

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bliss, C. *Semantography*. Sydney: Semantography Publications, 1965.
- Krampen, M. *Geschichte der Strassenverkehrszeichen*. Tübingen: Narr, 1988.
- McDonald, E. T. *Teaching and Using Blissymbolics*. Toronto: Blissymbolics Communication Institute, 1980.
- Muter, P. "Blissymbolics, Cognition, and the Handicapped." In *Communication and Handicap*, edited by E. Hjelmquist and L. G. Nilsson, pp. 233-252. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1986.
- Neurath, O. *BASIC by ISOTYPE*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1937.
- Sawyer-Woods, L. "Symbolic Function in a Severe Non-Verbal Aphasic." *Aphasiology* 1.3 (1987): 287-290.
- Sonesson, G. "The Semiotic Function and the Genesis of Pictorial Meaning." In *Center/Periphery in Representations and Institutions: Proceedings of the Conference of the International Semiotics Institute, Imatra, Finland, July 16-21, 1990*, edited by E. Tarasti, pp. 156-211. Imatra: Acta Semiotica Fennica, 1992.
- Sonesson, G. "Prolegomena to the Semiotic Analysis of Prehistoric Visual Displays." *Semiotica* 100.2-4 (1994): 267-331.
- Steele, R., et al. "Computer-Based Visual Communication in Aphasia." *Neuropsychologia* 27.4 (1989): 409-426.
- Wallis, M. *Arts and Signs*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

—GÖRAN SONESSON

**BOGATYRĚV, PĚTR GRIGOR'EVICĚ** (1893-1971), Russian folklorist and literary scholar, a co-founder of the Moscow Linguistic Circle in 1915 and an active member of the Prague Linguistic Circle from 1928 onward. Bogatyřev studied under the historical-philological faculty of Moscow University (1912-1918); after lecturing at Saratov University (1919-1921), he returned to Moscow, where he directed a theater while teaching at the Higher Technical School. From 1922 until 1939, he lived in Czechoslovakia, where in 1930 he defended a doctoral thesis at Bratislava University on Subcarpathian folklore. In 1940, he was appointed professor at the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow, then at Moscow State University; his study *Czech and Slovak Folk Theater (Lidové divadlo české a slovenské)* was accepted as his doctoral dissertation in 1940. In addition to his work at the university, Bogatyřev headed the Section of Folklore at the Institute of Ethnography of the Soviet Academy of Sciences from 1943 to 1949. From 1952 to 1959, Bogatyřev worked at Voronež

University and from 1958 to 1963 at the Institute of World Literature. From 1964 until his death, he taught again on the philological faculty of Moscow State University.

Bogatyřev and Roman Jakobson met in August 1914 when they both were students standing in line to register for classes; they immediately planned common fieldwork projects and soon started collecting and publishing dialectological and folklore materials from Russian provinces (1914-1916); they also founded a linguistic circle at Moscow University. This discussion group led to the foundation of the Moscow Linguistic Circle in 1915, which fostered heated debates on the semiotic problems of the relations between folklore and literature in 1919 and 1920. Bogatyřev insisted on and demonstrated the possibility of a rigorous typology of folklore narratives, a task later fulfilled by Vladimir Propp with fairy tales. From the early 1920s, Bogatyřev's studies were influenced strongly by Ferdinand de Saussure's emphasis on synchronic studies in linguistics and by a focus on dynamic elements in the synchronic view of folklore. He was particularly engaged by the constant change of both form and function in folklore and the competition between different, even opposite, functions related to one and the same folklore event. On the basis of the material collected during several expeditions to Carpathian Russia, Bogatyřev published his study *Magical Acts, Rituals, and Beliefs in Subcarpathian Russia* (1929). In further applications of "functional structuralism" to ethnographic studies, Bogatyřev published "The Christmas Tree in Eastern Slovakia" (1932-1933), "Costume as Sign" (1936), and the subsequent book on this topic, *The Functions of Folk Costume in Moravian Slovakia* (1937). Bogatyřev described how one and the same object may serve different functions in varying contexts and how different objects may fulfill one and the same function. He also reflected on the problem of functional hierarchy, contending that the consideration of the separate functions of an object is not sufficient and that the structural unity of an object is more than the mere sum of its elements. Bogatyřev focused upon the problem of the dominant and secondary functions, the possibility and laws of their changes, and what he termed the "function of the structure of functions": On the one hand, the loss of a particular function might lead to the loss of other functions; on the other hand, secondary functions that might predate the others can eventually guarantee the sur-

vival of a given phenomenon. In brief, the concept of "polyfunctionality" pertains to the dynamic change of the hierarchy of functions.

Several of Bogatyřev's structuralist works from the late 1930s were devoted to folk theater. In his study of the functions of folk costume, Bogatyřev distinguished two functional varieties of the costume: It functions as a material object and as a sign at the same time. In theater, all theatrical phenomena are signs of signs or signs of material objects. Together with subsequent studies by Jindřich Honzl and Jiří Veltruský these works laid the foundations for modern semiotics of theater. During the last 30 years of his life in Russia, Bogatyřev became one of the most important experts in Slavic folklore.

[See also Prague School; Russian Formalism; and Theater.]

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Bibliografija naučnych rabot i perevodov P. G. Bogatyřeva"  
 In P. G. Bogatyřev, *Voprosy teorii narodnogo iskusstva*, pp. 523-542. Moscow, 1971.
- Bogatyřev, P. G. *Actes magiques, rites et croyances en Russie Subcarpatique*. Paris: Institut d'études Slaves, 1929.
- Bogatyřev, P. G. *The Functions of Folk Costume in Moravian Slovakia* (1937). The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- Matejka, L., and J. R. Titunik, eds. *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1976.

—PETER GRZYBEK

**BOURDIEU, PIERRE** (b. 1930), French ethnographer and cultural sociologist whose interest has focused on the social practices of everyday life and whose work has been influential in related fields of educational sociology, critical linguistics, and cultural studies. Bourdieu sees all social phenomena as organized semiotically by codes, rules, symbols, images, language, and signifying systems. Culture and society, therefore, can be analyzed in terms of theories of signification and signifying practices. Although Bourdieu is not a semiotician by either disciplinary or theoretical orientation, his theoretical and empirical work has focused on the semiotic representations of individuals, groups (i.e., social classes), and institutions (e.g., schools).

In his early ethnographic account of the Algerian Kabyle, (1973, 1979), Bourdieu examined how the cultural organization of time, space, persons, and social relations and identities among the Kabyle was structured in a symbolic and cultural order of mean-

ing. Influenced by Claude Lévi-Strauss's structuralism, Bourdieu interpreted the Kabyle's culture and social system as organized primarily around binary oppositions of meaning, ritual and symbolism, social relations and practices. The most fundamental opposition and basic difference, according to Bourdieu, is that of sex and gender. Sexual difference is real and biological (natural), whereas gender difference is a socially constructed, symbolic order of meaning (cultural). The symbolic meanings, rituals, and values attached to sexual difference in complex gender systems provide a core cultural distinction and means of classification not only among the Kabyle but for all cultures.

Social practices in everyday life are coded symbolically and embodied in real, material bodies. Bourdieu's early recognition of the cultural and theoretical importance of the body and embodied difference is the key to his later conceptualization of the "habitus" (as embodiment of "cultural goods" and symbolic value) and more indirectly of his concepts of "cultural capital," "symbolic violence," and his later work on language and "symbolic power."

Educational sociology in the late 1970s and 1980s utilized the concepts of cultural capital and symbolic violence to explain how schooling reproduces social class differences through the differential pedagogical treatment that children receive, depending on the kinds of cultural capital they bring with them from home. By *cultural capital* Bourdieu means certain kinds of legitimate and relevant knowledge a pupil brings to school that the school variously values or devalues. Closely associated with cultural capital is symbolic capital, which is the prestige, honor, and social status associated with family background and bestowed on the child. In Bourdieu's early studies of the class-stratified French education system, economic and social capital are seen to be indexed by the father's occupational and educational status, which in turn enables financial privilege or imposes constraints, and by class-related social relations with others of similar social and economic access and resources. Bourdieu thus suggests that in the "social space" of the school each child brings a set of social and symbolic goods that signify class background and that interact with the middle-class attitudinal and behavioral codes and knowledges of the school. Pupils present their selves through a range of semiotic significations; these include dress, speech patterns, language use, attitudes toward learning and the

# ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEMIOTICS

---

Paul Bouissac

*Editor in Chief*

99-1782

Institut für Slawistik  
Universität Graz

Merangasse 70

A-8010 Graz

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

New York 1998 Oxford