



THOUGHT, LANGUAGE AND SPEECH: SOME FUNDAMENTAL TOPICS OF SEMIOTICS

C.S.Biju Ph.D, Associate Professor in English.
St.Thomas' College (Autonomous), Thrissur, Kerala, India.

Abstract:

The article attempts to explore the linguistic base of psychoanalysis by inquiring twentieth century approaches to language, especially Noam Chomsky's interventions in linguistics. The philosophical ground on which modern linguistics devised a system which was explicitly used by psychoanalytic approaches, the fundamental principles of Freudian psychoanalysis and the findings of modern linguistics are also detailed in this paper.

Key words: Metaphor, Metonymy, Sign, Signifying chain, phonic image and visual Image.

The system of signifiers produced by the structure in the profound angle should be separated from the formal grammatical structure itself, and this is found in the polemic among perception and perceived. According to many linguists, this results from a fundamental arrangement of rules based on syntactical structures. All in all, the theoretical level of the network of insights instead of the actual things and the rational structures requires a theoretically formulated construction of generality. In the profound design of language in Chomskian linguistics, where in apperception can be outlined. This requires the development from the specific to the general in thought, and conversely, the surface part of apperception, the impression of actual relations, must be perceived inside the theoretical structure of specific viewpoint. At the end of the day, an unadulterated and exotic impression of actual relations is inconceivable. The unmediated view of phenomenology and a reasonable construction in every case currently evident is the comprehensible structure which comes goes before the tangible structure.

Noam Chomsky gave to act as an illustration of such ambiguity in many expressions. Here every signifier in the signs compares to a specific set of signifiers but because of the place of every signifier in the structure of the expression, there are numerous potential outcomes of multitudes of networks of signifiers. The thing can be either the subject or the object of the expression because of its demonstrative impact. Such tendency in language fills in as a groundbreaking effect, in the light of the fact that in perusing the expression the perceiver becomes conscious of the hidden algorithm, conceptual framework which requires the view of the expression, at the end of the day, crafted by the unconscious. Hence subject becomes aware of itself in language, and hesitant about its own interaction in absence. Such equivocalness delivers the expression practically unimportant, and shows the impediments of language as portrayal corresponding to both unconscious and the self in absence.

The conceivable disjunction between the signifier and the signified was insisted by Saussure himself in the similarity of language to layers of planes or waves: "Against the drifting domain of thought, would sounds without help from anyone else yield pre-defined elements? No more so than thoughts. Phonic substance is neither more fixed nor more rigid than thought; it's anything but a form into which considered must need fit yet a plastic substance isolated thus into particular parts to outfit the signifiers required by thought" (p. 112). Subsequently the "semantic reality can accordingly be envisioned in its entirety for example language-as a progression of adjoining developments separated on both the endless plane of confused thoughts and the similarly obscure plane of sounds." Language doesn't "make a material phonic method for communicating thoughts," as the relationship of the piece of paper would recommend, however it rather serves "as a connection among suspected and sound, under conditions that of need achieve the complementary delimitations of units." all in all, language makes the disjunction among signifier and connoted in primary linguistics, yet associates the idea and the insight, the understandable and reasonable.

However, for Saussure, the phonic substance of language in the obscure plane of sounds is unchangeably separated from the endless plane of muddled thoughts in thought, the intelligible, which should be seen not as an grid of signified, but rather as a network of signifiers themselves, which, "turbulent essentially... indistinguishable and confounded," as uncovered in dreams, are requested during the time spent language, in the communication with the grid of signifiers in discourse, composing, and synthesis, hence, "language works out its units while coming to fruition between two ill defined masses," between which there is an unbridgeable hole. In the requesting of language, the development of the sign, the "thought-sound" in the blending of the implied and signifier, or the inclusion of one phonetic signifier into an grid of theoretical signifiers, is totally self-assertive as per its own systems, as indicated by

Saussure. "Not exclusively are the two spaces that are connected by the etymological reality undefined and confounded, however the decision of a given cut of sound to name a given thought [network of dynamic signifiers] is totally self-assertive" (113). The main determinate element in the matching of the phonetic signifier with the thought or idea is a socially resolved punctuation, which may be portrayed as Chomsky's "arrangement of decides that describe profound and surface designs and the groundbreaking connection between them." Consequently for Saussure, "the social reality alone can make an etymological framework." This would be a reason for the Lacanian Other.

Language can't along these lines rely upon an immediate connection between a signifier and connoted, between a word or structure and a thought, to produce meaning. In Saussure's similarity, an grid of signifiers collaborates on a phonetic level, while simultaneously an grid of signifieds communicates on a theoretical level, and it is at the marks of convergence between these two networks that language is created. Since the collaborations between the signifiers on the phonetic, actual level are free of any appended conceptual signifiers, the connections must be described as "contrasts" in resistance, and that, however "contrasts without positive terms" (p. 120). Not exclusively is language at the phonetic level, that is, discourse, surface construction or logos as such, described as a play of contrasts without intervening terms, however the theoretical degree of language, the profound design, is likewise portrayed as a play of contrasts without positive terms. "A semantic framework is a progression of contrasts of sound joined with a progression of contrasts of thoughts... "as per Saussure. This reaffirms the need that the connoted be viewed as a grid of theoretical signifiers. The development between the series of contrasts of sound and thoughts is characterized by Saussure as "moving," and it is this moving which decides the creation of importance in language. "Despite what the powers of progress are, regardless of whether in segregation or in blend, they generally bring about a change in the connection between the connoted," or grid of signifiers, "and the signifier.... Language is drastically feeble to safeguard itself against the powers which starting with one current then onto the next are moving the connection between the signified and the signifier. This is one of the outcomes of the subjective idea of the sign" (74-75).

Jacques Derrida alluded to this "methodical creation of contrasts" presented by Saussure as *différance*, which depends on the relationship of the grid of signifiers, and the grid of signifieds, which is the etymological framework language without discourse. As per Saussure, the "semantic framework (*la langue*) is essential for discourse occasions (*parole*) to be understandable and produce their results, however the last option are important for the framework to set up a good foundation for itself." Due to this self-referential reliance of *la langue* and *parole*, language is viewed as the development of an arrangement of contrasts, *différance*.

Derrida's neologism alludes to both the demonstration of varying and the demonstration of conceding, as the development of contrasts is viewed as conceding a potential connection between a signifier and what may be a signified. *Différance* is connected with the term *espacement*, or

"dividing," and can likewise be connected with the Saussurean expression "moving." In *Places*, Derrida portrayed *différance* as "a design and a development that can't be considered on the resistance presence/nonappearance [signifier/signified]. *Différance* is the efficient play of contrasts, of hints of contrasts, of the dividing by which components connect with each other." The dispersing is hence the "creation, at the same time dynamic and inactive... of spans without which the 'full' terms couldn't connote, couldn't work." *Différance* is the instrument of the development of contrasts in meaning without even a trace of an immediate connection among signifier and signified, in the phonetic design presented by Saussure.

Further, as per Derrida's point of view, "the play of contrasts [*différance*] includes amalgamations and references that keep there from being all of a sudden or in any capacity a straightforward component that is available all by itself and alludes just to itself. Regardless of whether in composed or in spoken talk, no component can work as a sign [signifier] without connecting with another component which itself isn't just present" (26). In language, no word or image can work as a sign without connecting to another signifier. This connection implies that every 'component'-phoneme or grapheme-is established concerning the different components of the arrangement or framework. This linkage, this weaving, is the text, which is delivered distinctly through the change of another text. Nothing, either in the components or in the framework, is anywhere essentially present or missing. There are just, all over, contrasts and hints of follows, as in the hints of mnemonic deposits of Freud.

In the prospect of Lacan, the missing signifier is the way to understand both the metaphor and metonymy, the main instruments of signification in *différance*. This can be connected to the bar of implication of Lacan, as the *chôra* of *différance* in signification, the place where the system of separation is as of now not reducible, and which establishes an uprooting of the job of the *chôra* in old style reasoning in current semantics. The difficulty of there "being without warning or in any capacity a straightforward component that is available all by itself" is available in Zeno's mystery. In the trip of a bolt, the bolt is consistently in a specific area at any given moment, and in this way should never be moving. The bolt must be moving assuming every specific moment is found comparable to going before and succeeding moments, and contains the hints of those moments, as a signifier in language would contain the hints of all former and succeeding signifiers in a sentence.

Derrida recognized the keeping up with by Saussure of a founded connection between the signifier and the "implied" a type of "logocentrism," a sort of metaphysics in the qualification between the reasonable and the coherent, between the phonetic peculiarity in discourse and the thought or idea. In mysticism the signifier is subjected to the connoted and it is the ticket or idea which is essential. The magical is situated in the "supernatural signified," the chance of the thought or idea which surpasses language, as in nous, and the chance of an astuteness which surpasses reason and rationale. In *Places*, "support of the thorough [on the piece of Saussure] differentiation a fundamental and juridical qualification between the signans and the signatum

and the condition among signatum and the idea leaves open on a basic level the chance of thinking about a connoted idea in itself, an idea basically present to thought, free from the etymological framework, in other words from an arrangement of signifiers" (19).

Saussure clarified that any chance of a "supernatural signified" must be found in the theoretical idea itself, the coherent, as portrayal, as "in language, one would neither separation be able to sound from thought nor thought from sound; the division could be refined just uniquely, and the outcome would be either unadulterated brain research or unadulterated phonology." Such is the main standard of transcendentalism, that the signifier can't be free of the signified by which it is established. Derrida proceeded, "in leaving this chance open, and it is so left by the actual guideline of the resistance among signifier and connoted and along these lines of the sign, Saussure went against the basic securing of which we have spoken," and thusly he "agrees to the customary interest for what I have proposed to call a 'supernatural implied,' which in itself or in its quintessence would not allude to any signifier, which would rise above the chain of signs and at a specific second would no longer itself work as a signifier." Yet there is no supernatural signified in power that isn't associated with a signifier.

This differentiation emerges inside the follow, inside *différance*, rather than as a deduced condition, and the metaphysic is saved all things considered. It will be passed on to Jacques Lacan to challenge this relationship, the need of the signified. In the moving of Saussure, the double play of separation between the theoretical and the physical, it is at those places of the collaboration between like signifiers, and in their blend, where a "positive truth" or "worth" is created in language. Assuming the theoretical signifier is viewed as a mimetic structure in thought, and accordingly a trickery or a deception in the Non-romantic sense, then, at that point, it would be hard to acknowledge that worth could be delivered in language along these lines, essentially for the reasons for creative articulation or synthesis, idyllic articulation in jungle language.

An illustration of the changes of Saussure's approach can be found in an analysis of the two expressions "I learn it" and "I take it", which have a similar sounds in speech, which was focused on by Saussure over composition, however an alternate meaning. The meaning relies upon the setting in which the expression happens, which can give an explanation; hence the worth of the sign in implication relies upon its relationship to different signs. Saussure elaborates that all linguistic terms derives its value from their opposition to other terms in his *A Course in General*

Linguistics(88). The set up set of rules in language administers its activities which happen between the grid of signifiers in discourse and composing and the grid of signifiers in thought which comprise the connoted. While the "cut" or resistance among sound and believed is significant in language, the identification between sound and thought in language is similarly significant, which delimits the chance of the supernatural implied in this oppositional linguistics. Both the cut and the distinguishing proof are essential to relate sound to thought, and the moving or play of contrasts which produces meaning happens on all levels, in the grid of phonetic signifiers, the grid of unique signifiers, and in the cooperation between the two, which is both identification based and antithetical, in consistent opposition.

Select Bibliography

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak Johns Hopkins University Press, London 1976

Dolar, Mladen, *A Voice and Nothing More* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 2006.

Evans, Dylan, 1996, *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, New York: Routledge.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits, A Selection*, trans. Alan Sheridan New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1977.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966

Žižek, Slavoj. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan Through Popular Culture* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 1991.