Prof. Dr. Alfred Toth

Priority in thematized realities

1. In the system of the 10 sign classes their dual realities contain two types of thematizations, a dyadic and a triadic one:

1. (3.1 2.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.2 1.3) M-them. I, i.e. (1.2, 1.3)-them. (3.1)

2. (3.1 2.2 1.3) ×
- (3.1 2.2 1.3) I, O-them. M, i.e. (3.1, 2.2)-them. (1.3)
- (3.1 2.2 1.3) O, M-them. I, i.e. (2.2, 1.3)-them. (3.1)
- (3.1 2.2 1.3) I, M-thematized O, i.e. (3.1, 1.3)-thematized (2.2)

2. However, as the three types of thematizations presented in the reality thematics of the sign class (3.1 2.2 1.3) show, these two kinds of structural realities appear to be fragmentary from the point of view of their respective types of thematizations. If we abolish the Law of Inclusive Trichotomic order (cf. Toth 2008a), we get a system of 27 sign classes[1] and reality thematics that show the following types of thematizations:

(3.1 2.1 1.1) × (1.1 1.2 1.3) M-them. M
(3.2 2.2 1.2) × (2.1 2.2 2.3) O-them. O
(3.3 2.3 1.3) × (3.1 3.2 3.3) I-them. I

There seems to be only one type of homogenous thematization per triadic sign value, although from a purely structural viewpoint, it is not clear, if the correct structural realities are (a.b c.d e.f), (a.b c.d e.f) or (a.b c.d e.f) as f.ex. in (2.1 1.2 1.3), (3.1 3.2 2.3) and (3.1 2.2 1.3).

(3.1 2.2 1.2) × (2.1 2.2 1.3) O-them. M
*(3.2 2.2 1.1) × (1.1 2.2 2.3) O-them. M
*(3.2 2.1 1.2) × (2.1 1.2 2.3) O-them. M

In this and the next "trichotomic triads" we recognize now our three alternative structures (a.b c.d e.f), (a.b c.d e.f) and (a.b c.d e.f), which we shall call left-, right- and sandwich-thematizations (cf. Toth 2007, p. 179):

(3.1 2.3 1.3) × (3.1 3.2 1.3) I-them. M
*(3.3 2.3 1.1) × (1.1 3.2 3.3) I-them. M
*(3.3 2.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.2 3.3) I-them. M

1 The sign classes of the complementary set, which does not comprise the set of the 10 sign classes, are marked by asterisk.

(3.1 2.1 1.2) × (2.1 1.2 1.3) M-them. O
*(3.2 2.1 1.1) × (1.1 1.2 2.3) M-them. O
*(3.1 2.2 1.1) × (1.1 2.2 1.3) M-them. O

(3.2 2.3 1.3) × (3.1 3.2 2.3) I-them. O
*(3.3 2.3 1.2) × (2.1 3.2 3.3) I-them. O
*(3.3 2.2 1.3) × (3.1 2.2 3.3) I-them. O

(3.1 2.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.2 1.3) M-them. I
*(3.3 2.1 1.1) × (1.1 1.2 3.3) M-them. I
*(3.1 2.3 1.1) × (1.1 3.2 1.3) M-them. I

(3.2 2.2 1.3) × (3.1 2.2 2.3) O-them I
*(3.2 2.3 1.2) × (2.1 3.2 2.3) O-them I
*(3.3 2.2 1.2) × (2.1 2.2 3.3) O-them I

To our surprise, in the system of the 27 sign classes, we find no less than 6 triadic structural realities:

*(3.2 2.3 1.1) × (1.1 3.2 2.3) triadic
*(3.3 2.2 1.1) × (1.1 2.2 3.3) triadic
*(3.1 2.3 1.2) × (2.1 3.2 1.3) triadic
*(3.3 2.1 1.2) × (2.1 1.2 3.3) triadic
(3.1 2.2 1.3) × (3.1 2.2 1.3) triadic
*(3.2 2.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.2 2.3) triadic

3. However, the three types of structural realities shown above, seem to be fragmentary, too, since by aid of combinatorics we get the following 6 types of thematizations which we will show using the sign class (3.1 2.1 1.3):

(3.1 2.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.2 1.3)
(2.1 3.1 1.3) × (3.1 1.3 1.2)

(3.1 1.3 2.1) × (1.2 3.1 1.3)
(2.1 1.3 3.1 × (1.3 3.1 1.2)

(1.3 3.1 2.1) × (1.2 1.3 3.1)
(1.3 2.1 3.1) × (1.3 1.2 3.1)

By dualizing the reality thematics which present the respective structural realities, we thus do not get proper sign classes, but transpositions of sign classes which we have proven to be defined sign classes, too (cf. Toth 2008b). Conversely, by starting with sign classes in which the Law of Degenerative Triadic Order is abolished, i.e. in allowing all 5 transpositions per sign class, we get reality thematics, whose structural realities introduce a new notion into

semiotics, namely that of **semiotic priority** amongst which the following two basic types can be distinguished (still using our above example):

1. Priority of (1.2) before (1.3) or reverse
2. Priority of (1.2 1.3) / (1.3 1.2) before (3.1) or reverse

Therefore, type 1 shows priority between the thematizing sub-signs, while type 2 shows priority of between thematizing vs. thematized sub-signs.

Bibliography

Toth, Alfred, Zwischen den Kontexturen. Klagenfurt 2007
Toth, Alfred, Semiotische Strukturen und Prozesse. Klagenfurt 2008 (= 2008a)
Toth, Alfred, Semiotic symmetry and the question of identity. Ch. 1 (= 2008b)