



Western-Iranian Semiotics: Rational Abstract Logic vs. Sensory Evolutionary Logic

Mohammad Hatefi¹

Received: 6/10/2023

Accepted: 3/4/2024

Abstract

The main question of the article is what semiotic model can be sought in the context of these philosophical theories, what is the evolutionary relationship of these models with each other and what is the relationship between the Iranian semiotic model and the West. The findings show in the Iranian philosophical tradition, in the heritage of Farabi and Avicenna, an epistemic system which has roots in Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thinking based on rational presupposition of priori categories. To them, the beginning of the sign is where the active intellect adapts the forms of a prior art imaginable to material matters. As a result, Farabi and Avicenna represent a semiotic system in a modern sense. But Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra introduce an evolutionary epistemic system, indicating the beginning of the abstract movement of the thinkers. This theory is similar to the ideas of the Renaissance in Europe and adapts to the modernist theories of semiotics. According Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra, there are no selfsame signs. In their semiotics, except by the mind, the sign cannot reach the field of creativity and semantic interpretation. For them, the sign flows through the steady evolution of sensory differentiation into abstract and collective space. We show in his paper the usefulness of

¹ - Assistant Professor at Department of Civilization, Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies, Tehran, Iran mo.hatefi@yahoo.com



Copyright© 2024, the Authors | Publishing Rights, ASPI. This open-access article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- NonCommercial 4.0 International License which permits Share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and Adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) under the Attribution-NonCommercial terms

this implicit semiotics as a method for textual analyzing by analyzing a visual-verbal literary text.

Keywords: *Western-Iranian Semiotics, Rational Abstract Logic, Philosophical tradition and semiotics The Iranian philosophical tradition of Farabi , Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra.*

Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

Every intellectual system for analyzing the existence and phenomena is, in a general sense, a semiotic system. The present research, shows that not only in the Western scientific tradition but also in the Iranian tradition, we can extract a rich implicit history of semiotics along with this tradition. The findings show in the Iranian philosophical tradition, in the heritage of Farabi and Avicenna, an epistemic system which has roots in Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thinking based on rational presupposition of priori categories. To them, the beginning of the sign is where the active intellect adapts the forms of a prior art imaginable to material matters. As a result, Farabi and Avicenna represent a semiotic system in a modern sense. But Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra introduce an evolutionary epistemic system, indicating the beginning of the abstract movement of the thinkers. This theory is similar to the ideas of the Renaissance in Europe and adapts to the modernist theories of semiotics. According Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra, there are no selfsame signs. In their semiotics, except by the mind, the sign cannot reach the field of creativity and semantic interpretation. For them, the sign flows through the steady evolution of sensory differentiation into abstract and collective space. I show in his paper the usefulness of this local philosophy as a semiotic package and a epistemology which is ready to be translated to a method for textual analysis

2. Literature Review

It cannot be associated with the new history of semiotics, which discusses the beginning of semiotics from modern theories, especially from Saussure and Peirce, but in order to write the history of semiotics, the entire history of philosophy from Plato onwards and other philosophical fields and scientific branches should be included. In this regard, especially the history of logic and linguistics is very important

(Echo, 1984). In the West, three historical periods of semiotics can be distinguished from each other: the ancient period (Greek and Roman period until the time of Augustine), the middle period (from Augustine to Dante) and the Renaissance era. The origins of the brilliant roots of logic, poetics, rhetoric, and hermeneutics should be found in these periods, and the emergence of semantics and early theories about the nature of sign and meaning in the modern period should be traced (Nöth, 1995). In the same way, the history of Iranian philosophy can also be considered as a field for the history and background of semiotics, and the present article tries in this direction..

3. Methodology

The research method in this article is citation-analytical.

4. Results

The findings show in the Iranian philosophical tradition, in the heritage of Farabi and Avicenna, an epistemic system which has roots in Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thinking based on rational presupposition of priori categories. To them, the beginning of the sign is where the active intellect adapts the forms of a prior art imaginable to material matters. As a result, Farabi and Avicenna represent a semiotic system in a modern sense. But Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra introduce an evolutionary epistemic system, indicating the beginning of the abstract movement of the thinkers. This theory is similar to the ideas of the Renaissance in Europe and adapts to the modernist theories of semiotics. According Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra, there are no selfsame signs. In their semiotics, except by the mind, the sign cannot reach the field of creativity and semantic interpretation. For them, the sign flows through the steady evolution of sensory differentiation into abstract and collective space. We show in his paper the usefulness of this implicit semiotics as a method for textual analyzing by analyzing a visual-verbal literary text.

References

- Andersen, T. H., Boeriis, M., Maagero, M., and E. S. Tonnesses, E. S. 2015. *Social Semiotics: Key Figures, New Directions*, London and New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Aristotle, 1990, *on the soul*, trans. A. M., Tehran: Hekmat. [In Persian].
- Bochenski, Joseph M. 1961. *A History of formal logic*, Trans. Ivo Thomas & Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bochenski, Joseph M. 1968. *Ancient Formal Logic*, Amsterdam: North Holland.

- Bouissac, P., 1976. The "golden legend" of semiotics, *Semiotica*, 17, 371-84.
- Bronwen, M. & Felizitas, R., 2006. *Key terms in semiotics*, London: Continuum.
- Burkhardt, H., 1980. *Logik und Semiotik in der Philosophie von Leibniz*, München : Philosophia.
- Coseriu, E., 1975. *Die Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols., Tübingen: TBL.
- Dascal, M., 1978. *La Semiologie de Leibniz*, Paris.
- Dascal, M., 1987. *Leibniz: Language, Signs, and Thought*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Deely, J. N. et al. (eds.), 1986. *Frontiers in Semiotics*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Deely, J. N., 1982. *Introducing Semiotic: Its History and Doctrine*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Deely, J. N., 1986. Semiotic as framework and direction, In Deely, J., et al. (eds.), *Frontiers in Semiotics*, 264-271.
- Ducrot, O. & Todorov, T., 1981 (1972). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eco, U. et al. 1986. Latratus canis (The dog's barking), In Deely, J., et al. (eds.), *Frontiers in Semiotics*, 63-73.
- Eco, U., 1984. Proposals for a history of semiotics; In: Borbé, Tasso (ed.); *Semiotics Unfolding*, 75-89.
- Farabi, A. M., 1986. The Letters (Al-Horouf), Beirut: Darolmashregh. [In Arabic].
- Gabler, D., 1987. *Die semantischen und syntaktischen Funktionen im Tractatus "De modis significandi"*, Bern: Lang. Haller, 19-59.
- Hollingworth, M., 2013. *Saint Augustine of Hippo: An Intellectual Biography*, London, New Delhi, New York and Sydney: Bloomsbury Pub.
- Joly, A., 1986. Descartes; In Sebeok, T. A. (ed.), *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, 183-185.
- Kretzmann, N. 1967. History of semantics; In: Edwards, Paul (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, New York: Macmillan, vols. 78, 358-406.
- Kretzmann, N. 1974. Aristotle on spoken sound significant by convention; In: Corcoran, J. (ed.), *Ancient Logic*, Dordrecht: Reidel, 3-21.
- Kretzmann, N. et al. (eds.), 1982. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Leeuwen, T., 2005. *Introducing Social Semiotics*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Leibnitze, G. V., 1996. Monadology, trans. Y. Mahdavi, Tehran: Kharazmi. [In Persian].
- Martin K., Oehler, k., Posner, R., Thomas A. Sebeok, T. A., Uexküll, T. (eds.), 2013 (1987). *Classics of Semiotics*, New York, NY: Plenum Press, 129-145.
- Mauro, T., 1975. The link with linguistics. In Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *The TellTale Sign*, Lisse: de Ridder, 37-46.

- Mobasheri, M., 2008. *Space and time in Kant's philosophy; a critical view*. Tehran: Research Center of Islamic Culture and Thought. [In Persian].
- Mohaqeq Damad, S.M. 1991-1992. The theory of reason, Articles and Reviews, *Quarterly of Theology* (special issue: Islamic philosophy and theology), University of Tehran, Faculty of Theology, Winter & Spring, 51, 147-160. [In Persian].
- Morris, C. W., 1946. Signs, Language, and Behavior, In Morris, C. W., *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*, The Hague: Mouton, 733-798.
- Nöth, W., 1995. *Handbook of Semiotics*; USA: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Peirce, Ch. S. P., 1976. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1974
- Plato, 1994. *Complete Works*, 2 vols., trans. M. H. Lotfi & R. Kaviani, Tehran: Kharazmi. [In Persian].
- Poser, H. 1979. Signum, notio und idea, *Zeitschrift für Semiotik*; 1, 1979; 299-303.
- Rey, A. 1973. *Théories du signe et du sens*. 2 vols, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Robins, R. H., 1971. *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, Port Washington: Kennikat.
- Sasani, F., 2012. Semiotics of place (Collection of papers of 7th symposium of semiotics), under the supervision of B. N. Motlaq, Tehran: Sokhan. [In Persian].
- Saussure, F., (2009). in F. Sojoodi (ed.), An introduction to structuralism in linguistics, *Structuralism, post-structuralism and literary criticism*. Tehran: Soore Mehr, 48-9. [In Persian].
- Schmitter, P., 1983. Plädoyer gegen die Geschichte der Semiotik, In Eschbach, A. & Trabant, J. (eds.), *History of Semiotics*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 3-23.
- Sebeok, T. A., 1976. *Contributions to the Doctrine of Signs*, Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Sebeok, T. A., 1979. *The Sign and Its Masters*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Shayghan, D., 1994. Henry Carbon. Horizons of spiritual thinking in Islam, Trans B. Parham, Tehran: Farzan. [In Persian].
- Shirazi, Sadr al-Din M. (1383). *Al-Hikmah al-Motaaliya fi al-Asfar al-Aqliyya al-Arbaeh*, vol. 3, ed. M. Mohammadi, Under the supervision of S. M. Khamenei, Tehran, Sadra Pub. [In Arabic].
- Shirazi, Sadr al-Din M. (1383). *Al-Hikmah al-Motaaliya fi al-Asfar al-Aqliyya al-Arbaeh*, vol. 6, ed. M. Mohammadi, Under the supervision of S. M. Khamenei, Tehran, Sadra Pub. [In Arabic].
- Shirazi, Sadr al-Din M. (2004) *Al-Hikmah al-Motaaliya fi al-Asfar al-Aqliyya al-Arbaeh*, vol. 8, ed. A. A. Rashad. Under the supervision of S. M. Khamenei, Tehran, Sadra Pub. [In Arabic]
- Simone, R., 1972. Sémiologie augustinienne, *Semiotica*, 6; 1-31.

Sojoodi, F., 1385. Semiotics of time and the passage of time; a comparative study of verbal and visual works, Journal of the Academy of Arts, 1, 46-64. [In Persian].

Suhrawardi, Shikh Shahab al- din (1996). Majmoe Mosanafat. Ed. S. H. Nasr, Tehran: Cultural Studies and Humanities Institute. [In Arabic]

Todorov, T., 1977. *Theories of the Symbol*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.