The discussion I intend to present in this study is a part of a more extensive dissertation concerning conventions in various fields of culture.

In the introduction to this dissertation, I distinguish several meanings of the word “convention,” which I must quote in the summary, as I use them repeatedly in the further course of this discussion. Generally speaking, there are three meanings of the term “convention”: convention in the sense of arrangement, in the sense of decision, and in the sense of custom. Within each of these meanings I distinguish the functional aspect and the productive, or result, aspect of a given activity. Let us add that obviously not all arrangements, decisions or customs assume the character of a convention, only their certain subsets. Thus, C-I-a is a convention understood as an activity of authorized people consisting in: (1) removing the actual or possible inconsistent standpoints of grantors of these people in a given issue, and (2) assuming a common standpoint valid for the grantors under specific conditions (where the authorized person and the grantor may be the same subject of activity in some cases). C-I-b is a product of C-I-a presented in the form of a verbal message which provides the content of the arranged standpoint and the conditions of the commitment.

C-II-a is as much as a decision in the issue of the choice of a determinant or a class of determinants $W$, which continue a certain system (an order of relationships) in the scope of results of a sign character belonging to the universum of cultural objects.

C-II-b is the determinant selected in the above way. It may be a postulate, a definition, a system of axioms, a rule of conduct, a literary or artistic canon, etc.
C-III-a is a certain custom, a stereotypical manner of behavior, which is not instinctive behavior, and is supposed to communicate specific meaning content determined by the directive of the type C-II-b or an agreement C-I-b, even if the people who preserve the custom are not aware of the convention which conditions it.

C-III-b constitutes objectivized manifestations of C-III-a (social conventions, conventional attire, decorations, etc.).

The domain in which conventions play an important role, in each of the meanings of the word “convention” mentioned above, is *ex definitione* the domain of signs of various kinds. What is more, we may venture a statement that the notion of a convention is specific to it and that it necessarily penetrates this world because sing systems and meanings are so common in the world of culture.

Human speech discussed as a natural, spontaneous manner of people’s behavior in their pursuit of externalizing their own spiritual states, of communicating with others, of influencing others and cooperating with them, of précising and consolidating knowledge about reality, is not an example that the notion of a convention is specific to it and that it necessarily reduced to communicating certain content determined by directives of the type C-II-b or by agreements C-I-b. This does not stand in contradiction with the fact that a language understood as a system of signs and rules of using them is a result of a convention of the type C-II-a, whereas the rules themselves may have the characteristics of the convention C-II-b. This especially concerns artificial and formal languages, as well as certain aspects of natural language.

However, not all symbols, if we take a certain specific meaning of the term, have a conventional character. This particularly concerns the domain of symbols which are customarily called “indexes.”

The notion of an index, variously defined and interpreted, can be reduced to the concept of an ordered set $U$, such that $U = F\{(a \rightarrow b) \text{ for } S\}$, when $S$ is a conscious subject, $a$ is a certain state of affairs available in perception such that it may be included by $S$ as an indicator of the occurrence of another state of affairs, namely $b$. A given $a$ indicates $b$ if and only if $S$, noticing $a$, may accept $b$ in view of the fact that there is a certain relationship of assignment between $a$ and $b$. This relationship of assignment may be ontically founded (*e.g.* because $a$ causally determines $b$) or based on convention. In the second case, the role of conventions may be twofold. Either it consists in equipping the indicator $a$ with certain sign elements assumed by conventions, where the state of affairs $a$ is founded as an indicator by a real relationship (either functional or causal) with the state of affairs $b$, or this relationship consists in the relationship of