

## **MESSAGES AND SIGNALS**

**Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU**

Professor, PhD, CCSCMOP, University of Craiova, Romania

### **Abstract**

This study analyzes the main four books of J. L. Prieto in order to delimit what materials he considers to be critical, decisive in the construction of the message. The method used is comparative-meta-analytical. It turns out that J. L. Prieto counts on the signal as the main type of semio-semantic material that is used when building messages.

**Keywords:** message, code, sign, signal

### **1. Introduction**

Luis J. Prieto is the most important linguist who, through the theoretical choice of the message, enters the signal order. “Messages and signals” is his reference book. In his view, semiology is “science of signals” (L. J. Prieto, 1972, p. 6). Signals are designed as tools for transmitting messages, an operation described by Prieto in terms that remind Eric Buysens. Like this, Prieto emphasizes the social function and fundamental relationships of the communication act (called by Eric Buysens, modalities, Buysens, 1969). Transmitting a message means setting up one of those social relationships we call “information”, “interrogation” or “order”. The transmitter of a signal, ie the

one who produces it, thus triggering what is called a “semic act”, does so to inform the receiver of something, to ask him something or finally to order something: “Information, interrogation or order is the message the transmitter is trying to transmit with the signal” (LJ Prieto, 1972, p.9). In his act, the transmitter produces indices by which he deliberately appreciates Prieto, providing the receiver with indications of the interpersonal relationship. By knocking at a door, hailing at an intersection, wearing the Red Cross band, marking a meeting on the agenda, we produce semicrams. In order to achieve the Semic act, that is, to transmit the message (which is the purpose of triggering the Semic act) “it is necessary - and sufficient - on the one hand, that the receiver realizes the intention of the transmitter to send a certain message, the other part, to identify what this message is. “(Prieto, 1972, p. 10) Thus, on the one hand, the intentionality of” a certain message “, on the other hand, the knowledge of the code, which makes it possible to precisely select the intention of the transmitter from the set of information, questions or orders that can be imagined. The way in which the signal performs this mission (the function of the message or the signal mechanism) is one of the fundamental issues that semiology is called to study. The analogies presented by the various codes in terms of operating mechanisms make it possible to study them in this context. The essential differences between codes (languages) will therefore not be at the level of the functioning mechanism, because “all codes are sealed, since they are everywhere entities composed of a signal class and a class of messages that correspond in such a way that when the signal belongs to a certain class of signals, the message is always a member of the corresponding message class” (Prieto, 1972, p. 153).

## **2. Several semiologies**

Like other specialists, Prieto appreciates that the phenomenon of communication must be studied in semiology. Depending on the field, there are, according to Prieto, three semiologies.

a) Semiology of communication is considered an extension of linguistics, in the area of manifestation of “languages” in the sense that they are identical to “discourse about something”, whatever its substance of manifestation; linguistic, in a narrow sense, would be subordinated or embedded in this semiology of communication. “The notion of communication, according to Prieto, must be defined ... as establishing a social relationship between two persons due to an index (sn) produced by one of them, and by means of which it provides the other person with an indication (s) regarding this report social “(Prieto, 1975a, p. 126). Under these circumstances, communication becomes significant. The social report is an information, an injunction or a question and is the “message”, and the index that the transmitter produces and through which the message is transmitted is the “signal”. Semiology of communication would deal with signs that have signal properties, that is, intentional indices, which, for example, distinguished Buysens (1969) from natural or spontaneous ones. Intentiveness involves the convention, and this, communication, that is, a social report (Ali, 2018; Vaníčková, 2019; Vasylenko, 2019). Semiology of the communication must determine how these signals work, linguistic or other, as well as the referent to whom they give the indication they give (Prieto, 1975a, pp. 127-128). The distinction between intentional indices (fauna: rainy) and natural indices (rain noise) leads to the definition of meaning (Rosca & Teposu, 2018; O'Regan, 2019; Arhip & Arhip, 2018): a natural index is one whose relationship with what is indicated, as well as its ability to be an index, exists by nature of things, while intentional indices acquire this capacity in a particular society that establishes the link between the index and the indicated work; in this case, conventional indexes are spoken. The meaning can therefore be defined as “the relationship that exists between an index and the indicated work when this relationship is not natural but established by a social group” (Prieto, 1975a, p. 129), and the semiology whose object is the meaning will be called “Semiology of Significance”.

b) The Semiology of Significance will deal both with the facts studied by the Semiology of Communication, ie signals and conventional signs that are not signals and which the Semiology of Communication does not study. Here comes all that Prieto proposes to call a “ceremony”: human behavior in general that becomes significant given that we live in society. The various manifestations of behaviour (Ghenea; Vasylenko, 2019; Bârgăoanu & Durach, 2019) can be studied using the methods developed for the study of linguistic significance or, more preferably, the methods of communication semiology.

c) Semiology of artistic communication that would be an area between the two previous semiologies. Its existence is only suggested as a hypothesis, because: “as the name of this branch postulates, the artistic phenomenon is probably a communicative phenomenon (sn) that would keep, if so, directly the semiology of communication, the communication resulting from a part of deliberate choice of ceremonies, that is to say, what constitutes, as I have said, the subject of Semiology of Significance “(Prieto, 1975a, pp. 115-116).

In Prieto's conception there is identity between sign and sign, between sign and sign, and, in the particular case of natural languages, between sign, sign and statement: Significant and appropriately signified is a sem. Semes, in codes called “languages”, receive the special name of “statements.” A code is a system of messages, messages. The “sign-function” therefore acquires at least an index value to which the social framework serves as a revelator: for this “sign-function”, Prieto proposes the name “ceremony”. “The manner in which the transmitter proceeds to denote the message, to the extent that this mode is the result of an election” is the style of communication (Prieto, 1975a, p. 102). It would be, on the one hand, the world of clues - “the immediately perceptible facts, says Prieto, that make us understand something about something else that is not” - and the world of signals on the other - that of “artificial clues” says Prieto, that is, the facts “which provide an indication and which have been expressly produced for it”. (E. Buyssens (1969) said that for a perceptible fact to

be a signal, first of all, it must be produced to serve as a clue). Prieto argues that, to be sure there is communication, “it is necessary - and sufficient - if the receiver makes the proposal that the transmitter makes to send a determined message”, “the receiver will achieve the purpose of the transmitter to convey a determined message.” “How, he continues, is the signal arranged to allow the receiver to realize that the transmitter is trying to send a message? The answer is very simple: the signal of the fact itself produced indicates to the receiver what the transmitter proposes. Any language is, above all, a means of communication (Nistor, 2018; Björk, Danielsson & Basic, 2019; Middleton, 2019); only this function allows understanding the structure of a language” (Prieto, 1975b, p. 10), which leads to the possibility of claiming that at the basis of any knowledge there is a structure analogous to a language, and that any knowledge is involved in a practice. This practice in the case of language is communication (Prieto, 1975b, p. 10 and p. 151).

Natural human languages (Dixon, 2017; Mohamad, Ibrahim & Khaidzir, 2018; Basic, Delić & Sofradzija, 2019) are the only codes where there would be messages built in such a way “where it would be possible to adapt the circumstances to the amount of significant clues provided by the signal,” or in other words, to adapt the message economically to the situation in which takes part (Prieto, 1972, p. 168).

### **3. Conclusion**

J. L. Prieto finds out two of the ten nuclear materials of the message: Sign and Signal. In order to build messages, a communicator has at its disposal ten materials: hint, index, indicator, sign, word, signal, symptom, story image, symbol. It can be said that J. L. Prieto imposed the signal as an important material of the message.

## REFERENCES

Ali, H. M. (2018). Schema Activation Management in Translation: Challenges and Risks. *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, 2(1).

Arhip, O., & Arhip, C. (2018). Meta-referential aspects of modern communication of shakespeare's artistic message. Arhipelag XXI Press.

Bârgăoanu, A., & Durach, F. (2019). Echo Chambers and Polarization of Opinion: When Multiple Voices Create Multiple Realities. *Challenges in Strategic Communication and Fighting Propaganda in Eastern Europe: Solutions for a Future Common Project*, 142, 120.

Basic, G., Delić, Z., & Sofradzija, H. (2019). Ideology of Neo-fascism, Education, and Culture of Peace. The Empirical Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In *Critical Education* (Vol. 10, No. 6, pp. 1-20).

Björk, K., Danielsson, E., & Basic, G. (2019). Collaboration and identity work: A linguistic discourse analysis of immigrant students' presentations concerning different teachers' roles in a school context. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 1-22.

Buysens, E. (1969). *Vérité et langue*. Éditions de l'Institut de sociologie (de l') Université libre de Bruxelles.

Danielsson, C. B. (2019). The School of Architecture, The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden. *Context: The Effects of Environment on Product Design and Evaluation*, 431.

Dixon, I. (2017). 'Legitimate thinking': using metaphors and fuzzy concepts to radicalise the audience. *Creativity imagination in social sciences. Actele Conferinței Internaționale de Științe Umaniste și Sociale „Creativitate. Imaginar. Limbaj*.

Ghenea, Ș. V. Social representations in the educational field. *Cognitive variables in didactic communication. Creative imagination in social sciences*, 150.

Middleton, C. R. (2019). *Successful Strategies for Retaining Profitability in an Education-Sector IT Project*.

Mohamad, N. A., Ibrahim, R., & Khaidzir, K. A. M. (2018). *Knowledge Transformation Model in Architecture Critique Session using Cloud Feature*.

Nistor, P. (2018). Social Services Offered by Faith-Based Organizations in the Post-Secular Society. *Logos, Universality, Mentality, Education, Novelty. Section Social Sciences*, 7(2), 55-71.

O'Regan, T. J. (2019). An account of silence in diagnostic radiography: a cultural quilt. [usir.salford.ac.uk](http://usir.salford.ac.uk)

Prieto, L.-J. (1964). *Principes de noologie*. La Haye.

Prieto, L.-J. (1972). *Messages et signaux*. 2-e éd., Paris: PUF.

Prieto, L.-J. (1975). *Études de linguistique et de sémiologie générale*. Genève: Droz.

Prieto, L.-J. (1975). *Pertinence et pratique*. Paris: Minuit.

Roșca, V. I., & Țeposu, O. L. (2018). The Influence of Education on Subjective Underemployment: Research on Multinational Corporations in Romania. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 19(4), 328-340.

Vaničková, R. (2019). Changes in Lifestyle of Population and Solutions in Logistics of Bakery Products: Practice in the Czech Republic. In *Economics, Management and Technology in Enterprises 2019 (EMT 2019)*. Atlantis Press.

Vasylenko, V. (2019). Peculiarities of using socio-communication technologies in the process of developing positive image of a higher education institution. *Науковий журнал «Бібліотекознавство. Документознавство. Інформологія»*, (1), 32-40.