CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO SEMIOTICS

SECTION 1: GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SEMIOTICS

1.0. INTRODUCTION

The birth of a new discipline in academics, specially in the human sciences is a rare occurrence indeed. The growth of semiotics in the second half of the twentieth century can be recognised as such an event. The possibility of a 'science of signs' was hinted at by Ferdinand de Saussure only in the beginning of this century and today, semiotics is offered as a course in several universities all over the world. A good number of institutions and groups devoted to the study of semiotics are functioning in several countries. The influence of semiotic thinking can be seen in fields as varied as anthropology, literary criticism, psychology, folkloristics and cybernatics. From legal semiotics to zoo semiotics, no field in humanities and the social sciences, has escaped its influence.

One way of understanding any theoretical approach is by looking at the kind of questions it asks. A preliminary understanding of the concerns of semiotics can be derived by looking at the questions that semiotics asks and the way it tries to answer them. Semiotics is a science that studies signs and sign systems. It is derived from the Greek word semeion meaning 'sign'. A study of the sign is a study of the process of communication. So, the two questions semiotics is concerned with are: how is meaning generated and how is it communicated? These two questions are no doubt related and are part of the phenomena of communication. What
then is communication? According to Sándar Hervey, "the conveying of 'messages' by 'signals' constitutes the prototype of the phenomenon of communication". Language is, undoubtedly the most highly developed form of communication that man has at his command, but non verbal means of communication also form an important segment of human communication. The Highway codes of squares, triangles, zebra marks and lights of different colours; gestures and body movements used as signifying devices; the colour pattern and layout design of an advertisement; even the symptom exhibited by a patient - all these are examples of non verbal communication. In all these instances, 'messages' are communicated by means of 'signals'. Semiotics is fundamentally concerned with the relation between signals and messages - both verbal and non verbal. "Semiotics", says Hervey "concerns itself, par excellence, with communicative acts/events".

The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and the American philosopher C.S. Peirce are usually recognised as the founders of this new discipline. Both of them spoke of the need for a new science exclusively for the study of signs. The famous statement of de Saussure, where he proposed the possibility of such a science in his Course in General Linguistics is quoted below:

Language is a system of signs that express ideas, and is therefore comparable to a system of writing, the alphabet of deaf-mutes, symbolic rites, polite formulas, military signals etc. But it is the most important of all these systems.

A science that studies the life of signs within the society is conceivable... I shall call it semiology (from Greek Semeion 'sign'). Semiology would show what constitutes signs, what laws govern them. Since the science does not yet exist, no one could say what it would be; it has a right to existence, a place staked out in advance.
At about the same time, the American philosopher C.S. Peirce was working on a universal theory of signs. He declared that the entire cognitive world was made up of signs. "The entire world", wrote Peirce, "... is perfused with signs if it is not composed exclusively of signs". He also proposed a doctrine of signs, "... Semiotic[s], a quasinecessary or formal doctrine of signs".

Both the terms, semiotics and semiology are now in use. Semiotics is used in America whereas semiology is in use in Europe. Though both words refer to the 'science of signs' we can perceive the two traditions in the nomenclatures themselves: The European tradition known by the name semiology draws its concepts from de Saussure and structural linguistics. The American branch, semiotics is more closely allied to the logical-philosophical tradition of Peirce. It is interesting to note that Peirce used the term 'semiotic' though the letter 's' has come to be added to the term in use now. Though semiology was a term coined by de Saussure, the term semiology was already in existence in medical science for the branch that studied symptoms in patients (or symptomatology).

Though the formal study of signs as a distinct discipline developed only recently, it would be wrong to assume that thinkers of the past were not concerned with signs and their signification. Philosophers have evinced a keen interest in signs from the time of Socrates himself. John Locke, the British philosopher also wrote about signs. French semioticians, often trace this concern for meaning and signification to past thinkers like Abelard, Descartes, Condillac and De Tracy. Many semioticians have proposed the writing of a history of semiotics that would delineate such a lineage.
In the Indian philosophical and linguistic tradition also, the problem of meaning and cognition has been one of the primary concerns of many Indian systems of thought. R.N. Srivastava and K. Kapoor make this point explicit. "Although semiotics as an independent discipline came to be identified with C.S. Peirce (1839-1914) and F. de Saussure (1857-1913) and as an organised academic undertaking became visible only in the second half of the twentieth century, as a theoretical speculation, its origin may be traced in ancient India to a number of thinkers belonging to different schools of thought". It may be of interest to note here that de Saussure was himself a historical linguist and a specialist in Sanskrit.

These historical antecedents show how, the study of the sign and the relation between the message and the signal has attracted the attention of linguists and philosophers even in the past. At the same time, it has also to be conceded that the concern with sign was not their primary field of enquiry. Their work in the field was subordinate to their primary concerns.

If we observe the growth of semiotics against the general background of the intellectual atmosphere of the twentieth century, we can see the growth of semiotics (and structuralism) in the second half of this century, as a reaction against the nonholistic approach to knowledge. One of the major developments of knowledge in the last hundred years has been the growth of specialised fields of knowledge. This specialisation no doubt helped the growth of each field but each field of knowledge developed into an isolated and segregated discipline. In this period of specialisation interdisciplinary studies were frowned upon with the result
that there seemed to be no hope of synthesis between these
desperate fields. Even philosophy was no exception to this. The philosophy of Wittgenstein and that of Existentialism that exercised a great influence in the middle of this century, are basically philosophies of retreat. Robert Scholes sums up the situation in a nutshell. "The language philosophers insisted that there is no possible correspondence between our language and the world beyond. The existentialists spoke of the isolated man, cut off from objects and even from other men, in an absurd condition of being. From the logical atomism of Russell to the nausea of Sartre, fragmentation ruled the intellectual world during the first part of this century". 13

Semiotics, on the other hand, insists on a holistic view by situating the structure at the centre of its study. Meaning of all cultural manifestations (including language) is seen as emanating from the system of arbitrary conventions. This shift from the isolated individual human being, to the system, as the originator of meaning had profound implications. Reality is not something 'out there' which we perceive individually and then express in language. Our cognition of reality itself is conditioned by language - the particular language which we share with other speakers of the language. As Terry Eagleton says, "There were the seeds here of a social and historical theory of meaning, whose implications were to run deep within contemporary thought". 14 Semiotics also tried to evolve a methodology which aimed at the unification of all sciences into a new whole. Such an attempt may appear too ambitious, but semiotics by and large appears to be moving in this direction though the attempts at such a unified view are as yet only preliminary.
One of the results of such an attempt has been the current 'confusing' scene in semiotics, with its plethora of theories, approaches and terminologies. These, often conflicting viewpoints, have led to such a profusion of theories that it is sometimes difficult to see any commonality between them. This baffling variety can be traced to the influence of different sciences from which semiotics has drawn its concepts: linguistics, biology, psychology, information sciences, cybernetics and recently, studies in artificial intelligence, to name only a few. Underlying all this profusion, we can perceive the search for a truly holistic view of human knowledge. The present scene is perhaps indicative of the search for a universal theory of signification.

After these introductory remarks, the chapter begins with a brief summary of some of the key concepts developed by de Saussure and Peirce. These concepts provided the foundations for all the later developments in semiotics. This is followed by studies of three main periods, when these concepts were applied for the study of different aspects of culture: Russian Formalism, the Prague School and the developments in France in the 60's and 70's. This approach does not claim to present a historical view of the growth of semiotics. For one thing, the gaps, chronologically and geographically, are too many. In addition, I have not dealt with some of the main theorists like Morris, Hjelmselv and Prito. On the other hand, I have concentrated on periods and Schools where the semiotic approach was the major approach of interpretation and analysis. In them we also get applicational models, with which they analysed various aspects of culture - from literature to fashions. In these Schools, for the most part, semiotic and structural
approaches overlap and merge, so that it is difficult at times to separate the two. Section 1 of the chapter ends with a look at the current scene in semiotics.

Section 2 will deal with semiotics and performance studies. If section 1 is more general in nature, giving an overview of semiotics, section 2 will deal with those aspects that are more directly related to the present study. It will begin with a study of the work done on theatre semiotics. The chapter will end with a study of some of the performance theories of the present.

1.1. FERDINAND DE SAUSSURE

Ferdinand de Saussure was born in Geneva in 1857. He was educated in Germany and taught for a number of years in Paris. Then he moved to Geneva where he began to give lectures in General Linguistics. He did not publish much in his own lifetime. Three years after his death, two of his students published the book *Course de Linguistique Generale* (Course in General Linguistics) in 1916. It was based on the notes taken by a number of students who had attended his lectures. This book of such 'uncertain authorship', became the most influential book that directly gave rise to movements like semiotics and structuralism. It changed not merely our understanding of language but of the cognitive world itself (as understood through language). Perhaps there is no discipline in the human science that has not been influenced by de Saussure.

The theoretical concepts posited by de Saussure in his *Course*, have become the fundamental tools of all later semiotic study. In fact these concepts have become so
fundamental in modern thinking that one need not be surprised if one comes across these concepts in non-semiotic and non-structuralist writings. Some of the important concepts of the *Course* are explained below.

1.1.1. Synchronic and diachronic

To begin with, the course was a revolt against the nineteenth century tradition of historical and generative study of languages. Linguists till then were chiefly concerned with the origin and evolution of languages or of individual elements of language. But de Sausurre argues, as Jawaharlal Handoo says, "that language should be studied, not only in terms of its individual parts and not only diachronically or historically, but also in terms of relationship between those parts and synchronically; that is in terms of its current adequacy". In other words, the synchronic study of language is an attempt to reconstruct the system as a functional whole. Synchronic linguistics aims at studying the whole of language at a given time and not on examining particular elements of language over a span of time. Historical linguistics was well entrenched at the time of de Saussure, but in opposition to the prevalent view, he emphasised on the need to study language synchronically. At that time, de Saussure’s view was in the words of Scholes, "iconoclastic in the extreme."

This shift from the diachronic to the synchronic perspective was a profound philosophical shift, because it emphasised the need of studying the whole system rather than the isolated elements of language. This does not mean that a synchronic study can only be of the present. If one can make a study of all aspects of language, that is of the entire
system, as it operated at any one particular span of time in the past, then that would be a synchronic study of the language of that particular period.

The structure of language is an abstract entity, and cannot be encountered in any individual speech utterance. The structure of language, de Saussure points out, is in the 'collective consciousness', which is to be distinguished from any single individual's knowledge of language. It is to be located in society, in the users of the language as a whole. This emphasis on the study of the abstract elements of the structure at a given time, marked a profound shift from the diachronic to the synchronic perspective. This synchronic approach no doubt marked the beginning of structural linguistics but it is strange to note that de Saussure himself never uses the word structure. As John Sturrock says, "One of the oddities of the Course in General Linguistics, given the influence it has had, is that it nowhere contains the term 'structure'". Instead de Saussure, throughout, uses the term 'system'.

1.1.2. Form and substance

The concept of structure essentially involves the process of abstraction, because in any empirical observation, we will come across only individual speech utterances but never the abstract structure as such. But any study, in order to become scientific, has to make a shift from these concrete, individual and variable phenomena to that of the abstract system which makes these concrete objects meaningful. This dichotomy of the concrete versus the abstract can be termed as a dichotomy of the substance versus the form. The form, as Sándor Hervey observes, provides the
'rationale' behind the variable substance of 'reality' to give it a patterned appearance. Substances are nothing but a concrete realisation of form. To quote Hervey, "Without forms, substance would be amorphous, a hopeless jumble of senseless events; without substances, forms would be vacuous and lacking in any kind of practical applicability".  

Hervey gives three examples to explain this form-substance dichotomy. First, I shall take the example of the game of chess, a highly rule bound game, which philosophers and linguists seem to be fond of using as an example. A knight or a pawn in a game of chess gets its value only with reference to the rules of the game which determine its movement and value in relation to the other entities on the board. (In chess, these entities are often referred to as 'pieces'- this word refers to the conceptual entity as well as to the physical object. The 'piece' - knight for example, denotes the iconic physical object that has the shape of a horse as well as to the conceptual entity that has the power of moving in a special way.) The insignificant pawn suddenly gains in value and becomes 'the queen', the most powerful 'piece', when it reaches the eighth rank. In substance, it may continue to be the same piece of wood or any other material, but due to the form that determines its value, it now becomes the queen. Infact, even after the pawn has been queened, many players, continue playing with the pawn-the material piece, that in form has now become the queen. In the game of chess, form has an overriding priority over substance.

The other example given by Hervey is worth quoting in its entirety to make the form-substance opposition very clear:
The Edinburgh-London night train leaves every night at 10-30 p.m., provides sleeping accommodation and a restaurant car etc.

This way of speaking of the Edinburgh-London night train (generically) creates the impression that we are dealing with one constant entity with regularly specifiable properties. Yet, there is no guarantee that a single carriage, a single member of the crew, in fact any single concrete detail, will be the same on two different occasions of the departure of what we call 'the same train'. How are we to reconcile the obvious lack of sameness in terms of physical trappings with the equally obvious fact that if I always travel to London from Edinburgh on a train leaving at 10-30 p.m. then I am fully entitled to say, 'I always go to London by the same train'.

The form-substance dichotomy makes immediate and complete sense of this apparent paradox. The 'sameness of the 10-30 p.m. night train is an abstract sameness ... whereas the physical differences are a matter of 'concrete' detail. In other words, the concept of the 10-30 p.m. night train from Edinburgh to London is a form: The physical composition of particular trains leaving on particular occasions is variable on the level of substance'.

This form-substance dichotomy can be related to another pair of concepts that Saussure posits with regard to language.

1.1.3. la Langue and la Parole.

F. de Saussure distinguishes among three levels of linguistic activity. "Langage, la Langue and la Parole". Langage includes the entire human potential for speech and so is too broad and amorphous an area for study. Langue on the other hand is the language system which one uses to generate individual utterances that are intelligible to others. These individual utterances are defined as parole by de Saussure.
Langue being a social product is conventional. Only this should be the proper object of linguistic enquiry according to de Saussure.

A language system, being an abstract entity has no existence of its own. It must be constructed on the basis of parole or individual utterances. But linguistics must move from a study of these variable individual utterances to that of the system which controls and makes these individual events meaningful. Without a prior knowledge of langue, these individual utterances will not have any meaning.

The concept of langue and parole has been of phenomenal importance in the thought process of subsequent developments in semiotics. The relative importance and the dichotomy between the two, attracted the attention of later thinkers like Mikhail Bakhtin and Roman Jacobson. They tried to tackle some of the issues raised by the langue-parole opposition that were not handled by de Saussure. The concepts of langue and parole can be related to Jacobson's model of code and message or Chomsky's concept of competence and performance.

1.1.4. Sign: signifier and signified

After having established the basic tenets, de Saussure proceeds with the study of the linguistic structure. The basic element of the structure, according to him, is the sign. Having defined the system, he now moves on to consider the semiological function of the system, which is to mediate between the two domains of the amorphous mass of thought and the amorphous mass of physical manifestation (sound). A sign is not simply the name of a thing but a complex whole that
links the two aspects of the sound-image and the concept. The sound-image, according to de Saussure, "is not the material sound, the purely physical thing, but the psychological imprint of the sound, the impression that it makes on our senses". Thus a sign has two faces: the phonetic and the semantic. The function of the sign is to mediate between the abstract mental image and the sound image. Both these worlds are abstractions. The relationship between the two is nicely expressed by Sturrock. "Sound without sense is not part of language, it is, in the telling description found by modern theorists of communication, mere 'noise'; and sense without sound (or without its material manifestation in writing), is impossible".

These two aspects of the sign are defined by de Saussure as signifier and signified. Signifier (de Saussure uses the term signifiant) refers to the physical manifestation and the term signified (signifie) for the conceptual aspect of the sign. Sign is dyadic in nature mediating between the signifier and the signified. One of the fundamental aspects of Saussurian theory is that the relationship between the signifying sound and the signified concept is arbitrary. By this, he means that there is no inherent motivated relationship between the two. It is only conventional. Had this not been the case, we would not have had so many languages in the world. There would have been the same signifier for the same physical object (referant), in all the languages of the world. F.de Saussure gives the examples of mouton in French and 'sheep' in English as two signifiers for the same referant.

This concept of arbitrariness has far reaching implications as it alters not merely our understanding of
language but of our comprehension of the universe itself. It makes language autonomous of the reality that it represents. In the example given above, the French word *mouton* and the English word 'sheep' have the same referent, but their signified is not same, because in English, there is another word 'mutton' for the dish which French does not have. The English signifier thus offers a relation or contrast which is absent in French. This alters the English speaking person's conceptual understanding of the universe as ordered by his language. It follows from this that it is the language that determines the order of the world. In addition, an idea or a thought does not have a clear shape (even to one self) until it is articulated or structured in language. In other words, our thought process is dependent on language. As de Saussure makes it clear, it is impossible to conceive of ideas or thoughts without language, "... without the help of signs we would be unable to make a clear cut, consistent distinction between two ideas. Without language, thought is vague uncharted nebula. There are no preexisting ideas, and nothing is distinct before the appearance of language".  

We may take up here another notion that is central to the Saussurian concept: the notion of 'difference'. In language (as in any other significatory system), the value of any entity of signification - be it a phoneme or a sign - can be determined only by differentiating it with other entities in the system. Or as de Saussure himself puts it, "in language there are only differences ... a linguistic system is a series of differences of sound combined with a series of differences of ideas". If we take the example of the game of chess again, the value of an entity of chess, be it the queen or the pawn, can be determined only by its difference from other entities. From this, emerges the notion of
opposition. Opposition involves differences. So, the value of any entity is that which makes it different from other entities. In other words, the value can be determined only negatively-by what it is not. This concept of negative signification becomes very important in the treatment of signs.

1.1.5. Syntagmatic and paradigmatic dimensions

One of the many crucial observations of de Saussure regarding the nature of the sign is that, "... the signifier, being auditory is unfolded solely in time, [and so]... it represents a span, and the span is measurable in a single dimension; it is a line". This leads us to the conception of linear progression because each utterance is of necessity linear as it has to be delivered in an order if it is to be understood. This brings us to the two possible ways in which structures can be studied: (1) The linear (or syntagmatic) relations; (2) the associative (or what has now come to be called paradigmatic) relations. Each sign occurs in an utterance preceded and followed by other signs. This horizontal relation, that orders the relation of the sign to other signs in the utterance is called syntagmatic. At the same time, each sign by association invokes all the other signs to which it bears a relation. For example, the value of 'street' in English is made clear by the existence of other expressions like 'road', 'path' 'avenue', 'highway' etc. These are the associative values of the sign 'street', which can be thought of as the vertical axis. This has now come to be known as paradigmatic relations. John Sturrock objects to the use of the term 'paradigmatic' because he feels that it makes this relation more formal than what de Saussure had in mind when he used the term, associative. The
opposition between the two levels is made clear in the following statement by de Saussure. "The syntagmatic relation is in presentia. It is based on two or more terms that occur in an effective series. Against this, the associative relation unites the term in absentia in a potential mnemonic series". The study of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations, achieved great importance in later developments of semiotics and structuralism.

F. de Saussure's work was so phenomenal that there is perhaps no field of human science that has not been influenced by his ideas. The growth of structuralism and semiotics can be directly traced to the Course. What he wrote about language changed our very conception of meaning and reality and how we perceive it. Terry Eagleton, the Marxist critic, expresses this succinctly in his comments on structuralism:

The structuralist emphasis on the 'constructedness' of human meaning represented a major advance. Meaning was neither a private experience nor a divinely ordained occurrence; it was the product of shared systems of signification... Language predated an individual and was much less his or her product than he or she was a product of it... The way you interpreted your world was a function of the language you had at your disposal... What meaning you were able to articulate depended on what script or speech you shared in the first place.

1.2. C.S. PEIRCE

Charles Sanders Peirce was an American philosopher who wrote extensively on signs around the same time that Saussure was giving his lectures in Geneva. His work deals extensively with signs and the classification of signs. He also proposed a science, semiotic[s], that will study the
signs in society (as has already been referred to). But little attention was paid to Peirce's work for long, as it was considered too esoteric and exacting. By the time his work came to be known and widely studied, semiotics had already become a developed field. Semioticians have drawn on his ideas for further development.

Peirce begins his work on a very broad canvas, beginning with the definition of the term science itself. He distinguishes four different kinds of reasoning. Based on this, he posits a typology of the whole field of human sciences. Then taking up the question of degrees of existence, he recognises three hierarchical levels which are termed by him as 'Firstness', 'Secondness' and 'Thirdness'. We can begin directly with his definition of the sign:

A sign or a representamen is some thing which stands to some body for some thing in some respect or capacity. It addresses some body, that is, it creates in the mind of the person an equivalent sign or perhaps a more developed sign. That sign which it creates, I shall call the interpretant of the first sign. The sign stands for something, its object. It stands for the object not in all respects but in reference to a sort of an idea which I have called the ground of representation.  

The above statement makes explicit two other concepts — interpretant and object, that are central to his concept of the sign. Signs, according to Peirce, have the quality of "thirdness" because they are mediators, "between two other entities that they determine and dominate by virtue of their very power to mediate between them". Peirce, thus sees the sign as a triadic relationship. (In contrast, de Saussure's conception of the sign is dyadic. He sees it in binary relations.) The notion of the triadic relationship pervades
the whole of Peircian analysis of signs. The sign mediates between the object and the interpretant. The mental recognition of what the sign stands for (which is abstract) is termed, the interpretant. The perceptual features of the sign (which is concrete) is the object. The sign mediates between the mental recognition and the concrete experience. This can be represented by the following diagram.

Sandor Hervey, explains these two terms by taking a concrete example. If a hot water tap in a bathroom is marked 'H', the mental cognition that a tap marked 'H' will give hot water is the interpretant whereas the experience of the tap actually dispensing hot water becomes the object.

1.2.1. Typology of signs

Peirce's classification of the sign is also triadic based on the three nodes discussed above. In each, he again distinguishes three types:

(1) From the point of view of the mediating sign:
    (a) Qualisign (b) Sinsign (c) Legisign

(2) From the point of view of the object:
    (a) Icon (b) Index (c) Symbol
(3) From the point of view of the Interpretant:
   (a) Rheme (b) Proposition (c) Argument

Based on this classification, he further goes on to distinguish ten classes of signs. Resulting from the cross classification of the above, he posits a grand typology of sixty six types of signs. Of these, only the second, icon, index and symbol, has really proved to be influential. Hervey gives a succinct explanation of the three terms:

1. "If the sign denotes its object by virtue of a real similarity that holds between the physical properties (cf. Firstness) of the sign and the physical properties of the object, Peirce designates that sign as an icon."

2. If the sign denotes its object by virtue of a real cause and effect link (cf. Secondness) that holds between the sign and the object, Peirce designates that sign as an index.

3. If the sign denotes its object by virtue of a general association of ideas that is in the nature of a habit or convention (cf. Thirdness), Peirce designates that sign as a symbol."

Thus icons represent the signified by virtue of similitude. Diagrams, maps, onomatopoeic words are examples of iconic signs. It should be realised that in some cases, the similarity may be hard to maintain, but similitude in any form is enough for the sign to become iconic. Index on the other hand, represents by a real physical connection. Stocking denoting legs, smoke denoting fire can be taken as examples of indexical signs. Peirce includes the pointing
finger also in the category of indexical signs. In a symbol, the relation, between the object and the sign is conventional and arbitrary. Man made codes, algebraic systems are examples of symbols. The most famous example of symbol is of course, language (spoken and written).31

It should also be remembered that the three categories of signs never exist in a pure form. In any given instance, each sign has more than one quality and the question is only one of predominence. So in any analysis that makes use of these categories, one has to guard against any absolutist application.

As has already been pointed out, Perice uses the term 'Semiotic' to designate the new branch of science. A comparison with this and de Saussure's 'semiology' will reveal the basic differences between the two thinkers and the later schools that emerged. To begin with, de Saussure uses the term sign only to designate conventional and arbitrary entities, that have a specific communicative function. Peirce's concept of sign is much broader, where symbols are just one sub-category of his scheme of things, which extend to indexes and icons as well. As Hervey says, "Peirce's 'semiotic' is a theory of signification while Saussure's 'semiologie' is a theory of systems of conventions for communication".32

1.3. RUSSIAN FORMALISM

The earliest attempt at studying a cultural artifact as a system, in this case, literature, was made by Russian Formalists, a group that flourished in Russia during 1915-30. For the first time, they tried to establish a 'scientific'
basis for the study of literature. They emphasised on the formal elements of literature, playing down the emphasis on 'content' or 'message'. In this they were reacting against the 'Symbolists' and 'Aesthetes' who were chiefly concerned with the message and the beauty of literature. The growth of Formalism coincided with the Russian Revolution, and so, they were iconoclasts attacking the earlier Schools of literary criticism. It is thus no surprise that early Formalist writing is polemical. Their work developed freely between 1921 and 1925 after which, they came under attack from hardline Marxists, specially because they were accused of neglecting the social reality and the historical process. Later, Formalism fell out of favour with the hardened party line and by 1930s vanished altogether. (It appeared in a more vibrant and more truly semiotic form in Prague later, and that will be discussed in the next section.)

Though chronologically, Formalism began before de Saussure's Course was published, many of the Formalists were familiar with de Saussure's theories. One of de Saussure's students in Geneva, Sergej Karcevskij, who had returned to Russia, had introduced many writers owing allegiance to Formalism, to de Saussure's concepts much before the Course was published. Two other influences behind Formalism were psychology and phenomenology of Hussrel.33

1.3.1. Different School and Phases

Though Russian Formalism is often referred to as a School, it would be wrong to think of the entire movement as one monolithic whole. To begin with, there were two groups, one the Moscow Linguistic Circle of which Roman Jacobson and Petr Bogatyrev were the important members. The other group
was in Leningrad (St.Petersburg), where a group called Opojaz (Petersburg society for the study of poetical language) was formed. Its main representatives were Shklovsky, Eichenbaum and Bernstein. The Moscow group was more interested in problems of linguistics, whereas Opojaz concentrated more on theories of literature. We can also discern a clear growth in the Formalist thinking itself from the early stages to 1930's where some of the early rigid Formalist positions were redefined.

Peter Steiner recognises three distinct phases in the development of Formalism and comes up with three metaphors to act as models for the three phases:

The model of the 'machine' governs the first phase which sees literary criticism as a sort of mechanics and the text as a heap of devices. The second is an 'organic' phase which sees the literary texts as fully functioning 'organisms' of interrelated parts. The third phase adopts the metaphor of 'system' and tries to understand literary texts as the products of entire literary system and even the meta system of interacting literary and non literary systems.

Much of the work of Russian Formalists has been made available in English translation only recently. That these writings are being studied after a lapse of more than sixty years, shows the critical soundness of their theories. Part of the interest in their writings is also due to the growth of structuralism.

The early part of Formalism was dominated by Victor Shklovsky. He along with Boris Eichenbaum and others insisted on the 'literariness' of works of literature: its constructed quality. They concentrated on isolating the
devices by means of which literary language was made different from everyday speech. Shklovsky went so far as to declare, "A work of literature is the sum total of the stylistic devices employed in it". This approach of concentrating on the devices employed in a literary work, can be seen in the titles of the studies themselves, for example, Eichenbaum's "How Gogol's *Overcoat* was Made". Shklovsky and Tomashevsky wrote extensively on the novel. They distinguished between *sjužet* and *fabula* that can be termed the plot and the story. They declared that plot is literary while story is only the raw material to be organised into a literary creation by the writer. Eichenbaum used the concept of 'motif' for the analysis of plot structures. Motif, according to him, was "the most elementary narrative unit". But gradually, Formalists began to conceive of motif as a constructive principle of the plot, rather than as an element of the story. Laurence Sterne's eighteenth century English novel, *Tristram Shandy* was highly praised by these critics for its devices as a fiction primarily about fictional devices.

Shklovsky put forward the concept of 'defamiliarisation' as the primary task of literature. According to him, reality is always perceived as though in a veil. Our perception of reality becomes habitual and automatic. Art makes us see reality by defamiliarising it. John Sturrock, explaining this concept, says, "Art exists to help us recover the sensation of life; it exists to make us feel things, to make the stone, 'stoney'". This idea was later developed by the Prague structuralists who gave it the name 'fore-grounding'. Bertolt Brecht, in his *Theory of Epic Theatre* extended on this idea and created the conception of 'alienation effect'. 
An important member of Moscow Linguistic Circle was Roman Jacobson, who provides the best example of the application of linguistic principles for literary criticism. He put forward the notion of the 'dominant' in the study of literary works. He looked at literary works as dynamic system in which certain elements are effaced and certain others become dominant. He defined the notion of the dominant as, "The focussing component of a work of art; it rules, determines and transforms the remaining components". He also stressed that particular periods can be studied as governed by a 'dominant' which may be derived from a non literary system. "The dominant in Renaissance poetry was derived from the visual arts; Romantic poetry oriented itself towards music and Realism's dominant is verbal art". He, at the time, was also engaged in developing his concept of different functions of language. In his 1935 essay on Formalism, he talks of the poetic function of the language of poetry. These ideas were later crystallised into a global theoretical form by him in his vastly influential Theory of Communication.

1.3.2. Mikhail Bakhtin

Formalism adopted many of the theoretical concepts of Saussurian linguistics, but was not completely structurlalist in its approach. Many a time, Formalists were attacked by the Marxists for totally neglecting the social context. The most famous of these, was perhaps Leo Trotsky's book, Literature and Revolution (1924). Some of the later Formalists tried to synthesise Formalism and Marxism. The best example of such a synthesis can be found in the writings of the group commonly referred to as the Bakhtin School. The authorship of several works appearing under the names of
Mikhail Bakhtin, Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov was under dispute for a long time though it is now commonly acknowledged that most of them were written by Bakhtin himself.

This School was not interested in abstract linguistic pursuit where language was seen in isolation from the social context. Voloshinov argued that words are active dynamic social signs having different connotations for different social classes. The verbal sign could also be an area of class struggle because the ruling class will always try to impose its 'uni-accentual' meaning. Bakhtin developed the fundamental concept of 'heteroglossia' in his *Discourse of the Novel* (1934-35), in which he argued that 'utterance' constantly and unconsciously produces a range of meanings that stem from social interaction. This, according to him, is the basic condition that controls the production of meaning in all discourse, where monologue is really not possible.

Bakhtin did not take the entirely Marxist view that literature is a direct reflection of the interaction of social forces, but retained the Formalist interest in literary structure. He was interested in showing how language defies authority and liberates alternative voices. This attitude is best reflected in his writings on Dostoevsky and Rabelais. These authors allowed the free interplay of different voices and value systems without imposing their 'will' on all the characters. In his work on Rabelais, Bakhtin relates Rabelais's writings to the carnival folk culture and explains his work in the context of the culture of the market place, without which, he cannot be completely understood. Bakhtin uses the term 'carnivalisation' to
explain how carnival has shaped the literary genres. This ethnographic approach of Bakhtin, the literary critic, makes Richard Bauman declare that in his work we see, "an approach to folk culture understood as a cultural system in which the situational context, social relations, genres and codes of imagery are all mutually interdependent".\(^{41}\)

1.3.3. Vladimir Propp

The greatest contribution of Russian Formalism, from the point of view of a scientific approach, was Vladimir Propp's remarkable work *Morfologija Skazki* (*Morphology of the Floktale*).\(^{42}\) Reference has already been made to the attempts by Formalists of analysing the structure of the narratives with concepts like *sjuzet*, *fabula* and motif. The idea of motif as the elementary narrative unit was first proposed by Vaselovskij, the Russian folklorist. Propp rejected this idea of motif as the indivisible unit of the narrative because according to him, it was a suspect abstraction. He showed how different motifs may describe similar actions although characters and attributes may differ. He gives the following example to make the point clear. "A tsar gives an eagle to a hero. The eagle carries the hero away to another kingdom ... A sorcerer gives Ivan a little boat. The boat takes Ivan to another kingdom."\(^{43}\) In both the instances, the characters and motifs are different but we find an invariant element, 'the hero acquires a magical element'.

In other words, the characters and details are variables but the acquiring of a magical agent is the constant. Propp decided that it was important to study these constants rather than the variables. This shift from the variables to the constants was a great conceptual advancement.
because as Handoo says, "... folklore scholarship of the pre-Proppian era was closely guided by these variable elements... in all kinds of folklore studies. Propp on the contrary, found that it was not characters or dramatis personae but their constant actions or functions that formed the basic elements or the component parts of the tales".44

Taking function as the basis of his analysis, Propp distinguishes only thirty one functions of characters in the hundred tales analysed by him. This marked a major step in structural analysis, in moving from the variable features to the constants of the structure. Propp concluded that the number of functions of characters in a fairy tale are limited and that the order of the function is always the same. (Propp points out that this applies only to the fairy tale in folklore and not to the literary fairytale.)

Propp's work was, in the words of Alan Dundes, the "exemplar par excellence" in syntagmatic structural analysis.45 Folklore studies till then were highly atomistic and as Handoo says, it was with this phenomenal work that "folklore could really claim to have entered a scientific era".46 But for long this work was neglected in Russia itself and its first English translation appeared only in 1958. But already a number of studies using Propp's model have appeared, proving how influential Propp's method is, even today.

1.3.4. Conclusion

Looking at the achievements of Russian Formalism as a whole, we can say that their greatest achievement was in their efforts to evolve a scientific approach for the study
of literature for the first time. They moved away from the 'content' oriented studies to the study of the formal elements of literature. This marked the first step in the evolution of structuralism. In the words of Jan Broekman, "... in Russian Formalism, a structural approach is already to be seen, determined by phonological and linguistic findings. Opojaz theoreticians considered literature as a semiological system, and they undertook a functional and systems analysis albeit piecemeal. In this was, a literary technology came into being, characterised by present day structuralism".47

In the works of Bakhtin and his group, we also see an effort to synthesise Formalism and Marxism with the emphasis not merely on the formal elements of literature but also on the social context. We find such an approach developing specially in the works of the later Formalists. Language was seen by them as being dynamic in nature, always releasing alternate voices.

Though historically Russian Formalism came to an end in 1930s, its concerns were continued in Prague. We see the growth of a true semiotic perspective in Prague Structuralism and this was made possible only by the solid foundation laid by the Russian Formalists.

1.4. THE PRAGUE SCHOOL

1.4.1. Semiotic Concerns

The year 1926 marked a significant landmark in the development of semiotics, when in Czekoslovakia, the Prague Linguistic Circle was formed. Among its members were two
leading thinkers, Roman Jacobson and Petr Bogatyrev, who were part of Russian Formalism, but who had emigrated to Prague. Czechoslovakia had its own tradition of scholars like Bernard Bolzano, who in early nineteenth century itself had spoken of a study of signs and Vilem Mathesius who had argued for the study of static (synchronic) linguistics as opposed to the dynamic (diachronic). But it is also clear that the two strong influences behind the theoretical positions of the Prague School were Russian Formalism and the linguistic postulates of de Saussure. If the Russian Formalists were a loosely knit group, the Prague Linguistic Circle was a more homogeneous group and could be properly called the Prague School.

The creative usage of sign systems formed the basis of their study of language and art in general and so their concerns were clearly semiotic. They tried to relate the study of structures to the larger world and criticised the rigid formalism of the Russian School. In this, they were nearer to the approach of Bakhtin and his School. The Prague School continued the study of structures and formal aspects of works of art, but this study was situated in the larger context of the process of signification, with reference to the values of the society where it functioned. Jan Mukařovský in his essay, "Art as a Semiotic Fact" (1936) makes this point clear. "The objective study of the phenomenon 'art,' must regard the work of art as a sign composed of (1) a perceivable signifier, created by the artist, (2) a signification/= aesthetic object/registered in the collective consciousness and (3) a relationship with that which is signified, a relationship which refers to the total context of social phenomena. In the second of these constituents lies the structure proper of the work of art".48
He explains what he means by social phenomena later in the essay, "Science, philosophy, politics, economics and so on of any given milieu". In this statement we can see how Mukarovsky extends the taxonomical and morphological concerns of Russian Formalism, by making such formal study of structure, a part of the larger semiotic concerns about signification and with reference to the larger outside world, where the work of art functions as a sign system between the members of a certain community. He also makes use of the Saussurian concept of 'collective consciousness', which according to de Saussure, is the foundation of every semiotic system. Applying this concept to the sphere of art, Mukarovsky says that the structure proper of a work of art lies in the signification registered in the collective consciousness and shared by the members of the community which includes the artists as well as the consumers of art. So even though the work of art remains the same in the course of time, the signification may change because of the change in norms and rules (the social structure) that govern the signification.

The Prague School viewed the verbal system as the predominant field of analysis as it served as the model of analysis for other 'sign-systems' which also could be studied as languages. Semiotics was seen by them as "the most crucial issue in the intellectual and cultural resurgence of modern times".

The nature of relation between the sign system and the real world denoted by it became one of the central concerns of the Prague School. Karl Bühler had spoken about the three functions of language: (1) The representational function (referential) referring to what is spoken about;
The expressive function (emotive) referring to the speaker: (3) The appellative (conative) function referring to the person spoken to. Mukarovsky added a forth function 'aesthetic' in order to account for the poetic use of language. In the 'aesthetic' function, the linguistic sign itself becomes the centre of interest. The other functions are also present in a work of literature, but they are subordinated to the primariness of aesthetic function. Similarly, the aesthetic function is not limited to a work of literature. It is present even in ordinary speech-in fact in all uses of language.

1.4.2. Roman Jacobson

The credit for assimilating all the earlier work done in this field and presenting a universal communication theory goes to Roman Jacobson. Drawing also from modern information theory, Jacobson pointed out two other elements essential for communication-code and message. As a corrolory, he also posited six functions of language.

Another of Jacobson's contributions, his concepts of metaphor and metonymy may be mentioned here. This is based on his study of the problems of language acquisition among aphasics. He realised that language disorder in aphasia oscillated between two poles that could be related to de Saussaure's concepts of synatagmatic and paradigmatic relations. But Jacobson, extended this and related it to rhetorical theory and even to poetics. Jacobson came to the conclusion that the two language disorders of the aphasics could be related to two rhetorical figures: metaphor and metonymy. What Jacobson means by these two terms is made clear in the following explanation given by Scholes:
... metaphorical substitution is based on a likeness or analogy between the literal world and its metaphorical replacement (as when we substitute den or burrow for hut), while metonymical substitution is based on an association between the literal world and its substitute. Things which are logically related by cause and effect (poverty and hut) or whole and part (hut and thatch) as well as things that are habitually found together in familiar contexts (hut and peasant) are all in metonymic relationship to one another.

Jacobson recognises metaphor and metonymy as two poles of language, not only at the level of individual use but at higher levels as well. The discourse as a whole or even certain literary movements and ages can be studied as giving primacy to the metaphoric or the metonymic means of thinking and expression. Jacobson himself illustrates this. "The primacy of the metaphoric process in literary schools of Romanticism and Symbolism has been repeatedly acknowledged, but it is still insufficiently realised that it is the predominance of metonymy which underlies and actually predetermines the so called 'realistic' trend".

Jacobson recognises the competition between these two processes in all human endeavour - be it painting or the structure of dreams or even in magic rites. He concludes that this important dichotomy has not been recognised so far, only because metonymy is harder to perceive and because metaphor dominates poetry, which has been the main object of rhetorical study.

1.4.3. Non-verbal sign systems

One of the great achievements of the Prague School was the application of semiotic principles to the study of different aspects of culture, like theatre, folklore and
costume. They studied the hierarchy of functions in these sign systems. For example Petr Bogatyrev in his study of folksongs says, "The functions of song, form a complete structure. Besides aesthetic function, songs entail various other functions: magic function, regional identification work rhythm... and so forth. In fact, very often the dominant function of folksongs will not be aesthetic at all". Thus he shows how the folksong is multifunctional. This idea was taken up by many musicologists. Antonin Sychra, for example, showed how songs that involved a great number of people like marching or dance songs were dominated by fixed metrical schemes with prominent use of elements like intensity and loudness. Songs that were linked to individual expressions, on the other hand, allowed for great variation.

Bogatyrev’s study of folk costume was a great extension in the semiotic study of culture, because the study involved not merely the study of non-verbal signs, but was applied to material objects (costume) which till then, had never been thought of as constituting a sign system. Costume, Bogatyrev tells us, while constituting a sign structure, is at the same time a material object in its non semiotic terms. In this study, he showed how, "folk costume indicates sex, religion, national, ethnic or regional affiliation; professional as well as social categories while at the same time, it covers the human body and performs many strictly practical functions". Conceptually, this treatment of folk costume was a great advancement over Functionalism as costume is treated in terms of its signification and not merely in terms of its material properties like the texture or colour.
1.4.4. Semiotics of theatre

Some of the best contributions of the Prague School were with regard to theatre and performance. The complex phenomenon of the semiotics of theatre involving several sign systems, attracted some of the best minds of the Prague School. Till that time, the field was mostly neglected and little progress was made though the beginning of such a study could be said to have been made by Aristotle himself. The contributions of the Prague School to this field is described in the following terms by Keir Elam, "...probably the richest corpus of theatrical and dramatic theory produced in modern times, namely the body of books and articles produced in the 1930s and 1940s by the Prague School structuralists".57

The beginning of such a study was made in Otakar Zich's work, *Aesthetics of the Art of Drama*. In this work, he stresses on the heterogeneous systems at work in theatre, which are interdependent. Of these systems, no single system, including the written text, is dominant. So, Zich insisted that these interrelated components like pantomime, music, dance, written script or lighting must be studied in their mutuality and interaction rather that in isolation.

Zich was not a structuralist himself but his work exercised a great deal of influence on all subsequent studies. Zich's work was based mostly on the study of realistic theatre and so his model was found to be too narrow by the Prague semioticians who extended their study to other theatre forms like Chinese theatre and folk theatre.

The dominating work in the field of theatrical semiotics was done by the folklorist Bogatyrev in his
"Semiotics in the Folk Theatre" (1938). He emphasised on the notion of Transformation as the most distinctive feature of theatre: how even real life objects which may not have any signifying power (or of which we may not be aware) become laden with overriding signifying power on the stage. "On stage, things that play the part of theatrical signs, can, in the course of the play acquire special features, qualities and attributes that they do not have in real life". 58

Bogatyrev gives the example of an actor playing the role of a millionaire, wearing a diamond ring. The audience will take the ring as a sign of his wealth. It does not matter whether the diamond ring is real or false.

Jindrich Honzl, extending on Zich's work, saw 'action' as the dominant feature of dramatic art, and developed the concept of 'dynamism' of the sign where the signifier can stand for any signified class. 59 The dramatic scene for example may be represented by sets on the stage or they may also be represented by gestures or what Bogatyrev calls 'verbal scenery' - through description by verbal signs. The choice of course depends not merely on the sign systems but on the particular theatrical code.

Jiri Veltrusky, on the other hand, emphasised on the dialectical opposition of action forming one pole, and all the other components of theatre forming the other pole. He emphasised on the fluidity of the hierarchy of elements in the theatre where "the figure at the peak of the hierarchy ... attracts to itself the major attention of the audience". 60 The study of the functioning of the different sign system in conjunction can lead to 'contrastive semiotics'. To put it in his own words:
If not all, at least several semiotic systems combine, complement and conflict with one another in dramatic art... None of them can denote reality in its entirety; each has a different meaning even though they all refer to the same thing. In this sense, theatre offers an opportunity to study in optimal conditions almost as in a laboratory—both the common and the distinctive features of different sign systems or to put it differently, contrastive semiotics.\(^\text{61}\)

If we consider the general theoretical positions of the Prague School, the relationship between langue and parole (or to use Jacobson's terms, code and message) was seen by them as a dialectical one where they refused to give prominence to one at the expense of the other in their study. The dichotomic structure of the two was itself of the greatest interest to them and so they insisted that neither the concrete signifier nor the abstract system could be studied in isolation. This conceptual attitude towards the langue-parole dichotomy was applied to the study of art, theatre, music and other aspects of culture which were also treated as 'language'. Roman Jacobson continued to work on this langue-parole dichotomy even after the demise of the Prague Circle.

The outbreak of the second world war virtually rang the death knell of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Bogatyrev returned to U.S.S.R. Roman Jacobson and René Wellek chose to live in the west. But the great contributions of this School to semiotic theory have continued to attract the attention of scholars even to this day. We had to wait till the 1960s for semiotic activity to resurface again, this time in Paris.
1.5. THE FRENCH SCHOOL

Though semiotics has had a long intellectual history as we have already observed, its present popularity and status can be directly related to the contributions of several French intellectuals like Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, Claude Lévi-Strauss etc. who began to apply the linguistic concepts of de Saussure to different fields of study like literature, psychoanalysis, anthropology etc. Even an intellectual movement, in order to succeed and become popular needs institutions and leaders to foster them (as Foucault, himself one such leader, shows us in his works). And as Sturrock says if one, "can find them in Paris, so much the better, since it is there that the western world has learned to shop for its new ideas".62

The concerns of the French School were basically a continuation of the concerns of the Russian and Prague Schools. As Jan Broekman puts it, it was, "the same but different".63 The several circles of Parisian structuralists studied the same themes but approached them differently. Their approach was more epistemological and philosophical in nature drawing freely from philosophers from Plato to Hegel and from Marx to Heidegger. The Paris circle was an unstructured group often linked to educational institutions. It is difficult to call them a 'School', because the links between the leading figures and their writings are often diffuse, but a certain basic approach remains recognisable. The primary role of linguistics as a methodology dominates all fields of study from anthropology to psychoanalysis. Apart from the Schools already discussed, the influences of Noam Chomsky, Hjelmlev, Martinet and Benveneste also become important and this can be seen in the writings of most
members of the group. Julia Kristeva commenting on the dominant role played by linguistics in the conceptual change that came about in human sciences, says, "The sixties witnessed a theoretical ebullience that could roughly be summarised as leading to the discovery of the determinative role of language in all human sciences". The linguistic paradigm as the dominant mode of thinking can be seen in Claude Lévi-Strauss' analyses of myths and totems, in Jacques Lacan's study of the subconscious or in Michel Foucault's works on history and human institutions. This was one major advancement over the Russian and the Prague Schools, because the structuralist model, developed as a thought process in human thinking as a whole and not merely in the study of language-oriented studies.

The output of the thinkers mentioned above and others of the French School, has been so profuse, the fields in which they have worked so diverse and their insights so profound and philosophical, that it is not within the bounds of this work to deal with their work even summarily. So, this study has chosen to deal with only a few of the writers concentrating only on their salient contributions. In the choice of writers, I have been guided not merely by their contributions to semiotics (as understood from a narrow perspective). I have taken a more general view, where the views of these writers have been instrumental in shaping the present day discourse as a whole, both modernist and post modernist. That is why, I have left out some obvious semiotic perspectives like that of René van den Boe. The exclusion of J.Derrida, from the above view point, may appear indefensible. But I have refrained from dealing with the post structuralist view points, as it would have needed a
treatment not merely of the concepts of Derrida but also of the continuous debate between him and some of the other thinkers of the French School.

After a look at the influential journal Tel Quel and its contributions, this section will deal with the works of Barthes, Lacan, Lévi-Strauss and Foucault. The stress will be on their salient conceptual contributions, which have brought about a radical change in the modern intellectual climate.

1.5.1. Tel Quel

Tel Quel is a journal and a series of publications. Writers like Julia Kristeva and Jacques Derrida are connected with this group. It took a deep interest in Russian Formalism and used linguistics as the foundation of their analysis.

For the members of this group, the concept of meaning acquired a functional sense. Tzvetan Todorov, who translated many of the Formalist texts into French, said that the meaning of a literary element depended on the function which we give to that element. This interpretation depended on the reader who rearranged the elements into a new structure and assessed it according to his own standards. Based on the three poles of the author, the language and the reader, a theory of writing could now be posited. Broekman, quoting Genette sums it up thus. "The literary text, therefore, does not in a servile way pass on a meaning the author had in mind, but it creates a structure, presented to the reader as a set of forms that expect to be imbued with sense". This is again the functional approach, emphasising that it is form that determines content.
The writing subject is thus decentralised and the subjective authority of the author is no more imposed on the reader. The text can thus be said to be liberated. Julia Kristeva, for example, distinguishes between Pheno-texte and geno-texte, by which she means the expressed communication and meaning generating other meanings. No text is ever original— it originates from other texts. Kristeva uses the term 'intertextuality' to refer to the text in the text or more precisely 'texts in the text'. This word has now come to be accepted in critical terminology of even those writers that do not subscribe to semiotics.

Tel Quel and the other groups, though giving priority to de Saussure, do not accept the view of giving primacy to the synchronic approach over the diachronic. They follow the Russian Formalists who held the view that only a synthesis of the diachronic and synchronic viewpoints could be fruitful. Some members of the group have tried to synthesise hermeneutics with the linguistic approach by emphasising that language as langue can not be separated from language as parole. The works of Kristeva herself or that of Barthes and Goldman in semiology and literary criticism can be taken as examples for such an approach.

1.5.2. Roland Barthes

Of all the figures of the French intellectual circles of the 1960s and 1970s, Barthes is perhaps, the best known internationally, and one who seems to have succeeded Sartre as the leading French intellectual. Susan Sontag pays him glowing tribute in the following words, "...of all the intellectual notables who have emerged since world war II in France, Roland Barthes is the one, whose work I am most
Barthes was a semiotician, literary critic, structuralist, an incisive analyser of western culture and an author himself, though he was closely associated with propagating the notion of 'the death of the author'. We have already observed in the studies of the Russian and Prague Schools how the emphasis on structures and formal aspects do not leave space for the individuality of the 'genius' of the author. A text can only be seen in the significatory structure of other texts. To quote Barthes himself on this, "...a text is not a line of words releasing a single theological meaning (The message of an Author-God), but a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash".

Barthes insists that writing is always a dialogue. (In this he is close to Bakhtin.) The literary work, according to him, is a sign for something lying beyond the work. So, there arises the need for decoding. Two systems of signs are at work in literature: one is the communication in language; for the second system, the first acts as the indicator. So, he concludes that literature becomes a parasite on language. When we extend our search to the secondary or connotative levels, we 'open-up' the text. These and other questions raise the issue of a unity from which the literary work may be understood.

Barthes, throughout his career, outlined and expoused different projects, disciplines and methods, that changed the way one looked at cultural objects. Yet, there was a streak of anarchist and hedonist in him. Many a time, he wrote disparagingly about the projects he himself set in motion. He thus refused to be tied down to any one course and has often been criticised for this. But to his admirers, these
contradictions are a 'sign' of his restlessness, which to them, is the real Barthes. But one can perceive a strong semiotic underpinning in the various endeavours of Barthes. He explains his concept of semiology in the book, *Elements of Semiology* (1964).^6^9

It is difficult to consider Barthes' writings on semiotics as a 'theory'. He never presents his views in any logical scientific manner. Infact there are many contradictions within his corpus of writings on the 'science of signs', and he revels in such contradictions. So, instead of calling it a theory, Sandaor Hervey labels Barthes' views as 'semiotics as an ideology' and studies the Barthesian approach in terms of paradoxes.^7^0

The first of such paradoxes is what he calls the Paradox of Scope. Signs for Barthes, stand for all sorts of entities endowed with signification. His view is that in features of a culture, there can be no event or fact that can be termed 'innocent'— or without signification. An apparently simple fact like a beard may become a signifier for stating, "I am different and want to show that difference". This message is obviously oblique and according to Barthes, these oblique and indirect sigifications are more effective than expressive or direct significations. Semiotics, should concern itself, he says, with these peripheral indirect or 'doubtful' cases of signification rather than cases of highly explicit communication, which do not form part of Barthesian semiotics.

In the relation of semiology to linguistics, Barthes takes a stand which is opposed to de Saussure's. F.de Saussure had envisaged a field for semiology (as a study of
signs in general) which would include linguistics also. But Barthes sees semiotics as a part of linguistics as non-linguistic semiotic systems are inconceivable without language. The other reason given by him is that other semiotic systems can not convey comprehensible messages without the mediation of language. For instance, the message conveyed by a red traffic light is not a 'traffic-light-message' but the linguistic message 'stop'.

1.5.2.1. Denotation-and connotation

Barthes' search for peripheral or indirect signification leads him to posit two levels of signification: denotation and connotation. This can be best understood in his analysis of fashions. Fashion is a system where meaning is created by differentiating garments, endowing details with significance. As Barthes says, "It is the meaning that sells clothes". In his analysis of fashions or of advertising, he concentrates on the 'secondary' or peripheral levels of signification, where what is left unsaid becomes to him the text. Such signification is described by him as 'parasitic' on the object.

Barthes relates his idea of 'parasitic' signification to Hjelmslev's concept of connotation. This term is applied by Hjelmslev for a higher level of signification, functioning thereby as a secondary sign. But there is a fundamental difference in the way Barthes uses the term. This is made clear by Hervey:

Berthes treats 'connotation' and signification as synonymous terms whereas in Hjelmslev, 'connotation' is applied only to the secondary signification of objects that are already signs in their own right. The signification of objects that are not in themselves coded signs (cloths, food, photographs and so on)
should not, strictly speaking be referred to as 'connotation' since there can be no question here of that signification being 'secondary' to some underlying literal meaning.

The concept of connotation can also be represented through the following diagram.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Secondary sign:} & \text{Signifier} & \text{Signified} \\
\hline
\text{Primary sign:} & \text{Signifier} & \text{Signified} \\
\end{array}
= \text{Connotation}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Primary sign:} & \text{Signifier} & \text{Signified} \\
\hline
\end{array}
= \text{denotation}
\]

The primary meaning of the sign becomes the signifier for the connotative signification. To take an example, the signifier 'dog' may refer to the four legged animal signifying 'canine' at the denotative level. It may also signify 'faithful', 'friendly' and other range of meanings at the connotative levels. Barthes insists that connotative significations are neither part of convention nor of the natural interpretation. This opens the interpretation to the danger of being highly hermeneutic or idiosyncratic. But the task of semiotics, according to Barthes is, "the labour that collects the impurity of language, the waste of linguistics, the immediate corruption of any message: nothing less than the desires, fears, expressions, intimidations, advances, blandishments, protests, excuses, aggressions and melodies of which active language is made".

One of the best examples of Barthes' semiotic approach can be seen in his analysis of 'myths'. He uses the term myth in a special sense. A myth is not a mere belief but the embodiment of a belief with an ideological content that
signifies hinting at an ideological content. He has analysed the 'myth' of the photographs used in newspapers and the advertising myths. Barthes' analysis of modern cultural and social phenomena as a whole can be seen in terms of these myths.

Barthes' entire work can be seen as ideologically projected, where semiotics served as a powerful tool for dismantling many of the comfortable bourgeois 'myths' and cults. It is perhaps ironical that Barthesianism, his iconoclastic style of analysis and destruction of the myths itself became a myth and Barthes, a cult figure.

1.5.3. Jacques Lacan

Jacques Lacan was a practicing psychoanalyst. He was a neo Freudian, trying to find relevance in Freud in the context of the post Freudian developments. His crucial insight was that the subconscious could be deciphered only with the aid of structural linguistics. His tome of writings are contained in his work *Ecrits*. He writes about the nature of human discourse. Though his work was chiefly in the field of psychoanalysis, his writings also consist of views on society that are close to the views of Althusser.

The philosophical postulates of Subject and the Other becomes crucial to Lacan's analysis of the subconscious. The entire world was to be perceived on the basis of this opposition. He relates it to the Freudian concept of Ego, and states that the imaginary register of the Ego, blocks the relation of the Subject to the Other: so the primary task of analysis would be to bring the Subject into prominence. Lacan presents the Subject as "$" which he calls a subject
barred with a signifier. Darian Leader explains the concept thus. "The Subject for Lacan is a barred subject... born into a world of language, the child must assume signifiers in the Other and literally subject himself to the autonomy of the symbolic structures at play. Similarly, the Subject is barred in that it does not know what it wants: there are no signifiers in the Other to pin down exactly what the Subject wants. Thus the bar in $ indicates not a signifier but the lack of a signifier, a signifier that is missing from the Other". 75

Lacan's writings are very terse and difficult, but the essence of his opinions can be perceived in statements like, "The discourse of the subconscious is structured like language" and "The conscious is the discourse of the Other". In psychoanalysis, Lacan insists not on the dream itself but on the patient's conversation (discours) about it. The patient thus presents a document as well as an interpretation of it (which is itself a document).

He argues that absolute subconscious which has to solve all the problems of consciousness no longer exists. It is the 'speech of the Other'. So, it belongs to discourse and to the order of language and culture. It is also relative and marginal. Thus giving a totally new meaning to subconscious, he attempts to separate completely the two fields of psychology and psychoanalysis.

In analysing the displacement of meaning, Lacan uses Jacobson's concepts of metaphor and metonymy, by relating the two axes to the two mechanisms that Freud assigned to the unconscious. This is related by Lacan to the study of the Subject and the Other.
Lacan's contributions can be summed up in the following words of Sturrock. "The psychoanalyst who has done most to bring out the dependance of Freud's thought and method on language... is the Frenchman Jacques Lacan... It is through Lacan that Freudian current has flowed once and for all into structuralism or if one prefers, that the structuralist current has flowed into Freudianism".76

1.5.4. Claude Lévi-Strauss

Claude Lévi-Strauss has exercised such a great influence on present day thinking that his researches in the field of Cultural Anthropology, have in the words of Broekman, "contributed not only to present day structuralism but more generally to epistomological questions of our times".77 Like most other members of the French group, in Lévi-Strauss, we see the desire to be scientific. He draws the conceptual tool for his structural approach from linguistics, particularly from phonological models.78 From this, he developed the concept of binary opposition, in abstract entities, working in the way a society functions and organises itself. This became one of the most important concepts for Lévi-Strauss in all his later works. This also became one of the accepted tools in structural analysis as a whole. Lévi-Strauss, for example, saw the opposition between nature and culture as central to the understanding of any society. This can be seen in his work on totemism where he showed how the so called 'primitive tribes', show a resourceful and intelligent ordering of the natural environment. In the words of Sturrock, Lévi-Strauss, "maintains that totemistic systems of discrimination are theoretical, because they function as models of how to make sense of the world".79
From the works of Levi-Strauss, structuralism emerges as a model of thinking. He extended his study to the ambitious project of finding the logic of culture and society itself. He sees every society as an ensemble of symbolic systems. Language, kinship rules and even the relationship of art, science and religion are all seen as examples of it. The dynamics of symbolic systems are governed by the principles of contradiction and mutation. So, either a society finds itself in a state of constant mutation or it collapses because of contradictions.

Levi-Strauss' major work was in the area of myths. He views myths as meaningful entities that show a society's way of understanding the world around it. In the words of Lévi-Strauss himself, "myth is language, functioning on an especially high level where meaning succeeds practically at "taking off" from the linguistic ground on which it keeps on rolling". In order to decipher the meaning, there is the need for analysis, because the real meaning which is immanent, is always different from the apparent meaning. Lévi-Strauss uses the structuralist model for his analysis, where he reduces the myths to their constituent elements or mythemes. These mythemes in turn have to be arranged in a new structure. He compares this task to that of deciphering a musical score—which should be read along two axes, the horizontal and the vertical. Only with this restructuration, the logic of the myth becomes apparent and what appeared as arbitrary or chaotic, assumes a structure. Only then, the real meaning of the myth becomes clear. Myths according to Lévi-Strauss, "have a function of reconciling on the imaginary plane, those social contradictions, which can not be resolved on the real plane". The resolution of contradictions thus becomes the primary function of myths.
We can also see the difference between Propp and Lévi-Strauss in the analysis of folktales and myths. Both adopt, the structural model, but Propp is never concerned with the fundamental question of why the tale was created in the first place. The difference between the two is made clear by Handoo. "Undoubtedly, Propp's interest did not go beyond the formal structure of the tale; whereas Lévi-Strauss' problem was to know the mode of thinking that engenders folktale and mythology". 82

Lévi-Strauss attacks the western concept and model of history. Sartre accuses Lévi-Strauss of rejecting history, but it would be more accurate to say that he rejects the Hegelian concept of progress, which assumes that the western civilization is an example of the society that has achieved the greatest progress (assuming thereby that other societies are primitive).

Lévi-Strauss never posited a philosophy although many of his views are highly philosophical. His search for a model that can account for all established facts, can itself be seen as an epistemological one. But such a purely structuralist approach has also come in for criticism. Broekman, for example, says, "He thus seeks to introduce order into the world, without answering the question whether this is an intelligible order only, or whether it also involves reality". 83

1.5.5. Michel Foucault

Foucault's major works were a study of historiography though he himself was the most trenchant critic of historiography. The principal theme of his works, is the
process of historical change. But he proposes to study this change epistemologically—in terms of to what he calls 'epistemes'. (This term is explained later). He stressed on the 'break' or discontinuity in history, whereas traditional historians are more concerned to show continuity underplaying the discontinuity in the historical process. Foucault makes a distinction between 'total' and 'general' history or between history and archaeology. Robert Young explains the difference between the two terms thus, "... whereas a total history draws everything together according to a single principle, a general history analyses the space of dispersion and heterogeneous temporalities".84

Such an attempt at writing a 'general' history, where he concentrated on particular discourses, can be seen in his works like *Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic* and *The Order of Things*. In historical processes, order is a quality which is not apparent. That can only be perceived from a point of view—of language or of scientific argument. But it is the codes of a culture that determine how man enters into that order. Science and philosophy will explain why he obeys these orders only, rather than some others. Between these, he recognises an intermediary field which is never taken cognizance of by classical history. Foucault argues that the history of madness is a history of the Other. On this, there was a debate between him and Derrida. Derrida questioned Foucault's understanding of the relation of the same to the Other, which posits madness as outside the sphere of reason. But Foucault contended that the difference between him and Derrida was a difference between 'textuality' and 'history'.

Foucault insists that history should be studied in synchronicity since each age organises its knowledge
differently from the preceding and succeeding ages. This particular ordering of knowledge forms, as Sturrock puts it, "a kind of a categorical grid which each age places over reality in order to comprehend it".\textsuperscript{85} Foucault uses the term 'episteme' to describe the particular way in which each age made sense of the world around it. He explains the term thus. "By episteme, we mean, in fact, the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences and possible formalised systems... it is the totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period between the sciences, when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities".\textsuperscript{86} (Foucault himself, later used Neitzche's concept of genealogy instead of episteme). The history of any discipline or branch of knowledge, could only be studied in relation to the episteme, as revealed in the other branches of knowledge of that age.

As a historian, Foucault emphasised on the mechanisms of controlling discourse that have existed in all ages, by permitting certain ideas and opinions to exist while forbidding others. Sturrock sums up Foucault's opinions in the following words:

All discourse according to Foucault, is subject to the power of those in authority, so that discursive structures that he may uncover as a historian need to be seen as authoritarian and repressive. As a libertarian, he looks on historiography, together with the documents it rests on, as a conspiracy of the powerful and orthodox against the powerless and eccentric.\textsuperscript{87}

Seen in this light, we can understand Foucault's rejection of the (scientific) thinking of 18th and 19th
centuries as being totally anthropocentric. So he calls for an end to anthropocentrism—the death of man. He says that in our day we can only think from within the vacuum of 'the vanished man'. Foucault attacks humanism as an ideology and takes a stand that can be called 'anti-humanism'. Through this he wants to emphasise on 'generality' which to him is more fundamental than individuality.

1.6. THE CURRENT SCENE

The present day developments in semiotics can be described as one of proliferation—both in the growth of new theories and in the application of semiotic perspectives for the analysis of varied domains of human (and non-human) knowledge. Today, semiotics has come to include a wide variety of human disciplines both scientific and literary. The editors of *Sign System and Function*, for example, recognise more than sixteen different meanings in which the word semiotics is used by different authors. One of the major differences underlying these varying standpoints, seems to revolve round the question of scope. Does semiotics include in its range of study, all entities that can be construed significatory, or does it restrict itself to expressively communicable acts. Based on this, we can perhaps distinguish between those semiotic theories that argue for a broad range and those that restrict it to a narrow range. Georges Mounin (following Prito) distinguishes between semiotics of communication (dealing with purposeful and conventional communicational systems) and the semiotics of signification, involving interpretation of what he calls indices. By indice he means a clue or an indication picked up by the observer as possibly leading to knowledge of an aspect of a given natural or social phenomenon. (Smoke
denoting fire can be taken as an example.) He says that an indice is not a signifier but is only significative, meaning that they come to mean something to the observer through a process of interpretation.  

With regard to the question of scope we have a wide divergence of views. On the one hand we have those that declare that semiotics, "declares itself concerned with the entire universe (and nothing else)" (Eco). On the other, we have those that state that semiotics is concerned with only those entities that have communication as their raison d'être (Axiomatic Functionalism). Emerging from this basic difference, the theoretical positions which they take, also show wide divergences.

Of these different schools and theories, I have dealt with only a few of the important approaches. Even of these approaches, only the barest sketch is given, without going into the theoretical positions in detail because of limitations of space.

1.6.1. The Tartu School-Jurij Lotman

In the 1960s, there emerged a powerful stream of semiotic activity in the Soviet Union. The Institute of Slavonic Studies in Moscow University and Tartu University in Estonia, led by Jurij M. Lotman, became the centres for such an activity. They received a strong impulse from linguists, working in the fields of cybernetics and information theory. Specially, the work that was being done on machine translation had a great influence on them. At the same time, they continued the tradition of Russian Formalism, though it was not a simple revival of Formalism.
The Soviet School applied semiotics for the study of varied fields of culture. The writings of Lotman provided the theoretical framework for such a study. Lotman views the whole of culture as a comprehensive modelling device and views the entire aggregates of sign systems as united by culture. He says that language acts as the primary modelling device and other sign systems form a secondary modelling device. Culture, according to him is, "a vast complex and unified secondary modelling system that incorporates many subsystems and receives fundamental structuring patterns from primary modelling system of natural language". Cultural activity is viewed as a sign. Culture's functioning as a sign system is to be seen against the background of non-culture.

Lotman also mentions of tensions between sign systems. These tensions, according to him, result in complex mediations between the different categories of signs. The centre of culture acts as a powerful organising influence but at the same time culture itself has to reckon with 'peripheral quasi-structures' which contribute to the internal disorder.

The Soviet Semioticians, spoke of the 'text' not merely in literary works but in all artistic and cultural phenomena. They perceived of the text as a signal. For any entity to become a text, it should fulfil three requirements. "(1) A text must be bounded or 'fixed', framed apart as distinct from the non-text (2) A text must be a means for the conscious transmission of a message, rather than an accidental occurrence, (3) A text must be understandable, permitting interpretation and an adequate reception of the message".
Lotman, in contrast to many other schools of semiotics, does not reject interpretation as a valid exercise. As D.W. Fokkema and Kunne-Ibish say, "To Lotman, art is not only to be perceived but to be interpreted. Interpretation is a cultural necessity". The interpretation (and function) of a text is related by him to a given code and a given value system. He presupposes the relation between the structure of the text and the cultural code to which it belongs. Though he is concerned with the outside world, he wishes to keep the problem of truth and falsity outside the domain of his semiotics. He also does not address the question about whether the structure is perceived by the observer or whether it exists in the real world.

The attitude of Soviet semiotics as a whole is summed up by David Lucid in the following words. "The ultimate implication of Soviet Semiotics is that human beings not only communicate with signs, but are in large measure controlled by them. A 'sign system' models the world in its own image. Signs not only passively mirror reality but also actively transform it ... Man can be described as both the creator and the creation of signs".

1.6.2. Paris School of Semiotics- A.J. Greimas

A.J. Greimas and his followers came to be known by the above name. Greimas draws his influence from Structuralism, Phenomenology and the work on narratology done by Propp, Dumezil and Lévi-Strauss. His seminal work was Structural Semantics. He believed that the vocation of semiotics was to strive for scientificality or at least systematicity. Greimas attempts to account for verbal meanings of all kinds and formulates rules and concepts that will account for meanings
produced—from sentences to complete texts. His major work was in the field of the study of the narrative and in projecting a narrative syntax. He recognises four stages in the narrative schema and proposes to study the text in terms of its narrative grammar with concepts like isotopies, subject-object opposition etc.

His work, though very systematic and thorough, leaves many questions unanswered. It is perhaps most instructive, not so much for its actual contributions as for the difficulties it encounters in accounting for the meaning of a literary text. As Jonathan Culler says, "...by examining the difficulties his theory encounters, the ways in which it fails, one may hope to shed some light on the possibilities and limitations of semantic theories of this kind. Greimas's work is only the most ambitious example of a particular way of applying linguistic models to the description of literary language". 95

1.6.3. Umberto Eco's Theory of Semiotics

Another important theorician of semiotics is Umberto Eco. In his work, A Theory of Semiotics (1977), he sets out on the ambitious project of positing a universal theory of signification. He makes a distinction between a theory of codes and a theory of sign-production. Instead of the notion of sign he proposes the concept of sign function. By a theory of codes, he proposes to study the abstract notion of the possibility of generating sign functions, provided they are sanctioned by social convention. By sign production, he refers to the actual physical production of expression based on the possibility provided by the signification system. The
difference between the two, he says, is one of rules and processes. Eco points out that this distinction is not the same as the one between langue and parole.

Semiotics, according to him, is a theory of the lie. "Semiotics is concerned with every thing that can be taken as a sign. A sign is every thing which can be taken as significantly substituting for something else. This some thing else does not necessarily have to exist, or to actually be somewhere at the moment in which a sign stands in for it. Thus semiotics is in principle the discipline studying every thing which can be used in order to lie. If something can not be used to tell a lie, conversely it can not be used to tell the truth: it can not in fact be used 'to tell' at all".  

The idea of 'Semiosis' is central to Eco's theory. As he says, semiosis is the paramount subject matter of semiotics. "Semiosis is the process by which empirical subjects communicate ... Empirical subjects, from a semiotic point of view, can only be defined and isolated as manifestations of this double (systematic and processul) aspects of semiosis. This is not a metaphysical statement but a methodological one".  

To posit a unified theory of all phenomena of signification is an ambitious project and Eco's work, as he himself says, can be taken as preliminary exploration of such a theoretical possibility. He continued this search in his later work Semiotics and The Philosophy of Language (1984) also.
1.6.4. Edward Said and the Discourse of Orientalism

The question of historiography and the need for the writing of a new history was the focus of Foucault's study. This new history, of the colonised states as well as of the West, has to take into consideration the question of Eurocentrism and its relation to colonialism. The study of imperialism becomes central not merely for understanding the discourse of the colonised countries but also for understanding European thought. "European thought since the Renaissance," says Robert Young, "would be as unthinkable without the impact of colonialism as the history of the world since the Renaissance without the effects of Europeanisation." 98

The first such attempt at 'decolonising the mind' of the now politically free Third World countries, was Franz Fannon's *The Wretched of the Earth*. 99 But the most sustained analysis of the discourse of imperialism, not merely as a political practice but also as an intellectual paradigm that justified the political hegemony and which continues to exercise its hold on the minds of the erstwhile colonisers and the colonised even now, is Edward Said's work *Orientalism*. 100

Edward Said makes use of Foucault's concept of representation to show how Orientalism was a creation of the Eurocentric West which projected the Orient as the Other, which was to be appropriated through colonisation. As Said says. "The relationship between the Occident and the Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony." 101 Drawing examples from literary, historical, military and administrative sources, Said
demonstrates how the representation of the Orient was created. But the texts of Orientalism create not only the knowledge but also the reality that they appear to describe. Said recognises two levels of Orientalism. One is its construction as representation by academics which he calls 'Orientalising the Orient'. The other is how this representation of the Orient became an instrument in the hands of the colonial forces in establishing their political hegemony. In this he criticises the complicity of the academic forms of knowledge with institutions of power.

Said's work brings out forcefully, the strength of Western cultural discourse, and how these continue to exercise their hegemony even after the end of the political colonisation. He says, "My hope is to illustrate the formidable structure of cultural domination and specifically for formerly colonised people, the dangers and temptations of employing the structure upon themselves and upon others." 102

This work demonstrates forcefully how literary and cultural 'texts' are always shaped by political forces though the 'politics' behind it may not be obvious. 103 Said's work has often been criticised for its theoretical inadequacy and because he offers no alternative to the phenomenon which he criticises. All the same, said's work has become highly influential. His significant contribution has been to demonstrate how the question of imperialism can not be divorced from the literary, cultural discourse, as being irrelevant. He has also demonstrated how the intellectual 'constructs' of the dominant class work as 'colonisers' over the minds of the less powerful and the minorities. As Robert Young says, "[Said's work] has enabled those from the minorities, whether categorised as racial, sexual, social or
economic to stake their critical work in relation to their own political positioning rather than feel obliged to assume the transcendental values of the dominant discourse of criticism."\textsuperscript{104}

Said's work has been included here as it is a significant contribution to the present day discourse on colonialism and the exercise of power.

1.6.5. Conclusion

The current scene in semiotics may appear as one of confusion with little in common among the innumerable theories and positions. But in the prevalent baffling diversity, we can also discern an emerging trend, which is to view semiotics not as a method, but as a meta-discipline for the study of symbolic systems, whatever be the field or discipline. Jean-Claude Gadin and others make this point clear in an article in *Semiotica*. They see "... a shift in the objects of study from communication systems to the modelling systems which underlie phenomenological and scientific explanations of human phenomena ... a change in perspective is already evident in [attempts] to interpret human phenomena in terms of underlying world views taken as modelling systems of behaviour in their own right".\textsuperscript{105}
1.7. INTRODUCTION

One of the offshoots of the influence of semiotics on folkloristics has been the emergence of an ethnographic or performance oriented approach. The seminal work in this field has been done by Dell Hymes and Richard Bauman. They have primarily been influenced by the works of Bakhtin and Jacobson. The communication model proposed by Jacobson, and the six functions that he assigns to the six elements of communication, have been used by them extensively in the study of verbal art. They sharply disagree with Jacobson and Bogatyrev's contention that folklore is only langue. They insist on seeing each performance as a 'text' to be studied in relation to the situation, the addressee-interaction and the social/cultural context that guides as well as controls the performance. They are aware that each individual performance (parole) is guided by the tradition (langue), but they insist that the relation between the two is dialectic. In their studies, they concentrate on the way this dialectic relationship operates.

If the first part of this chapter was a general survey of the growth of semiotics, this section will be more specific in nature, dealing with those aspects of semiotic theory and practice that are more intimately connected with the study of yakṣagāna. To begin with, this section will deal with the work done on semiotics of the theatre. The Prague Structuralists, as we have already observed, were the first to do substantial work in this direction. After a brief study of some of the other works done in this field,
this section will deal with the performance oriented approaches, specially of the works of Dell Hymes and Richard Bauman.

1.8. SEMIOTICS OF THEATRE

1.8.1.Signs in the Theatre

Theatre and performance studies had received little scholarly attention until recently. It is only with the work of the Prague School that this field of really came of age. Some aspects of the work of Prague Structuralists on theatre, that had a general bearing on semiotics, have already been dealt with in the earlier section. Their more specific work, relevant to theatre studies is taken up here. They did not restrict their study to western theatre, but extended it to different forms of theatre including folk theatre, Chinese theatre and even Charlie Chaplin's mimes. Jan Mukařovský was the first to apply the Saussurian concept of sign to the study of the theatre. He considers the performance text as the macrosign and the signified as the 'aesthetic object' residing in the collective consciousness of the public. Bogatyrev, in his highly influential work on folk theatre, draws attention to what Keir Elam Calls 'semiotization of the object'. By this, he refers to the symbolic role that is ascribed to every object on stage, suppressing its practical function. A chair on stage, for example, is not merely an item of furniture; it becomes a semiotic unit standing "for the class of objects of which it is a member". But its significatory potential does not end there. Apart from representing the entire class, it will also have connotative significations and the audience will be more keenly aware of these secondary significations in case of a theatrical sign.
Infact, connotation plays such an important role in theatre semiosis, that Bogatyrev says that on stage, an item of costume or a set is "a sign of a sign and not the sign of a material thing". The chair, that we had taken as an example earlier, may connote 'power', 'position' or 'comfort'.

Because of the connotative range of signification, theatre is capable of signifying an unlimited range of signifieds by using a limited range of signifiers. That is why, the theatrical sign always has a polysemy of meanings. This is much more true of traditional and folk theatre forms, where there is a strict economy of the signifiers used. Keir Elam seems to miss this point when he states that in Chinese and Japanese theatres, "the semantic units are so strictly predetermined that the denotation-connotation distinction virtually disappears". There is also the potential of the transformability of the sign, where the same signifier may be made to represent several signifieds in the course of the play. Karel Brusak, in his work on Chinese theatre demonstrates how the actor himself, through gestures, 'establishes' the set.

The Prague School applied the Formalist's conception of 'foregrounding' (and defamiliarisation) to the analysis of theatre also. Foregrounding was evolved as a linguistic concept but it was eminently suited for the study of the theatrical text as it could be visualised as a 'spatial metaphor'. As has already been remarked, the Prague School saw the performance text in terms of hierarchy of elements. But this hierarchy was visualised as dynamic in nature where order is not predetermined. Any one of the elements can be suddenly 'foregrounded'. (Brechtian theatre, for example, adopts several such foregrounding devices.)
After the pioneering work of the Prague School, nothing of note was done in the field, until Tadeusz Kowzan, the Polish semiotician, applied semiotics again to the study of the theatre. He proposed a typology of thirteen systems at work in theatre. Kowzan himself states that this typology is only preliminary. But this was the first systematic attempt at classification. Kowzan also distinguishes between natural and artificial signs depending on the presence or absence of motivation. He says that the theatre transforms natural signs into artificial ones. He gives a flash of lightning as an example. Thus, events which may have no communicative function in life, acquire it on the stage.

1.8.2. Icon Index and Symbol

This classification of signs by Peirce, has been applied to theatrical studies also. In theatrical representation, verisimilitude plays a predominant role, and so iconic signs may be said to be the dominant mode. Ian Kott, was perhaps the first theatre critic to highlight the prominence of icons in theatre. He says, "In theatre, the basic icon is the body and voice of the actor". The actor as a sign is largely iconic so long as he represents a similar human being, which is what we mostly find in realistic Western theatre. But, in many other theatre forms, specially the traditional theatres of the east, where men play female roles, or where (as in Kudiāṭṭam) an emotion like Anger is personified by an actor, the question of iconicity of the actor becomes more complex.

Pointing out the prominence of indexical signs in theatre, Keir Elam says, "The category of index is so broad that every aspect of performance can be considered in some
In theatre for example, prominent use is made of body movement as a signifying device. Birdwhistell was the pioneer in the study of kinesics—body movements as signifying devices. In the same manner, spatial distance as signs was studied by E.T. Hall and he called such a study, proxemics. Theatre, makes use of both body language and spatial distance as signifying systems and these may be included in the category of indexical signs.

Symbols may not be prominently made use of in realistic theatre, but in many traditional theatre forms of the East (to which yakṣagāna also belongs), symbolic signs become the prominent mode of representation. As the relation between the sign vehicle and its object is arbitrary in symbolic signs, such theatre forms normally become highly codified forms. A prior knowledge of the code becomes a prerequisite for proper communication to take place.

Even as these signs are applied for theatrical studies, it must be remembered that a sign may have more than one quality and as Peirce himself indicates, these categories never exist in a pure form.

1.8.3. Ostension

In theatre, each sign is not merely a sign of a physical object, it is a sign of a sign, because it represents an entire class. A chair on the stage for example, not merely denotes a chair of real life, but at also represents the entire class of chairs of which it is a member (apart from its other connotative significations). This particular mode of representation is termed ostension. Umberto Eco, explains how this mode of representation,
differentiates theatre from literature or painting and says, "Ostension is one of the various ways of signifying, consisting in derealising a given object in order to make it stand for an entire class. But ostension is, at the same time, the most basic instance of performance".115

If one holds up a pen in hand and tells a child, "This is a pen", that particular pen then becomes 'derealised', because it then stands for the entire class of pens. This is an example of ostension. All objects on stage are ostended because they function as sign of signs. The entire theatrical performance may itself be thought of as an example of ostension.

1.8.4. Meaning in Theatre

Any attempt to deal with the question of meaning in theatre, has to deal with the crucial question raised by Mounin, with regard to communication in theatre. He asks, "Is there really communication-communication of the linguistic type-or is there stimulation aimed at trigering responses? Do the actors communicate with the spectators in the same way as they communicate with each other?".116 Mounin else where insists that communication can not be said to take place where the sender of a message can not become the receiver and the receiver, the sender. His contention is that in theatre, the information giving, process is always unidirectional. Mounin's conception of communication seems to be based on a narrow linguistic concept, as Keir Elam points out. In addition, the kind of theatre he seems to have in mind is "the weakest form of bourgeois spectacle".117

The greatest problem in analysing a performance text, lies in identifying the many systems at work, the internal
relations between each and the way they combine for meaning to be communicated. Another problem is to find the minimal signifying unit. Many attempts have been made in this direction including Kowzan's concept of significative unit of a spectacle which he calls a 'slice'. Keir Elam, on the other hand, is of the opinion that the search for these discrete units, is itself misplaced. To believe that these arbitrary units function like phonemes, is according to him "an abuse of the linguistic model".\textsuperscript{118}

1.8.5. Keir Elam

Instead, Keir Elam proposes to study the theatrical spectacle, in terms of system and codes. He says that little has been done in investigating theatrical systems beyond identifying them. He presents an elaborate typology of theatrical and dramatic subcodes and relates them to cultural codes, through which the audience is able to interpret them. He classifies them under different heads like systemic, linguistic, epistemic, ideological etc. He goes on to analyse the conventions of space (actor to actor and actor/s to audience) in terms of proxemics propounded by E.T.Hall. In the same manner, body motions as communicative systems are analysed on the lines proposed by Birdwhistell and his concept of kinesics.

At the end of his study, he concentrates on the spectator, whose role in the communicative process has, for the most part been neglected. So far, little empirical research has been done on theatrical reception. Also, the spectator's mode of decoding will quite often differ from the actor's coding, with the result that many a time the spectator perceives the text according to canons known to him
and arrives at his/her meaning of the text. Elam sees the spectator's role from a fundamental perspective. The spectator in a way, initiates the entire process of theatrical communication by the simple act of buying a ticket or by his very presence. "Of all the successive audience signals, the most significant is its simple presence, which constitutes the one invariable condition of the performance."\(^{119}\) Audience reaction is not openly acknowledged in most theatre forms. Yet, it exerts its influence on the performance itself and on reception by other spectators.

1.8.6. Patrice Pavis

Another important contributor to the semiology of theatre is the French semiologist Patrice Pavis. Making a distinction between semiology and semiotics, he describes the task of semiology of theatre thus. "Semiology does not concern itself with locating meaning (an issue that belongs more properly to hermeneutics and to literary criticism) but with the modes of production of that meaning throughout the theatrical process, beginning with the director's reading of the script through to the interpreting task of the spectator".\(^{120}\) Charting the course that semiotics of theatre has taken over the years, like the search for minimal signs or the attempt to project a satisfactory typology of signs, he says that in some recent developments, semiology is trying to include approaches that were formally excluded from its methodological field in the past. "These latest developments", he comments, "show a greater flexibility in the purely linguistic method and a clear desire to set up a poetics or rhetoric of theatre forms, without being intimidated any longer by the genre that is specifically theatre but encompassing all types of performance".\(^{121}\)
Commenting on how theatrical semiology has always opposed the 'imperialism' of the written text in theatre studies, he says that a dialectical tension exists between the dramitic text and the actor. He proposes to study the proformance text in terms of specific codes, nonspecific codes and mixed codes. His writings also contain examples of semiotic analyses of particular performance texts.

In conclusion we may say that inspite of the substantial work that has been done in the field of theatre semiotics, no comprehensive theory encompassing all aspects of theatre phenomenon has as yet emerged. Some of the recent studies in the field, show a shift of emphasis. The early works, as we have seen, concentrated on the nature of the sign in the theatre and its operation, the theatrical codes and the search for minimal signifying units. Marvin Carlson points out the change of emphasis in recent studies. "The semiotic analysis of specific performances by single critic, reception analysis of audiences and attempts to describe performance in terms of shifting fields of energies rather than through communication models are among the most popular of these more recent studies". 122

1.9. THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF PERFORMANCE

Folklore studies, specially of oral literature, had, for long, concerned itself mainly with 'texts'. A major shift of emphasis in the last thirty years has been the awareness that context is as important as the 'text' in the study of these genres. Milman Parry and Albert Lord's work *The Singer of Tales* was concerned basically with studying the formulaic characteristics of oral poetry but this work also showed for the first time, the importance of context and
performance in the study of folklore. Folklore scholarship, for the most part, had concerned itself with the 'text', isolating it completely from the context of its performance. Handoo, commenting on such a text oriented approach says, "Text orientedness...has been one of the unpleasent things that caused a theoretical lag in folkloristics. Most of the theoretical orientation in folklore indicates towards the fossil nature of folklore, in which case, text becomes the most important thing". But many folklorists began to question the neglect of context in folkloristics. Dell Hymes as long back as 1962 spoke of how verbal art has been viewed as abstracted from social use. Many scholars, drawing the concepts and methodologies from different fields like linguistics, sociology, psychology and literary criticism began to view folklore from a new perspective, where folklore instead of being seen as a text was studied as a performance-an event in time and space where a tradition is performed.

The result of such a shift of emphasis was the emergence of the concept of 'performance'. Performance theory presents a new perspective in folkloristics. Elinar Keenan, Michelle Rosaldo, Barbara Krishenblatt Gimblett and Joel Sherzer are some of the important practitioners of such an approach. The two authors who have provided the theoretical formulations for this approach through their writings are Dell Hymes and Richard Bauman.

1.9.1. Dell Hymes

Dell Hymes was a sociolinguist. In his article, "The Ethnography of Speaking" (1962) he drew attention to the social use of language. As a corrective to the text oriented approach, he proposed a study of the ethnography of speaking,
which would be, "concerned with the situations and uses, the patterns and functions of speaking as an activity in its own right".124

Laying stress on the cultural and behavioural setting, he recognises seven factors that constitute a speech event. They are (1) sender (2) receiver (3) message (4) channel (medium) (5) code (6) topic (referent) and (7) setting. These factors closely resemble the elements that Jacobson mentions in his communication model, except for the last one.125 Similarly Hymes recognises one more function of language than Jacobson—the contextual or situational function. In this change proposed by Hymes to Jacobson's model, his emphasis on the context or situation becomes clear.

Hymes developed on this theory, particularly with reference to folklore in his later essay, "Breakthrough into Performance" (1975). In it he focusses on performance as situated in a context and the emergent quality of performance. "The concern is with performance", he says, "not as something mechanical or inferior ... but with performance as something creative, realised, achieved even transcendent of the ordinary course of event".126 Every performance, according to him, has to have the following qualities: interpretable, reportable and repeatable. He explains how tradition exists for the sake of performance and is realised through performance. Hymes' contributions have been so central to performance theory, that Peter Claus and Frank Korom say, "Hymes' work was surely a 'breakthrough', and few performance centred folklorists are not familiar with his work".127
1.9.2. Richard Bauman

Richard Bauman, has been writing on several aspects of performance theory over the last few decades. He has not merely provided the applicational models through his studies, but has also provided a theoretical base to performance theory in his work, *Verbal Art as Performance*. His theoretical postulates, as projected in this book, are analysed here.

The idea of performance involves the artistic action as well as the artistic event. This points to a fundamental change in perspective from folklore as material to folklore as communication. Bauman prefers to use the term, 'verbal art' and 'spoken art' to folklore. He proposes that the ethnography of performance will study verbal art, "as a way of speaking".128

Earlier studies of verbal art, he says, are mostly text centred. Though attention is paid to other aspects like general linguistic norm, by far, the text (which many a time is only an informant's resume or abstract of performance) remains the focus of study. On the other hand, he defines the new approach thus. "A performance centred conception of verbal art calls for an approach through performance itself. In such an approach, the formal manipulation of linguistic features is secondary to the nature of performance per se, conceived of and defined as mode of communication".129

The performance can be seen as a special mode of communication and the performance itself provides the frame within which the messages being communicated are to be understood and interpreted. In any performance, the
performer assumes the responsibility for a display of communicative competence. On the other hand, the audience also assumes the right to regard the performance and performer with special intensity. Thus the theory of performance, changes the conception of folklore where it is no longer necessary to start with 'artful texts'. The performance itself becomes constitutive of the domain of verbal art. To make the notion of performance explicit, Bauman takes the examples of the types of speech among the people of Malagasy Republic, the Ilongot of Phillipines and the Japanese professional story tellers.

It is clear that all speech acts do not form part of performance. What constitutes a performance and what does not, is a culture-specific question and so the principal issue in performance studies is to decide what range of speech activity is conventionally expected by the members of the community, to constitute a performance. It is clear that 'performance' and 'nonperformance' are not clearly demarcated segments. The difference is one of degree—varying in intensity and range—from ordinary speech to speech that has aesthetic and ethical value and so constitutes a performance.

1.9.2.1. Frames - Keying of the Performance

Basing his remarks on Bateson's concept of metacommunication, Bauman says that each communication includes within it instructions on how the messages are to be interpreted. These can be termed frames and these are culture specific. They help in eliciting the attention of the audience and in arousing an expectancy in them. Bauman
says that such devices help in the keying of the performance. He gives a list of the following:

Special codes;
Figurative language;
Parallelism;
Special paralinguistic features;
Special formulae;
Appeal to tradition;
Disclaimer of performance.

It should be remembered that such a list is inconclusive and the primary task of the ethnographer of performance is to find, "the culture specific constellations of communicative means that serve to key performance in particular communities".\(^{131}\)

In performance, normally attention will be paid to those genres that are conventional and recognised as performances. But in case of genres where the probability of performance is lower or unexpected, the fact of performance is likely to be overlooked. Banuman gives the example of 'personal narrative' in American societies as one such instance. He also says how certain communities may conceive of speech activity in terms of acts rather than genres.

In viewing performance as situated behaviour, he stresses on 'event'. "We use the term event to designate a culturally defined bounded segment of the flow of behaviour and experience constituting a meaningful context for action".\(^{132}\) In certain events like cultural performances, performance becomes an integral attribute. There may be other events where performance is optional (like telling
jokes at a party) and still others where it is not considered relevant at all. Of these, cultural performances are the most highly formalised ones and are usually public and elaborate. But the concept of performance includes the, "spontaneous, unscheduled optional performance contexts of every day life". The real challenge for the ethnographer is to recognise and study them.

Performance is always controlled by the rules of a given community about speaking in general. As an example, Bauman takes up the question of the relationship of aesthetic and ethical values. Certain performances may be aesthetically very enjoyable though frowned upon ethically (talking nonsense for example). Moral systems often accommodate disreputability also. He says that the relationship between performance and disreputability is one that needs to be studied closely. [In India also, most performing artists have traditionally been thought of as disreputable-the *devadasi* (lit. God-slave, see ch. II,n.65) system is but one example of it.]

The question of competence required of a performer depends on the nature of the performance and the cultural systems in which the performance takes place. The other roles in society played by the performer and the way and extent to which his other roles are dominated/ influenced by his performance, need to be studied. But all the patterns of performance, genre, acts, events and roles are always interactive and interdependent and so cannot occur in isolation.

In performance, Bauman also includes what Hymes calls 'metaphrasis'. This refers not to performance itself, but to
the imitation of performance (which may not conventionally be permitted.) The ritual of marriage enacted in children's play may be taken as an example. This, Bauman says, is an aspect of performance that has rarely been studied.

1.9.2.2. Emergent quality of Performance

Central to Bauman's concept of performance, is what he calls its 'emergent quality'. Each performance is a unique event. One has to see this uniqueness in the background of the patterning of the entire domain of social interaction by the community. So the emergent quality is to be seen in the interplay of individual competence, communicative resources and the context. He considers Alfred Lord's Singer of Tales, as one of the first examples of a performance study in totality, because Lord demonstrates the emergent quality of the oral text—how it is composed in performance. Completely novel and completely fixed texts are two extreme poles within which most performances can be situated. On the other hand, the text, reduced to writing, attains, a fixity.

Along with text and event structure, another phenomenon that may also be said to emerge during performance is social structure. Here Bauman mentions some of the recent works in sociology, which stress on the emergence of social structure in social interaction itself. Performance, most often being a public event, leads to social interaction where the spectators willingly surrender their time and attention to the performance. The performer, being the focus of attention of the audience, gains prestige and control over them. Because of this control, the potential for transformation of social structure also becomes available to him. As Bauman says, the performers are feared, "because of the potential
they represent for subverting and transforming the status-quo". This may also explain why performers are mostly thought of as deviant and are tried to be marginalised by conventional social structure. "If change is conceived of in opposition to the conventionality of the community at large, then it is only appropriate that the agents of change may be placed away from the centre of that conventionality, on the margins of society". In these remarks we can see that Bauman extends the concept of performance to include all art and artists as agents of change.

In conclusion, Bauman says that the ethnography of performance can lead to a new folkloristics. By and large, anthropology and folklore have so far been concerned with what Raymond Williams calls 'residual culture'. In the present integrative nature of modern culture, residual culture gets more and more absorbed with dominant culture and as a result, folklore as a discipline is bound to die. Bauman states that folklore should, instead, begin studying 'emergent culture'. Raymond Williams describes this concept as, "new meanings and values, new practices, new significances and experiences continually being created". Bauman concludes that performance can thus become the cornerstone of a new folkloristics. We can perhaps see the new trend in folkloristics. Many of the present studies of contemporary folklore can be said to be studies of precisely such emergent cultures.
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