Webs of Significance
Semiotic Perspectives on Text
MARJORIE SIEGEL AND DEBORAH WELLS ROWE

Why Semiotics Now?

Texts are not what they used to be. Consider the morning commute on a New York City subway. People still mark off their social boundaries by keeping their noses in a newspaper, or last night’s homework, but it is more common to see people plugged into their mp3 players or tapping out text messages on their phones. Screens that used to take up entire desktops are now “personal, portable and pedestrian” (Ito, Okabe, & Matsuda, 2005) and dis/play images, music, and animation as well as writing. Much has been made of the shift “from page to screen” (Snyder, 1998) but with the rise of social networking sites, video gaming, fanfiction, blogging, and YouTube, texts have become part of a new web of signification—Web 2.0—a term that has come to signify the latest version of the Internet in which people are producers, not just consumers, of culture. Wikipedia and “WeMedia” (Bowman & Willis, 2003) capture this participatory ethos of interactivity and involvement. Expertise is under siege as anyone with time, interest, and digital access can contribute to deciding what counts as knowledge on Wikipedia, and what counts as news on websites serving as outlets for “citizen journalism” (e.g., blogs, Flickr, as well as media outlets such as http://www.cnn.com/ireport/). The emergence of Web 2.0 calls into question the conventional definition of a text as a static, monomodal, material surface that relays a writer’s intended meaning to a reader.

The texts and practices characteristic of Web 2.0 point to the need for a theoretical lens broad enough to explain what counts as a text, how texts mean, and how to do things with texts in this new communicative landscape. Linguistic theories—even those that fuse language and social practice, such as Halliday’s functional-systemic theory (1978) and Austin’s speech act theory (1975)—can no longer suffice given the ease with which images, sounds, and movement can be tapped for signification. Semiotics—a broad field of studies that looks at “meanings and messages in all their forms and all their contexts” (Innis, 1985, p. vii)—provides a rich conceptual palette for making sense of the “plurality of texts that circulate” (New London Group, 1996, p. 61) in a 21st-century social landscape. Until quite recently, semiotics has not been considered relevant to literacy theory and research, despite its long history within philosophical studies (see Deely, 1982). Yet, the basics of semiotics—the idea that signs are social forces and that anything can be taken as a sign—make semiotics uniquely suited for studying texts in the contemporary communicative landscape.

In this chapter, we outline the major semiotic traditions and their contributions to defining, theorizing, and analyzing texts. We begin with an overview of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914) and Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913), the two figures most closely associated with semiotic thought in modern times. Of the two, Saussure’s definition of a sign as an arbitrary relationship between signifier and signified is more widely known, but we believe Peirce’s theory of semiosis has a surprising resonance with contemporary literacy practice and thus offers greater potential for understanding texts. We then examine the work of Vygotsky, Bakhtin, Voloshinov, Kress, and Scollon and Scollon, all of whom give signs a central place in their theories of human thought, language, and literacy. Although our review will necessarily be limited in scope, we have selected those ideas we regard as essential both to understanding texts and to imagining new possibilities for designing, interpreting, embodying, and questioning texts in school literacy curricula.

To introduce these ideas, we turn to a setting that often appears immune to the changes in texts described earlier—school. Schools are the one place where texts appear to have undergone little change. Even more troubling is the way school literacy is shrinking to fit federal and state educational policies at the very moment that real world literacy is morphing into multiliteracies. Computers may be present in schools, but still cede center stage to books for reading and paper for writing. However, it doesn’t take the click of a mouse to design and transform a text, Web 2.0 style; all you need is a child. Five-year-old Hector accomplished...
this with his reading partner, Beatriz, during independent reading time in their New York City kindergarten. Their joint participation in a reading event will serve to illustrate what each semiotic tradition can contribute to an understanding of texts.

Weaving Webs of Significance with Text: An Illustration

In a New York City kindergarten, the reader’s workshop mini-lesson had just concluded, and children were directed to read their “little books” to themselves and then to their partners. Hector and Beatriz, two Dominican American children who had been reading partners for most of the school year, moved to the block corner with their book baggies, stuffed with books deemed just right for these two young readers. Beatriz selected What Can Go Up?—a book with a question-answer pattern describing items being placed in a tree house (“Can the rug go up? Yes, the rug can go up. Can the mat go up? Yes, the mat can go up.”)—accompanied by a photograph depicting the action. As the children read the title, Beatriz inverted the title’s meaning so it became What Can Go Down? and turned her book upside down as she did so. “This is my new book,” she declared. Hector ignored this at first, reading the actual words quickly and in a robot-like voice. He finished his version before Beatriz, and declared, “I’m gonna get What Can Go Down!” He put his book back in his baggie, and pretended to look for the “new” book. “I found it!” he reported, and held his book upside down, so what appeared to go up in his first reading would go down in the second. He and Beatriz read the new version, turning the pages backwards and oftentimes pausing to check if they were on the same page. Suddenly, Hector started reading very fast, and Beatriz tried to catch up. He read the last page, “We can go down, too,” closed his book quickly, and started singing while waiting for Beatriz to finish.

What does it mean to take a semiotic perspective on this literacy event, and what might such a lens contribute to educators’ understandings of texts in these changing times? To address these questions, we offer multiple readings of this event, each pursuing a different theoretical approach to semiotics.

Signs, Texts, and Meanings: Semiotic Traditions

We begin with a question that is basic to understanding texts: What is a sign? To answer this question, we must first assert, “nothing is a sign in and of itself” (Merrell, 1979, p. 150). As noted earlier, semiotics is the study of how acts and artifacts come to be interpreted as signs. Thus, signs do not have given meanings but, instead, have the potential to represent and generate meanings. Two distinct analytic traditions, emerging from the work of Saussure and Peirce, have addressed the problem of how signs work. Saussure, a Swiss linguist, considered linguistics a branch of what he called “semiology,” yet his analysis of linguistic signs served as the model for all signs. Saussure’s analysis of the system by which linguistic signs achieve their meanings led to the development of an analytic approach known as structuralism (evident in the work of Piaget, Chomsky, and Levi-Strauss [Gardner, 1981]), that dominated the humanities to such an extent that semiotics and structuralism were regarded as synonymous.

Peirce, an American philosopher who had a long career as a scientist, may be best known for his taxonomy of icon, index, and symbol, signs that function by virtue of resemblance (icon), physical connection (index), or a cultural convention which has become a rule or habit (symbol). Peirce sought to develop an understanding of logic that could account for human thought and action. His starting point was the observation that there could be no direct knowledge of the world except as mediated by signs. In a well-known passage, Peirce wrote, “It seems a strange thing …that a sign should leave its interpreter to supply part of its meaning; but the explanation of the phenomenon lies in the fact that the entire universe…is perfused with signs” (cited in Sebeok, 1977, p. vi).

The most important idea semiotics contributes to the understanding of texts is how signs work, and the contrast between Saussure’s explanation and that of Peirce amounts to the difference between structure and process. For Saussure, signs work only in relation to the structure of the sign system whereas for Peirce, signs work only when an interpreter brings one sign in relation to another, thus generating meaning through expansion as opposed to substitution. Saussure was interested in language as a system (langue) rather than the actual practice of speech (parole). He proposed that a sign is an association between form (signifier) and meaning (signified). This association is arbitrary (i.e., there is no resemblance between the word ‘dog’ and the concept of a dog). Thus, the signification that results from this association results from rules that govern the system. Key to understanding this system is the relation of signs to other signs in the system, rather than to their referents outside the system. Signs become meaningful on the basis of differences (typically oppositional differences) from other signs, so “house” acquires meaning in relation to apartment or vacation cottage or condo.

Peirce’s description of sign-functioning, on the other hand, emphasizes process and generativity rather than structure. Peirce proposed that signs become meaningful through the enlargement and expansion of meaning, which he called “semiosis.” In contrast to Saussure, who posited the relation of form and meaning as a two-term relation between signifier and signified, Peirce explained semiosis through his depiction of a semiotic triad. The sign (representamen) stands for the object in relation to a third element—another sign—which Peirce called an interpretant. For him, semiosis involved transformation, as in metaphor, and not simply the translation of a signifier into a signified. The meaning of one sign is expanded through the mediation of another sign. An important passage in Peirce’s writing states “a sign is something by knowing which we know something more” (Hardwick, 1977, p. 31). The “something more” that
we know is provided by the interpretant, which brings the object and representamen into relationship with another sign, and in this way, sets in motion an unending process of translation and interpretation that Peirce called “unlimited semiosis” (Eco, 1976). This is why Eco (1976) concludes, “the sign always opens up something new. No interpretant, in adjusting the sign interpreted, fails to change its borders to some degree” (p. 44).

Our discussion, thus far, suggests that a text cannot be a container of ready-made meanings; instead, a text is an “assemblage of signs” (Chandler, 2002, p. 2). Chandler adds that this assemblage is “constructed (and interpreted) with reference to the conventions associated with a genre and in a particular medium of communication” (p. 3). However, we would argue that any “assemblage of signs” has the potential to mean in ways not fully circumscribed by conventions of genre or medium. These aspects of the text are relevant but sometimes overemphasized and, especially in school, become a way to confine meaning by focusing on “appropriateness.” Peirce’s explanation of the interpretant in semiosis as a sign that both mediates and generates another sign is critical to understanding texts because it means that there are no single signs. The existence of a sign presupposes other signs: “the meaning of a sign inchoatively contains all the texts within which the sign can be inserted. A sign is a textual matrix” (Eco, 1976, p. 184). Thus, if a sign is a triadic relation that is part of a chain of semiosis, then a text can be understood as an assemblage of signs with the potential to produce and link to other texts.

These ideas may seem light-years away from Hector and Beatriz’s reading of What Can Go Up? Yet, Peirce’s explanation of semiosis can be useful in sorting out what is a text and how texts mean in this event. Given that a sign is anything that can be taken as a sign, and a text is an assemblage of signs, then this event incorporates multiple texts: the material text (What Can Go Up?); the invented text (What Can Go Down?); the children’s textual performances (assemblages of linguistic, visual, kinesthetic, and musical signs); and, the discursive (practicing fluent reading of “just right” books with partners), temporal (during readers’ workshop), and spatial (in the block corner) setting for the event. It is the children who decided to treat these materials and performances as texts, approaching them with the expectation that they could “stand to someone for something in some respect or capacity” (Peirce, cited in Eco, 1976, p. 180). From a sociocultural perspective on signs and texts, this expectation is regarded as a cultural achievement, and not a property of the material and embodied texts themselves. Hector’s action of returning his copy of What Can Go Up? and pretending to search for his new book, What Can Go Down? illustrates two ideas usually masked by the familiar fiction that a text represents meanings to be reproduced: anything can be taken as a sign, and signs mean through their relation to other signs. Not only did the children decide what could be taken as a sign or a text, but, as Peirce observed, they also contributed part of the meaning of texts they read. With a participatory ethos associated with Web 2.0 practices, these sign-makers literally and metaphorically turned literacy on its head to generate a playful, imaginative, and embodied reading. The children violated text conventions by turning the book upside-down and reading back to front while generating a new meaning through the mediation of an interpretant such as “choice time” or “drama,” two options during the school day. In doing so, they transformed the expected school reading of this text (fluently reading the words) into what Dyson (2003) would call a “textual toy.” Thus, we would argue that Beatriz and Hector’s “oppositional” reading of What Can Go Up? was not limited solely by the conventions associated with the genre of the “little book” or with reading as a practice in this classroom. They treated their classroom as “perfused with signs” and did the work assigned to them by the process of semiosis, generating meanings through the mediation of one sign with another.

Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) recent work on geosemiotics extends Peirce’s discussion of semiosis by highlighting the indexicality of signs—the ways that signs reflect or point to their locations in the concrete, spatial world. Rather than seeing texts/signs as autonomous artifacts, they argue that a significant part of the meaning of any sign is the way it is placed in the material world. Scollon and Scollon have highlighted two types of sign-functioning involving indexicality. Some signs (e.g., printed text, actions, objects) point to the physical spaces where they are located. For example, Beatriz and Hectors “little books” point to (index) the kinds of reading that kindergarteners are expected to do in the physical space of this classroom where they are taught to read using predictable language structures and illustrations as supports. Signs can also symbolically index spaces not physically present. For example, the children’s reading of the text upside down and with the concept of down substituted for the text’s printed word, up, likely indexed home spaces where they encountered the idea of “opposite day” through popular cartoon shows. In short, the signs produced by Hector and Beatriz in their reading performance, gained much of their meaning from their emplacement in the kindergarten classroom, but also from the ways they indexed the children’s shared understanding of out-of-school spaces.

Signs gain their meaning not only from their emplacement in the material world, but also from the embodied practices (movements of bodies through space and in relation to one another) through with they are performed. Leander (2002) argues that embodied practices, as one type of material sign, are important semiotic resources offering possibilities for meaning-making different from those provided by language. Through gesture and the positioning of bodies, speakers create social spaces where certain identities are empowered or silenced. In our example, Hector and Beatriz not only link their talk, but also use gaze and coordinated physical action (page turning) to signal joint engagement. The embodied action of holding the books upside down signed collaborative engagement in both parodying and participating in a familiar school reading practice. Embodied
practices are a critical part of complex, multimodal signs created through everyday social interaction. While the linguistic texts used or created in literacy events have been the usual focus of language arts researchers and educators, this work highlights the importance of broadening our semiotic lens to analyze the ways texts are created by the social geographies and embodied features of literacy events.

**Sociocultural Perspectives**

Mediation is as central to sociocultural theory as to Peirce’s explanation of semiosis. However, when texts are viewed through a sociocultural lens, mediation fuses with human action to create an approach to signs, texts, and meanings that retains Peirce’s focus on process while placing more emphasis on both the cultural and historical formation of signs and their power to shape external and internal worlds.

Sociocultural theory, rooted in the illuminating essays of L. S. Vygotsky (1896–1934), has reshaped the way language educators understand thinking and learning. Yet, within the field of education, Vygotsky’s notion of the zone of proximal development has overshadowed the centrality of semiotic mediation in his social theory of mind. Sociocultural theory foregrounds what human beings do as organized in activities that are practiced by social groups. Thus, the primary focus of sociocultural theory is human action, that is, culturally mediated social practices and their enactment through historical time. As Wertsch (1991) notes, “When action is given analytic priority, human beings are viewed as coming into contact with, and creating, their surroundings as well as themselves through the actions in which they engage” (p. 8). Vygotsky’s interest in how this transformation of external worlds and inner selves is accomplished led to his analysis of tools and signs, or what Wertsch calls “mediational means” (p. 12).

Vygotsky’s distinction between tools and signs is fundamental to understanding semiotic mediation. He notes that both tools and signs serve a mediation function, but argues that the familiar analogy of signs as tools does not get at the important difference in how each orients human action. He writes, “A tool’s function is to serve as the conductor of human influence on the object of activity; it is externally oriented” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 55, emphasis in original). In contrast, the sign does not change the object of the action, but serves as “a means of internal activity aimed at mastering oneself” (p. 55). With these distinctions, Vygotsky argues that the “real tie between these activities” (p. 55) is their combined role in the development of higher psychological functioning, such that the use of signs “fundamentally changes all psychological operations just as the use of tools limitless broadens the range of activities within which the new psychological functions may operate” (p. 55).

Vygotsky recognized the varied forms of mediational means employed in human action (i.e., sign systems such as language, diagrams, and arithmetic), but tended to prefer verbal mediation and consider it natural even though his primary method was developmental, aimed at understanding the formation of what were thought to be natural mental processes (Wertsch, 1991). The use of the genetic, or developmental method, allowed Vygotsky to study how action changed—and thus how mental functioning changed—when mediational means were introduced. This preference for language is evident in much sociocultural analysis. However, some contemporary sociocultural scholars have shown that the variation in kinds of meanings to be represented have, historically, required the creation of multiple modes of representation, recognizing that language is neither the only mediational means available, nor the one best able to represent particular meanings (John-Steiner, 1985, 1995).

A sociocultural perspective on text, therefore, emphasizes “individual(s)-acting-with-mediational-means” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 12) within particular cultural, historical, and institutional settings. This implies a dynamic, reflexive relationship between text and context in which individuals-acting-with-text shape and are shaped by their participation in activities. The spotlight is on the actors and their actions with texts, rather than on the texts that are acted-upon. Moreover, Vygotsky’s distinction between tool and sign suggests that texts can mediate action in both ways, that is, a text can be a tool that allows individuals to act on the world, and a text can be a sign that allows individuals to transform their mental functioning, consciousness, and identity.

Sociocultural theory takes us further in exploring Beatriz and Hector’s reading by casting light on their actions with mediational means, including talk, gestures, and movements. We see how they use the text as a tool to act on the external world as well as a sign to act on their internal worlds. Understanding how the text becomes both a tool and a sign requires a consideration of the multiple goals of this activity. Despite the fact that their official reading spot is in the block corner, they are expected to accomplish an instructional goal—practicing fluent reading—by reading the text aloud to one another or in unison, a goal that is itself a cultural-historical artifact. But the children’s actions suggest they have additional goals for this activity. One goal is relational in that the children are clearly eager to interact with one another as friends and reading partners. Another goal is play. These two goals are linked in action when Beatriz decides to turn the book upside-down and invent a new text, and Hector joins the play by pretending to find his own copy of the new book, What Can Go Down? He then launches into a fast-paced, robot-like reading that pays the barest attention to the conventions of “good reading,” evidence of his collusion in Beatriz’s reading game. Here we see how the children use text as a tool to act on each other and their world, transforming the activity from work to play. Their joint participation and shared knowledge is apparent in the words, gestures, and movements they use to make room for play in the course of their reading lesson. We cannot be certain how the text also became a sign for the children, transforming their inner selves, but we expect that their imaginative reading developed in Hector and Beatriz a greater control over, consciousness of, and identity as
meaning-makers. Knowing that texts are meaning potentials and that even a text written in black and white can be re-mediated to generate a new and original meaning is a valuable, if unintended, outcome of this reading lesson.

In recent years, sociocultural theorists have turned to the work of M. M. Bakhtin (1895–1975) and V. N. Voloshinov (1884–1936) to extend Vygotsky’s writings about the “social” in sociocultural. Wertsch (1991) argues that Vygotsky provided the outlines for the analysis of historically, culturally, and institutionally situated forms of mediated action, but his early death prevented a fuller rendering. The contributions of Bakhtin and Voloshinov are, thus, significant because they bring power and ideology to the analysis of the social through a focus on discourse rather than language as a system, as Saussure theorized. Indeed, their critiques of Saussure’s structuralism led them to make the “living utterance” (Morris, 1994, p. 76) the basic unit of analysis in a theory of language. An utterance could be a word or a text, but “the living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads…it cannot fail to become an active participant in the social dialogue” (p. 76).

Embedded in this quote are several essential ideas that have particular resonance for the way language arts educators think about texts. First, a text is dialogical, that is, socially situated and historically produced through its participation in multiple dialogues. As Bakhtin famously stated, “It is not, after all, out of the dictionary that the speaker gets his [sic] words!” (Morris, 1994, p. 77). Utterances are part of a chain of meaning; they respond to a prior dialogue and anticipate an answer. Second, a text is ideological in that it represents a particular view of the world. This is captured in Voloshinov’s notion of the “evaluative accent” (p. 36) whereby “each element in a living utterance not only has a meaning but also has a value” (p. 37) that is always associated with a particular social group. The result is “a constant struggle of accents” (Morris, 1994, p. 37). Finally, this struggle of accents is evident in the heteroglossia that characterizes texts. If an utterance is part of an ongoing dialogue populated by other people’s words, then a text carries the traces of multiple conflicting voices. Bakhtin referred to discourses within texts as “centripetal” and “centrifugal,” terms he glossed as centralization and decentralization or unification and stratification. Thus, a text is a site for tension and conflict.

This brief description of Bakhtin and Voloshinov’s contributions to a sociocultural approach to signs, text, and meanings allows us to revise our reading of Hector and Beatriz’s event to acknowledge the ideology and power at work in what has, thus far, been represented as a playful interaction. What we observe in their reading of What Can Go Up? is the “struggle of accents” as they participate in an ongoing dialogue about what it means to be a reader and a child in this kindergarten class. In Hector’s case, we can begin to hear his “evaluative accent” in his near-parody of school reading. Hector’s super-fast reading, accomplished with barely a look at the words and photographs and in the voice of a cartoon robot, bears traces of “other people’s words,” including the “unified” or official discourse of the lesson (good readers read fluently) and the unofficial discourse of their peer world (friendship, fun, and popular culture, especially Hector’s favorite TV show, SpongeBob SquarePants, where “opposite” day regularly occurs). The heteroglossia of the children’s own living utterances indicate their efforts to negotiate the tensions among multiple discourses and identities through mediated action.

A Social Semiotic Perspective

Semiotic traditions have always treated semiotics as social in that Saussure defined signs as social conventions and Peirce claimed that signs do not exist without interpreters. However, social semiotics makes social practice the basis of sign, text, and meaning. M.A.K. Halliday (1978) first introduced the idea of language as social semiotic, rejecting Saussure’s autonomous, decontextualized system because it ignored the basic social fact that people talk to one another in particular sociocultural contexts. For Halliday, linguistic choices are social choices about how to represent the world (ideational function) and act out the social order (interpersonal function) through particular organizational means (textual function). Thus, “language as social semiotic” meant “interpreting language within a sociocultural context in which the culture itself is interpreted in semiotic terms” (p. 2). Hodge and Kress (1988) go further in their critique of Saussure, proposing that the contents of Saussure’s “rubbish bin” constitute a semiotics of social practice in concrete social situations. This perspective would include what Saussure excluded: culture, society, and politics; semiotic systems beyond language; concrete signifying practices; time, history, process, and change; semiotic processes; the material nature of signs. Kress (1997, 2003) continues to elaborate these ideas by developing a social semiotic perspective on multimodal literacy practices. A central theme in his work on multimodality is the way each mode offers particular affordances of meaning. Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) analyze visual images to reveal that they, like language, are structured by a grammar rooted in social expectations for image construction. This work challenges language researchers to take seriously the semiotic notion that meaning making is not exclusively a linguistic enterprise—a fact that is increasingly apparent in a Web 2.0 environment.

Kress (1997) has also used the construct of interest to explain how the sign-maker’s perspectives and preferences guide text construction including choices of meanings, modalities, and forms. He argues that sign-makers shape their texts in relation to their personal interpretations of the chosen topic and their preferences for modes of representation: “Signs arise out of our interest at a given moment, when we represent those features of the object which we regard as defining of that object at the moment (that is, wheels as defining of car). This interest is always complex and has physiological, psychological, emotional,
cultural and social origins” (p.11). For Kress, interest is a personal frame bounding acts of sign-making (e.g., reading, writing, drawing) by identifying the criterial features of an object or event that sign-makers represent in the signs they create. Linking this idea to Peircean notions of semiosis, interest may, in part, guide sign-makers’ choices of the second sign—the interpretant—they bring to an act of meaning-making.

While interest is, in some ways, individual, Kress points out that it is also social and cultural since an author’s interests are shaped by the cultural practices and materials used in sign-making. He assumes that as sign-makers act out of their own interest they are influenced by their personal histories as well as the sociocultural affordances and constraints of their present location. Kress stresses the active and creative role of authors, who “act energetically, intelligently, perceptively, out of their interest, innovatively making for themselves their means of communication and representation (p. 113). Rowsell and Pahl (2007) have recently suggested that Kress’ notion of interest can best be understood as a facet of a sign-maker’s socioculturally situated identities. They describe interest as part of identity narratives constructed over time and expressed through the sign-maker’s preferences for materials, topics, and actions during composing or reading. They argue that identities—and by extension, interests—are historically rooted in sign-makers’ participation in the sociocultural practices of their communities and are evident—sedimented—in their actions and texts. Signs, then, are historical artifacts shaped by the sign-maker’s performed identities that are in turn shaped by their histories of participation in the sociocultural practices of their Discourse communities. Beatriz and Hector’s multimodal enactment of What Can Go Up? serves to illustrate how their histories of participation and socioculturally situated identities as engaged students, successful readers, friends, popular culture enthusiasts, and gender performers have become sedimented in their sign-making.

Conclusion

Semiotics provides us with a view of text and meaning making that is interpreted, multimodal, socially performed, emplaced, and embodied. Across the semiotic perspectives we have explored, there is a movement away from a Sau- ssurian conception of texts as static signifying structures containing meaning. A Peircean view of signs as mediated by other signs contributed by the sign-maker meshes well with contemporary constructivist views of comprehension and textual interpretation. Further, Peirce’s expansive view of sign-material provides a unified space for exploring the proliferation of sign systems that are part of new literacies. New directions in the semiotics of texts come at just the right time to provide the theoretical leverage needed to address literacy practices in a 21st-century landscape.

Note

1. We are indebted to Carolyn Panofsky for her clarifying insights into sociocultural theory.
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