Open Peer Review on Qeios

Semiotics

Muhammad Taqiyuddin¹

1 University of Darussalam Gontor

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

i found and conclude a semiotic categorised as follows:

- a. As a concept, Semiotics does not constitute a distinct discipline; instead, it functions as a philosophical framework. It serves as a tool for comprehending discourse and elucidating what falls under the domain of 'signs' and can aid in the understanding of signs.[1] Semiotics as a concept also situates itself as both the object and subject of study within the field.[2]
- b. In addition to its conceptual aspect, semiotics can be referred to as an instrument or perhaps as a form of 'instrumental science' (prerequisites). Consequently, similar to the position of 'logic' or 'grammar', which serve as instruments for evaluation, semiotics evaluates the aspects of symbols, signs, or icons, as well as their relationships, including the signifiers and signifieds. In these layers, semiotics operates as a multidisciplinary analytical tool within media studies.
 [3]
- c. As a 'sign' itself. This connection maintains ties to semiotics as a studied concept. In essence, semiotics, from the perspective of the philosophy of language, constitutes a 'sign' and a philosophical discourse in itself. Particularly, it focuses on the 'sign' as a human construct intended for specific human utilisation, or simply as an arbitrary sign. [4]From the perspective of communication philosophy, its meta-model analysis underscores that communication involves an 'exchange of signs'.[5]This aligns closely with meta-analysis, which involves scrutinising an analytical tool that triggers a process of 'imitation' and assimilation, thereby incorporating other socio-cultural elements into our cognition. Through the assimilation of these 'signs', an expectation arises for us to familiarise ourselves with the 'signs' from diverse cultures and eventually embrace them.[6] At a more foundational level, semiotics as a 'sign' itself, within the context of communication science, positions itself as a 'message'. This indicates that a 'sign' bears a message intertwined with socio-cultural aspects, including theological ones. In this category, the term semiotics can be traced interculturally, as the use of the word 'semeion' has been employed in the Greek era and still persists as a term to signify a 'sign'.
- d. As a discipline, in this capacity, semiotics functions as a 'measuring tool' in categorising abstract concepts and empirical entities into specific theoretical frameworks. It then strives to uncover the relationships and explanations between the sign, signifier, and signified. This process aims to reveal: i) how a sign is forged and shaped (sign making), and ii) how a sign is applied in practical terms.[7] Semiotics occupies this role, considering all signs as components of a cultural process that aligns with the communication process.[8]

[1] Umberto Eco, Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language, vol. 398 (Indiana University Press, 1986), 10.

[2] Umberto Eco, A Theory of Semiotics, vol. 217 (Indiana University Press, 1979), 7.

[3] Marcel Danesi, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics, Media, and Communications* (University of Toronto Press, 2000), vii–viii.

[4] John Fiske, Reading Television (Routledge, 2004), 24.

[5] Adrian Pablé, "Communication Theory and Integrational Semiology: The Constitutive Metamodel Revisited," *Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication*8, no. 1 (2017): 55–67.

[6] Dimitrios Meletis, "Is Your Font Racist?' Metapragmatic Online Discourses on the Use of Typographic Mimicry and Its Appropriateness," *Social Semiotics*, 2021, 1–23.

[7] Leo van Lier, The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective (Springer, 2004), 55.

[8] Eco, A Theory of Semiotics, 1979, 217:9.