistles to the Corinthians, from incorrect assumptions to inaccurate conclusions: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part" (I. xiii. 9)--hence the dense tangle of the web as the controlling metaphor for the many logically interacting circumstances suggested in this paper.

5. CONFERRING ABOUT SEMIOTICS. As Stankiewicz has recently pointed out, the connection of poetics with semiotics was clearly formulated in 1929, in one of the Theses of the Linguistic Circle of Prague, which proclaimed that "Everything in the work of art and its relation to the outside world... can be discussed in terms of sign and meaning; in this sense aesthetics can be regarded as a part of the modern science of scene, of semiotics" (Stankiewicz 1974:630). In 1958, I organized a conference on verbal style my scholarly contribution to which considered "the semiotic system" of a text in its interrelation with its phonic organization (Sebeok 1960:231), and where a main theme developed by Jakobson, in his epochal closing statement on "Linguistics and Poetics," stemmed from

an observation that "many poetic features belong not only to the science of language but to the whole theory of signs, that is, to general semiotics" (ibid. 351). This Bloomington meeting was doubtless the initial one in a series of get-togethers, nominally devoted more or less to the verbal arts, but distinctly tinged with a trace of already perceptible semiotic coloring. In the 1960's, such conferences rapidly expanded in two directions: they became international as to participants, and turned increasingly pansemiotic as to subject matter. Both extensions resulted directly from initiatives taken by Polish semioticians, the origins of whose lively interest in this area "are to be found in the intensive development of the Polish school of logic during the last fifty years. Following the Second World War Polish scholars displayed growing interest in problems common to the theory of literature and linguistics. This led to a series of international work-groups on poetics in Poland, which can also boast of having become a tradition.....The natural development of the disciplines mentioned...eventually leads to a discipline which would encompass all systems of signs and man, as their author and receiver, that is, to semiotics" (Greimas 1970:vf.). The first "International Conference of Work-in-Progress devoted to Problems of Poetics" (Poetics...1961) was held in Warsaw in 1960, the second in 1961 (id. 1966). These were followed by two successive meetings in Poland on semiotics at large, the first in 1965, the second, held under the auspices of UNESCO, in the town of Kazimierz, in 1966 (Greimas 1970, magisterially examined by Osolsobě 1973a; cf. Sebeok 1974a:229f.). Finally--and I use the word both advisedly and pessimistically--a third meeting was convened in Warsaw for 1968, "at which time an international political crisis prevented the holding of more than a rump session"(Sebeok 1974a: 230); nonetheless, most of the papers read or intended for presentation were, in due course, published in full, or at least in abstract (Rey-Debove 1973). All those who care about the amazing progress and spread of semiotics during the previous decade--which, as is well known culminated in the foundation, in Paris, on January 21, 1969, of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS)--must become familiar with the bulky contents of the four aforementioned tomes of conference transactions, and be ever mindful of the historic efforts of our Polish confreres on behalf of the entire worldwide community of semioticians.

In another place (Sebeok 1974a:227f.), I have described the pioneering U.S. interdisciplinary conference on semiotics that

took place in Bloomington in the Spring of 1962 (the proceedings of which were later embodied in Sebeok, et al., 1972[2]). A rather differently styled North American Semiotics Colloquium was held in Tampa, July 28-30, 1975 (the proceedings of which will appear in the Advances in Semiotics series of the Indiana University Press, in 1976). This Colloquium--the Honorary Chairman of which is Charles Morris -- was particularly interesting because it is closely interlined, in fact, forms an organic part of, the 1975 Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, co-sponsored by the entire State University System of Florida through the University of South Florida; (a wide selection of semiotics courses, for the first time ever, made up one of the main focus areas of the summer-long program of the Linguistic Institute, with a multinational visiting faculty and a large corps of students in attendance from many countries--see also 6.). Second, the dozen or so invited Colloquium speakers were deliberately chosen from among prominent semioticians resident in either Canada or the United States. One principal aim was to wind upwith the foundation of a viable North American semiotics association of some sort, having several specific tasks and responsibilities, including eventual affiliation with the IASS. [6] Third, support for the Colloquium was provide over and above the local sources, through the munificence of the American Council of Learned Societies as well as the International Research and Exchanges Board; the latter provided generously for the unprecedented added participation of scholars from centers of semiotic researches in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Yugoslavia.

In the USSR, the first formal meeting on semiotics was held, in Moscow, in the Summer of 1962. The resulting book (Simpozium 1962) opens with a short paper by V. V. Ivanov, who defines the meaning and scope of semiotics in a most valuable way. The last of the world-renowned series of semiotic colloquia, held in Estonia, appears to have been the fifth (Semeiotikè 1973). Whether or not these creative seminars will be allowed to formally continue, their literary impact has already been massive (cf. fn. 3, above), and the seeds carried abroad by a handful of young participants from the group have begun to germinate in foreign soil. Their exertions will not have been in vain, for the rich crops are beginning to be harvested in Western lands.

In 1967, the University of Urbino began a series of con-

tinuing Summer seminars which, through various excursions and alarums, and dramatic shifts in leadership, appear to have congealed into a functioning Centro Internazionale di Semiotica e di Linguistica (cf. Marcus 1974). In part a Summer Session for students, in part a forum for established scholars convened to informally discuss diverse semiotic topics with one another in a modern university set in early Renaissance surroundings, Urbino has provided a rare site where representatives of workshops in Eastern Europe can freely mingle with those in Western Europe and the Americas, in a relaxed ambiance, Italian-style. Urbino has also launched, in 1971, a series of Working Papers and Prepublications, bewilderingly sectioned into six subseries (which can be safely disregarded); I have received 31 pamphlets so far, but the highest number reads F41.

Several cities, like Paris and Toronto, have created disparate semiotic Circles (Jakobson 1971), or the like, meeting at irregular intervals, sometimes reported (e.g., Semiotica 4.286-294, 7.369-375), more often tacit. It is difficult enough to keep track of local happenings in places such as Bucharest (Semiotica 5.301f.), Budapest (Hoppál 1971, 1973), or Buenos Aires (Semiotica 5.297-300), or all of Czechoslovakia (Osolsobě 1973b) and Poland (Pelc 1974) in the absence of regularly published reports, but it is clear that semiotic associations of varying degrees of cohesion and continuity are multiplying even in such unexpected corners of the world as Sicily (the Circolo Semiologico Siciliano can boast of five monographs so far; cf. the fifth, Sparti 1975), or Ribeirão Preto, a community in the State of São Paulo, which has set up a Centro de Estudos Semióticos A.J. Greimas (and which publishes Significação: Revista Brasileira de Semiótica since August 1974).

An exceptionally high number of conferences have been convened during the first half of our decade to debate particular semiotic topics of the most varied sort: on interaction ethology (Amsterdam 1970--see Sherzer 1971), on pragmatics (Jerusalem 1970--see Staal 1971), on the relation of semiotics to medicine and health problems (New York, 1970--see Lewis 1971), on the semiotics of the cinema (Oberlin, 1972--see Koch, to appear), the First International Congress of Musical Semiotics (Belgrade, 1973--see Versus 7.101-104), and a symposium on Peirce's concept of sign (Washington, 1975--see Peirce Newsletter, April 1975), to mention only a few, with many more scheduled to take place yet this year or, later on, during the second half of this decade. The most important among these

will include several more Peirce-oriented events (Baltimore, 1975, and the First International Peirce Congress in Stuttgart, 1976--see 1. above, and Peirce Newsletter, April 1975), a formative Semiotisches Colloquium convened by German practitioners (Berlin,1975), and three loosely intertwined successive symposia, still in the early planning stages, on, respectively, iconicity, indexical expressions, and the symbol.

By all accounts, the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (Milan, June 2-6, 1974) "was a great success" (in the words of Nelson 1975:296, an inspired aperçu that should be read by two groups of semioticians--those who attended the Congress, and those who did not). Moreover, I think that, in historical perspective, the Congress will loom as the watershed of semiotics in its contemporary phase, the crucial event when the subject edged into the academic establishment. This is certainly not because of the answers provided by the motley assemblage of speakers and discussants (cf. Thomas 1974:185), but rather because of the cheerful atmosphere of self-criticism that prevailed and because so many of the right kinds of questions that were insistently brought up, especially by the young people present. In short, semiotics is very much alive as it begins to emerge from its protracted infancy to find its rightful place among the law-seeking sciences of man; thus Saussure's oft-quoted prophetic utterance of some seventy years ago is about to be fulfilled: "Puisqu'elle n'existe pas encore, on ne peut dire ce qu'elle sera; mais elle a droit à l'existence, sa place est determinée d'avance" (Saussure 1972:33).

6. TEACHING SEMIOTICS. Given, as Peirce once remarked , that "all this universe is perfused with signs, if it is not composed exclusively of signs" (V, 448n), it should amaze no one that semiotics, or the doctrine of signs, is everywhere. Rather, what is surprising is that semiotics is nowhere--well, hardly anywhere at all--within the academy. For many, like Eco (1974:16), "semiotics is a scientific attitude, a critical way of looking at the objects of other sciences," more a method than a discipline. Yet it was precisely Peirce who held the view that "The true and worthy idea of the science [of logic] was that it was the art of devising methods of research --the method of methods" (Fisch and Cope 1952:289), and who said, in a memorable public lecture at Johns Hopkins, in September 1882: "This is the age of methods; and the university which is to be the exponent of the living condition of the human mind, must be the university of methods" (ibid.).

The following year, Peirce's "contract was summarily terminated under obscure circumstances" (Macksey 1970:6), and he never held any other teaching post. Although he lectured extensively on implicitly semiotic topics after the Hopkins episode, I am reasonably certain that Morris' sporadic semiotic seminars of the early 1940's, to which I referred earlier (1. above), were, at least in this country's educational system, without any precedent.

During the thirty years or so after Morris, semiotics as such continued to flow beneath the surface of some of our most distinguished campuses, erupting, geyser-like, only on the rarest of occasions, usually in response to irresistible student demand. To give a parochial example (only because I know it best): each of the last four visiting professorships I held--at the University of Colorado in 1969, at Stanford in 1971, and at the University of South Florida in 1972 and 1975--required me to offer an introductory course on semiotics, as I have done, for the past few years, in the Honors Division on my home grounds. At several of our major universities, faculty groups joining forces in all sorts of combinations have tried to mount programs of varying ambition, design, level of funding, and, of course, different degrees of success. Thus Columbia announced the formation of "a theoretical group exploring alternatives in semiotics" (Semiotext(e) 1974 1.2), while an informal faculty committee from Berkeley asked to consult with me in San Francisco, in the Spring of 1972, about ways and means of developing semiotics in their branch of the University of California. In the meantime, chairs with a semiotics label attached were set up in such far-flung centers of learning as Bologna, Canberra, and Montreal. So far as I have been able to determine, however, Brown University can lay claim to pride of place, at least in the United States, for having established a "semiotics concentration," or program for undergraduates, confidently expected in Providence to "become as central to modern humanistic education" as rhetoric was when it was added to curricula half a millennium ago; (cf. "Brown University Concentration in Semiotics," distributed by its English Department in April, 1975). It is heartening to note that although, because of financial exigencies, Brown is at present contemplating the elimination of as many as 75 of its 460 non-medical faculty positions over the next three years, the allure to students has been so intense that "What expansion takes place will occur in semiotics" (Scully 1975:11).

Motivated by my conviction that the most exciting devel-

opments in linguistics are bound to happen, in the years immediately ahead, at the periphery of its more traditional concerns--in neurolinguistics at the one extreme, and in "pragmatics," or, to be a shade more precise, in respect to the "deictic anchorage of utterances" (Rommetveit 1968:185, Fillmore 1973) at the other--I goaded the director of the 1975 Linguistic Institute to concentrate heavily on selected topics in just such zones (among others), and, for the first time in the history of this venerable enterprise, an array of explicitly labelled semiotic courses is actually being offered not only of an introductory character, but also in such specialized fields as "kinesics," the semiotics of the cinema, the semiotics of the performing arts and of the verbal arts, and examining the relationship prevailing between linguistics and semiotics in the last century and this. These studies were greatly enhanced by the visitors who graced the Colloquium mentioned under 5., above.

A singularly propitious development, laden with promise for a bright future of semiotics in American university life, may be assumed to eventuate from an imaginative grant the National Endowment for the Humanities recently made to Indiana University for a "Pilot Program in Semiotics in the Humanities," beginning in the Fall of 1975. This project was designed to inaugurate the teaching and facilitate the integration of semiotics into our curriculum. By mid-1976, in the light of extensive consultations with more than a dozen visiting scholars of eminence, our faculty and student community should be ready to present a solid, coherent program meeting the standards of both the federal Endowment and our University administration, tending to assure a steady course of reasonable systemic growth well into the 1980's. The fit of this Program with the Peirce project on our sister-campus in Indianapolis (1.) is exceptionally felicitous too.

The image of the modern semiotic universe has, until lately, suffered from excessive fragmentation, much as the world of astronomy must have appeared to John Donne when he wrote, in 1611, "'Tis all in pieces, all coherence gone;/All just supply, and all Relation." Many semiotic instruments have lately been heard, but most were being played separately rather than in harmony. The aim of our Program, and other efforts like it, is to make the experience whole again for the generations to follow, and to restore for them, as it were, its orchestral unity through the arts of teaching.

So much, for the time being, about the teaching of semio-

tics. But what about semiotics in teaching?[7] Let me momentarily dwell on an expression Morris introduced under the name of "applied semiotic," that subdivision of the totality he defined as the one which "utilizes knowledge about signs for the accomplishment of various purposes" (Morris 1971:303, 366). One striking area of application, that may be cited from the field of bionics, consists of attempts to transfer the principles governing echolocation in, say, bats (radar) or marine mammals (sonar)--a solipsistic use of sign behavior--to the design of guidance devices for the benefit of blind humans (Rice 1967; for further zoosemiotic illustrations, cf. Sebeok 1972:132f.). I have always favored Morris' understanding of this term, for I found it convenient; but I recognize that, for some other scholars, it carries quite different (and mutually inconsistent) connotations, as I once before pointed out (Sebeok 1974a:236f.). However, a fairly common usage confines applied semiotics strictly within the area of pedagogy, appearing to mean something like the teaching of, for instance, gSigns (see 2., above) to hearing persons who teach or otherwise serve the deaf (Oléron 1974), to chimpanzees (Gardner and Gardner 1971:127-144), or to "normal" humans, enabling such members of our species to acquire a range of social skills for role-playing (e.g., by the method proposed by Stanislavsky for budding actors), sensitivity training, behavior therapy, or the like (Argyle 1969:x), and to supplement second-language acquisition in the classroom.

The foregoing suggests a few further observations. First, there is a rapidly accumulating literature (ultimately instigated by Darwin) dealing with the ontogeny of nonverbally coded motor signs in humans (Latif 1934, Brannigan and Humphries 1972, Blurton Jones in Hinde 1972:271-296), notably, of facial expressions in infants and children (Charlesworth and Kreutzer 1973), including tongue showing (Smith, et al., 1974:222-227), all best studied as a part of the closely allied science of human ethology (McGrew 1972:14-16, Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, Ch. 18). Second, and in sharp contrast, the literature dealing with the acquisition of further, that is, culturally alien, codes is very thin indeed. The question then boils down to this: if, as is the case, we lavish incalculable amounts of energy, time, and money to instill in children and adults a range of foreign language competencies, why are the indissolubly parallel foreign gesticulatory skills all but universally neglected, especially considering that even linguists are fully aware that what has been called the total communication package, "best likened to a coaxial cable carrying many messages at the same

time" (Smith 1969:101), is hardly an exaggerated simile? Oddly, some of the teachers of the Western Romance languages, particularly of French or Spanish, appear to have best appreciated the necessity for introducing "the gestures of the speakers of the target language along with the linguistic patterns being taught" (Saitz 1966:33), and a modest but not uninteresting flurry of suggestive books and articles has sprung up here and there. (For French, cf. e.g., Brault 1962, and, in a more popular vein, Alsop 1960; for Iberian Spanish, Green 1968; for Colombian, Saitz and Cervenka 1972, where further references are given. As a matter of fact, informal training in foreign gesticulations sometimes reinforces language drills in some U.S. government programs, for instance, of the Peace Corps; cf. Schnapper 1969.)

Now one of the more fashionable methodologies currently pursued by language teachers here (Alatis 1968) and abroad (Nickel 1971) goes by the name of contrastive analysis, meaning the study of correspondences, or the lack of them, between paired source and target languages, mainly with a view to the effective teaching of the latter. What I should like to urge here is that comparative studies throughout the rest of the semiotic domain be immediately intensified, following Efron's (1972) elegant contrastive analysis of tendencies in the gestural behavior of several groups of Eastern Jews and Southern Italians, and expanded on the model of Ekman's (1971) definitive work on universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. The results of such scholarly researches, effectively constituting a dialect-atlas of nonverbal semiotic behavior, or another latticed pattern, should, then, as rapidly as possible, be assimilated by foreign-language teachers and those concerned with instruction in cross-cultural and cross-ethnic matters (e.g., Taylor and Ferguson 1975). I timidly venture to suggest that the beginnings of a scarcely digested data-base may already exist for the Southern and Western Romance populations, where the scrutiny of motor signs seems for some time past to have been accepted as an avocation (e.g., for Italian, see Cocchiara 1932, for Portuguese, Basto 1938, for Spanish, Poyatos 1970, inter alia).

Five years back, I answered the question posed by myself, "Is a comparative semiotics possible?" (Sebeok 1970), in the affirmative, and now I would like to go on to advocate that its pedagogical consequences be also faced up to and opened to inquiry. I do so in full awareness that applied semiotics lacks glamor, and even respectability in certain quarters more par-

tial to theory and/or description, a view which I can but ruefully counter with a remark attributed to the famed mathematician Richard Courant: "Pure mathematics is a small and not very significant part of applied mathematics."

7. THE SEMIOTIC TRIPOD. In our semiotic Pantheon, the name of Saussure stands engraved as the emblem for the linguistic affinities and extensions of the hierarchically superordinate field, while that of Peirce, "the heir of the whole historical philosophical analysis of signs" (Morris 1971:337), and now manifestly the bench mark for all contemporary deliberations, epitomizes its manifold filiation with the profoundest strata of human wisdom. The third, admittedly uneven leg upon which semiotics rests, very likely the most deeply rooted, is medicine, the revered ancestral figure surely being Hippocrates (c460-c377 BC), "der Vater und Meister aller Semiotik" (Kleinpaul 1972:103). These three fundamental semiotic traditions--the medical, the philosophical, and the linguistic--have, of course, thoroughly intermingled at various points in Western intellectual history, although at other times they have striven for autonomy. For instance, Sextus Empiricus, the most prominent of the Skeptics, was, like Locke, a physician by profession (Stough 1969:11-15), with a decided interest in the theory of signs (Ogden and Richards 1938:266-268). But while the philosophical and linguistic strands are appreciated, more or less widely, I have found that the distinctive contributions of medical semiotics--or, to reinforce Shands' apt coinage, "clinical semiotics" (1975)--are seldom understood. Medical inquiry revolves around one particular subclass of signs called "symptons" (and their stable, rule-governed configurations, "syndromes"), which are, in turn, often considered a species of a more basic grouping, "indexes" (as shrewdly observed by Bühler 1965:28). It is a peculiarity of symptoms that their denotata are generally different for the addresser, viz., the patient ("subjective symptoms," confusingly called by many American medical practitioners "signs") and the addressee, viz., the examining physician ("objective symptoms," or simply "symptoms") (Sebeok 1975c:#2)[8]. Symptomatology, also known as "semeiology," or the like, in many Western languages (Sebeok 1973), eventually developed into a branch of medicine foreseen and durably delineated by Galen (130-c200), who taught that semiotics--being one of the six principal branches of medicine--is to be divided into three parts, "in praeteritum cognitionem, in praesentium inspectionem et futurorum providentiam" (Galenus 1965:690), meaning that its threefold preoccupation must be

with diagnostics, focusing on the here and now, and its twin temporal projections into the anamnestic past (i.e., case history) and the prognostic future. Fifty years after Crookshank's neglected essay (1923), a reasoned rapproachement between the general theory of signs on the one hand, and medical theory and clinical praxis on the other, is again in progress, stimulated in no small part by the pioneer works of Michel Foucault (Barthes 1972:38), by such attempts as those of Barthes himself (ibid.), and, in an entirely different vein, of Celan and Marcus (1973). Conferences like the one reported by Lewis (1970), and more specialized ones being actively planned (e.g., on specifically psychiatric-psychotherapeutic aspects of clinical semiotics), will doubtless speed up the process of reconvergence given a decisive turn at the Bloomington semiotic conference of 1962 (5., above) where we all profited immensely from the insights of the ten participating physicians, and where a not inconsiderable portion of the discussions was devoted to the vital problem, "How the patient communicates about disease with the doctor" (Sebeok, et al.,1972:11-49, Blum, 1972, Ostwald 1973:236-59). Physicians are also publishing more and more through semiotic outlets: in the Approaches to Semiotics series alone, four books have appeared by three M. D.'s (Ostwald 1973, Ruesch 1972, Shands 1970, 1971; see also Bär 1975, a volume which inaugurates the Studies in Semiotics series, partially replacing the former).

The metaphor of the tripod is, I think, historically justified, and has the right sorts of connotations for me personally--with a surveyor's level, or transit, as well as with a kind of examination, Cambridge-style--but it does become a bit awkward if pushed too far. For one thing, I did observe that these three semiotic traditions have interwoven in various ways and at various times, which does conjure up the ungainly figure of a three-legged stand with rubbery legs of unequal length. To take only one recent example of such blending, "Montague's semiotic program" (as the editor of his posthumous papers has dubbed it, 1974:1ff.) illustrates how one man's framework for the study of a natural language has brought metamathematical tools to bear on the analysis, consisting of logical elements which "are natural developments of standard logical theories," compounded with linguistic elements (independent though they may be of current grammatical theories). When one reflects further on the explosion of the 1960's, and the ways in which semiotic theory, practice, and methods have pervaded a broad spectrum of late 20th

century thought, ranging from architecture to zoology, the image does take on science-fiction attributes, with (for some of my conservative colleagues) menacing pseudopodial protrusions. It would be a salutary and informative exercise to assess, field by established field, the successes and failures of these intrusions. One wants to know, among other things, why semiotics has achieved great successes in application, for instance, to the cinematic crafts (cf. Bettetini 1973, Lotman 1973, Metz 1974, Worth 1969), whereas its impact on the art of dancing has, as far as I can judge, made only modest headway (Ikegami 1971); or why its insidious encroachments on the study of culture has been far more robust (as mentioned before) than on descriptions of the conduct of international relations (Jervis 1970); and so forth. An inquiry of this scope would clearly be out of place here, but I would like to inspect cursorily just two lines of lateral development, the first because it hints at what may be feasible, the second for the opposite reason, because it is an already flourishing enterprise.

In 1970, a Polish legal scholar (Studnicki 1970; cf. Droste 1972) published a remarkable paper, far reaching in its implications, consisting of a sophisticated analysis, from a strictly semiotic point of view, of "traffic signs," namely, that subclass of visual signs which are used in the regulation and control of traffic on public roads (danger signs, mandatory signs, prohibitory signs, information signs). What the author did not treat, nor, I believe, returned to elsewhere, was a detailed analysis of the prescriptions which form the legal basis of the system under consideration, the totality of which he succinctly referred to "under the name of 'Law'" (ibid. 151). The Law standardizes the sign-types utilized in the system and its text includes a list of the corresponding patterns. The semantic rules contained in the text of the Law assign to each of the signs in the system "a definite utterance of the ethnic language," to wit, "the natural translations" of the appropriate signs (ibid. 161). Studnicki's approach is relevant for a theory of normative languages in general, and thus opens up exciting new avenues for investigation. A "legal semiotics" can be envisaged in outline: if the Law is regarded as a system of signs, the mechanisms of which are concretely institutionalized, difficult problems appear in a new light, for example, the age-old question of drawing an analytical boundary between the legal system and the environment in which it lies embedded, or how social norms, unspecific as these tend to be, nonetheless provide authoritative guides to

conduct. Since the peculiar province of law seems to be juridical interpretation, the possibilities for a semiotic research strategy are boundless, but hitherto barely tested.

If legal semiotics is as yet hardly more than a gleam in someone's eye, musical semiotics has progressed, in the 1970's, far beyond the programmatic declarations and early attempts collected by Nattiez (Musique en jeu 1971; cf. the interesting review article by Osmond-Smith 1974), and advanced by him in a notable lecture he delivered in the Indiana University School of Music the following year (Nattiez 1972). Harking back directly to the work of Ruwet (1972), a scholar equally adept in linguistics and musicology, who has set forth an explicitly reproducible procedure allowing for the delimitation and definition of musical units, and to his conception of such units according to a hierarchic principle, Nattiez has pushed forward on several fronts: he continues as a vigorous anthologist of musical semiotics (Musique en jeu 1973; the first special thematic issue of Semiotica, in Vol. 15, No. 1 1975, entirely devoted to music, was likewise assembled by him), a foremost contributor to his chosen field (Nattiez 1975), and a dedicated teacher who has promoted the University of Montreal into a mecca for students wishing to specialize in intricate questions of musical semiosis. This difficult domain of semiotics, marked by the absence, or very much diminished presence, of the referential function, has spread and matured sufficiently to have merited an international congress in 1973 (5.), and book-length publications are multiplying (e.g., Pagnini 1974) whereas a handful of articles contained the sum total of knowledge only a few years ago.

As Morris has insisted, esthetics "becomes in its entirety a subdivision of semiotic," and the approach to it in terms of the theory of signs "is thus not merely significant for art, esthetics, and semiotic, but for the whole program of unified science" (Morris 1971:416, 433). Understanding the esthetic function of sign systems as displayed in the several arts, verbal and pictorial, two-and three-dimensional, pantomimic and choreographic, introversive and extroversive, and ranging in appeal from mass culture, like the comic strip, to more elitist strata, like the opera, thus becomes an essential concern and preoccupation of modern semiotics and in the human context beyond, with a vast, accreting, specialized literature. The dramatic forward thrust of musical semiotics is paralleled across the board, to be sure with variations in speed, intensity, and individual initiative, but the arachnoid semiotic

movement envelops the totality of esthetic discourse, as Morris foresaw when he married axiology, or the study of preferential behavior, to the inherently interdisciplinary semiotic enterprise.

8. APPENDIX: NOTES TOWARD A CHECKLIST OF SERIAL PUBLICATIONS. Semiotica--the official organ of the IASS--will have published, from 1969 to the end of 1975, approximately 6,000 pages, distributed over 15 volumes of four fascicles each. Semiotica strives to maintain a reasonable balance among the various semiotic domains, and, at the same time, contributions of quality received from scholars who labor in different countries. The journal, now a monthly, routinely accepts articles in either French or English, sporadically also in German. The cardinal conception underlying the editorial policy of Semiotica is to provide a link between all the creative workshops of the world, as well as to be a forum for the most diverse scientific approaches to the doctrine of signs. Its founding editor likes to think of Semiotica as a sort of clearing-house for novel and stimulating ideas, and as the focal point in an international and multidisciplinary network, or, in a word, web. A uniform, comprehensive set of indexes, especially of subjects, for all the volumes published so far, plus perhaps a glossary of technical terms used throughout, are a priority desideratum.[9]

There exists, of course, a multitude of outlets which have printed articles, or may do so in the future, concerned either directly or tangentially with semiotic topics. The mere listing of linguistic periodicals takes up 27 pages in the latest UNESCO bibliography (for the year 1972, published in 1975), to say nothing of those servicing philosophy, the verbal arts, and other specialized domains, including even theology (thus Linguistica Biblica, edited in Bonn, carries an ever increasing number of explicitly labeled semiotic pieces). I will, of necessity, mainly confine myself, in the list that follows, to the mere handful of periodicals which explicitly identify themselves with semiotics or are otherwise obviously relevant:

Cahiers internationaux de symbolisme, produced in Belgium; 26 issues have appeared through 1974.

Degrés: Revue de synthèse à orientation sémiologique, also produced in Belgium; six issues have appeared through 1974.

Le Journal Canadien de Recherche Sémiotique/The

Canadian Journal of Research in Semiotics, produced in Edmonton; two volumes have appeared so far.

Studia Semiotyczne, a publication of the Polish Semiotic Society, each issue of which is accompanied by a separate pamphlet, Semiotic Studies, containing English summaries of the Polish articles. I have seen four numbers, the latest dated 1973.

Versus: Quaderni di studi semiotici, produced in Italy; nine numbers have appeared through 1974.

It is very difficult to keep track of fugitive "special issues" on semiotic topics which this or that journal features, because these are often improvisations directed at a particular segment of the total semiotic readership. An early case in point is Sprache im Technischen Zeitalter, a well-known German periodical, which unexpectedly blossomed forth with an issue (No. 27, 1968) entirely devoted to film semiotics: "Zeichensystem Film/Versuche zu einer Semiotik." Five years later, Screen came out with a "special double issue" (Vol. 14, Nos. 1-2, 1973) on "Cinema Semiotics and the Work of Christian Metz." One could enumerate a host of similar epiphanies in architecture (e.g., Sémiotique des plans en architecture and Sémiotique de l'espace, both published in Paris, 1973, by the so-called Groupe 107), literature (Helikon, Vol. 19, Nos. 2-3, 1973) music (see 7., above, re Musique en jeu 1971, 1973), the visual arts (esp. Communications No. 15, 1970; cf. idem, No. 4, n.d.), ideology, as in the issue devoted to "Sémiologie et société" of Sociologie et société (Vol. 5, No. 2, 1973), etc. Furthermore, a journal may simply present its readers with a bouquet of semiotic miscellanea in a random number (as in Vozes, Vol. 68, No. 8, 1974, on "Semiotica & semiologia").

An event of quite exceptional important for the welfare of the field occurred in 1973, when the editor of The Times Literary Supplement commissioned nine articles on assigned semiotic topics, which then appeared in two successive special issues, together entitled "The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics" (Nos. 3,735-3,736), of the TLS. The timing (Oct. 5 and 12, 1973) was deliberately set on the occasion of the 25th Frankfurt Book Fair, where this conspectus of semiotics received maximum exposure and was, by all accounts, accorded an uncommonly warm reception by a wide circle beyond the specialized public. Most of the essays, revised and with materials added, were later included, and are now conveniently available, in a book (Sebeok 1975a).

At the Milano Congress (5., above), some of the journal editors met to discuss ways and means of facilitating communication. One decision taken that Summer was to start a Bulletin of Literary Semiotics, an international newsletter designed to keep track of recent and forthcoming publications, to announce forthcoming conferences and the like, and to keep its readers informed of work in progress. The first issue, edited by Daniel Laferrière, appeared in May of 1975. Several other newsletters, rather informal in appearance and coverage, more or less regularly service those interested in aspects of nonverbal communication (the 12th number in four years of "Nonverbal Components of Communication, Paralanguage, Kinesics, Proxemics" came out in May, 1975), including zoosemiotics (viz., "human ethology"--see the Human Ethology Newsletter, the 9th number of which appeared in May, 1975). Others are regional in orientation, as the Szemiotikai Tájékoztató of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (No. 1, 1975), announced to appear six times a year, to be exclusively devoted to semiotic activities in Hungary.

As for serials designed to accommodate booklength contributions to the theory of signs--monographs, including reprints of classics in the field, translations of important foreign-language books into some other tongue, collections of articles by a single author or on some unified theme, and pertinent conference proceedings--the following can be singled out:

Approaches to Semiotics: since 1969, about fifty volumes have been published in this series (in The Netherlands), many of them listed among the references to this article. Beginning this year, two new series are appearing, both under the auspices of Indiana University--Advances in Semiotics (Eco 1976 Bouissac 1976), and Studies in Semiotics (Bär 1975, Jakobson 1975, Wallis 1975, Fiordo 1976).

The French house Mame has published six books, since 1972, in a collection with the over-all title, Univers Sémiotiques. In Italy, Bompiani has a series, Il campo semiotico, with four books out so far. In Studies in African Semiotics (edited by S.O. Anozie), a series "presenting contemporary interpretations and evaluations of language and communication in Africa," there are two anthologies and one monograph available as of 1975, and a Semiotic Association of Africa, "to be formally inaugurated in the near future," has just been proclaimed. Rumors of still other series, soon to be activated in at least three West European countries, are currently being bruited about, but concrete information about these is lacking.

September, 1975

REFERENCES

Alatis, James E., ed. 1968. Report on the Nineteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Albrecht, Erhard. 1967. Sprache und Erkenntnis: Logisch-Linguistische Analysen. Berlin: VEB.

Alsop, Stewart. 1960. How to Speak French Without Saying a Word. The Saturday Evening Post 233.26-29.

Apel, Karl-Otto. 1973. Charles W. Morris und das Programm einer pragmatisch integrierten Semiotik. In: Zeichen, Sprache und Verhalten, by Charles William Morris, pp. 9-66. Düsseldorf: Schwann.

Argyle, Michael. 1969. Social Interaction. New York: Atherton.

Arrivé, Michel. 1974. Sémiologie ou sémiotique? Le Monde, June 7.

Back, Kurt W. 1972. Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training and The Encounter Movement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bär, Eugen. 1975. Semiotic Approaches to Psychotherapy. Studies in Semiotics 1. Bloomington: Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies.

Barthes, Roland. 1964. Éléments de sémiologie. Paris: Seuil. [English version--1967a. Elements of semiology. London: Jonathan Cape.]

---. 1967b. Système de la mode. Paris: Seuil.

---. 1972. Sémiologie et médicine. In: Les sciences de folie, ed. Roger Bastide, pp. 37-46. Paris: Mouton.

---. 1974. L'aventure sémiologique. Le Monde, June 7.

Basto, Claudio. 1938. A linguagem dos gestos em Portugal. Revista Lusitana 36.5-72.

Bellour, Raymond and Christian Metz. 1971. Entretien sur la sémiologie du cinéma. Semiotica 4.1-30.

Bense, Max. 1967. Semiotik: Allgemeine Theorie der Zeichen. Baden-Baden: Agis.

---, and Elisabeth Walther, eds. 1973. Wörterbuch der Semiotik. Cologne: Kiebnheuer & Witsch. [Cf. Kenneth Laine Ketner and Christian J. W. Kloesel's 1975 review article, The Semiotic of Charles Sanders Peirce and the First Dictionary of Semiotics, Semiotica 13. 395-414.]

Benveniste, Émile. 1969. Sémiologie de la langue. Semiotica 1.1-12, 127-135.

Bertin, Jacques. 1967. Sémiologie graphique. Paris: Mouton.

Bettetini, Gianfranco. 1973. The Language and Technique of the Film. Approaches to Semiotics 28. The Hague: Mouton.

Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1970. Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Cf. Paul A. R. Bouissac's 1972 review article, What Does the Little Finger Do? An Appraisal of Kinesics, Semiotica 6. 279-288.]

Blum, Lucille Hollander. 1972. Reading Between the Lines: Doctor-Patient Communication. New York: International Universities Press.

Bocheński, J. M. 1956. Formale Logik. Freiburg: K. Alber.

Bogatyrev, Petr. 1971[2] [1937[1]]. The Functions of Folk Costume in Moravian Slovakia. Approaches to Semiotics 5. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Henry Glassie's 1973 review article, Structure and Function, Folklore and the Artifact, Semiotica 7. 312-351.]

Bosmajian, Haig A. 1971. The Rhetoric of Nonverbal Communication: Readings. Glenview: Scott, Foresman.

Bouissac, Paul. 1973. La mesure des gestes: Prolégomènes à la sémiotique gestuelle. Approaches to Semiotics, paperback series 3. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1976. Circus and Culture: A Semiotic Approach. Advances in Semiotics 2. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Brannigan, Christopher R. and David A. Humphries. 1972. Human Non-Verbal Behaviour,A Means of Communication. In: Ethological Studies of Child Behaviour, ed. N. Blurton Jones, pp. 37-64. Cambridge: University Press.

Brault, Gérard J. 1962. Kinesics and the Classroom: Some Typical French Gestures. French Review 36.374-382.

Brilliant, Richard. 1963. Gesture and Rank in Roman Art: The Use of Gestures to Denote Status in Roman Sculpture and Coinage. Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 14. New Haven: Academy.

Brun, Theodore. 1969. The International Dictionary of Sign Language: A Study of Human Behaviour. London: Wolfe Publishing Ltd.

Bühler, Karl. 1965[2] [1934[1]]. Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer.

---. 1968[2] [1933[1]]. Ausdruckstheorie: Das System an der Geschichte aufgezeigt. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer.

Burghardt, Gordon M. 1970. Defining "Communication." In: Communication by Chemical Signals, eds. James W. Johnston, Jr., David G. Moulton, and Amos Turk; pp. 5-18, New Yor: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bursill-Hall, Geoffrey L. 1971. Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages: The Doctrine of Partes Orationis of the Modistae. Approaches to Semiotics 11. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Jean Stefanini's 1973 review article, Les modistes et leur apport à la theorie de la grammaire et du signe linguistique, Semiotica 8.263-275.

Buyssens, Eric. 1943. Les langages et le discours: Essai de linguistique fonctionnelle dans le cadre de la sémiologie. Brussels: J. Lebègue. [A revised version is incorporated in id. 1967. La Communication et l'articulation linguistique 9-74. Brussels: Presses Universitaires.]

---. 1956. Le langage par gestes chez les moines. Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie de Bruxelles 29.537-545.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. 1973. Roland Barthes: un regard politique sur le signe. Paris: Payot.

---. 1974. Une sémiologie politique. L'Arc: Roland Barthes 56.25-29.

Carnap, Rudolf. 1942. Introduction to Semantics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Celan, Eugen and Solomon Marcus. 1973. Le diagnostic comme langage, I. Cahiers de Linguistique 10.163-173.

Charlesworth, William R. and Mary Anne Kreutzer. 1973. Facial Expressions of Infants and Children. In: Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Research in Review, ed. Paul Ekman, pp. 91-168. New York: Academic Press.

Chevalier, Jean and Alain Gheerbrant, eds. 1973-74 [1969[1]]. Dictionnaire des symboles: mythes, rêves, coutumes, gestes, formes, figures, couleurs, nombres. Paris: Seghers.

Chomsky, Noam. 1972. Language and Mind. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich.

Ciolek, T. M. 1975. Human Communicational Behavior: A Provisional Checklist of References to the Use of Gesture, Postures, Bodily Contact, Spacing, Orientation, Facial Expressions, Looking Behavior, and Appearance in the Course of Face-to-Face Interactions. Sign Language Studies 6.1-64.

Clerk, Christian. 1975. The Cannibal Sign. Royal Anthropological Institute News 8.1-3.

Cocchiara, Giuseppe. 1932. Il linguaggio del gesto. Turin: Fratelli Bocca.

Coquet, Jean-Claude and Julia Kristeva. 1972. Sémanalyse: Conditions d'une sémiotique scientifique. Semiotica 5.324-349.

Corti, Maria. 1973. Le jeu comme génération du texte: des tarots au recit. Semiotica 7.33-48.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1969, 1972. Die Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Eine Übersicht. (Teil I: Von der Antike bis Leibniz. Teil II: Von Leibniz bis Rousseau.) Stuttgart: Vogt KG.

Critchley, Macdonald. 1939. The Language of Gesture. London: Arnold.

Crookshank, F. G. 1923. The Importance of a Theory of Signs and a Critique of Language in the Study of Medicine. In: Ogden and Richards 1938:337-355.

Crystal, David. 1969. Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English. Cambridge: University Press.

---. 1974. Paralinguistics. Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 12, Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 265-295. The Hague: Mouton.

Culler, Jonathan. To appear. Saussure. Fontana Modern Masters. London: Collins.

Dascal, Marcelo. 1972. Aspects de la sémiologie de Leibniz. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Davis, Flora. 1970. The Way We Speak 'Body Language'. The New York Times Magazine, May 31, pp. 8-9, 29-34 41-42.

---. 1971. Inside Intuition: What We Know About Nonverbal Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Davis, Martha. 1972. Understanding Body Movement: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Arno Press.

Deely, John N. 1974. The Two Approaches to Language: Philosophical and Historical Reflections on the Point of Departure of Jean Poinsot's Semiotic. The Thomist 38.856-907.

DeLacy, Phillip and Estelle, eds. 1941. Philodemus: On Methods of Inference; A Study in Ancient Empiricism. Philological Monograph 10. Philadelphia: American Philological Association.

de Vries, Ad. 1974. Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dewey, John. 1946. Peirce's Theory of Linguistic Signs, Thought, and Meaning. The Journal of Philosophy 43.85-95.

Dreyfuss, Henry. 1972. Symbol Source Book: An Authoritative Guide to International Graphic Symbols. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Droste, Frederik G. 1972. The Grammar of Traffic Regulations. Semiotica 5.257-262.

Dubois, Jean, et al., eds. 1973. Dictionnaire de linguistique. Paris: Larousse.

Ducrot, Oswald and Tzvetan Todorov. 1972. Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage. Paris: Seuil.

Dummett, Michael. 1973. Frege: Philosophy of Language. London: Duckworth.

Eakins, Barbara Westbrook. 1972. Charles Morris and the Study of Signification. Dissertation. The University of Iowa.

Eco, Umberto. 1968. La struttura assente: Introduzione alla ricerca semiologica. Milan: Bompiani. [German version--1972. Einführung in die Semiotik. Munich: Fink.] [Cf. Paolo Valesio's 1971 review article, Toward a Study of the Nature of Signs, Semiotica 3.155-185.]

---. 1973. Il segno. Milan: ISEDI.

---. 1974. Closing statement at the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, Le Journal Canadien de Recherche Sémiotique 2/2.7-16.

---. 1976. A Theory of Semiotics. Advances in Semiotics 1. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [Italian version--1975. Trattato di semiotica generale. Milan: Bompiani.]

Efron, David. 1972[2] [1941[1]]. Gesture, Race and Culture. Approaches to Semiotics 9. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Allen T. Dittmann's 1973 review article, Style in Conversation, Semiotica 9.241-251.]

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Irenäus. 1970. Ethology: The Biology of Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Eimermacher, Karl. 1971. Entwicklung, Charakter und Probleme des sowjetischen Strukturalismus in der Literaturwissenschaft. In: Teksty sovetskogo literaturovedčeskogo

strukturalizma, ed. Karl Eimermacher, pp. 9-40. Munich: Fink.

Eisenberg, Abne N. and Ralph R. Smith, Jr. 1971. Nonverbal Communication. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Ekman, Paul. 1971. Universals and Cultural Differences in Facial Expressions of Emotion. Current Theory and Research in Motivation 19. 207-283.

---, and Wallace V. Friesen. 1969. The Repertoire of Nonverbal Behavior: Categories, Origins, Usage, and Coding. Semiotica 1. 49-98.

---. 1975. Unmasking the Face: A Guide to Recognizing Emotions from Facial Clues. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Eschbach, Achim. 1974. Zeichen - Text - Bedeutung: Bibliographie zu Theorie und Praxis der Semiotik. Munich: Fink.

Faccani, Remo and Umberto Eco, eds. 1969. I sistemi di segni e lo strutturalismo Sovietico. Milan: Bompiani.

Fast, Julius. 1970. Body Language. New York: M. Evans.

Fedorenko, N. P., ed. 1970. Ekonomičeskaja Semiotika. Moscow: Nauka. [German version--1972. Ökonomische Semiotik. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.]

Fillmore, Charles J. 1973. May We Come In? Semiotica 9. 97-116.

Fiordo, Richard Anthony. 1976. Charles Morris and the Criticism of Discourse. Studies in Semiotics 4. Bloominton: Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies.

Firth, Raymond. 1973. Symbols: Public and Private. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fisch, Max H. 1972. Peirce and Leibniz. Journal of the History of Ideas, 33. 485-496.

---, and Jackson I. Cope. 1952. Peirce at the Johns Hopkins University. In: Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce, eds. Philip P. Wiener and Frederic H. Young, pp. 277-311, 355-360. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fokkema, Douwe W. 1974. Semiotiek en Structuralisme in de Sovjetunie. Forum der Letteren 15.138-156.

Fresnault-Deruelle, Pierre. 1975. L'espace interpersonnel dans les comics. In: Sémiologie de la représentation: théatre, television, bande dessinée, ed. André Helbo, et al., pp. 129-150. Brussels: Complexe.

Galenus, Claudius. 1965. Opera Omnia 14. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Gardner, Beatrice T. and R. Allen Gardner. 1971. Two-Way Communication with an Infant Chimpanzee. In: Behavior of Nonhuman Primates: Modern Research Trends, eds. Allan M. Schrier and Fred Stollnitz, Vol. 4, pp. 117-184. New York: Academic Press.

Garrison, Fielding H. 1929[4]. An Introduction to the History of Medicine: With Medical Chronology, Suggestions for Study and Bibliographic Data. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Glasersfeld, Frnst von. 1974. Signs, Communication, and Language. Journal of Human Evolution 3.465-474.

Green, Jerald R. 1968. A Gesture Inventory for the Teaching of Spanish. New York: Chilton Books.

Greenlee, Douglass. 1973. Peirce's Concept of Sign. Approaches to Semiotics, paperback series 5. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Gérard Deledalle's 1974 review article, Qu'est-ce qu'un signe? Apropos de Peirce's Concept of Sign de Douglass Greenlee, Semiotica 10.383-397.]

Greimas, Algirdas J., et. al. 1970. Sign, Language, Culture. The Hague: Mouton.

Guiraud, Pierre. 1971. La sémiologie. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. [English version--1975. Semiology. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.]

Gutiérrez López, Gilberto A. 1975. Estructura de lenguaje y conocimiento: Sobre la epistemologia de la semiotica. Madrid: Fragua.

Hall, Edward T. 1966. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City: Doubleday.

---. 1968. Proxemics. Current Anthropology 9.83-108.

Harrison, Randall P., et al. 1972. The Nonverbal Communication Literature. The Journal of Communication 22.460-476.

Hayes, Francis C. 1957. Gestures: A Working Bibliography. Southern Folklore Quarterly 21.218-317.

Hediger, Heini. 1970. Zur Sprache der Tiere. Der Zoologische Garten 38.171-179.

---. 1974. Communication Between Man and Animal. Image Roche 62.27-40.

Helbo, André. 1974. Prolégomènes à la sémiologie théâtrale: Une lecture de Port Royal. Semiotica 11.359-374.

---, et al. 1975. Sémiologie de la représentation. Brussels: Complexe.

Hendricks, Gordon. 1975. Eadweard Muybridge: The Father of the Motion Picture. London: Secker and Warburg.

Herculano de Carvalho, José G. 1969. Segno e significazione in João de São Tomás. In: Estudos Linguísticos 2.129-168. Coimbra: Atlântida.

Hess, Eckhard H. 1975. The Tell-Tale Eye: How Your Eyes Reveal Hidden Thoughts and Emotions. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Hewes, Gordon W. 1975. Language Origins: A Bibliography. Approaches to Semiotics 44. The Hague: Mouton.

Hinde, R.A. 1974. Biological Bases of Human Social Behaviour. New York: McGraw-Hill.

---, ed. 1972. Non-verbal Communication. Cambridge: University Press.

Hjelmslev, Louis. 1953. Prolegomena to a Theory of Language. Baltimore: Waverly.

Hooff, J.A.R.A.M. van. 1972. A Comparative Approach to the Phylogeny of Laughter and Smiling. In: Hinde 1972, pp. 209-238.

Hoppál, Mihály. 1971. Szemiotikai kutatások Magyarországon. Fotóművészet 14/2.9-18, 34.

---. 1973. Semiotic Research in Hungary. Acta Ethnographica 22.204-216.

Horányi, Özséb, and Pléh Csaba. 1975. Jelek a rajzfilmben. In Tanulmányok a magyar animációs filmről, pp. 226-248. Budapest: Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet és Filmarchivum.

Hrushovski, Benjamin and Itamar Even-Zohar. 1972. A Short Hebrew-English-French-German-Russian Dictionary of Terms in Semiotics, Semantics, and Allied Fields. Hasifrut: Quarterly for the Study of Literature 3.412-426.

Huggins, W. H. and Doris R. Entwisle. 1974. Iconic Communication: An Annotated Bibliography. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Huxley, Aldous. 1963. Literature and Science. New York: Harper & Row.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1971. A Stratificational Analysis of the Hand Gestures in Indian Classical Dancing. Semiotica 4.365-391.

Jakobson, Roman. 1971. An Example of Migratory Terms and Institutional Models. In: Selected Writings 2.527-538. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1972. Motor Signs for 'Yes' and 'No'. Language in Society 1.91-96.

---. 1974. Main Trends in the Science of Language. New York: Harper & Row.

---. 1975. Coup d'oeil sur le développement de la sémiotique. Studies in Semiotics 3. Bloomington: Research Center for the Language and Semiotic Studies.

Jaulin, Robert. 1970. Formal Analysis of Geomancy. Semiotica 2.195-246.

Jervis, Robert. 1970. The Logic of Images in International Relations. Princeton: University Press. [Cf. Anatol Rapoport's 1973 review article, Games Nations Play, Semiotica 9.272-288.]

Jorio, Andrea de. 1832. La mimica degli antichi investigata nel gestire Napoletano. Napes: Stamperia e Cartiera del Fibreno.

Kang, Wook. To appear. G. H. Mead's Concept of Rationality: A Study of the Use of Symbols and Other Implements. Approaches to Semiotics 54. The Hague: Mouton.

Kauffman, Lynne. 1971. Tacesics, the Study of Touch: A Model for Proxemic Analysis. Semiotic 4.149-161.

Kelemen, János. To appear. Locke's Theory of Language and Semiotics. Language Sciences.

Kendon, Adam. 1972a. Some Relationships Between Body Motion and Speech: An Analysis of an Example. In: Aron Wolfe Siegman and Benjamin Pope, eds., Studies in Dyadic Communication. New York: Pergamon Press.

---. 1972b. Review of Birdwhistell 1970. American Journal of Psychology 85.441-455.

Key, Mary Ritchie. 1974. U.S.A.-Nonverbal Communication. Versus 8/9.248-280.

Klaus, Georg. 1963. Semiotik und Erkenntnistheorie. Munich: Wilhelm Frank.

Kleinpaul, Rudolph. 1972^{2} [1888^{1}]. Sprache ohne Worte: Idee einer allgemeinen Wissenschaft der Sprache. Approaches to Semiotics 19. The Hague: Mouton.

Knapp, Mark L. 1972. Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Koch, Christian, ed. To appear. Semiotics and the Cinema. Approaches to Semiotics 52. The Hague: Mouton.

Koch, Walter A. 1974. Semiotik und Sprachgenese. In: Idem, ed., Perspektiven der Linguistik 2.312-346. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner.

Kowzan, Tadeusz. 1975. Littérature et spectacle. Approaches to Semiotics 58. The Hague: Mouton.

Krampen, Martin, 1965. Signs and Symbols in Graphic Communication. Design Quarterly 62.3-31. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center.

Kretzmann, Norman. 1967. Semantics, History of. In: The Encyclopedia of Philosophy 7.358-406. New York: Macmillan.

Kristeva, Julia. 1969. Semeiotikè: Recherches pour une sémanalyse. Paris: Seuil.

---, Josette Rey-Debove, and Donna Jean Umiker. 1971. Essays in Semiotics/Essais de semiotique. Approaches to Semiotics 4. The Hague: Mouton.

Kull, I.G. 1965. Semiotika i obučenie. Semeiotike 2.11-21.

Land, Stephen K. 1974. From Signs to Propositions: The Concept of Form in Eighteenth-Century Semantic Theory. London: Longman.

Latif, Israil A. 1934. The Physiological Basis of Linguistic Development and of the Ontogeny of Meaning. Psychological Review 41.55-85, 153-176, 246-264.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1973. Anthropologie structurale deux. Paris: Plon.

Lewis, Kathleen. 1970. Conference on Language and Medicine. Language Sciences 12.14-16.

Lindekens, René. 1971. Éléments pour une semiotique de la photographie. Brussels: AIMAV.

Lotman, Jurij. 1973. Semiotika kino i problemi kinoestetiki. Tallin: "Eesti Raamat."

---, et al. 1975. Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (As Applied to Slavic Texts). In: Sebeok 1975a, pp. 57-83.

---, and Boris A. Uspenskij, eds. 1973. Ricerche semiotiche: nuove tendenze delle scienze umanenell'URSS. Turin: Einaudi.

Lotz, John. 1972. A Select Bibliography on Script and Language. Visible Language: The Journal for Research on the Visual Media of Langague Expression 6.79-80.

MacKay, D. M. 1972. Formal Analysis of Communicative Processes. In: Non-verbal Communication, ed. Robert A. Hinde, pp. 3-25. Cambridge: University Press.

Macksey, Richard. 1970. Lions and Squares: Opening remarks. The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy, eds. Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato, pp. 1-14. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Maldonado, Tomás. 1961. Beitrag zur Terminologie der Semiotik. Ulm: J. Ebner.

Mallery, Garrick. 1972[2] [1881[1]]. Sign Language Among North American Indians Compared with that Among Other Peoples and Deaf-Mutes. Approaches to Semiotics 14. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Georges Mounin's 1973 review article, Une analyse du langage par gestes des Indiens (1881), Semiotica 7.154-162.]

Malmberg, Bertil. 1973. Teckenlära: En introduktion till tecknens och symbolernas problematik. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers.

Mar, Timothy T. 1974. Face Reading: The Chinese Art of Physiognomy. New York: Signet.

Marcus, Solomon. 1974. Din activitatea Centrului internaţional de semiotică şi linguistică al Universităţii din Urbino--Italia. Studii şi cercetări lingvistice 25.645-646. 3.155-197.]

Maritain, Jacques. 1943. Sign and Symbol. In: Redeeming the Time, Ch. 9. London: Geoffrey Bles.

Martinet, André, ed. 1968. Le langage. Encyclopédie de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard.

Martinet, Jeanne. 1973. Clefs pour la sémiologie. Paris: Seghers. [Cf. Gérard Bucher's 1975 review article, L' Objet de la sémiologie, Semiotica 14/2.]

Massin. 1970. Letter and Image. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

McGrew, W. C. 1972. An Ethological Study of Children's Behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Meader, Clarence L. and John H. Muyskens. 1962. Handbook of Biolinguistics 1. Toledo: Herbert C. Weller.

Meetham, A. R. and R. A. Hudson, eds. 1969. Encyclopaedia of Linguistics, Information and Control. Oxford: Pergamon.

Mehrabian, Albert. 1972. Nonverbal Communication. Chicago: Aldine, Atherton. [Cf. Murray Melvin's 1974 review article, Some Issues in Nonverbal Communication, Semiotica 10.293-304.]

Meletinsky, Eleazar and Dmitri Segal. 1971. Structuralism and Semiotics in the USSR. Diogenes 73.88-115.

Metz, Christian. 1974. Language and Cinema. Approaches to Semiotics 26. The Hague: Mouton.

Miller, David L. 1973. George Herbert Mead: Self, Language, and the World. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Moles, Abraham, ed. 1971. La Communication. Paris: Centre d'Etude et de Promotion de la Lecture.

Montagu, Ashley. 1971. Touching: The Human Significance of the Skin. New York: Columbia University Press.

Montague, Richard. 1974. Formal Philosophy: Selected Papers..., Richmond H. Thomason, ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Morris, Charles W. 1971. Writings on the General Theory of Signs. Approaches to Semiotics 16. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Ferruccio Rossi-Landi's 1975 review article, Signs About a Master of Signs, Semiotica 13.155-197.]

Mounin, Georges. 1968. Saussure ou le structuraliste sans le savoire. Paris: Seghers. [Cf. Jean-Jacques Nattiez's 1973 review article, Quelques problèmes de la sémiologie fonctionnelle, Semiotica 9.157-190.]

---. 1970. Introduction à la sémiologie. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Musique en jeu. 1971, 1973. Dossier: la sémiologie de la musique, No. 5.3-98. Analyse méthodologie sémiologie, No. 10.3-90. Paris: Seuil.

Nagel, Ernest. 1959. Charles Sanders Peirce, A Prodigious but Little Known American Philosopher (review article). Scientific American 200.185-192.

Nattiez, Jean-Jacques. 1972. Is a Descriptive Semiotics of Music Possible? Language Sciences 23.1-7.

---. 1975. Fondements d'une sémiologie de la musique. Paris: Union générale d'éditions.

Nelson, Lowry, Jr. 1975. Signs of the Times: Semiotics 1974. The Yale Review 64.296-320.

Nickel, Gerhard, ed. 1971. Papers in Contrastive Linguistics. Cambridge: University Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 1975. Exploring Semantic Structures. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. 1938[5] [1923[1]]. The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Ohm, Thomas. 1948. Die Gebetsbegärden der Völker und das Christentum. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Oléron, Pierre. 1974. Éléments de repertoire du langage gestuel des sourds-muets. Paris: CNRS.

Osmond-Smith, David. 1974. Problems of Terminology and Method in the Semiotics of Music. Semiotica 11.269-294.

Osolsobě, Ivo. 1973a. Fifty Keys to Semiotics. Semiotica 7.226-281.

---. 1973b. Czechoslovak Semiotics Past and Present. Semiotica 9.140-145.

---. 1974. Divadlo, které mluví, zpívá a tančí [The Theatre which Speaks, Sings, and Dances (Semiotics of the Musical Theatre)]. Prague: Supraphon.

Ostwald, Peter F. 1973. The Semiotics of Human Sounds. Approaches to Semiotics 36. The Hague: Mouton. (Cf. Iván Fónagy's 1975 review article, Analyses sémiotiques de la voix, Semiotica 13.97-108.)

Pagnini, Marcello. 1974. Lingua e musica: Proposta per un'indagine strutturalistico-semiotica. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Parret, Herman. 1975. Idéologie et sémiologie chez Locke et Condillac: La question de l'autonomie du langage devant la pensée. In: Ut Videam: Contributions to an Understanding of Linguistics, ed. Werner Abraham, pp. 225-248. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Peirce, Charles S. 1965-1966. Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, eds. Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss, and Arthur W. Burks. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, The Belknap Press.

Peirce Newsletter, The Charles S. 1974-. Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism, Lubbock: Texas Tech University.

Pelc, Jerzy. 1974. The Development of Polish Semiotics in the Post-War Years. Semiotica 10.369-381.

Pinborg, Jan. 1962. Das Sprachdenken der Stoa und Augustins Dialektik. Classica et Mediaevalia 23.148-177.

---. 1972. Logik und Semantik im Mittelalter Ein Überblick. Stuttgart: Fromann-Holzboog.

Poetics, Poetyka, Poetika I and II. 1961, 1965. Warsaw: PWN.

Pohl, Jacques. 1968. Symboles et langages 1: Le symbole, clef de l'humain. Paris: Sodi.

Poinsot, Jean. To appear. Treatise on Signs (Tractatus de Signis), ed. John N. Deely. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Poiret, Maude. 1970. Body Talk: The Signs of Kinesics. New York: Award Books.

Pottier, Bernard, ed. 1973. Le langage: Les dictionnaires du savoir moderne. Paris: Centre d'Etude et de Promotion de la Lecture.

Poyatos, Fernando. 1970. Kinésica del Español actual. Hispania 53.444-452.

Prieto, Luis J. 1966. Messages et signaux. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

---. 1968. La sémiologie. In: Martinet 1968, pp. 93-144.

---. 1975. Études de linguistique et de sémiologie générales. Geneva: Droz.

Rastier, François. 1972. Idéologie et théorie des signes. Approaches to Semiotics 17. The Hague: Mouton.

Rector, Monica. 1974. Glossario de Semiotica. Vozes 68.5-17.

Resnikow, Lasar Ossipowitsch. 1968. Erkenntnistheoretische Fragen der Semiotik. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften. [Enlarged edition from the original Russian, 1964; in 1967, an Italian translation was published under the title, Semiotica e Marxismo: I problemi gnoseologici della semiotica. Milan: Bompiani.]

Revzina, Olga G. 1972. The Fourth Summer School on Secondary Modeling Systems (Tartu, 17-24 August 1970). Semiotica 6.222-243.

Rey, Alain. 1971. La théorie positiviste des langages: Auguste Comte et la sémiotique. Semiotica 4.52-74.

---. 1973. Théories du signe et du sens. Lectures 1. Paris: Klincksieck.

Rey-Debove, Josette, ed. 1973. Recherches sur les systèmes signifiants: Symposium de Varsovie 1968. Approaches to Semiotics 18. The Hague: Mouton.

Rice, Charles E. 1967. The Human Sonar System. In: Animal Sonar Systems: Biology and Bionics, ed. René-Guy Busnel, pp. 719-755. Paris: Masson.

Rijnberk, Gérard van. 1953. Le langage par signes chez les moines. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Rommetveit, Ragnar. 1968. Words, Meanings, and Messages: Theory and Experiments in Psycholinguistics. New York: Academic Press.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1953. Charles Morris. Rome: Fratelli Bocca.

---. 1974. Linguistics and Economics. In: Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 12, Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 1787-2026. The Hague: Mouton.

Ruesch, Jurgen. 1972. Semiotic Approaches to Human Relations. Approaches to Semiotics 25. The Hague: Mouton.

---, and Weldon Kees. 1956. Nonverbal Communication: Notes on the Visual Perception of Human Relations. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Russell, Patrick J., Jr. 1973. The Philip Mills Arnold Semeiology Collection. Saint Louis: Rare Books and Special Collections Department, Washington University Libraries.

Ruwet, Nicolas. 1972. Langage, musique, poésie. Paris: Seuil. [Cf. Jean-Jacques Nattiez's 1974 review article, Problèmes de sémiologie musicale et de poetique structurale, Semiotica 11.247-268.]

Saitz, Robert L. 1966. Gestures in the Language Classroom. English Language Teaching 21.33-37.

---, and Edward J. Cervenka. 1972. Handbook of Gestures: Colombia and the United States. Approaches to Semiotics 31. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Fernando Poyatos' 1975 review article, Gesture Inventories: Fieldwork Methodology and Problems, Semiotica 13.199-227.]

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1972. Cours de linguistique générale. Critical edition by Tullio de Mauro. Paris: Payot.

Schapiro, Meyer. 1969. On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art: Field and Vehicle in Image-Signs. Semiotica 1.223-242.

Scheflen, Albert E. 1972. Body Language and the Social Order: Communication as Behavioral Control. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

---. 1974. How Behavior Means. Garden City: Anchor Books.

Schenk, Günter. 1973. Zur Geschichte der logischen Form, Vol. 1, Einige Entwicklungstendenzen von der Antike bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Scherer, Klaus R. 1970. Non-verbale Kommunikation: Ansätze zur Beobachtung und Analyse der aussersprachlichen Aspekte von Interaktionsverhalten. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Schnapper, Melvin. 1969. Your Actions Speak Louder.... Peace Corps Volunteer, June, pp. 7-10.

Scully, Malcolm G. 1975. A Special Kind of Literacy. Chronicle of Higher Education 10.1,11.

Sebeok, Thomas A. 1953. Review. International Journal of American Linguistics 19.159-160.

---. 1958. Review. International Journal of American Linguistics 24, 79-82.

---, ed. 1960. Style in Language. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

---. 1968. A Selected and Annotated Guide to the Literature of Zoosemiotics and its Background. Social Science Information 7.103-117.

---. 1970. Is A Comparative Semiotics Possible? In: Exchange and Communications: In Honour of Claude Levi-Strauss' Sixtieth Birthday, eds. Pierre Maranda and Jean Pouillon, pp. 614-627. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1972. Perspectives in Zoosemiotics. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1973. "Semiotika" i Rosdstvennye Terminy. Voprosy Jazikoznanija, No. 6, pp. 44-53. [English version--1975. "Semiotics" and Its Cogeners. Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, 1: General and

Theoretical Linguistics, ed. Mohammad Ali Jazayery, et al. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.]

----. 1974a. Semiotics: A Survey of the State of the Art. In: Sebeok 1974b, pp. 211-264.

---, ed. 1974b. Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 12, Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences. The Hague: Mouton.

---, ed. 1975a. The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

---, ed. 1975b. Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 13, Historiography of Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1975c. Six Species of Signs: Some Propositions and Strictures. Semiotica 13.233-260.

---. 1975d. Zoosemiotics: A Bibliography. Versus: Quaderni di studi semiotici. No. 10.

---. 1975e. Iconicity. Opening address delivered at the Charles Sanders Peirce Symposium on Semiotics and the Arts, The Johns Hopkins University Centennial Celebration, Baltimore, September 25.

---. 1976. Semiosis in Nature and in Culture. A Perfusion of Signs: Transactions of the North American Semiotics Colloquium. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

---, ed. T.A. Sebeok. Semiotics. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

---, Alfred S. Hayes, and Mary Catherine Bateson, eds. 1972^2 [1964^1]. Approaches to Semiotics: Cultural Anthropology, Education, Linguistics, Psychiatry, Psychology. The Hague: Mouton.

---, and Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok, eds. To appear. Aboriginal Sign Languages: Gestural Systems Among Native Peoples of the Americas and Australia. New York: Plenum.

Semeiotikè: Trudy po znakovym systemam [Works on Semiotics]. 1965-1973. Vols. 2-6. Tartu: Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis. [Jurij M. Lotman's

Lekcii po struktural'noj poetike was published as Trudi 1 (1964).]

Semiotext(e): Alternatives in Semiotics. 1974-. 1-.

Shands, Harley C. 1970. Semiotic Approaches to Psychiatry. Approaches to Semiotics 2. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1971. The War with Words: Structure and Transcendence. Approaches to Semiotics 12. The Hague: Mouton.

---. 1975. Linguistic Correlates of Medical Disorder: Disproportionate Disability. Ms.

Shepherd, Walter. 1971. Shepherd's Glossary of Graphic Signs and Symbols. New York: Dover.

Sherzer, Joel. 1971. Conference on Interaction Ethology. Language Sciences. 13.19-21.

Sign Language Studies. 1972-. Vols. 1-.

Simon, John. 1975. Antonioni: The Passenger will please refrain...Esquire, July, pp. 16ff.

Simone, Raffaele. 1972. Sémiologie augustinienne. Semiotica 6.1-31.

Simpozium po strukturnomu izučeniju znakovyx sistem. 1962. Moscow: Nauka.

Smith, Henry Lee, Jr. 1969. Language and the Total System of Communication. In: Linguistics Today, ed. Archibald A. Hill, pp. 89-102. New York: Basic Books.

Smith, W. John, et al. 1974. Tongue Showing: A Facial Display of Humans and Other Primate Species. Semiotica 11.201-246.

Sommer, Robert. 1969. Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Sparti, Antono di. 1975. Linguaggio pubblicitario: analisi linguistica di un corpus pubblicitario di sigarette americane. Quaderni del Circolo Semiologico Siciliano 5.

Sperber, Dan. 1974. Le symbolisme en général. Paris: Hermann.

Staal, J. F. 1971. What Was Left of Pragmatics in Jerusalem. Language Sciences 14.29-32.

Stammerjohann, Harro, et al. 1975. Handbuch der Linguistik: Allgemeine und angewandte Sprachwissenschaft. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1975. Structural Poetics and Linguistics. In: Sebeok 1974b, pp. 629-659.

Stent, Gunther S. 1969. The Coming of the Golden Age: A View of the End of Progress. Garden City: Natural History Press.

Stepanov, Yu. S. 1971. Semiotika. Moscow: Nauka. [In Russian.]

Stetson, R.H. 1951. Motor Phonetics: A Study of Speech Movements in Action. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Stokoe, William C., Jr. 1972. Semiotics and Human Sign Languages. Approaches to Semiotics 21. The Hague: Mouton. [Cf. Bernard Th. Tervoort's 1973 review article, Could There be a Human Sign Language?, Semiotica 9.347-382.]

---. 1974. Motor Signs as a First Form of Language. Semiotica 10.117-130.

Stough, Charlotte L. 1969. Greek Skepticism: A Study in Epistemology. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Studia z Historii Semiotyki 1 (1971), 2(1973). Monografie z Dziejów Nauki i Techniki, Zakład Historii Nauki i Techniki Polskiej Akademii Nauk 68, 88. Warsaw: PAN.

Studnicki, Franciszek. 1970. Traffic Signs. Semiotica 2.151-172.

Tavolga, William N. 1974. Application of the Concept of Levels of Organization to the Study of Animal Communication. In: Nonverbal Communication, eds. Lester Krames, Patricia Pliner and Thomas Alloway, pp. 51-76. New York: Plenum.

Taylor, Orlando and Dianna Ferguson. 1975. A Study of Cross-Cultural Communication Between Blacks and Whites in the U.S. Army. The Linguistic Reporter 17/3.8,11.

Thom, René. 1974. Modèles mathématiques de la morphogénès: Recueil de textes sur la théorie des catastrophes et ses applications. Paris: Inédit.

Thomas, Jean-Jacques. 1974. The Semiotic Parole. Substance": A Review of Theory and Literary Criticism 10.182-189.

Todorov, Tzvetan, ed. 1971. Documents: Sémiologie du théâtre. [Consists of French translations of Peter Bogatyrev, Les signes du théâtre, 1938; and Roman Ingarden, Les fonctions du langage au théâtre, 1958.] Poetique 8.515-538.

Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society. A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy. 1965-1975. Vols. 1-11.

Verdiglione, Armando, ed. 1975. Psicanalisi e semiotica. Milan: Feltrinelli. [Cf. Eugen Bär's 1976 review article, Psychoanalysis and Semiotics, Semiotica, to appear.]

Verón, Eliseo. 1971. Ideology and Social Sciences: A Communicational Approach. Semiotica 3.59-76.

Versus: Quaderni di studi semiotici. 1971-1974. Nos. 1-9. [Cf. János Kelemen's 1974 review article, The Semiotic Conception of VS, Semiotica 11.75-97.]

Wallis, Mieczysław. 1975. Arts and Signs. Studies in Semiotics 2. Bloomington: Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies.

Walther, Elisabeth. 1974. Allgemeine Zeichenlehre: Einführing in die Grundlagen der Semiotik. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Watson, O. Michael. 1970. Proxemic Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Study. Approaches to Semiotics 8. The Hague: Mouton.

Watt, W. C. 1967. Morphology of the Nevada Cattlebrands and their Blazons. Pittsburgh: Department of Computer Science, Carnegie-Mellon University.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. Semantics and Semiotics. In: International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 14.164-169. New York: Macmillan & Free Press.

Weitz, Shirley, ed. 1974. Nonverbal Communication: Readings with Commentary. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weltring, Georg. 1910. Das Semeion in der aristotelischen, stoischen, epikureischen und skeptischen Philosophie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Antiken Methodenlehre. Bonn: Hauptmann'sche Buchdruckerei.

Wescott, Roger W. 1966. Introducing Coenetics: A Biosocial Analysis of Communication. American Scholar 35. 342-356.

Whiteside, Robert L. 1974. Face Language. New York: Frederick Fell.

Worth, Sol. 1939. The Development of the Semiotic of Film. Semiotica 1. 282-321.

Wundt, Wilhelm. 1973. The Language of Gestures. Approaches to Semiotics, paperback series 6. The Hague Mouton.

NOTES

[1]An instructive parallel is, however, reported by Stent (1969:35-36) from the natural sciences: "To designate his approach to the understanding of life processes, Astbury coined the term molecular biology. Though for the next decade Astbury made vigorous propaganda in its favor, this neologism was very slow to find wide acceptance. Throughout the romantic period, for instance, no member of the Phage Group thought of or referred to himself as a 'molecular biologist,' for the very good reason that structure then played as peripheral a role in his preoccupations as did genetics in the preoccupations of the structural analysts. In fact, the Phage Group had no generic designation at all to describe its activity. Its members were most reluctant to call themselves, as might have seemed natural, 'biophysicists.' For, as was explicit in my earlier quotation from Delbrück's 1949 speech, 'A Physicist Looks at Biology,' they considered that term to have been 'ill-used.' More precisely, in the eyes of the Phage Group, two kinds of people were then wont to refer to themselves as 'biophysicists': physiologists who were able to repair their own electronic equipment, and second-rate physicists who sought to convince biologists that they were first-rate. It was only in the wake of the confluence of structure and genetic analysis produced by subsequent developments... that the veterans of the romantic period and their disciples suddenly realized, like Monsieur Jourdain, that what they had been doing all along was molecular biology. Their pressing need for adopting some satisfactory cognomen for their line of work was later explained by Francis Crick: 'I myself was forced to call myself a molecular biologist because when inquiring clergymen asked me what I did, I got tired of explaining that I was a mixture of crystallographer, biophysicist, biochemist and geneticist, an explanation which in any case they found too hard to grasp.'"

[2]In this research area, a negativistic tendency seems to prevail since at least 1888, when Kleinpaul paradoxically designated the topic of his classic compilation as Sprache ohne Worte, that is, "speech devoid of words" (Kleinpaul 1972).

[3]For representative writings by the celebrated Soviet--sometimes, eponymously, "Tartu"--School on Secondary Modeling Systems, consult all of Semeiotikè (1965-1973), Revzina (1972), and the references given by Sebeok (1974a:228f., esp. in

fns. 36-38). Lotman, et al. (1975) set forth an authoritative, if programmatic, statement about the semiotic-typological nature of the concept of culture, as envisaged by five leaders of the group, many of whose most important writings have been variously reprinted, translated, and/or anthologized in the West, a few short pieces in the pages of Semiotica. Two especially useful collections, both published in Italy, are by Faccani and Eco (1969), and Lotman and Uspenskij (1973), the latter containing a valuable survey, by D. M. Segal, of "Le ricerche sovietiche nel campo della semiotica negli ultimi anni" (452-470), rounding out Meletinsky's and his own earlier (1971) conspectus. Cf. also Eimermacher 1971, and Fokkema 1974.

[4]There are numerous reference works devoted to "symbols," often restricted to the graphic sense. A sampling of the best recent source books of this genre includes: Bertin 1967, Brun 1969, Massin 1970, Shepherd 1971, Dreyfuss 1972, and de Vries 1974. For a recent account of theoretical and experimental work in graphics, see Krampen 1965. Among general dictionaries on symbols, I found the four volumes compiled by Chevalier and Gheerbrant (1973-1974) by far the most useful. An absorbing periodical pertaining to graphics is Visible Language: The Journal for Research on the Visual Media of Language Expression, now in its 9th volume.

[5]I suppose it behooves me to furnish here at least one example of a work that I would regard as a model bibliography of some semiotic topic, in this case, in linguistics. Such a work, of immense authority and professional competence, from a narrow segment of the field, is Paul Rivet and Georges de Créqui-Montfort's Bibliographie des langues Aymará et Kičua (1540-1955, in 4 vols.), which I had the pleasure of reviewing some twenty years ago (Sebeok 1953, 1958). The entries and layout of Russell 1973, in a kindred genre, constitute another attractive pattern deserving of the attention of would-be bibliographers of semiotics; (cf. Semiotica 11.385f.)

[6]The Program of the Colloquium, held July 28-30, was a follows: Rulon Wells, Yale University, "Philosophy of Language and Semiotics"; J. Jay Zeman, University of Florida, "Peirce's Theory of Signs"; Henry Hiż, University of Pennsylvania, "Logical Basis of Semiotics"; Edward Stankiewicz, Yale University, "Semiotics and the Verbal Arts"; Harley C. Shands, The Roosevelt Hospital, "Clinical Semiotics"; Louis Marin, The Johns Hopkins University, "Semiotics and the

Visual Arts"; Özséb Horányi, Hungarian Academy of Sciences "Theoretical Possibilities of the Description of Pictures" Diana Agrest, Princeton University, and Mario Gandelsonas, The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, "Semiotics and Architecture"; Jean-Jacques Nattiez, University of Montreal, "Semiotics and Music"; Paul Bouissac, University of Toronto. "Semiotics and Spectacles: The Circus"; Solomon Marcus, University of Bucharest, "Semiotics and Spectacles: Theatre"; Thomas A. Sebeok, Indiana University, "Summation: Semiotics in Nature and in Culture."

At the concluding Business Meeting, two principal items were discussed by the assembled participants. The first of these resulted in the creation of a Semiotic Society of America. Three officers were provisionally elected: Henry Hiż, of the University of Pennsylvania, President; Eugen Bär, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Vice-President; and Thomas A. Sebeok, Indiana University, Secretary-Treasurer. The aforementioned are collectively charged with responsibility for formally incorporating the new Society, and drafting its Constitution, which is to be ratified at the next meeting, when regular elections will also be held. It is intended that the Society will, in due course, affiliate with the International Association for Semiotic Studies.

The second item centered on the organization of semioticians in Canada. It was tentatively agreed that both sides would work, in the months ahead, towards an eventual bipartite North American Semiotics Federation, and that annual meetings may be alternately scheduled in Canada and the U. S. A.

[7]For a glimpse of a Soviet view, advocating a semiotic approach to optimize the teaching process, "especially essential in programmed learning," see Kull 1965.

[8]This distinction between "signs" and "symptoms" in American medical practice was called to my attention by William O. Umiker, M. D.

[9]Members of the Editorial Committee of Semiotica are Claude Brémond (France), Umberto Eco (Italy), Henry Hiż (USA), Julia Kristeva (France), Juri M. Lotman (USSR), Jerzy Pelc (Poland), Nicolas Ruwet (France), Meyer Schapiro (USA), and Hansjakob Seiler (Germany, DBR); Roland Barthes (France) was a member from 1969 to 1974.