1. Each semiotic theory must include a reality theory (cf. Bense 1992, pp. 67 ss.) as each sign class needs a reality thematic. Reality thematics serve as testing instances for the model-theoretic correctness of the representation of objects in sign classes. Insofar, Gfesser (1990) is right if he speaks about the subject-(sign class) and the object-pole (reality thematic) of a “doubled representation”. While the mapping of reality thematics to sign classes in unambiguous, in monocontextural semiotics, it is Korzybski-ambiguous, in polcontextural semiotics.

2. In the following, I present the complete system of the 10 Peircean sign classes plus their dual reality thematics based on a semiotic 3-contextural matrix. Kaehr (2008) speaks of “complementary” rather than dual reality thematics.

\[
(3.1_3 2.1_1 1.1_{1,3}) \times (1.1_{1,3} 1.2_1 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.1_3 2.1_1 1.2_{1,3}) \times (2.1_1 1.2_1 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.1_3 2.1_1 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 1.2_1 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.1_3 2.2_{1,2} 1.2_{1,2}) \times (2.1_1 2.2_{1,2} 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.1_3 2.2_{1,2} 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 2.2_{1,2} 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.1_3 2.3_{2,3} 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 3.2_{2} 1.3_{3})
\]
\[
(3.2_2 2.2_{1,2} 1.2_{1}) \times (2.1_1 2.2_{1,2} 2.3_{2})
\]
\[
(3.2_2 2.2_{1,2} 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 2.2_{1,2} 2.3_{2})
\]
\[
(3.2_2 2.3_{2} 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 3.2_{2} 2.3_{2})
\]
\[
(3.3_{2,3} 2.3_{2} 1.3_{1,3}) \times (3.1_{1,3} 3.2_{3} 3.3_{1,2})
\]

However, reality testing cannot directly “interpret” the reality thematics in order to come to a decision if an object, event or process has been correctly represented by its dual or complementary sign class. What is needed is to determine the so-called structural or entitetical reality that is presented in the reality thematics:
In opposition to the structural realities presented in the reality thematics of monocontextural sign classes, in thematizing structures of the form \( XX \rightarrow Y \) or \( YY \leftarrow X \) (i.e. where 2 sub-signs belonging to the same fundamental category thematize one sub-sign out of a different one), these two sub-signs with the same triadic value lie in 2 different contextures.

If a genuine sub-sign (an identitive morphism) is part of a thematizing structure, then this genuine sub-sign lies in 3 different contextures, and we have thus thematizing structures that lie in 3 different contextures.

Like in monocontextural semiotics (cf. Bense 1992, p. 76), the reality thematic of the Peircean (monocontextural) sign class \( (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3) \) presents a triadic structural reality:

\[
\begin{align*}
    (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3) & \quad \text{I}<3>, \ O<2, \ 1>-\text{thematized } \text{M}<3> \\
    (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3) & \quad \text{I}<3>, \ \text{M}<3>-\text{thematized } O<2, \ 1> \\
    (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3) & \quad O<2, \ 1>, \ \text{M}<3>-\text{thematized } \text{I}<3> \\
\end{align*}
\]

and also like in its monocontextural corresponding structure, the thematized entities show the fundamental categories of the complete sign relation:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{M } <3> \\
    \text{O } <2, \ 1> \\
    \text{I } <3>,
\end{align*}
\]

although the relation between the sign thematic and its reality thematic is asymmetrical in contextuated version of \((3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3 \times 3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.3)\):
(3.1 2.2 1.3) × (3.1 2.2 1.3).

However, as Bense also pointed out (1992, p. 70), we have also to take into consideration for a semiotic reality theory the Class of the Genuine Categories, the main-diagonal of the semiotic 3×3 matrix. In 3-contextural systems, it looks as follows:

(3.3 2.2 1.1) × (1.1 3.2 3.3)

Also the Genuine Catorial Reality is triadic:

O<2, 1>, I<3, 2>-thematized M<3, 1>
M<3, 1>, I<3, 2>-thematized O<2, 1>
M<3, 1>, O<2, 1>-thematized I<3, 2>,

and also here the thematization structures show complete sign relation:

M <3, 1>
O <2, 1>
I <3, 2>.
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