

Journal of African films and Diaspora Studies (JAFDIS)
(Research on African Films, Diaspora Studies, Performance
Arts and Communication Studies)

Published consistently since, 2018

ISSN: 2516-2705 (Print) ISSN: 2516-2713 (Online)

Indexed by SCOPUS, IBSS, EBSCO, ProQuest, COPENICUS,
ERIH PLUS and SABINET

Volume 9, Number 2, June, 2026

pp 213-225

Madness, Power, and the Nigerian State: A Semiotic
Analysis of the Film *King of Boys*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2516-2713/2026/v9n2a11>

Anthony Yashim Nkom, Ph.D

Department of Mass Communication

University of Benin, Edo State

tonynkom@gmail.com



Ikechukwu Anthony Kanu, Ph.D

Department of Philosophy

Veritas University, Abuja

ikee_mario@yahoo.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-1977-202X

Abstract

This study examines the Nigerian film *King of Boys* through a semiotic lens to explore how its symbolic representations of “madness” communicate broader anxieties about political power, legitimacy, and state dysfunction in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic. Drawing on theories of representation, semiotics, political culture, and postcolonial power, the analysis interprets characters, settings, and narrative elements as signs that encode the contradictions of Nigeria’s political environment. Findings reveal that the film constructs a metaphor of a fragmented, incoherent state in which the boundaries between legality and criminality collapse, political authority is performed rather than institutionalised, and power is sustained through violence, loyalty networks, and moral ambiguity. By highlighting these patterns, *King of Boys* functions as an educative cultural text that mirrors Nigeria’s

governance challenges and invites critical reflection on the nature of political legitimacy. The study situates the film within media studies, political communication, and African cultural analysis, demonstrating the value of cinema as a tool for understanding and critiquing socio-political realities.

Keywords: *Madness, Nigeria, Semiotic, Cinematic, King of Boys, Power*

Introduction

The Nigerian film *King of Boys*, directed by Kemi Adetiba, examines political recruitment and culture in Nigeria during the 4th Republic. It can be described as a cinematic reflection of the political culture in the Nigerian state, where political power is coveted and won by those who should ideally not have any business in governance. Through the characters, narratives, and symbolism, the film shows a state in which absurdity has been institutionalised (Adetiba, 2018). There appears to be no demarcation between the good and the bad, the appropriate and the profane, the evil and the just. Evidently, audiences are treated to a spectacle of absurdity that could best be conceived as madness. The writer, therefore, takes a position of judgment to assert that the central themes captured in the film can be conceived through the metaphor of madness, a state of dysfunction and absurdity.

Madness is more than just a metaphor for a situation in which goals and instruments are subverted by persons who have assumed roles not meant for them. With this subversion of roles, the state falls into dysfunction as the intent and purpose of political power for the society are altered. What cements this absurdity is the normalisation of the crisis. Films, in many instances, mirror society; they reflect certain themes worthy of the public's attention (Priyanka, Garima, & Nagendra, 2022). When a film has a central theme of political power in a particular context, it becomes an educational episode for viewers. Scholars widely acknowledge that film serves as a cultural artifact capable of mirroring the social, political, and economic realities of the societies from which it emerges (Bahadkar, 2010). Cultural theorists argue that cinema does more than entertain; it encodes prevailing values, tensions, and power structures that shape collective life. As Hall (1997) explains, representation in visual media refracts social experiences, helping audiences interpret their world. Thus, when filmmakers intentionally embed social themes into their narratives, films become interpretive spaces

through which viewers engage with the complexities of their own environments.

A growing body of literature highlights film's role in examining political power and governance. Political communication scholars note that films that portray themes such as leadership struggles, corruption, authoritarianism, and civic resistance offer audiences an accessible framework for understanding political dynamics (Rosenstone, 2006; Giroux, 2011). Rosenstone (2006) argues that politically themed films function as informal educational tools, shaping how viewers grasp political processes. Similarly, Giroux (2011) emphasizes that film can cultivate critical citizenship by exposing audiences to narratives that interrogate the exercise and abuse of power, particularly in contexts where formal political education is limited.

Audience reception studies further demonstrate that films centered on social and political themes often act as catalysts for reflection, debate, and civic awareness (Gillespie, 2012; Kersten et al., 2017). Viewers do not simply consume these narratives; they interpret them through the lens of their lived experiences, societal frustrations, and aspirations. This aligns with media effects theories such as cultivation theory and framing, which suggest that repeated exposure to politically charged narratives can shape perceptions and attitudes (McQuail, 2010). Consequently, films that foreground power relations do more than tell stories; they function as educative episodes that encourage audiences to interrogate structural inequalities and evaluate the legitimacy of political actors within their societies. *King of Boys* is a film produced during Nigeria's fourth republic and, like every other art, open to varying interpretations (Adetiba, 2018). Again, with the sub-themes of normalised disarray, a crisis of legitimacy, and the linkage between the underworld and noble political offices in Lagos, Madness becomes a conceptual tool to unravel the absurdity brilliantly captured in the film. This study adopts a semiotic analysis of the film, which provides a dimension that has not been explored in the literature.

Semiotic Analysis as Method: From Signs to Social Meaning

Semiotics is the study of signs, symbols, and the creation and communication of meaning. It explores how people interpret words, images, gestures, sounds, and objects as part of everyday communication (Anderson, Hoybye & Risor, 2024). At its core, semiotics helps us understand not just what something is, but what it represents. Signs consist of two parts: the *signifier* (the form, such as a word or image) and the *signified* (the concept it represents). It could also consist of a three-part model: the *sign*, the *object*,

and the *interpretant*, emphasizing the role of interpretation in meaning-making (Staal, 1966).

Semiotics is used across many disciplines, including linguistics, media studies, advertising, and cultural studies. For example, in advertising, colors, logos, and slogans are carefully chosen to evoke certain emotions or ideas. A red rose may signify love, while a traffic light uses colors to communicate rules without words (Olteanu & Campbell, 2018). In today's digital world, semiotics is especially relevant. Emojis, memes, and icons function as modern signs, carrying meanings that vary across cultures and contexts. Understanding semiotics allows us to critically analyze how messages are constructed and how they influence perception (Shackell, 2019; Kanu & Pilani, 2024). In summary, semiotics is a powerful tool for decoding the hidden meanings behind everyday communication, revealing how humans create and share understanding through signs.

To grasp the symbolism encoded in the movie *King of Boys*, through the metaphor of madness, a semiotic lens is indispensable. Semiotics, the study of signs and their meaning, provides a method of uncovering how cultural symbols, gestures, and phenomena communicate ideas beyond their immediate appearances (Chandler, 2017; Noth, 1995). Semiotics is rooted in the work of Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles Sanders Peirce, and this semiotics has become central to cultural and political analysis, allowing researchers to interpret not only words and texts but also images, performances, and social realities. Semiotic analysis functions by identifying the signifier (the form a sign takes), the signified (the concept it represents), and the broader codes or myths that these generate in society (Barthes, 1972 & 1991).

Semiotic analysis has historically been used to decode advertising, media, literature, and cultural practices. In political communication, scholars have used semiotics to interpret campaign posters, speeches, and slogans, showing how leaders manufacture meaning to secure legitimacy (Nussbaum, 2011; Hayward, 2018; Machin & Mayr, 2012). In the African context, semiotic methods have been employed to read the symbolism of clothing, language use, and protest cultures, particularly in how citizens resist state oppression through symbolic practices (Noth, 2011; Oha, 2018). In the film, semiotics provides a way to interpret the encoded messages in characters, narratives, and symbols.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in a set of interrelated theories that help illuminate how *King of Boys* constructs and communicates political meaning. At the core is Hall's (1997) theory of representation, which argues that the media do not simply depict reality but actively shape how audiences understand social and political life. Through images, characters, and narrative codes, films organize meaning and circulate dominant or contested interpretations of the world. In this sense, *King of Boys* becomes a symbolic text where political dysfunction is not merely shown but encoded in culturally meaningful signs.

Semiotics provides the primary analytical framework for interpreting these signs. Building on Saussure's distinction between the signifier and the signified and on Peirce's broader triadic model of icons, indices, and symbols, semiotics enables this study to examine how gestures, settings, and character behaviours point beyond the literal to suggest deeper political anxieties (Chandler, 2017). Barthes' (1972) notion of myth further strengthens this approach by showing how everyday cultural symbols accumulate into overarching narratives; in this case, the myth of a "mad" or incoherent state where the lines between legitimacy and criminality collapse. These symbolic representations resonate strongly with political culture theories that describe Nigeria's Fourth Republic as shaped by patronage, elite domination, and prebendal competition (Diamond, 1991; Eliagwu, 2011).

Scholars such as Joseph (1987) and Ake (1996) argue that political actors often treat public office as personal property, producing governance marked by distrust, conflict, and institutional fragility. The film mirrors this landscape by portraying political authority as a performance maintained through violence, loyalty networks, and transactional relationships. Finally, the study draws on postcolonial theories of power, especially Mbembe's (2001) analysis of African political authority as theatrical, excessive, and frequently entangled with illegality. Mbembe's insights help explain why the film's depiction of political space appears chaotic and spectacular, revealing a system where power is dramatized through intimidation, ritual, and symbolic displays of dominance. Together, these theoretical perspectives provide a coherent framework for understanding how *King of Boys* functions as a cultural text that critiques the instability and moral contradictions of governance in contemporary Nigeria.

Semiotic Analysis: Introduction and Context to the King of Boys

Released in 2018 and directed by Kemi Adetiba, *King of Boys* is a Nigerian political-action thriller with a running time of approximately 169 minutes. Set largely in Lagos, the film interweaves the glitz of political campaigns with the brutality of the city's criminal underworld. Shot across urban locations such as Government House, inner-city neighbourhoods, banquet halls, and informal settlements, the film constructs a visual geography that reflects the complexities of power in contemporary Nigeria. The narrative follows Eniola Salami, a wealthy businesswoman and philanthropist whose dominance in Lagos' political underworld fuels her ambition for formal power. The film is notable for its dense ensemble of characters: politicians, gang leaders, security operatives, and ordinary citizens, each contributing symbolic elements to the representation of political disorder.

Its sequel series, *King of Boys: The Return of the King* (2021), extends the universe, but this analysis focuses on the original film, where the foundational symbolic architecture is established. What distinguishes *King of Boys* is not merely its storyline but its semiotic richness. The film deploys recurring symbols, ritualistic gatherings, opulent political decor, dystopian street scenes, coded gestures of allegiance, and choreographed violence to communicate deeper messages about the Nigerian state. The tension between public order and private chaos permeates the film's aesthetic, making it an ideal text for semiotic inquiry. In analysing *King of Boys*, this study employs a semiotic approach that interprets characters, scenes, and narrative structures as cultural signs that convey political meaning. The analysis considers how the film constructs metaphors of madness, fragmentation, and moral decay to critique Nigeria's political landscape. By examining visual elements, character arcs, spatial settings, and narrative conflicts, the study reveals how the film embodies the contradictions, anxieties, and structural failures of governance in the Fourth Republic (Kanu, 2012).

Semiotic Analysis of Characters

Eniola Salami embodies the fractured identity of Nigeria. Publicly, she is a philanthropist and aspiring governor, a "Giant of Africa" figure. Privately, she is a ruthless crime lord. This duality mirrors Nigeria's split reality: official narratives of growth and democracy versus lived experiences of violence and deprivation. The film's Lagos is a visual semiotic field; glitzy political rallies

coexist with dark, violent underworld dealings, reflecting a nation trapped between projected power and internal decay (Adetiba, 2018; Stam, 2000).

The first set of signifiers from the film is the characters in the plot. They embody the absurdity in ways that become readily apparent to the audience. Eniola Salami, the “Mad” State Incarnate. She is both the signifier (the powerful kingmaker) and the signified (the corrupted, fragmented nation). Her psychosis is political: she hears the “voices” of past trauma and present paranoia, much like the state is haunted by its own violent history. Makanaki, the Uncontrolled Disorder. His chaotic rise from enforcer to challenger symbolizes the unpredictable violence of political rebellion. He is the “raving” force that destabilizes fragile systems. Alhaji Maikanji, the Vampire Elite. He represents the political old guard that loots and abandons. His calm exterior masks a parasitic relationship with the state, a literal “vampire elite.” Kitan, the Alienated Citizen. As a lawyer turned conspirator, she embodies the educated youth forced into morally ambiguous survival strategies (Adetiba, 2018). Her arc reflects the betrayal of professional promise.

The Naked State: Stripped of Dignity

The film’s portrayal of corruption, bribes, assassinations, and judicial manipulation strips the state of its dignity. Characters like Chief Ade Tiger (Paul Sambo) and Inspector Gobir (Toni Tones) represent a political class that normalizes theft and violence (Adetiba, 2018; Falana, 2024 & Oxfam in Nigeria, 2024). The decaying urban landscapes, unsafe streets, and compromised institutions are the “torn clothes” of the state. Eniola’s own transformation from victim to perpetrator illustrates how the system corrupts dignity, leaving everyone “naked” in the pursuit of power.

The Raving Politician: Incoherent Governance

The political elites in *King of Boys* act with the unpredictability and disinhibition of psychosis. Senator Bobo (Osas Ighodaro) and Makanaki (Remilekun “Reminisce” Safaru) embody erratic policy-making, shifting alliances, sudden betrayals, and violent crackdowns (Adetiba, 2018). Their actions lack logical coherence, mirroring the “disordered thought” of a state where governance is improvisational and self-serving. The audience, like citizens, is left navigating a reality where promises and threats are indistinguishable (Kanu & Haaga, 2012).

The Orphaned Nation: Alienation and Abandonment

The film's flashbacks to Eniola's traumatic past, a family destroyed by political violence, symbolize the abandonment of citizens by the state. The ordinary people of Lagos are orphaned by governance, left to fend for themselves. Eniola's rise is a response to this abandonment: she creates her own system of "care" through fear and loyalty (Adetiba, 2018). This reflects Nigeria's social contract crisis, in which the state is absent, and survival depends on informal, often criminal, networks (Kanu, 2025).

The Foraging Citizen: Survival in the Informal Economy

Many characters in *King of Boys* operate in the informal or criminal economy: gang members, spies, freelance assassins, and crooked cops. Their livelihoods are precarious, forged in the "ruins" of a failed formal system (Adetiba, 2018). Odogwu Malay (Illbliss) and Kitan (Adesua Etomi-Wellington) represent youths who turn to illegal means for survival, mirroring the Nigerian youth's forced "foraging" for opportunity in a broken economy (Kanu, 2025).

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study show that *King of Boys* operates as a cultural text through which the contradictions of political authority in Nigeria's Fourth Republic are symbolically expressed. Through its characters, visual landscape, and narrative arcs, the film constructs a metaphor of "madness" that reflects the instability, incoherence, and moral fragmentation of the Nigerian state. The semiotic analysis reveals how the signs embedded in the film—gestures of power, ritualistic violence, performative loyalty, and the fusion of crime with governance—communicate deeper anxieties about the nature of political legitimacy.

This symbolic construction aligns closely with Hall's (1997) argument that representation is a site where meaning is produced rather than passively mirrored. The film's depiction of Eniola Salami, for example, does not merely portray a powerful political actor; instead, she functions as a representational code for a nation caught between public aspiration and private disorder. Her dual identity as a philanthropist and crime lord signifies the split consciousness of the Nigerian state, a formal commitment to democratic order alongside an entrenched reliance on informal, often violent mechanisms of control. Through this dual symbolism, the film reframes

political power as inherently unstable, echoing Hall's premise that media texts organize meanings that help audiences interpret social reality.

The findings also demonstrate the usefulness of semiotic theory in uncovering the layers of meaning within the film. Characters such as Makanaki and Alhaji Maikanji operate as signs within a broader symbolic system. Makanaki signifies raw, unregulated rebellion, embodying the unpredictable eruptions of violence that characterise Nigeria's political space. Maikanji, in contrast, represents the entrenched elite whose calm exterior masks extractive and predatory governance. In Barthes' (1972) sense, these characters accumulate into a political "myth" of a state governed by contradictions, where legality and criminality coexist, where formal institutions survive only by aligning with informal power networks, and where political ambition is inseparable from brutality.

These portrayals strongly resonate with political culture theories that describe Nigerian politics as a terrain dominated by patron-client relationships, prebendalist appropriation, and elite competition. As Joseph (1987) argues, the Nigerian state often serves as a space where public resources become personalised, and where loyalty networks determine access to power. The film's scenes of vote rigging, backroom negotiations, and violent enforcement illustrate these dynamics visually, confirming Ake's (1996) observation that elite struggles often overwhelm the institutional frameworks meant to guide governance. The semiotic findings reinforce this literature by highlighting how cinematic signs replicate the underlying logics of political behaviour in Nigeria.

Furthermore, the findings align with the work of Mbembe (2001) on postcolonial analysis of power as a spectacle characterized by exaggeration, performativity, and the routine display of coercion. The film's aesthetic, its lavish political rallies contrasted with chaotic street violence, and its ceremonial oath-taking juxtaposed with betrayal illustrate what Mbembe conceptualizes as the theatricality of African political authority. Power in *King of Boys* is not administered but performed, not institutional but embodied, and not rational but excessive. This spectacle of power mirrors the lived experience of many Nigerian citizens who see governance not through policy outcomes but through dramatic shifts in loyalty, sudden eruptions of violence, and the overwhelming presence of elite influence in everyday life.

Finally, the findings show that *King of Boys* functions as a form of critical pedagogy by encouraging viewers to interrogate the structures of power that shape their society. As Giroux (2011) suggests, politically charged films can foster critical consciousness by providing symbolic frameworks through which citizens evaluate social conditions. The film's narrative arc, from

Eniola's ascent to her eventual downfall, offers viewers a metaphor for the cyclical nature of power in Nigeria, where political ambition often leads to self-destruction and where the system itself produces the crises it seeks to resolve. In presenting this metaphor, the film becomes an educative space that invites audiences to critically reflect on the moral and structural challenges of governance. Overall, the discussion of findings demonstrates that *King of Boys* is not merely a cinematic story but a semiotic map of Nigeria's political disorder. Its signs and symbols expose the blurred boundaries between governance and violence, the fragility of legitimacy, and the enduring influence of informal power. Through these findings, the study affirms the capacity of film to serve as a cultural archive and a site of political critique.

Conclusion

The semiotic analysis of *King of Boys* reveals a film deeply embedded in the political contradictions of Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Through its characters, visual codes, and narrative structure, the film constructs a metaphor of "madness" that captures the incoherence, violence, and moral instability at the heart of contemporary governance. The recurring symbols of fractured identity, predatory elites, betrayal, and ritualised power expose a political culture shaped by informal networks, prebendal practices, and persistent struggles for dominance. These representations align with broader theoretical insights on representation, political culture, and postcolonial power, illustrating how cinema can serve as a critical archive of national anxieties. Ultimately, *King of Boys* functions as more than a crime or political thriller; it is a cultural mirror reflecting the blurred boundaries between state authority and criminality.

Its semiotic landscape shows a state whose legitimacy is contested and whose institutions bend to the weight of personal ambition and informal coercion. The film challenges viewers to confront the enduring instability of the Nigerian political system, a system where power is performed through spectacle, maintained through violence, and sustained by networks of loyalty rather than democratic norms. By revealing these layers, the study demonstrates the power of film as an interpretive space where societies can examine themselves. It underscores the need for deeper engagement with cultural texts in understanding governance. It reinforces the role of cinema as a form of critical pedagogy capable of provoking reflection, debate, and the reimagining of Nigeria's political future.

This study has explored how *King of Boys* operates as a rich semiotic text that interrogates the intersections of madness, power, and statecraft within the Nigerian context. Through its layered symbols, character constructions, and narrative tensions, the film reveals how “madness” is not merely a psychological condition but a socially constructed label often deployed to delegitimize dissent or mask the excesses of political authority. At the same time, power is depicted as fluid, performative, and deeply entangled with violence, loyalty, and survival within a fragile state structure.

By situating personal ambition within broader institutional decay, the film ultimately reflects the complexities and contradictions of the Nigerian state, where moral boundaries are blurred, and legitimacy is constantly negotiated. This analysis, therefore, underscores the importance of cultural texts as critical sites for understanding political realities, suggesting that *King of Boys* is not just entertainment but a commentary on governance, identity, and the precarious nature of authority in contemporary Nigeria.

References

- Adetiba, K. (Director). (2018). *King of Boys* [Film]. Lagos: Ebonylife Films.
- Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Andersen, R. S.; Høybye, M. T.; Risør, M. B. (2024). “Expanding Medical Semiotics”. *Medical Anthropology*. 43 (2): 91–101.
- Bahadkar, S. (2010). *Movies and the role they play*. An article published in *Youth ki Awaz in Society*. Retrieved from <https://www.youthkiawaz.com/2010/06/movies-and-the-role-they-play/>.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies* (A. Lavers, Trans.). London: Jonathan Cape.
- Chandler, D. (2017). *Semiotics: The Basics* (3rd ed.). Oxfordshire, England: Routledge.
- Diamond, L. (1991). *Nigeria’s second republic: Presidentialism, politics, and administration in a developing democracy*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Elaigwu, J. I. (2011). *The politics of federalism in Nigeria*. Abuja: Adonis & Abbey.
- Falana, F. (2024). *On Nigeria’s “vampire elites.”* Lagos: Socio-Economic Rights Series.
- Gillespie, R. (2012). The art of criticism in the age of interactive technology: critics, participatory culture, and the avant-garde. *Int. J. Commun.* 6, 56–75

- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Canada: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. Sage.
- Hayward, S. (2018). *Cinema Studies: The key concepts* (5th ed.). Oxfordshire, England: Routledge.
- Joseph, R. (1987). *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the Second Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kanu, A. I & Pilani, P. M. (2024). "Semiotic Hermeneutic of 'New Wine, New Wineskins.' Symbols, Philosophy of Development and Africa". *Dialogue and Universalism*, 32(2): 151-162.
- Kanu, I. A. & Paul Haaga (2012). "Philosophy and Good Governance: The Nigerian Experience." Published in the *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 16(1): 773-783.
- Kanu, I. A. (2012). "The Church and National Development: Towards a Philosophy of Collaboration." Published in *African Research Review: An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*. 6(2): 113-122.
- Kanu, I. A. (2025). Nigeria: The forgotten past, the chequered present, and the distant future. A lead paper presented at the 2025 Association of Professional Philosophers of Nigeria Conference, held from 7-9 October at the Federal University of Lokoja, Kogi State.
- Kanu, I. A. (2025). Nigeria's Bittered and Embittered Trajectory: A Critical Rethink of 'Renaissance' and a Strategic Embrace of 'Akiism.' Jos: Augustinian Publications.
- Kersten, A., & Janssen, S. (2017). "Trends in cultural journalism: the development of film coverage, a cross-national perspective, 1955–2005." *Journal. Pract.* 11(7), 840–856.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. California: University of California Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics (L. Meintjes, Trans.). *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.
- McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Nöth, W. (1995). *Handbook of semiotics*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Oha, O. (2018). Semiotics of resistance: Reading symbolic protest cultures in contemporary Africa. *African Studies Review*, 61(3), 1–20.
- Olteanu, Alin; Campbell, Cary (2018). "A Short Introduction to Edusemiotics". *Chinese Semiotic Studies*. 14 (2): 245–260

- Oxfam in Nigeria. (2024). *Inequality in Nigeria: Exploring the drivers of income and wealth disparities*. Abuja: Oxfam.
- Priyanka, S., Garima, K. & Nagendra, K. (2022). *Role of Films in Society. Transcending the Horizon*. New Delhi: Rescent Publishing Corporation.
- Rosenstone, R. A. (2006). *History on film/film on history*. London: Pearson Longman.
- Shackell, Cameron (2019). "Finite semiotics: Cognitive sets, semiotic vectors, and semiotic oscillation". *Semiotica*. (229): 211–235.
- Staal, J. F. (1966). "Indian Semantics, I". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 86 (3): 304–311.
- Stam, R. (2000). *Film Theory: An Introduction*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.