

through repetition on different media supports and also by a strategy of legitimization by the company. In other words, these logos are not self-explanatory and must be justified and legitimized by the use of paratexts (such as advertising campaigns) designed to explain and justify the relationship between the representamen and its objects.

The logo signifies first as a system of discrete elements but also through the interactions and modifications of these elements. The logo is thus a moving and evolving structure of identifying elements. The visual-identity system of an organization, condensed in and assumed by the logo, has the same characteristics as the narrative identity of a human being. Narrative identity, as defined by Paul Ricoeur, articulates acquired identificatory elements into the composition of which otherness can enter and by which alterity can be assumed by the subject. It also articulates a style—that is, the constitution of identifying characteristics by which the sign is recognized. Hence, the structure of the logo might be “consistently” altered and thus identified afterward by reference to the original structure of the sign.

The IBM logo and its alteration operated by Paul Rand (the original designer of the logo), which is a metalinguistic transformation of an iconized logo into a symbolic and indexical pseudologo, is a good illustration of the concept of narrative identity. This logo transformed into a rebus (an eye, a bee, and the letter M) is still recognized and identified as the IBM logo because it keeps the “plastic invariants” and identity features of the original logo: a ternary structure, a stripe pattern, a specific typography of the letterhead (the “Egyptian” typography), and the specific blue color. Even though a principle of alterity has been introduced into the original sign, the recognition of the logo and its attribution to the IBM company is still valid because the deformation integrated new elements into a preexisting structure with easily recognizable and identifiable elements. In other words, it respected the visual style of IBM.

Like any other communication sign, the logo assumes all of the functions defined by Roman Jakobson as related to any verbal communication act: first, a phatic function, the aim of which is to maintain the contact and the control of the communicative channel. A logo's function is always in essence phatic because its first function is to establish contact between the sender (usually an organization) and a receiver (its actual and potential customers). Second,

the logo plays a poetic function that focuses on the aesthetic qualities of the message itself. Third, in its emotive or expressive function, the logo conveys information about its sender because it delivers a message about the identity and qualities of its sender as by proxy. Fourth, the logo's impressive or conative function is determined in part by information about the intended receiver. This is especially the case for brand logos, which usually represent either a consumer using the product or the ideal consumer so that the actual consumer can identify herself or himself with the image projected in the logo. Fifth, the logo plays a metalinguistic function that focuses on the code in which the message is expressed, as in the transformation of a famous logo. Sixth, through a referential function, the logo points to the context of communication and to the goods and services provided by the company or association.

Finally, a logo must differentiate one organization or brand from another. Hence, the logo represents the identity of an organization, and identity exists mainly through difference. Therefore, the logo can be viewed as a totem, as it can represent people from the same group. In this sense, the logo defines a group of central beliefs in pictorial form.

[See also Advertising; Aniconic Visual Signs; Iconicity; Ideograms; Indexicality; Jakobson's Model of Linguistic Communication; Peirce; and Pictorial Semiotics.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Floch, J.-M. “La voie des logos: Le face à face des logos IBM et Apple.” In *Identités visuelles*, pp. 43–78. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995.
- Green, D., and V. Loveluck. “Understanding a Corporate Symbol.” *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 8 (1994): 37–44.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. “The Effectiveness of Symbols.” In his *Structural Anthropology*, pp. 186–205. London: Penguin, 1969.
- Lhote, A. *Les invariants plastiques*. Paris: Hermann, 1967.
- Ricoeur, P. *Oneself as Another*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Schechter, A. “Measuring the Value of Corporate and Brand Logos.” *Design Management Journal* 4.1 (1993).
- Scott, D. “Air France's Hippocampe and BOAC's Speedbird: The Semiotics Status of the Logos.” *French Cultural Studies* 4 (1993): 107–127.

—BENOÎT HEILBRUNN

LOTMAN, JURIJ MIKHAILOVIČ (1922–1993), Russian literary scholar and semiotician whose works

have shaped the structural-semiotic approach to art and culture. Lotman studied literary scholarship at the University of Leningrad; among his teachers were former representatives of Russian formalism such as B. M. Ejchenbaum, B. V. Tomaševskij, and V. M. Zirmunskij. In 1952, he defended a thesis on A. N. Radiščev, a leading figure of Russian Enlightenment at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1954, Lotman started teaching at Tartu University in Estonia, where in 1961 he received his degree with a work on prerevolutionary Russian literature. From 1963 onward, Lotman held the chair of Russian literature at Tartu University.

Lotman began his academic career as a specialist in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russian literature. But in the late 1950s and early 1960s, he progressively developed a structural theory of literature based on information theory and semiotics. These structuralist studies, which he subsequently applied to art in general and to the semiotics of culture, proved to be influential in non-Slavic countries, where they became available in translation.

Lotman's *Lectures on a Structural Poetics* (*Lektsii po struktural'noi poetike, vvedenie, teorija stiha*) was published in 1964 as the first volume of the series *Studies in Sign Systems* (*Trudy po znakovym sistemam*), founded by Lotman, which was to become the main outlet of the Moscow-Tartu School. These lectures, given between 1958 and 1962 at Tartu University, marked an important turning point in his research, which had focused up until then on the history of Russian literature and Russia's cultural history (Lotman, 1968). The first printed testimony to Lotman's new interest is his 1963 article "On the Delimitation of the Notion of Structure in Linguistics and Literature," which, along with the other lectures, adumbrates Lotman's overall methodology. Following the writings of the late Russian formalists (mainly Jurij Tynjanov), Lotman defined literary works and literature as a whole, as well as the whole process of literary history, as a system of elements that form a hierarchically organized structure. Since this formal approach was a potential challenge to the official Soviet ideology, Lotman's handling of the notion of "model" can be seen as a masterpiece of ideological and methodological brinkmanship that bridged the ideological gap between Soviet Marxism and structuralist semiotics, since the official philosophical-gnoseological discussion of the late 1950s had reached the conclusion that any cognition is model

based. Therefore, it was possible for Lotman to redefine art semiotically on the basis of ideas sanctioned by materialist aesthetics. Assuming that a work of art is a model of reality and that it should be understood as a system of signs, art can be defined as an intersection of cognition and communication.

The publication of Lotman's *Lectures* in 1964 coincided with the first summer school held in Kääriku, near Tartu. These summer schools, held from 1964 to 1970, shaped the intellectual profile of the Moscow-Tartu School. In fact, the school as a whole owed its existence mainly to Lotman's organizational activity in the early 1960s: after the Moscow Symposium on the Structural Study of Sign Systems in December 1962, Lotman contacted the organizers, V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov, and initiated a long-term cooperative relationship. The broad horizons and spheres of interest of the involved scholars soon converged around the common denominator of culture, under which their diversity could be encompassed and methodologically integrated.

Beginning in the early 1960s, Lotman himself tried to study the regularities of human culture. Based on categories such as "language," "text," and "model," he tried to understand the process of cultural development and to conceive a cultural typology. Concrete analyses of various "secondary modeling" systems such as puppetry, film, theater, card games, painting, and the like formed the background for his theoretical models. However, his literary analyses remained the source from which he derived his general ideas about text and culture. Lotman's influential work on the semiotics of cultural space in literature and art is best represented by *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (1970), a theoretical work that originated in his analysis of Nikolai Gogol's prose.

Lotman's growing interest in the semiotics of culture is first documented in his "Problems in the Typology of Culture" (1977), followed by "Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures" (1975), written with other members of the Moscow-Tartu School. In these works, culture is understood generally as information; it is tentatively defined as some kind of "collective memory" and as the "totality of non-hereditary information acquired, preserved, and transmitted by the various groups of human society." Later, Lotman redefined culture as a dynamic "generator of meaning." Based on the concepts of biosphere and noosphere (referring to the Russian scientist Vernadskij), Lotman developed the holistic

concept of "semiosphere," which covers the totality of sign users, texts, and codes of a given culture. These ideas were later integrated into Lotman's *Universe of the Mind* (1990). Unlike most of his earlier theoretical articles, more recent works such as his monograph *Culture and Explosion* (1992) or his *Talks on Russian Culture* (1994) have not yet been translated into a Western language.

[See also Cultural Knowledge; Culture, Semiotics of; and Moscow-Tartu School.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Lotman

Lektsii po struktural'noi poetike, vvedenie, teorija stiha. Brown University Reprints 5, edited by T. G. Winner. Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1968.

"Problems in the Typology of Culture" (1967). In *Soviet Semiotics*, edited and translated by D. P. Lucid, pp. 213-221. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

The Structure of the Artistic Text (1970). Translated by R. Vroon. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977.

Analysis of the Poetic Text (1972). Ann Arbor: ARDIS, 1976.

"Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (as Applied to Slavic Texts)" (1973). In *The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*, edited by T. A. Sebeok, pp. 57-83. Lisse, Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press, 1975.

"The Semiosphere." *Soviet Psychology* 27 (1989): 40-61.

Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture. Translated by A. Shukman. London: Tauris, 1990.

Lotman, J. M., and B. A. Uspenskij. *Semiotics of Russian Culture*. Edited by A. Shukman. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984.

Other Works

"Bibliographie der Arbeiten von Jurij M. Lotman (1949-1992)." *Znakolog: An International Yearbook of Slavic Semiotics* 5 (1993): 201-275.

Jonaid-Sharif, L. "Text—Sign—Structure: The Poetics of Jurij Lotman." Ph.D. diss., University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1984.

Shukman, A. *Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Y. M. Lotman*. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1977.

—PETER GRZYBEK

LYOTARD, JEAN-FRANÇOIS (1924-1998), French philosopher and art theorist, author of a number of books outlining central characteristics and concerns of "the postmodern condition," and a critic of the rigidity of some manifestations of semiotic studies. Lyotard taught philosophy at several universities in France, retiring as professor emeritus at the University of Paris VIII. He also was a professor of French

at the University of California, Irvine, before moving to Emory University. While pursuing myriad interests in his research and political activities, Lyotard wrote influential studies such as *Discours, figure* (1971), *Des dispositifs pulsionnels* (1973), *La condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir* (1979), *Le différend* (1983), *L'enthousiasme: La critique kantienne de l'histoire* (1986), *Heidegger et "les juifs"* (1988), *Peregrinations: Law, Form, Event* (1988), and *Le postmoderne expliqué aux enfants* (1988). He also explored the intersections of theory and praxis by working with and writing for the group that published the Marxist organs *Socialisme ou barbarie* and *Pouvoir ouvrier*.

Lyotard's *Économie libidinale* (1974, translated into English as *Libidinal Economy* in 1993) is the work of his that is of most interest to semioticians, although ironically it is a biting, ferocious attack on what he saw as a smugly acquiescent if not quietist semiotics of the time. In the course of surveying related but contiguous facets of semiotics, Lyotard engages in a frenetically cadenced struggle that he articulated in another work as "an agonistics of language" involving "language 'moves'" (1979). While developing this general agonistics, Lyotard's book focuses on the potential intensity of semiosis as the primary site for analysis of signs and sign systems, rather than as a discipline that seeks a comfortable security in taxonomy and structure, monosemy and closure. While this position has been denigrated as merely a "violent affirmation of purely ephemeral desire" (Readings, 1991), it nevertheless outlines a distinctly vital position for semiotics by focusing on the intangible component of sign interaction that is arguably its most engaging, if most intangible, aspect. Lyotard posits the ever-shifting arena for this activity as "the great ephemeral skin," an economy in which opposing forces interact without negating their differences.

Économie libidinale is in particular an attack on structuralism and Marxism, although it also provided an important catalyst to semiotics in the mid-1970s by goading semioticians into intense self-scrutiny about their practices and, more important, the ideological assumptions that subtend them. Semiotics, Lyotard argues, has attempted to enact a move of leg-erdemain in which the sign is granted the status of a concrete, material entity instead of existing as a perpetual, energetic ebb and flow of deferral and slippery referentiality. It has succumbed to a type of "informational" imperialism motivated by the desire to not only posit but genuinely believe in a stable model

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