# Title:- Reality and function in literary texts: the Syntagmatic approach

**By: Demeke Tassew Dires (PhD); Assistant Professor in theory of literature, English Language and Literature department, DMU**

**Abstract**

The aim of this article was to argue against a thesis which says, 'if a literary text doesn't represent reality out of its own / the outside world/ it may lose its social function', which has been one of the polemical issue in literary studies since Aristotle. The issue of representation of reality in literature is as polemical as the word 'represent' itself[1]. Since ancient times, a number of literary scholars have attempted to give their own hypothesis about how reality is represented in literature. Some of them look it in relation to the social milieu in which the text exists, some say that reality exists in the text itself and others claim reality as something created by the readers. Based on their stand, then, they forward different theories and approaches. While writing this essay, I attempt to take a stand as a member of the circle of scholars who advocate the existence of reality in the text itself. I took this stand because I believe that literary texts such as novels truly claim that they represent reality. However, the reality that I am referring to is the one which exists in a text itself. I believe that a literary text represents its own reality. And the reality which exists in the text itself has a function of some kind in either instructing or informing the readers. It is my strong belief that a literary text, so as to have its some sort of 'social function' shouldn't necessarily represent reality out of the text itself.

**Key words: Reality; Literary function; Syntagmatism; literature; text**.

---

[1] Oxford learner's dictionary delivers seven contexts in which the word represent can be used. In which context it is being used in semiology, Literary or cultural studies is not clear, at list for me.

**Introduction** .

I couldn't claim that the argument on the representation of reality in literary texts is originally mine, but I am attempting to side scholars who advocate the notion that reality of a literary text is found within the text itself. As the title I give for my essay indicates, my intention of writing this essay is to argue against the a thesis which says, 'if a literary text doesn't represent reality out of its own / the outside world/ it may lose its social function.' I say no. A literary text should not necessarily be related to the real world to have a function of any kind. It is capable of doing this with in itself. So, I argue, a literary text represents its own reality and it still doesn't lose its function as a social phenomenon. That is why I choose *syntagmatism* as an approach.

In this essay, then, I try to discuss semiological concepts that are directly related to my point of argument, by especially focusing on works of Ferdinand De Saussure and Jurij Lotman. In addition, I may discuss basic concepts of narratology in relation to how reality and function is conceived in literary texts. Doing this, I hope, may help me to give shape for my argument and reach at a sound conclusion.

This essay has four parts. The first part is a short discussion about the general conceptions of representation of reality in art. The intention of having this discussion is to grasp general idea how reality is conceived in different approaches. In the second part of this essay I try to discuss *semiotics/semiology* in general by giving due emphasis for Ferdinand De Saussure's theory of the *sign* and Lotman's theory of *sign and codes*. The third part is about narratologists' approach to reality in and function of literary texts. In this part, I particularly take the novel as an example and attempt to reveal how reality exists in it. Besides, I discuss in a brief manner how function is achieved in a literary text under this conception. The last part, of course, is conclusion in which I try to summarize what is discussed and fore grounded throughout my essay.

## 1. Conceptions of reality inliterature

In the course of explaining the nature of literature and giving acceptable definition for it, different theories come in to existence. According to Jefferson & Robey (1958: 13) "theory is not something that has developed in a vacuum, but has arisen for the most part in response to the problems encountered by readers, critics and scholars in their practical contact with texts." When we look at

most of the literary theories that are forwarded by a number of literary scholars, we may get that the issue of representation of reality is a vital question that they attempt to respond to.

Taking the issue of how reality is represented in a literary text as a center, then, literary theories can be categorized under four fundamental critical orientations. In his book: *The mirror and the Lamp: Romantic theory and Critical tradition,* Abrams(1958) discusses these categories in detail. Let's look at them one by one.

### 1.1. Mimetic theory of literature

The notion "mimesis" is highly advocated by Aristotle. In his *Poetics*, he explains how much literature is dependent on imitation. As quoted in Berger (1995:11-12), Aristotle says: "Epic poetry and Tragedy, Comedy also and Dithyrambic poetry, and the music of the flute and the lyre in most of their forms are all in their general conception modes of imitation." For him art is a reflection of life. As Abrams (1995: 24) explains, "mimetic art is art that mirrors or reflects reality". This theory conceives art as a mirror to life. It reflects the realities of life and the day-to-day activities of human being. It has no function more than 'holding mirror to life'. This theory is criticized for giving literature lower status than life itself. It degrades the value of literature as an object by itself.

### 1.2. Objective theories of literature

The basic point of departure for objective theories of literature is their conception of art as an object. For these theories, art doesn't imitate reality. Rather, it has its own reality with in itself. As Abrams (1958:26) explains: " [t]he 'objective orientation' which on principle regards the work of art in isolation from all…external points of reference, analyzes it as a self-sufficient entity constituted by its parts in their internal relations, and sets out to judge it solely by criteria intrinsic to its own mode of being."

As Abrams says in the above quotation, objective perspective takes a literary text as an entity which has its own autonomy. Art for this orientation is not a "mirror" but a "lamp". It has its own reality which is constructed by its parts in their internal relations. It approaches art syntagmaticaly.

### 1.3. pragmatic theories of literature

For theories that are included under this category, literature exits because of its function. Art has a function of some kind i.e. instructional, persuasive, or informative etc. According to Abrams (1958: 20-21), "the pragmatic orientation, ordering the aim of the artist and the character of the work to the nature, the needs

and the springs of pleasure in the audience, characterized by far the greatest part of criticism from the time of Horace through the eighteenth century." As Abrams explains above, pragmatic orientation focuses on the social function of art. Sociology of literature can be taken as a good example here. For such a theory the Function is more important that the work itself.

### 1.4. Expressive theories of literature

In the above discussed orientations, the focus was on 'universe', 'work', and 'audience' respectively. The artist is not taken as a focus in neither of them. The creator of works of art and the creative process is taken as a focal point in expressive theories of art. These theories take the artist as a basis for the existence of art. For them art exposes the thoughts and feelings of the artist. Abrams (1958:21-22) explains this by taking poetry as an example. He says, "…poetry is defined in terms of the imaginative process which modifies and synthesizes the images, thoughts and feelings of the poet." According to this orientation the reality of an art is the reality of its creator because art is the means through which the artist reveals his thoughts and feelings in an imaginative manner.

So far, I have tried to discuss 'fundamental critical orientations of art/ in my case literature/ in a summarized manner. So, it is very much important to explain here why I attempt to do this. My objective of discussing these critical orientations is to show where my argument belongs to. My argument that I explained in the introduction part of my essay focuses on the notion - reality in a text itself. This, then, directly relates to the idea raised by 'objective theories of literature'. These theories, as it is elaborated above, take an art as an autonomous object and try to study it by its own. Because I am attempting to show how a literary text represents its own reality and how it functions in some way as it is, having objective theories of art as critical orientation, I think, is correct. Nonetheless, because there are a number of theories under this category, I should identify particularly which theory I am going to Use as a basis to substantiate my argument.

Of a number of theories that can be categorized under this critical orientation, I believe *that theory of the sign* is an important one for my discussion. Though it is not directly related to art, its objective analysis of language serves as a pillar for most literary theories that have objective orientation.

In the following section, I am going to discuss briefly the main concepts of this theory by focusing on the sign theory of Ferdinand De Saussure. I also attempt to reveal how reality is conceived in this theory by discussing other semiologists' theoretical concepts.

## 2. Theory of the singand reality

As I indicated above, theory of the *sign* can be taken as a significant theory in social sciences. Though it was first designed to study language in a systematic way, its theoretical concepts affect other disciplines like Literary and cultural studies in a remarkable way.

Charles S. Peirce and Ferdinand De Saussure are two very important names that are often mentioned in relation to this theory. Both of them contribute important theoretical concepts about *semiotics* and *semiology*, terms used by Peirce and Saussure respectively as a scientific name for the study of *signs.* Though these terms seem different, most scholars agree on the possibility of using them alternatively (Berger, 1995, Jong, 2008). In this essay also, these two terms are used interchangeably. As Berger (1995:73-74) explains: "[s]emiotics is, literary speaking, the science of signs. The word semiotics…is used to describe a systematic attempt to understand what signs are and how they function." De Saussure says that language is a system of signs. His concept of language as a sign system is very broad and complex. It is difficult to discuss all of his theoretical contributions in such an ordinary essay. However, since I am referring to it as a basis for my argument, it is germane to discuss some of his concepts in detail.

### 2.1 Saussure's theory of the sign

Saussure is very much prominent for his distinction between "*language/langue*" and *"speaking/parole*": the former as "abstract", and the later as "concrete". According to him unlike 'parole', 'langue' is the stable, and it is the social aspect of language. For him "langue" is the very useful part of language that helps us to see the nature of language in a general sense. So, according to him, linguistic study should focus on it, not on"parole".

After he tells us, convincingly, that "langue" should be the subject of linguistic study, he teaches us how it should be studied. And he introduces the "diachronic" and "synchronic" approaches. According to him, "diachronic" study of language focuses on its historical development. Whereas, "synchronic" study deals with how language is used at a particular time. For him the second one is the appropriate way to study

language[2] . Saussure believes that, if the language is studied "synchronically", the general principles which govern the use of that language can be discovered  appropriately.

"Synchronic" study of language focuses on "signs" and their relations with in the language itself. As Jong (2008:19) summarizes the implications of Saussure's preference for this type of study of language, she
 says: "...it implies that language is a unified whole at any particular point in time…Secondly, it suggests that language is self-sufficient and functions autonomously or independently of its historical development…Thirdly, it implies that language is a structured system."

This summary does not only tells us a lot about what implications does Saussure's preference for synchronic study have, but also takes us to his notion called "the differential nature of the sign." Synchronically, language is conceived as a structured system in which "terms" depend on each other to give a meaning. Jong (2008:37) quoting Saussure says, "signs operate only within a system in which each term is dependent on the other terms in the system." This system, according to Saussure, consists of "differences". Without these differences, we can't get signs with distinct meanings. As Jong referring Saussure further explains " [t]hese sets of differences belong to the system of language, to *langue* and not *parole*." The meaning of signs is found in *langue* through "*deferential relations*". So as to achieve this meaning of signs then, we need to create relationships between signs either "vertically" or "horizontally." As far as Saussure is concerned, these relationships help us to see the "differences" which are important factors for a sign to get its meaning. And he calls them "syntagmatic" and "paradigmatic" relationships respectively. *Syntagmatic* relationships according to Jong (2008:43) "…are relationships between all the words in a syntagm." These are relations that exist in a "concatenation." Whereas, paradigmatic relationships are relationships that are "governed by rules of association or selection" (Jong,2008:45). Both the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations are ways of getting meaning of words /signs/ in a system. They all are concerned in what the word refers to. Though Saussure, as Jong (2008:52) puts it, "doesn't tell us what linguistic signs stand for," his contributions in this regard help other scholars to forward important theoretical concepts on how a sign stands for a "referent". And this may take us to other semioticians' works.

---

[2] *Though there are a number of criticisms on this concept, I don't want to discuss them here  because I don't think that the scope of my argument doesn't allow me to do this. I am using Sausure's    ideas here being acceptable  for  me.*

Saussure in his theory of the sign attempts to forward a general system of language study. But the theoretical concepts have been found appropriate for other disciplines too. What Jong (2008:32) says supports this idea. As she explains, "[it] was De Saussure's founding of semiology as a 'science of sign' that enabled his insights about language to be appropriated by other disciplines besides linguistics."

One of these disciplines which make use of Saussure's linguistic concepts is *Literature.* Especially, the concept of *codes* is widely employed in literary studies. Structuralism, in this case, should be referred first. Structuralism is very broad literary theory which encompasses very significant theoretical concepts of a number of literary scholars. It is almost impossible to talk about structuralism in a general sense in such a limited essay except one focuses on a particular scholar. So, based on its significance to formulate my argument and the linkage it has with the sign theory of De Saussure, that I have discussed earlier, I prefer to focus on the theoretical concepts of the "semiotic–structuralist" Jurij Lotman.

Focusing on Lotman has triple advantage for me. First, because he is interested in the application of Saussure's concepts to the objective study of literary texts, it helps me to relate what I have been talking about theory of the sign with my argument about literary texts. Second, his approach to literary texts resembles to Saussure's approach to language. He attempts to apply most of Saussure's ideas on literary texts based on their textual feature. Treating his works here, therefore, assists me in arguing for my premise. Third, as Saussure formulates *simiology* to study the general concept of language, his effort was to come up with a general theoretical framework through which literary texts in general should be studied,. Literary theories that focus on particular genre of literature such as narratology exist based on his proposal. Granted, I may be able to come safely to the core point of my argument by using it as a bridge. In the following section, then, I am going to discuss Lotman's concepts that are related to the relation of *signs* in the text and its *codes*.

## 2.2. Lotman on literary text and its codes

My discussion on Saussure's semiology in the above section of my essay stopped at the point where I referred about the relation between the sign and its referent, which Saussure doesn't say anything about and is often criticized for. Other semioticians, then, prefer to use Peirce's sign theory to fill this gap in the field of semiology. Charles Sanders Pierce is well known for the three types of signs he proposes to show the relationship that exists between the sign and its "referent": i.e. "Iconic signs", "Indexical signs" and

'symbolic signs". He gives reputable explanation for these three types of signs. But what is very important for me here is not there explanation but his conception of the "motivated" nature of the relationship between the sign and what it stands for because it is what Lotman takes as a basis for his proposal. However, I may often touch up on the explanations of these sign types along with Lotman's concepts of the relation of signs in                                        a                                        text.

Saussure argues for the *arbitrariness* of the relationship between the *signifier* and the *signified*. In the contrary, Pierce argues against it. For him the relationship between the *sign* and its *referent* is rather motivated. Especially the "iconic" and "identical" signs have motivated relationship with what they stand for. According to him, 'arbitrariness' exists in "symbolic" signs because "these signs occur when there is a conventional relationship between the sign and what it stands for" (Jong,  2008:116).

The motivated relation between the sign and what it stands for, which is one of the basic contributions of Pierce, is advocated by Lotman's analysis of the literary text as a sign system. I will come back to this point later. But now let me say a little about Lotman's theory on the text and  its codes.

As I have tried to indicate in the above section of my essay, Lotman is one of the scholars who attempt to apply Saussure's theory of sign to study literary texts. He takes most of Saussure's concepts directly and uses them on texts as Saussure used them in his language study. His indebtedness to Saussure's theory starts from his acceptance of texts as a language product. This helps him to apply linguistic study to understand literary texts. For Lotman a literary text is a system of codes. Regarding this, Jong (2008:121) explains, "[h]is analysis of the structure of the poetic text leads to the insight that a variety of different codes operate within a single text." As Jong further says, for him the relationship between these codes is "motivated" not "arbitrary". And this motivated interaction of codes "determines the nature and meaning of the literary text". It is this concept that relates  Lotman  with Pierce.

According to Lotman there are three types of codes in a text such as "interatextual code", "intertextual code" and "extratexual code". He gives detail description about the difference between these codes and this description is widely discussed by other scholars often times. But for me, from these three types of codes, interatexual code is very important than the others because it refers to the interaction of codes with in a literary text itself which is directly related to what I am arguing for. So, I prefer to say a little about it so that

I can take my argument near to its destination    by being   more  focused.

Interatextual codes are codes that are found in the text itself. They refer to codes found in a particular text. These codes have deferential relationship to each other which, as Lotman says, determines the meaning of the text as a language system. His realization of the interatexual codes in a text helps him to identify and differentiate the sign systems that operate in ordinary and poetic language. As Jong(2008:127) referring Lotman Explains, for Lotman, a literary text is characterized by a particular relationship between ordinary and poetic language . Ordinary or natural language is a "primary modeling system", and poetic language is a "secondary modeling system".

His distinction between ordinary and poetic language is very much important to identify the language of literary texts. According to him, Poetic language is the "secondary modeling system" which "…is a model of the systematic or langue-based way meaning operate in ordinary language use" (Jong, 2008:128). This conception of literary language, then, leads him to conclude about a literary  text as a   "model  of its own  langue".

It is this conclusion that makes Lotman's concept peculiar in the field of *structuralist-semiology*. He considers a specific literary text as an autonomous system by itself. And as the system of language is *langue*, for him, a literary text is a system of its own langue. It is because of this that he insists on the significance of studying "the secondary modeling system" to understand the meaning of a literary text. According to him this model enables us to see the "motivated" relationship between sign systems in a text. The meaning that these sign systems create makes the text to be "the model of its own meaning". And he uses the term "iconicity" to explain this relationship (Jong,  2008:136).

Jong (Ibid) says, "we may interpret Lotman's claim to the iconicity of the literary or poetic sign as follows: Lotman regarded the poetic text as an iconic sign because there is relationship of motivation between the formal features of poetic text and range of meanings contained in the text."  So, the concept of iconicity is related to the relationship between the form and content of a text. According to what is stated in the quotation, the form motivates the meaning  of the  content.

So far, I have tried to discuss some basic concepts of Lotmans' proposal on sign and literary texts. My attempt is to show how he conceives literary texts through the general theoretical concepts of semiology. Using what Berger (1995:16) summarizes about Lotman's understanding of literary texts may help us to recapitulate ideas.

For Lotman, Berger (ibid) says, texts as works of art have the following characteristics: Very well defined internal organization, a different kind of language from non texts, a language that functions beyond the plan of language per se as a secondary language or secondary modeling system, a multiplanar character, or in other terms, multiple encoding which means they are open to being decoded in many different ways.

This generalization about literary texts is very much important for me to substantiate what I am arguing for. As I have stated in the introduction part of my essay, my argument focuses on the existence of reality in a text itself. To repeat what I have said there, I believe that a text represents a reality which exists in itself. What Lotman refers as 'iconicity" directly relates to this idea. However, so as to present my idea in a persuasive manner and to reach at a valid conclusion I would like to elaborate what Lotman says about reality and function of literary texts by taking the novel as an example.

My reason for focusing on the novel is that the issue of reality and function of literary texts is widely discussed by naratologists like Gerard Genete (1980,1988), who mainly use novels for their discussion in a way that I am advocating. So, focusing on the novel helps me to get scholarly support from others. Based on this premise and based the theoretical background that I have been constructing throughout my previous discussion, then, I am going to discuss about how the novel represents its own reality and functions per se. My discussion mainly relies on further ideas of Lotman and works of Gerard prience, the naratologist who directly deals with this concept in a number of his articles and books. Whenever necessary I try to explain ideas by using my own examples.

### 3. Reality in literary texts

Lotman's unadulterated concepts about literary texts are a basis for most of the 'contemporary' literary theories. Norratology is one of these theories. It basically takes Lotman's notion as a pillar and applies it on

narrative texts to understand their nature. One of the concepts that narratologists deal with is the relation of elements in the text itself. The text/ here novel is our focus/ is autonomous and the elements) in it are the 'sign systems' that determine the meaning of the text. According them, these elements are what we should study so as to understand the nature of the text. Their relationship and the way they are manipulated in the text, regardless of the author's intention and the social milieu in which they exist, has a power to reveal the meaning of   the  text.                                                                                                                      .

There is reality in a novel which is constructed by the "interatextual" relation of elements. So, the novel represents its own reality. Whatever stated in a narrative, whether is it true or false in the real world, its meaning should be understood within the text itself. To elaborate this idea I would like to cite Gerard (1991:548) here. In his article *Narratology, Narrative and Meaning* he says,

> To explain what governs the production of meaning in narrative, the narratologist must therefore establish a map of the worlds making up the narrative universe (what Ryan [1985] calls the modal structure of that universe). But s/he must also and perhaps above all, describe the conventions or devices which allow for the specification of the alethic value-the truth coefficient-of these worlds. Now, as Doleiel (1980, 1988) has pointed out, the propositions composing a narrative and its worlds can be distinguished on the basis of
>
> their origin (as signified by the text).

Gerard clearly puts the significance of looking at the narrative universe of the text to determine its meaning. What he calls "the alethic value" of the "world" of the text, as far as my understanding goes, is related to the truthfulness of the narrative itself. This truthfulness is, as to me, the way Gerard points to the reality of the text. As we have discussed in the above section, Lotman considers a text as a system of signs. So, here when I say truthfulness of the text, I am referring the truthfulness of different elements and devices that are found in the text within the relation they have to each other. Here, for any elements, the matter of being true or false is determined by the relation that it has with the other elements in the world of the text, not with its relation with the outside

world. Lets take few sentences from Gerard (Ibid):

> In terms of the narrative, and barring any textual indication to the contrary, the world described by the narrator constitutes the world as it is, whatever its

correspondence to our own world (or the way we imagine it) may happen to be. If, for example, the narrator declares that Cerisy is the capital of France, that Napoleon won the battle of Waterloo, that the Soviets have been occupying North America for many years, that Don Juan is chaste, or that Ulysses is naive, each one of these declarations represents a    fact in the  narrative  universe,  if  not  in  our  own.

According to Gerard, what we get in the narrative text is true by itself as far as it fits the reality of the world of the text. What we know in the real world can be presented in a distorted manner in the narrative, we may say that it is not true, it is not the way we get it in the real world, but in the context of its world, it is still true and real. That is why when we read fiction, knowing what we read is not real, we react for or against it. It evokes a feeling on us. Why does it happen? Why are we frustrated when we read ghost stories, or fell happy when a hero defeats a villain in a story as if those characters are real? The answer, though it is polemical, is answered above by Gerard. When we read narrative stories, like novel, we engage ourselves with a world which has reality of its own. This world is not related to the outside world. Reality is there in the text and the text as a code stands for  its on reality.

Let me windup my discussion about reality in literary texts by forwarding my own example. *Dertogada (2009)* is an Amharic novel, it is one of the most widely read and repeatedly published novels in the history of the Amharic Novel. One of the characters in the novel is called Shagiz, who is an engineer scientist in NASSA. This character resembles the person that the world knows very well in the real world, Kitaw Ejigu. He was the first NASA Chief of Space craft and Satellite Systems engineer and Ethiopian patriot. His name is very well known throughout the world because of his contributions for the space science. The main character of the novel that I am using as an example is also prominent scientist in NASA. His deeds are similar to the engineer that we know in the real world. The real Kitaw Ejigu had died on January 15, 2005 after he underwent surgery in Texas (www.enufforethiopiia.net). The fictional Shagiz also dies in a similar way. But in the story the narrator tells us that the death of the scientist is not true. The news of his death is false. He rather is abducted by the American Government and placed somewhere because Americans want to

exploit his talent more and to protect secretes that he knows about    American space technology.

Now, based on this resemblance between the main character of the novel and the scientist that we know in the real world, can we believe that the real Kitaw Ejigu is not really dead because the main character is not dead in the novel? Does it mean that the news of his death that we heard through local and international media was false? Can we even say that the main character of the novel is Kitaw Ejigu himself that we know in the real world? As far as my argument is concerned the answer for both of these questions is 'no!' because the way we believe the death of the scientist in the real world is different from the way we believe his abduction in the novel. We believe all of them are true in their own world. There is no way we could think about the fictional scientist and say 'so, the real scientist is not dead!'. The two may be similar but one can't represent the other. 'The abduction of Kitaw Ejigu by the American government' is true and real within the text itself, not outside it. And it is what all of the theoretical concepts that I have been discussing throughout my essay advocate_ the  text represents its own reality.

I hope, the above example shows the point of my argument clearly. But still there is a question I should further address. It is about the social function of literary texts. The question says, if we deny that literary texts can represent reality would it not lead to a loss of literary  value and literary  function in society? It leads us to the following discussion on the function of literary texts.

## 4. Function of literary texts

I would like to start my discussion about function of literary texts by asking a question. What is the function of literary texts? One may say informing; instructing, enlightening, entertaining, etc are there functions. I agree with this but still I may have a question. What is the difference between the function of literary texts and the function of nonliterary texts? One may say, the function of literary texts is different from non literary texts because it functions in a 'special' way. I can raise a chain of other questions and answers but all of them cannot be new. They have been exploited by different literary scholars for a long time. However, the answers are not found satisfactory yet and even they are very  much subjective.

So, my answer for this question cannot be new and original. It is the repetition of what the literary scholars that I have been referring often times in my essay have said already. And referring what

Lotman says about it is enough. Lotman as quoted in Berger (1995:16) says;

> Since it can concentrate a tremendous amount of information into the "area" of every small text(…) an artistic text manifests yet another feature: it transmits different information to different readers in proportion to each one's comprehension: it provides the reader with a language in which each successive portion of information may be assimilated with repeated readings. It behaves as a kind of living organism which has a feedback channel to the reader and there by instructs him.

When we study what Lotman says in the above quotation, we can see types of functions of "an artistic text". He refers information and instruction as functions of "an artistic text". Here it is important to remember his conception of a text as a system of signs and relate it with what he is referring. Still, his explanation about the function of a literary text emanates from his conception of the text as an autonomous and open ended entity. That is why he says "it transmits different information to different readers". If we see the quotation in detail, we may also come up with an idea which is related to his notion_ the relation of codes in a text. In the quotation we get a sentence which says, "it provides the reader with a language in which each successive portion of information may be assimilated with repeated readings" (emphasis mine). This statement tells us that there is different information but they are related to each other. And relating them is the task of the reader. From this then we can construe that according to Lotman an artistic literary text is the langue of its own system in which itcan deliver a number of functions for readers.

Granted, wouldn't it have been shortage of space, I could have said more on this point. However, what Lotman says above is what I agree with. Hoping that this may answer the question that I raised earlier, let me wind up my discussion here.

## 5.Summary

Throughout my essay I have been attempting to argue for an idea which says: literary texts truly claim that they represent their own reality and they function in some way per se. I substantiate my argument based on the theoretical concepts of different scholars. Semiologists like Saussur and

Pierce, Structuralist-semiologists like Lotman and narratologists like Prince were my focus of discussion. Because I discuss these scholars' works one as descendent of the other, I am able to show the theoretical foundation of my argument in a scholarly manner and reach at a persuasive conclusion.

**References**

Abrams.M.H.1958. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. New York. Oxford University Press.

Berger, Arthur Asa. 1995. *Cultural Criticism: A primer of Key Concepts*..USA: SAGE.

De Saussure, Ferdinand.1916. *Course in General Linguistics.*

Jeferson, Ann & David Robey.1991. *Modern Literary Theory*. Great Britain: B&S Ltd.

Jong, Marianne.2008. *Theory of the Sign in Literature and Culture*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Prince,Gerard. 1991. '*Narratology, Narrative and Meaning'*. Poetics Today. 12:3, PP :543-552

Worku,Yismake. 2009. *Dertogada*. Addis Ababa: Artistic printing press.