

**Coding, Code and communicativity**

**SAMIR ABBES\***

**1) Code :**

It is known that code is interesting since ROMAN JAKOBSON theory for communication, and linguistics define code by : < a system of signals ( or signs, or symbols), which is destined by a prior convention , to represent and to transmit the information inbetween the source ( or emitter) of signals and the destination point ( receiver) ><sup>(1)</sup>, and this definition gives way to understand the nature of a code as a possibility among different possibilities which convention could create from a single system, the colors system for example is so rich that is open to different kind of colors codes, traffic lights and also significations related to human mood where clear colors mean openness , happiness and amiability, when dark colors have the meanings of discretion, sadness and hostility, and maybe it is understood that context plays a big role in concentrating convention upon some systems which take more importance for some societies to create more and more codes, like what happens with visual system, and especially colors system, therefore some semiotic system are more rich with codes than other systems due to context effect . So the invention of paper gave more importance to the writing system so that it is resulted more writing codes which are named calligraphy , also the invention of computer added more importance to use numeric system through developing more numeric codes which helped a lot in proliferating of programation logiciels. Therefore it appears that code is what makes a system of signs communicational ; and it is possible to notice that is in some hoods of strangers wherein the context of need to loyalty concepts gives way to the social systems like parentage to be effective through family code.

It is noticeable that is in code through its definition lay two primordial aspects ; one is the systematic and the other is conventional, the first shows that the clearness of the system has a great influence in codes creations, the visual system for example is rich with codes, and it's the same case

---

\* Doctorat student in the modern arabic littérature, BADJI MOKHTAR UNIVERSITYANNABA ALGERIA

into the perceptual system, so the color system was rich with codes as is indicated above , but using computer treatment had permitted to reach more clearness of the colors system through the definition of more detailed degrees of the color intensity so that it becomes possible to create more colors codes, this clearness of semiotic systems could be named systemativity. Therefore it would be clear to say that systemativity helps in enriching codes and also in enriching systems with codes, mathematics for example created more numeric codes through developing numeric systemativity .

The second aspect of code which is the convention aspect is related to the term of interpretant suggested by C.S.PIERCE<sup>(2)</sup> , because from a view point it seems that what is conventional in a code is the interpretant , so for a code the mentioned is the conventional interpretant in comparison with a personal interpretant which is less conventional, and so on it would be possible to say that code theory is not so strange from C.S.PIERCE semiotics, and in another hand it would be possible to speak about a personal code wherein the convention diminishes to a stable intentionality or by other words a personal convention, in psychology a personality test using ink spots upon white cards shows that each person has his own personal code through the reconnaissance of different shapes or shadows in the ink spots for each person, which in another hand shows that the iconic resemblance is more personal.

In fact the convention aspect shows another face , since convention for some codes is prior than emitters themselves and not just prior than message coding, than it would be possible for a view point to substitute convention by another term like learning, and also to name code knowledge by code literacy as it is used in language learning, since a language is a code following the ideas of FERDINAND DE SAUSSURE where a language is a standard semiotic system,<sup>(3)</sup> .These ideas about code literacy seems to be important from a social and cultural perspective, because it is noticed that some codes are effective in some social fields wherein their literacy is missed, fashion code for example and also some ideologic codes are effective without having learnt them well, therefore it would be possible to name a code society a collectivity wherein exist this code effectivity or use beside its literacy, and to name a code market a collectivity wherein exist a code effectivity without its literacy. The fashion code for example knows a wide code society of fashion designers and fans, but it knows a wider and more huge code market, and it is the same case with the linguistic code,

wherein the code society is wide composed for example by writers and critics who have a wide code literacy, and by the code market composed by readers of different levels of illiteracy.

EMBERTO ECO defines a code by the transformation of a system to another system,<sup>(4)</sup> though this definition does not state clearly the conventional aspect of the code, it gives an important statement of the systemativity of the signifieds, and it opens by another hand the door to distinguish two types of codes, one is exterior when the signifieds system is different from the signifiers one, like the case of a dual languages dictionary, and another which is interior or reflective when the signifieds system is the same of signifiers, like the case of a one language dictionary following the example given by Emberto Eco himself,<sup>(5)</sup>. It would be possible to state too plus to Eco's definition that the conventional aspect of code does not miss the systematic nature, therefore it would be easy to say that conventional interpretants have their systemativity too, and it will be named the conventional system, because each representatum of a semiotic system has its own object through a single special interpretant, therefore it seems that Emberto Eco's code definition is coherent with C.S.Pierce semiotics, so it is clear that for a single code is understood to talk about three systems; the signifiers system, the signifieds system and the interpretant system.

Finally, it is important to talk about some characteristics of code working: < For Hjelmslev, who has defined it, connotation is a secondary meaning whose signifier is itself constituted by a sign or system of primary signification, which is denotation; if E is the expression, C the content, and R the relation of the two which establishes the sign, the formula for the connotation is (ERC)>.<sup>(6)</sup> says ROLAND BARTHES who says also in another place: < semiologically, each connotation is the starting point of a code><sup>(7)</sup>, in fact he does not state that the denotation level is a code as it would be clear for an expression, since a language is a code because it corresponds to the code definition as it is mentioned above, but in the other hand Roland Barthes mentions the exactly the point of combination of the linguistic code with the other codes, and it is the connotation level. So it would be clear to say that codes are combinatories, and this is characteristic could be noticed in the social life wherein some behaviours are socially coded to be not acceptable, and they are legally coded in the same time to be punished for, so the social code here is combined in the legal code, and it would be possible too in this example to notice that the co-existence of the two code is another characteristic of codes, as Roland Barthes proved in his codes analysis of the Sarrazine novel of Balzac in his book

S/Z, where Barthes found at least five co-existent codes in each textual part of the novel which he called *lexia* from the 561 *lexias* which constitute the whole text of the novel<sup>(8)</sup>, and in the field of the sociolinguistics it would be possible to notice a third characteristic of codes working which is alternance through the notion of code-switching which means :< the systematic alternation between language systems in discourse.><sup>(9)</sup>.

## 2) Coding :

It seems that coding is related to the two first aspects of code, either the Systematic aspect or the conventional aspect, but if it is related to the systematic aspect through a direct way, it is related to the conventional aspect through an indirect way, < Coding is related to the emitter-encoder level><sup>(10)</sup>,

Then in the case of the human being coding is a personal function, and maybe this case englobes the other cases of emitters-encoders, like animals and machines because human being coding maybe is more complicated operation, since it is possible to distinguish two types of coding of messages, the first is the one which conforms with the code, either in the signifiers level or in the signifieds level, and the second is the one which does not conform with the code in a one level of the two mentioned, though it works corresponding to it, therefore, this one is the type of coding which develops code, so it would be clear to name them the conforming coding and the developing coding, to the conforming coding corresponds a stable systemativity, so that the three systems of code, the signifiers system, the signifieds system and the interpretant system, remain the same they were before coding, and to the developing coding corresponds a developed systemativity where one of the two systems : the signifiers system or the signifieds system becomes more systematic, or by other words, more complicated with relations in between its elements, because coding creates more relations inbetween those elements which remain with the same number or quantity, so it would be possible to define systemativity by the sum of the relations inbetween system elements, and the developing of the systemativity by the increasing of this sum, therefore it is noticed that the two types of coding give three kinds of systemativity ; the developed signifiers systemativity, the stable systemativity and the developed signifieds systemativity, and to these three kinds of systemativity correspond three classes of codes which show different levels of communicativity which means the possibility to communicate the information or the message, these classes of codes

are : the ante-communicational codes, the communicational codes and the post- communicational codes.

**a) The ante-communicational codes :**

In this code the signifiers system knows a developed systemativity but the two other systems ; the signifieds system and the interpretants system, remain stable, so that it will be understood that the message will have a very thin level of communicativity in the code society, in fact this kind of codes permits the lowest communicativity because it is more personal and the least collectivity, and its signifier are the least transparent, and this kind of codes shows an iconic behaviour because it represent just a possibility for communication which misses its realisation, corresponding to the saying of firstness of C.Pierce, and from another side the developed side of this code is more personal like the iconic resemblance as it is mentioned above, also the signifiers of this code are the least transparent because it is more reduced to the signifiers level wich is more developed than the signifieds level which remains stable as it was before coding at least from a reciever perspective, and this last level which has a lower systemativity is incapable to guarantee the transparency of the signifiers, this class of codes could be called the creative codes which is in need to be communicational because they widen the volume of messages or informations to be communicated, and to reach this communicativity maybe needed by the code society, it would be necessary to develop the systemativity of interpretants untill it become equal to the signifiers systemativity, and it results from this developing the developping of the signifieds systemativity, and also the increasing of code communicativity, so that it is possible to distinguish for a litterary text for example different levels of communicativity, where the intertextuality shows more communicativity than the mere creative parts of the text, because creative signifiers systemativity is higher than intertextuality signifiers systemativity though the two are developed, also the interpretative text of the litterary text trys to develop its signifiers systemativity but it remains more communicative and less systematic, so the creative code is of the least communicativity.

It is important here to mention the third aspect of code plus to the systematic and conventional aspects which is the priority aspect, to say with Roland Barthes :< the code is the wake of that already><sup>(12)</sup>, maybe the code is prior than coding, but for a creative code, maybe coding

begins in the same moment where code get developped, so it is possible to say that code systemativity get developped by a personal role.

**b) Communicational codes :**

It is from a fonctional point of view that is said that a code is communicational, and this later is distinguished by a stable systemativity in its systems ; signifiers, signifieds and interpretants, and it knows an indexical behaviour because the hapening communication realisation does not represent a law corresponding to the secondness saying of C.S.Pierce, and also the high transparency of its signifiers gives the impression of a justified relation inbetween signifiers and signifieds. For this kind of codes the systemativity is the same for emitters and recievers in the code society, so that this society becomes homogene in comparison with that one of the ante-communicational which is heterogene, therefore it would be understood that code stable systemativity is a condition to create an homogene code society, the case of language code literacy for example shows a clear example of homogeneity of code society, where reading newspapers became a common habit in lot of societies which forms a social and cultural phenomanan in comparison with reading poetry which is less important from a view point of currency, therefore homogeneity of societies is related to some manifestations caused by code literacy, and following the same view point it is noticed that spreading fashion code literacy through fashion magazines for example plays in some modern societies a big role the existence of a common fashion style taste which distinguishes different life fields from parties halls to football stadiums.

It is covenant to mention about the communicational code which is collective in the code society some kinds of specific codes like language code, perceptual code which knows a very wide code society because perception for pretty all of the human being is the same ; we see, hear and smell in the same way the same things, and also the social code has a very wide code society.

**c) Post-communicational codes :**

This kind of codes is distinguished by a stable systemativity for the signifiers and the interpretants, while it shows a developped systemativity for the signifieds, it might be named also the explanative codes, and it shows a symbolic behaviour because communication realisations for it goes through a law like loyalty or obeissance or need, following the thirdness saying of C.S.Pierce, and because this law limits the significations of signifiers in some perspectives, so that signifiers become more

transparent for a partial collectivity among the code society, therefore these code could be named also specialised codes, or groups codes, or perspective codes, because they are less collective and they guarantee a special communication, among these codes there is the cultural code and the ideologic code, it seems that the first has the signifiers of more transparency than the second and also more spontaneous in the code society, therefore more communicational, but the two codes are of less transparency than a communicational code.

It is possible to notice that the post-communicational codes symbolic behaviour could be understood as an organized communication in comparison with the communicational codes indexical behaviour which shows a free communication, and it is noticed too that the transformation of codes of ante-communicational and post-communicational classes to the communicational class should go through the development of the systemativity of the interpretants system.

**3) Reading through codes :**

To read or to receive a text might be related to the observation of the systemativity state of its expressions from a point of view of stability or development of the signifiers system and the signifieds system, so that it would be possible to distinguish three kind of texts which are :

**A) Creative texts :**

This kind of texts are coded by ante-communicational codes, and the ambiguity which they could show is a sign of a developed signifiers systemativity, because their authors write in a new way which is distinguished by a non ordinary relations in between signifiers, therefore it would be clear to notice that these kinds of texts remove literatures and discourse with new possibilities which do not represent a destruction for the ordinary styles, but in the contrary they open way to the development of this language, though they have a more personal aspect in the beginning, because they represent the opportunity to be more and more collective through the efforts of development of the systemativity of the correspondent interpretants systems, so it seems that the discourse analysis studies go through this way of development, and it will be convenient to afford means for studying systemativity like semiotics and stylistics, and it is also convenient to distinguish different ante-communicational codes like the mere creative codes and the intertextuality codes and also the interpretative codes, which shows as it mentioned above different levels of development in their

signifiers systemativity, so that it might be distinguished in the creative texts levels of creativity and intertextuality and interpretation, because texts are communicating inbetween each other .

**B) Communicational texts :**

These texts are coded by communicational codes , and their signifiers and signified systems are of stable systemativity, so their language is ordinary, therefore it seems that their clearness is a sign of stable systemativity, we could find these texts in media and sample conversations which could represent interesting parts in some novels and also in newspapers texts, it would be clear to notice that their readers represent the majority of readers, because they are affordable by pretty everyone , and they are good spaces for social codes, and also the perceptual codes, therefore these text represent a good means for a free communication in the whole language code society or by other words for a standard communication.

**C) Explanative texts :**

These texts are coded by a post-communicational codes, their signifiers systemativity is stable, while their signifieds systemativity is developed, and the sign of this developed systemativity is expatiation which distinguishes them, and if they are less collective they are not accesible but for a partial collectivity of the code society, so that they represent an organized communication, these texts do not contribute in elaborating the ordinary language possibilities as do the creative texts, though they contribute a lot in elaborating the conceptual side of it, it is noticed that among these texts there are scientific texts, and the ideologic texts, and their signifieds developed systemativity could be observed in the conceptual side, therefore it would be possible for the ideology for example to study its conceptual growth by the comparative study of the ideologic texts from different periods.



**4) Results :**

It is noticed that the study of code nature and also coding nature could elaborate the whole semiotic important concepts, and it touches also communication theory, and it would be possible therefore to develop the discourse analysis so that it will be possible more and more scientific and methodologic analysis which would help in a better comprehension for different kind of discourse especially the litterary one, so it is noticed that the observation of the systemativity of the signifiers and signifieds systems of those text opens way to more methodologic discourse analysis.

**5) Notes :**

1. Le dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage, Jean Dubois et autres, Larousse , Paris, 2012, p 90.
2. C.S.Pierce , Ecrits sur le signe, rass.trad. et com.G.Deledalle, paris. Ed. seuil, 1978.
3. Saussure , Ferdinand de, Cours de linguistique générale, Paris, éd, Payot, 1962.
4. Eco U , Sémiotique et philosophie du langage, trad.M.Bouzaher, paris, éd .P.U.F. ,1<sup>er</sup> éd.,1988.
5. Eco U. , Sémiotique et philosophie du langage.
6. Barthes.R , S/Z , translated by : Richard Miller, Blackwell. 2002. P 7.
7. Barthes.R, S/Z, p 9.
8. Barthes.R, S/Z, p 20.
9. O'Grady W And others, Contemporary linguistics an introduction, Pearson Education Limited, England, 2011, p 624.
10. Jean Dubois et autres, le dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage, p 90.
11. C.S.Pierce, Ecrits sur le signe.
12. Baethes. R. S/Z , p