Chapter - I
Poetic Discourse : Semiolinguistic Perspective

1. At the end of the nineteenth century, a general theory of signs has been conceived and proposed by two great modern thinkers: the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) and the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914). Saussure uses the term semiology to refer to 'a science that studies the life of signs in a society' whereas Peirce uses the term semiotics and claims that 'logic in its general acceptation is merely another word for semiotics, a quasi-necessary or formal doctrines of signs'. Saussure brings into focus the social aspects of signs, Peirce their logical aspects. Some scholars like A.J. Greimas in their theoretical pursuit, still maintain the distinction between semiotics and semiology at the conceptual front. But in current usage, most often, the distinction has tended to become blurred (both terms have been derived from the Greek word σημειον, meaning sign) and semiotics is now the generally accepted term which refers to the systematic study of sign systems and their signification. Roy Harris (1993 : 665) mentions that 'Semiologie the term coined by Saussure was first used by him in 1894, thus anticipating by three years Peirce's use of the term semiotic'. Harris further suggests 'that this latter term had been anticipated two centuries earlier by the great English philosopher John Locke'.

2. Here is Peirce's classification of 'signs'. In itself, it will be or include: a qualisign, a sinsign, a legisign; in relation to a ground or object: an icon, an index, a symbol; in relation to its interpretant: a rheme, a dicent (or dici sign), an argument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as possible</th>
<th>as existential</th>
<th>as proposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sign-inherent)</td>
<td>(sign-object)</td>
<td>(sign-interpretant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualisign</td>
<td>icon</td>
<td>rheme ... as unilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinsign</td>
<td>index</td>
<td>dicent ... as referable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legisign</td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td>argument ... as conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten classes of signs which Peirce found most worth distinguishing are: 1. rhematic iconic qualisign, e.g. a feeling of "red"; 2. rhematic iconic sinsign, e.g. an individual diagram; 3. rhematic indexical sinsign, e.g. a cry of pain; 4. dicent indexical sinsign, e.g. weathercock; 5. rhematic iconic legisign, e.g. a diagram of isosceles triangle, (apart from the particular individuality of the diagram); 6. rhematic indexical legisign, e.g. a demonstrative pronoun; 7. dicent indexical legisign, e.g. any standardized attention-getter; 8. rhematic symbol (legisign), e.g. a common noun, a chess piece; 9. dicent symbol (legisign), or "proposition", is a sign connected with its object by an association of general ideas, ..., its intended interpretant represents the Dicent Symbol as being really affected by its Object, so that the existence or law which it calls to mind must be actually connected with the indicated Object ..., " 10. an argument is a sign whose interpretant represents its object as being a ..., sign through a law, namely, the law that the passage from all such premises to such conclusions tends to the truth..., its object must be general; that is, the Argument must be a Symbol. As a Symbol it must, further, be a Legisign. Its Replica is a Dicent Sinsign" (C.S. Peirce, Vol. 2. 263). [See Victorino Tejera, 1995 : 41]
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