

Semiotics of Meaning from the Linguistic System to the Visual System

Dr. Nourelhouda Bekai¹, Dr. Sheikh ShathanChatane Cheikh², Fatma Bedirina³

¹Zian Ashour University Djelfa, College of Arts Languages and Arts (Algeria).

²Zian Ashour University Djelfa, College of Arts Languages and Arts (Algeria).

³Ammar Theliji University Laghouat, College of Arts Languages and Arts (Algeria).

The Author's Email: houdhoude19@gmail.com¹, chatcheikh@gmail.com², bedirinafatma@gmail.com³

Received: 02/2023

Published: 09/2023

Summary:

Today, the semantic field is witnessing visual discourse competing with linguistic discourse in terms of the power of influence and conveying the message, which requires visual awareness in the image culture and a share of sensory and mental perception, all with an understanding of its format because it is an essential and important element in the cognitive, cultural, commercial and economic fields. We live in an ocean of realistic images. Virtuality is in keeping with digital civilization, and for the image to accompany the linguistic system in performing connotation and achieving communication, it is necessary to look at the terms and concepts that the modern linguistic lesson has taught in terms of describing the linguistic semantic structure, and the efforts of semiotic research, which has become an urgent necessity in the era of the image and its requirements, to clarify the overlap and relationship between image and language. Which one is more capable of conveying significance and describing meaning? This is what prompted researchers in the field of semiotics to include the field of optics in the research circle, in an effort to answer important and pivotal questions in the human mental and cognitive world, including: How do we communicate visually? How do we read a visual message? And how do we create a visual culture? This research paper seeks to show the semi-linguistic scientific overlap on this topic, with the aim of identifying the distinctive semantic characteristics of both the linguistic format and the visual format.

Keywords: linguistics, semiotics, image, language, tongue, connotation, sign, icon.

Tob Regul Sci. TM 2023 ;9(1):5398 - 5412

DOI: doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.377

Introduction:

We know that at the beginning of semantic research was the emergence of semiotics with the structural linguistic approach founded by De Saussure, in his famous book *Cours de linguistique générale*. He stated in his course that “it is possible to create a science that studies the role of signs as part of social life, and to be part of social psychology and thus from General psychology, and we see its name as semiology - from the Greek word *sémeion*, meaning sign - and it studies the nature of signs and the laws that govern them. Since this science does not yet exist, it cannot be certain that it will exist, but it is permissible for it to have a place in advance, and linguistics is only one of the branches. This is general science, and the laws discovered by semiotics are laws that are applied in linguistics, thus linguistics has a specific and clear place in the field of human knowledge.”¹ Saussure prefigured the existence of semiotics as an authentic science concerned with studying the sign within its psychological and social dimension, defining its subject and its right to exist, and he considered linguistics to be the most important element in it is to help her study the rest of the systems - the systems of signs - and to clarify the laws that govern them and the meanings of the signs. In this, Roland Barthes says: “It is certain that things, images, and behaviors can indicate (something), and this is what they do frequently, but never in a sufficient way.” Independent, because every semiological system is mixed with language. Many semiological systems cannot rise to the level of systems except through language, and it is difficult to imagine a system of images or things whose meanings can accept from now on the possibility of reversing Saussure’s proposal. One day, linguistics is not a part, even if it is distinct, of the general science of semiotics. Semiology is the part of linguistics that is responsible for the major units indicative of discourse.”² And with this theoretical belief, he reflects what was stated by the father of modern linguistics, De Saussure, and he caused a stir in the midst of semiotic research. Modern by addressing many semantic questions in his research on the elements of semiology, “some of which he applied to the image by recalling de Saussure’s linguistic propositions and categories (tongue/speech, signifier/signified, arbitrariness,...), and what ‘Yamslaiif’ brought in His semiotics about the terms (determination / implication or suggestion), and what Peirce brought, and where does it end? ³If it ends, what is behind it? Humanity, and thus paved the way for the study of myths and interest in studying systems of signs that Saussure did not talk about, such as foods, fashions, speeches, advertising, etc.⁴ This is in line with what the American linguist Leonard Bloomfield said that “linguists are the main contributors to semiotics.” Accordingly, the Saussurean semiotic strategy is based on studying the

1- Daniel Chandler: *Foundations of Semiotics*, Trans. TalaWahba, Arab Organization for Translation, 1st edition, Beirut Lebanon, 2008, p. 29.

2 - Mustafa Ghalfan, in *General Studies (its history, nature, topic, and concepts)*, New United Book House, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2010 AD, p. 62.

3- Roland Barthes: *The Rhetoric of the Image from the book: A New Reading of Ancient Rhetoric*, Trans.: Omar Okan, East Africa, Morocco, 1994, pp. 91, 94.

4 - SaedSaed and ObaidaSabti, *The Press Photo, A Semiological Study*, Modern University Office, Cairo, 2012, p. 15.

language by ignoring the characteristics that only serve to distinguish it from the rest of the semiotic systems, and which appear important at first glance (such as the speech device, for example).”⁵ With this act, the linguist will not only clarify the linguistic problem, but will also confront himself with semiotic systems. Multiple and diverse, the right to classify and explain them derives from the laws of linguistics within the space of general semiotics.

1- From semiolinguistic research to image semiotics:

The relationship between semiotics and linguistics revealed many questions and scientific and cognitive questions that expanded the field of research in order to clarify the place of each of them within the human sciences, “as much as it sometimes added to some of this research the character of sterile bidding and debates. Thus, the conflict between semiotics and linguistics became centered on whether Image semiology is nothing but a direct literal transfer of linguistic concepts and their application to visual models”⁶, or that communicating in natural language does not require applying the procedures of the linguistics approach to visual communication systems. Add to this the problem of defining the sign in the face of the conceptual multiplicity of the image and the fields of its presence. This matter was reflected in visual semiotics, so that it is also multiple. Let us propose semiotics, not just one. According to this proposal, we will prepare the semiotics of the theatrical image, the semiotics of the cinematic image, and the semiotics of the image in fine art and painting. And the semiotics of advertising, and all this semiotic richness of the image in its types and manifestations makes the researcher question the procedures and nature of the cognitive fields that the image displays in existential reality and in its space of operation.

- The principle of norms by which visual discourses are known
- The structure of iconic discourses

And the significance of mass communication. Some of them saw the dominance of the image over the present as an alternative to the culture of the written⁷, and all of this is what the research will seek to study in the following titles.

1-1- Visual discourse and linguistic discourse:

We learned in the Saussurean lesson that language is the ability that characterizes a human group and enables them to communicate with each other according to a system of vocal signs. This is the essence of the difference that de Saussure made between (language and tongue). Language is

5- Abdel Qader Fahim Shibani: General semiotics, its foundations and concepts, Arab House of Science Publishers, Difference Publications, Algiers, 1st edition, 2010 AD, p. 17.

6- Muhammad Gharavi: A Reading in Visual Semiology, Thought and Criticism Magazine, No. 13 (electronic) www.aljabriabed.net.

7- Quoted by Muhammad Nabhan Suwailem, Photography and Life, World of Knowledge Series, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, Kuwait, No. 75, March 1984, p. 105.

the social interface of language, that is, it is a social institution. It imposes its control on the individual speaker so that he can communicate with the rest of his group. "In the words of Saussure, language does not exist except by virtue of a contract concluded between the members of the group"⁸, and if the tongue is the social interface of the language, then speech is the individual performance of the tongue. Language is determined by the concepts of tongue and speech, but it is not the only way to communicate, as there are several non-linguistic systems that work to achieve it, perhaps the most prominent and oldest of which is the form. This is what Dr. Saeed Benkarad sees in his book 'Semiotics, Its Concepts and Applications': "The absolute symbolic existence of the tongue is matched by the tangible existence of the visual phenomenon. We see because there are things here that can be seen."⁹ Language in the modern sense is a signifying semiotic system that does not stop at linguistic signs, and in this The point of the topic: We point out "the importance of the communicative act within iconic semiotics, especially the semiotics of the image, which starts from the abstract scientific concept of the sign in order to end up with the concrete concept of meaning with its symbolic and even technical dimensions."¹⁰. Especially since the world has become the property of whoever sees it, and under the control of the culture of the eye, the image has been restored. Its verbal energy, and it became influential and dangerous in communication and dialogue. From this standpoint, semiotics had to discuss the idea of the image, which is how do we determine the nature of the image? Is there a way to reach this nature? This is what made the semiotic study believe that visual facts constitute a coherent language in which human use includes values of meaning, communication, and representation that must be studied. Dr. Sabri Mansour believes that "the visual text in postmodern art is a continuation of the path of abstract and creative freedom for Western artists. Its main features did not differ radically from previous experiences in modern art, although they were extended to broader and bolder horizons."¹¹ Especially since the world has become the property of those who see it. Under the control of the culture of the eye, the image regained its verbal power and became influential and dangerous in communication and dialogue. From this standpoint, semiotics had to discuss the idea of the image, which is how do we determine the nature of the image? Is there a way to reach this nature? And this What made the semiotic study believe that visual facts constitute a coherent language that human use includes values for meaning, communication and representation that must be studied. Dr. Sabri Mansour believes that "the visual text in post-modern art is a continuation of the path of abstract and creative freedom of Western artists, as its main features did not differ radically from the experiences of A

8 - A group of authors: Semiotics, Principles, Grammar, History, translated by: Rashid bin Malik, Dar MajdLawi for Publishing and Distribution, 1st edition, Amman, Jordan, 2008 AD, p. 271.

9- Saeed bin Karad, Semiotics, Its Concepts and Applications, Dar Al-Hiwar for Publishing and Distribution, Syria, 13th edition, 2012 AD, p. 79.

10- Ahmed Youssef, Semiotics of Communication and Dialogue Effectiveness, Concepts and Mechanisms, Semiotics and Discourse Analysis Laboratory Publications, 1st edition, University of Oran, 2004, p. 71

11- Jaballah Ahmed, The Image in the Semiology of Communication, Fourth National Forum, Semiotics and Literary Text, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Biskra, p. 7.

precedent in the art of modernity, even if it has been extended to wider and bolder horizons.”¹² Which made submitting to the semiotic approach an urgent necessity because society and culture today, according to Barthes, coexist with cultural dimensions and ideological symbolism to a large extent without censorship. Therefore, it is important to clarify the semantic values Revealing the hidden and invisible meaning in the image.

We must point out the transition from stones as a technique for making images, thus fighting evil spirits and unseen forces, to the development of science and the innovation of printing, publishing and photography technology, which contributed to the emergence of icon warriors. "Instead of man being a slave to unseen forces, he turned into a master of the world with the emergence of 'Anthropocentrism'. But did this freedom continue with the development of technology?"¹³. In the same context, we should not forget the role that writing played in demonstrating the basic characteristic of the image, which is the expressive and representational functions. "The Greek verb *graphien* carries a double meaning: to draw, to write. The image was the mother of the sign, but the birth of the sign of writing allowed the image to live a life separate from speech.... This means that the Greek discovered writing and drawing at the same time, for writing is drawing and an image and drawing is writing from The distinguished type.”¹⁴

So, from this overlap and intertwining of the sign in that it is once linguistic and the other is formal - the word and the image - all linguistic and semiotic studies began at the beginning of the twentieth century in studying the sign. However, a kind of confusion occurred between the two fields, and they were studied in the cognitive field of language, and then research appeared that shed light on Shedding light on the image, such as the works of Roland Barthes, which started from the study of Swiss linguistics, as a starting point for studying the image in general and photography in particular, to determine the elements of meaning that it contains and works to convey, as Émile Benveniste distinguished in his works related to semiotic systems, where he pointed out the existence of the system of the tongue that carries meaning and other forms that coexist. With it, such as visual forms of still and moving images, drawings, dance, music, etc., which are non-functional semiotic systems. In addition to Eco, who “does not hesitate to call for the independence of semiotics from linguistics, and the necessity of creating its own concepts and systematic and distinct tools”¹⁵, without denying the possibility of semiotics benefiting from linguistics and its most developed and scientifically rigorous branches in particular.

12- Jaballah Ahmed, *The Image in the Semiology of Communication*, Fourth National Forum, Semiotics and Literary Text, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Biskra. p. 7.

13- Souad Alami, *The Concept of the Image according to Régis Debray*, East Africa, Morocco, Lebanon, 2004, pp. 67, 68.

14- *Ibid.*, p. 48.

15 - Umberto Eco, *The Semiotics of Visual Patterns*, published by Muhammad al-Tahami al-Amari and Muhammad Odada, 1st edition 2008, Dar al-Hiwar, Syria, pp. 17, 18.

2- Semantic characteristics of the linguistic sign and the visual sign:

2-1- Arbitrariness and similarity:

Research into the field of non-linguistic signs is thorny and complex to the degree the complexity of the symbols, shapes, icons, and images that belong to it, unlike the linguistic field, which has its principles and laws in producing meaning, which are inherited and have existed at the same pace since its existence. This is what prevents dealing with linguistic discourse and visual discourse in the same way. The linguistic sign, with its two components (the signifier and the signified), is essentially arbitrary, as de Saussure mentioned, within the system of the tongue (the phonetic sequence Sh, C, R, E does not suggest the necessity of the concept of a tree), and this interpretation does not apply to the visual sign, as it is not arbitrary, just as it “is not Explained in the sense that makes it an entity carrying its connotations outside the context of human practice and its multiple norms.”¹⁶ Researchers differed in defining the nature of the iconic sign. Metz believes that what distinguishes the visual image from language, especially without other semantic systems, is its analogical feature, or iconicity, as American semioticians term it. It resembles the subject it represents sensually, as the image of the bird actually resembles it, while /bird/, whether sounded or written, does not resemble the actual bird in any way. “Borse defined icons as those signs that can represent their subject by means of their resemblance to it, or by virtue of the same characteristics that the subject possesses.”¹⁷ So the idea of iconicity in the field of visual perception was the starting point in the horizon of reconsidering all visual facts and instead of “being a ‘characteristic’”. Iconicity, as it refers to resemblance, is an entry point towards perceiving and understanding these facts. Similarity was the secret key that would lead to the formulation of his own concept of the perceptual model, or what is often called the ‘code of recognition’¹⁸. We can say that visual signs in general do not have The characteristics of the thing it indicates. Rather, it reproduces some elements of common perception based on normal cognitive norms. It also selects some stimuli that allow the formation of a cognitive process that has the same significance as the real experience to which the image (the iconic sign) refers.

We also find, on the other hand, that there are those who tend to interpret the image as being reasoned, such as Guy Gautier, who believes that the photograph tends more to reasoning. However, most researchers emphasize the previous idea of the truth of the image being a transfer of a subject in reality as well as its nature and elements. Roland Barthes defined the photograph as an unencrypted message, unlike complex linguistic messages that need someone to decode them in order to understand their meaning. For example, when a picture of a poor child is placed in the middle of ruins, and next to it is a sentence written in Hindi about the scourge of poverty, in front of a group of individuals. They are different in their language, their races, and their beliefs. Everyone will see the image and understand what it suggests, but the sentence can only be

16 -Saeed Benkarad, *Semiotics: Its Concepts and Applications*, previous reference, pp. 115, 116.

17-Umberto Eco, *The Semiotics of Visual Patterns*, op. cit., p. 29.

18 -Ibid., p. 9.

understood by those who master the Hindi language. Accordingly, the visual message is based on similarity and resemblance, unlike linguistic messages that are based on an arbitrary characteristic. However, the idea of the image does not need someone to decode it, as the majority would not be convinced by it. Umberto Eco believes, "The production of a meaning through the iconic sign (the image, for example) is not due to what the signifier within it arouses, for example, in terms of similarity to what it refers to, but rather it is due to the possession of "A code in which and through which all possible meaning is generated"¹⁹, and this is what Saeed Benkarad pointed out when he said: "The visual facts in their diversity and richness constitute a 'codified language', to which human use has deposited values for connotation, communication and representation. Based on this, the connotations that can be revealed within these "Signs are connotations resulting from cultural codification, not revealed essences of content"²⁰. From this angle, it, like the units of the tongue, is governed by facts that exist outside of it, that is, it is of an arbitrary nature, and its meanings are produced only according to this principle.

Based on the above, we note that there was agreement in the idea of similarity that distinguishes the visual sign from the rest of the signs used in communication, so that the scope of the term expanded to move between external representations and internal representations of things, events, topics, and people, and between producing or carrying out a process of reflection of aspects of similarity to visual thinking related to understanding the world from Through the language of form and image. As Arnheim said, "What is common to all images, however, is the perceptual logic that holds them together, by which they are composed, and also the universal character inherent in them."²¹ Despite this agreement, similarity is not achieved in all visual discourses, as the image may contain a set of arbitrary relationships between it and its subject, and also because the image is subjected to multiple qualitative changes, and this is what is known in semiotic research as degrees of iconography. There are several factors that affect the nature of the similarity, such as culture, religious and intellectual beliefs, customs and traditions, the angle of view, light, and other elements of confusion that prevent complete similarity between the image and its subject. The similarity between two things is within some link in their relationship, and thus it forms a specific system. Despite all this, the feature of similarity and resemblance remains the most important feature of the iconic sign - according to the Peircean concept - and is the basis of what distinguishes it from the symbol and the indicator.

In an article by Muhammad Gharavi²² about his reading of some of the theories that have focused since the sixties on approaching the image in its many types, he mentions Christian Metz's rejection of the similarity characteristic that Bors assigned to the image, in his article entitled "Beyond Similarity, the Image." He believed that true symmetry is what distinguishes the visual

19- Umberto Eco, *The Semiotics of Visual Patterns*, op. cit., p. 11.

20 -Saeed Benkarad, *Semiotics, Its Concepts and Applications*, previous reference, p. 118.

21 -Shaker Abdel Hamid, *The Age of Image - Negatives and Positives*, World of Knowledge, Kuwait, January 2005, p. 9.

22-See: Muhammad Gharavi, *A Reading of Visual Semiology*, FikroNaqd Magazine, No. 13 (electronic).

image (icon) from the rest of the signifying systems, and language in particular, especially in the terminology of American semiotics, that is, its general sensory resemblance to the subject it represents. “However, the image is analogous only in its general form, as it also includes arbitrary relationships to its subject. Metz imagines that we make the idea of similarity the most important thing that distinguishes the visual image, and this means projecting the part onto the whole. Just as it is not correct to generalize the phonetic phenomenon in natural language to the general pattern. For this language, it is not right to close the image on itself and independently of the rest of the signifying systems as a result of the similarity property, which is only part of its general components. The importance of similarity is embodied in its being a means of transforming codes. Through the image’s similarity to its “realistic” subject, the possibility of reading or Deciphering the image itself benefits from the teeth that are involved in reading the subject itself. Regarding the teeth that govern the iconic utterance, Eco mentioned ten teeth:²³

1- The principles of perception 2- The principles of recognition

3- Transmission teeth 4- Tonal teeth

5- Iconic teeth 6- Iconographic teeth

7- The teeth of taste and sensitivity 8- The teeth of rhetoric

9- Rhetorical teeth 10- Subconscious teeth

However, this importance varies from one image to another. In some iconic forms, such as contemporary trends in the plastic arts, the similarity feature may not provide us with any significant value. This is due to its complete absence from some pictures or drawings, which forces the student to search for other ways to understand the picture, based, for example, on its symbolic (or arbitrary) nature. This necessarily leads to leaving the absolute space of the image in order to establish a kind of communication with other signifying systems, most notably language, because of its arbitrary character as well. However, words, unlike images, “cannot in any sense be analogous to things in their designation,”²⁴ as Fearon believes.

2-2- Double joint and kidney:

The first thing we notice of the difference between the linguistic and visual systems is that the first presents itself with its pre-determined elements that make up its sequential speech, and the second presents itself in a comprehensive and general manner within a complete unity. We know that the linguistic system contains a basic characteristic that often distinguishes it from the rest of the semantic systems, which is articulation. Double articulation: the linguistic sign consists of separate elements, signifiantsunités, indicative units, or what are known as monomes, and non-significant units (phonemes), distinctive units. This articulation cannot be projected onto iconic

23 -Umberto Eco, *The Semiotics of Visual Patterns*, op. cit., p. 20.

24 - Abdel Majeed Al-Abed, *Measurement in Visual Semiotics*, Signs, No. 29, Morocco, p. 149.

signs because it does not fit with the nature of their elements, which are completely and totally different from the language. The visual image is presented within a single and complete frame. It forces the viewer to see it as a single sentence, describing it and remembering it as a complete unit whose homogeneous system is difficult to disturb. This characteristic is what stimulates the process of reception and perception in the recipient, stimulating in him the act of interpretation with all the capabilities that enable him to do so. It also escapes by its nature the binary division of the Saussurean sign (the signifier and the signified), and the image's lack of the double articulation property and its great connection to the reference that it resembles makes it in dire need of using the linguistic system, which we find in many of its manifestations. Such as advertising as visual discourse is one of the fields that calls for Its scope is both written and spoken language, and the still and moving image. However, this does not create an overlap in the purposes and social functions of advertising, as it is one of the visual discourses that are considered mixed texts, such as images accompanied by writing and talking cinema. We conclude that linguistic discourse can be deconstructed into its first components, after which the recipient reconstructs it to understand its meaning. However, visual discourse is complex and synthetic, and it is not easy to deconstruct it into independent elements.

2-3- Linearity and simultaneity:

Among the differences between the linguistic and visual systems is that the first is perceived by decoding the linearity of its spatially and temporally sequential elements, while the second presents itself as a whole, its elements spread out in one space. Linguistic functions take on the character of linearity in the message, so we perceive it according to the structure of the sentence, while the image is perceived as complete and does not progress. One element from another, "Saussure pointed out the linearity of the tongue in its contrast to the flat character of visual semiotics (drawings, paintings, traffic lights, cards, designs, etc...."²⁵, and since the tongue is a predetermined system, it is subject to strict grammatical, morphological, and semantic rules that do not It can be violated, in addition to the act of time, which requires each element of the language to appear after another in a sequential form, unlike visual discourse, which is free from all these restrictions. The recipient begins from where he wants in his perception of the elements of the image. Roland Barthes pointed out an important observation, which is that the image It is characterized by transparency, "it does not refer to itself but to the subjects it depicts. It is a signifier that hides itself behind a signified"²⁶, and this ability to hide behind the signified was not previously available to the word and to written and audio culture.

25- A group of authors: semiotics, principles, grammar, history, previous reference, p. 107.

26 -Ashraf Mansour, The Fetishism of the Image - Boudyard's Theory of Superreality -, Fusul Magazine, No. 62, p. 227.

2-4- The coexistence of image and language:

Despite all this difference between words and images in characteristics and function, they clearly coexist in the circle of human communication, but the problem lies in the manner of this coexistence and the extent of the influence of one on the other. They have existed together since ancient times, and the relationship between them has become more developed with the development of digital technology and the development of forms of communication between people. We now see the image (static and moving) together with a linguistic text in one of its two forms (spoken, written, or together). This is what made us unable to side with one system over the other. Semiotics must engage in research into the two discourses with equal importance, as the presence of language and image in one context has been numerous, numerous, and diverse. "It seems to us that even though they share in being two forms of fixation and recording, and therefore they work to preserve and immortalize artistic works, they differ in a set of data, and therefore a relationship is established between them, which Roland Barthes attributed to a duality based on anchorage and reinforcement when they come together." In one speech,²⁷ and this duality is what explains the two functions that Roland Barthes presented to the linguistic text that comes with the image....

He previously presented a linguistic text without visual support and it is somewhat ambiguous, but it is not as ambiguous as we find in an isolated image, as we do not know what it is really calling us to, so the first function appears, which is *Fonction d'ancrage*, by presenting the linguistic text. The appropriate reading of the image so that it does not exceed the limits set for interpretation. By using the linguistic format, the recipient chooses the intended meaning, so the authority of the text appears in directing the image semantically, as it is what confirms and explains its meaning, and prevents it from deviations and coercion to which it may be exposed during the processes of receiving it.

The second function is replacement and reinforcement (*Fonction du relais*, through which the meaning of the image is completed and the semantic deficiency it may be exposed to is filled.)²⁸ We find this use of language in moving images such as cinematic and television films, advertisements, animation...etc., which give meanings that do not exist. At the same time, we find many texts relying on images to explain what they are unable to explain, and this is what we often find in educational and scientific books, especially directed at children, to bring the idea of the subject closer to their minds. The illiterate, it is the gospel of the poor.²⁹

The value of the two functions also appears in "the fact that the image carries some characteristics that make it in our view insufficient in performing some expressive functions, including the

27 -Muhammad Khain, *The Iconic Sign and Advertising Communication*, Fifth International Forum (Semiotics and Literary Text), University of Biskra, November 2008.

28-Muhammad Khain, *The Advertising Text*, Applied Linguistic Study, Master's Thesis, Manuscript at the University of Oran, 2004-2005 AD, p. 59.

29-SouadAlami, *The Concept of the Image according to RégisDebray*, op. cit., p. 53.

absence of what is known as the arbitrary relationship between the signifier of the image and its meaning, which is the basis of agreement in the linguistic sign, as well as the strength of its suggestive nature"³⁰, and this will not be the case. It has only if it exists within a certain cultural framework that includes its connotations and connotations, and this is what makes us say that it has a gelatinous nature, obstructing the process of determining meaning and thus making the process of proof difficult.

2-5- The conflict between image and language:

It is self-evident that conflicting opinions emerge regarding which of the two speeches is more worthy of providing meaning? Which one is wider than the other so that it includes it? Who plays the role of cognitive champion in the field of semiotics? They are two discourses, despite their contradiction in the quality of the message, its channel, and how to perceive it. However, each discourse plays its role in conveying the meaning alongside the other, and they surround us from every side. From the problem - the contradiction between image and language - two opinions have emerged. Two prominent ones are:

1- The world is mute and only speaks through language (Barth's thesis)

2- Images are a self-contained semantic system, "Boysens' thesis"

The first idea of Roland Barthes came as a result of his inversion of de Saussure's statement regarding linguistics being part of semiology. Barthes considered the opposite (semiology is a branch of linguistics), because language is the most widely used system in our social life, and the rest of the systems are non-linguistic and denote themselves, except that they It relies on language to explain and interpret it, and this is what made all semiotic systems mix with it, and although he expanded the field of semiotic studies to include forms of clothing, traditions, eating, fashion, advertising,...., by investing in structuralist Swiss linguistics, and making language the basis for performing meaning. And the significance, even if the image invaded the era. Of course, Roland Barthes's vision was not free from criticism like other human theories, especially since it detracted from the role played by other systems of meaning, so it was met with violent criticism, and many researchers refuted it. So 'Porcher'³¹ reviewed what Roland Barthes said in the following points:

- In some of its types, the iconic message dispensed with language and contented itself with providing meaning to the recipient. An example of this is the complete success of silent films in entertaining the audience and conveying the intent contained in their message.

30-See AbdelaliBoutayeb, the mechanisms of advertising discourse, the fixed image as a model, signs, (electronic).

31- See: Muhammad Al-Amari, Image and Language - A Semiotic Approach - (electronic).
www.aljabriabed.net/n13_09omari.htm

- Roland Barthes studied non-linguistic patterns based on the linguistic discourse written around them, such as fashion, clothing, food,... and this is what is lacking in knowing their reality and their role in the social structure, for example: What is the benefit of fashion? How does it affect culture and identity? And this is what actually benefits society.

- It is sufficient to demonstrate the shallowness of the idea of the linguist's dominance over other systems of signs. It suffices to look at books on physics, chemistry, mathematics, and technology, to see the abundance of calligraphy and drawings in them, as it is inconceivable to imagine a work on zoology without drawings. Rather, we have doubts about his ability to understand. If his speech is purely linguistic."³²

As for the second opinion, which favors the image, and is represented by Buissens in his works, he acknowledges the existence of non-linguistic semiotic systems that are not linked to language except within certain limits and not a complete connection that denies them having a meaning on their own. This is what the researcher Muhammad Al-Ammari mentioned in his article, "The most famous semiotic systems are Tongues, of course, and we should mention alongside them scientific and logical symbols, road signs, trapistes' gestures, and those used by Native Americans to communicate between tribes that do not have the same tongue, and the ringing of church bells and military trumpets. Then, train lists and tourist guides are of great use. Of the signs, they are also used in maps, and printers proofreaders resort to a group of signs..., but it must be noted that they do not include the letters of the alphabet, nor the writing of "Bray," nor the "Morse" code, because these codes cannot be understood unless they are known. The language of its user, unlike the semiotic systems mentioned above, which do not have any linguistic basis."³³ We can claim that the image may sometimes succeed in killing the word, when it performs a deceptive act on it that undermines it, judges it, and may even be a judge over it, while it does not escape from assuming the role of a false witness to an event. From here, the image becomes a vision that infiltrates the visible, because the latter is no longer the only faithful keeper of the truth, and it is not enough to say that it creates the truth, as it may be used to hide other truths, as its selectivity has lost its neutrality. There are those who say: Let the image speak, express itself, replace words with words of a special kind, just as the viewer turns into its interrogator, a participant in a silent dialogue. The image delegates to those who watch it the task of expressing it with words, but this saying is not always correct, as it is like a word. special message.

Conclusion:

In summary of what we said, we see that a person's search into the truth of semantic signs is not a simple matter, especially related to the topics that he lives and that appear continuously and uninterrupted in his life, as they result from his human nature, such as language and image, let alone the nature of the relationship between them, and the field of knowledge that studies them

32 - Group μ. *Traité of the visual sign. For a rhétorique of the image.* Ed du Seuil.Paris.1992, p:52.

33 - Muhammad Al-Ammari, *Image and Language - A Semiotic Approach* - Previous Reference.

is still searching for methods. The appropriate procedures for study are a complex process in and of itself and in the relationship between the two formats together. Based on what was previously mentioned, we conclude that just as the visual format has a visual image on which it is based, the linguistic format has a mental image on which it relies. This is because the image is a representation of a reality or an imagination, using the tools of visual channels. Or by the perception produced by the process of mental perception, which is also the result of the process of linguistic description that stimulates this perception and works to carry it from the tangible visible reality to the intelligible mental visual. There is no break, but rather semantic continuity, between the multi-dimensional image format and the cursive writing format. The visual field is characterized by multiplicity of signs because it combines what is linguistic and what is visual. The semantic relationship was eternal between them.” All studies concluded that there are three types of relationships that link them: an equivalent relationship, an integrated relationship, and an appreciative relationship, all of which are invested in audiovisual perception. Accordingly, the relationship between the word and the image is a strong relationship, except that they are not of a single nature and do not They are heading in the same direction, and today they live in a state where one is no longer indispensable to the other in performing meaning under the authority of digital technological development that has affected the ways of communication between humans.

Sources and references:

- [1] Umberto Eco, *The Semiotics of Visual Patterns*, by Muhammad al-Tahami al-Ammari and Muhammad Odada, 1st edition 2008, Dar al-Hiwar, Syria.
- [2] Ahmed Youssef, *Semiotics of Communication and Dialogue Effectiveness, Concepts and Mechanisms*, Semiotics and Discourse Analysis Laboratory Publications, 1st edition, University of Oran, 2004 AD.
- [3] Ashraf Mansour, *The Fetishism of the Image - Boudyard's Theory of Superreality -*, Fusul Magazine, No. 62.
- [4] Jaballah Ahmed, *The Image in the Semiology of Communication*, Fourth National Forum, Semiotics and Literary Text, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Biskra.
- [5] Daniel Chandler: *Foundations of Semiotics*, Trans. TalalWahba, Arab Organization for Translation, 1st edition, Beirut Lebanon, 2008 AD.
- [6] Roland Barthes: *The Rhetoric of the Image from the book: A New Reading of Ancient Rhetoric*, Trans.: Omar Okan, East Africa, Morocco, 1994 AD.
- [7] Saeed bin Karad, *Semiotics, Its Concepts and Applications*, Dar Al-Hiwar for Publishing and Distribution, Syria, 13th edition, 2012 AD.
- [8] SouadAlami, *The Concept of the Image according to Regis Debray*, East Africa, Morocco, Lebanon, 2004 AD.
- [9] SaedSaed and ObaidaSabti, *the press photo, a semiological study*, Modern University Office, Cairo, 2012 AD.

- [10] Shaker Abdel Hamid, *The Age of Image - Negatives and Positives*, World of Knowledge, Kuwait, January 2005.
- [11] Abdel QaderFahimShibani: *General Semiotics, Its Foundations and Concepts*, Arab House of Science Publishers, Difference Publications, Algiers, 1st edition, 2010 AD.
- [12] Abdel Majeed Al-Abed, *Measurement in Visual Semiotics*, Signs, No. 29, Morocco.
- [13] Abdel-AaliBoutayeb, *Mechanisms of Advertising Discourse, The Still Image as a Model*, Signs, (electronic).
- [14] Mustafa Galfan, in *General Studies (its history, nature, subject matter, concepts)*, New United Book House, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2010 AD.
- [15] Muhammad Gharavi: *A Reading in Visual Semiology*, Thought and Criticism Magazine, No. 13 (electronic) www.aljabriabed.net.
- [16] Muhammad NabhanSwailam, *Photography and Life*, World of Knowledge Series, National Council for Culture, Arts and Literature, Kuwait, No. 75, March 1984.
- [17] A group of authors: *Semiotics, Principles, Grammar, History*, Translated by: Rashid bin Malik, Dar MajdLawi for Publishing and Distribution, 1st edition, Amman, Jordan, 2008 AD.
- [18] Muhammad Gharavi, *A Reading of Visual Semiology*, FikroNaqd Magazine, No. 13 (electronic).
- [19] Mohamed Khain, *The Iconic Sign and Advertising Communication*, Fifth International Forum (Semiotics and Literary Text), University of Biskra, November 2008.
- [20] Muhammad Khain, *The Advertising Text*, Applied Linguistic Study, Master's Thesis, Manuscript at the University of Oran, 2004-2005 AD.
- [21] Muhammad Al-Ammari, *Image and Language - A Semiotic Approach - (electronic)*. www.aljabriabed.net/n13_09omari.htm
- [22] Group µ. *Traité du signe visual. For a rhétorique de l'image*. Ed du Seuil.Paris.1992.