

Bujar Hoxha\*

# Multilingualism and sameness versus otherness in a semiotic context

<https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2017-0008>

**Abstract:** Many countries throughout the globe function in a system that allows the usage of more than one language. Such a multilingual social reality's construction, especially in societies like the one in which I am living, is perceived in many different ways: attempting thus to provide for the process of differentiating identity's oneness and sameness into various cultural subcategories, which already represent new realities (and/or otherness in terms of identity's conceptualization). Due to newly created social realities, semiotics naturally discusses the differences and/or oppositions that can contribute to various cultures' mutual exclusivity or inclusivity, in terms of various heterogeneous "transformations," which would thus overcome dualities, and be viewed as single acts of signs, or as a result of a process of singularization of their constituent components. I shall also attempt using a semiotic style that may enact a semiotics of action, grounded on the semiotics of passions, through a way of producing semantic taxonomies as pride versus humiliation, hegemony versus subordination, etc., obtainable due to disjunctive and/or conjunctive semiotic relations such as contextualization versus de-contextualization.

**Keywords:** semiotics, language, subject, passion, context

## 1 Introduction: The semiotic relevance of multilingualism

Human inter-communicational and/or formational processes (either referring to them as parts of communication theories Griffin 2003 or basing them on psychological grounds only Schwartz et al. 2011) include language(s) as one of the mediums through which a communicational process may be performed. The term *medium*, such as shown by scholars (see, for instance, Eco 1979; Guiraud 1983) includes all tools foreseen for an applicable and useable communication process generally, or for a semiotic process, specifically. Language or languages usage and/or their

---

\*Corresponding author: Bujar Hoxha, South-East European University, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, E-mail: b.hoxha@seeu.edu.mk

applicative processes in a full accordance with the linguistic norms as scientifically and culturally standardized norms, by all means are indispensable components either for a human understanding/misunderstanding, or, for any kind of other informational exchanging processes. It is also true however, that other means besides language recognition and usage may be decisive for achieving such a goal. Body language, movements, gestures, and other sorts of non-verbally perceived phenomena, are also a part of the overall communicational process. Semiotics in the specific sense of the word, not only foresees and provides for such processes: which may be developmental, communicative, functional, etc. (such as shown by “classical semiotics”; see, for instance, Tarasti 2000), but it is also relevant to the aforementioned issues, if seen in their various shapes, conceptualized as signs in action (at least in the way seen by Deely 2009). Semiotically perceived elements, among other socially related issues, can be expressed in the form of movements, relationships, and even actions in the frames of their final manifestations (such as described in their analyzable social contexts; see, for instance, Greimas and Fontanille 1993). In conclusion, my aim here is to see such relationships and/or contexts within various languages usages, which indispensably become an analytical object regarding overall cultural context. In my view, a linguistically perceived cultural context may be additionally encoded, due to various ways of social realities’ construction, (either of an objective or subjective nature) specifically taking into consideration diversity and/or otherness, as one of the ways of their semiotic comprehension.

Many countries throughout the globe function in a system that allows the usage of more than one language. This is not only due to such countries’ laws and regulations, but it is also dependent on the social and geographical status of their respective cultural diversities. The given social reality’s construction then may be perceived in more than one way, which would in other words mean providing for the process of differentiating identity’s oneness and sameness into various cultural subcategories that may in turn represent otherness in existing and/or newly created social contexts. Due to such other newly created social realities, which today represent a permanent process of changeability, semiotics, naturally, discusses the differences and/or oppositions that can contribute to various cultures’ mutual exclusivity or inclusivity, as well as to their transformability from one shape to another, so as to show an applicability of different signs’ in action into new shapes of their “becoming” (at least, such as perceived of in Guattari 1995; Deleuze and Guattari 1987). I shall intend by this the heterogeneous nature of language’s development as a cultural phenomenon, which not only can rely on its already established norms as we said, but can be subject to various contextual interventions, therefore subject to establishing other levels of intersubjective communication processes. It is in this issue that

I see the transformability of the phenomenon from one modelling into another. The matter shall naturally be clarified in the following pages of this text.

Owing to such aforementioned facts, I shall attempt to use a semiotic style that may enact a semiotics of action (as shown in Greimas and Fontanille 1993) so as to produce semantic taxonomies such as pride versus humiliation, hegemony versus subordination, etc., as a consequence of obtainable disjunctive and/or conjunctive semiotic relations, manifested in the shape of units such as contextualization versus de-contextualization. I shall in turn try to exemplify the present society I am living, in the frames of rendering such relations passionate, due to the modality in action and subjectivizing processes, based on hypothetical and epistemological grounds.

In order to perform such a task, one has primarily to perceive language as a cultural phenomenon, so as to enable its analysis in the frames of determined extra-linguistic components as well. Or, in other words, one of the ways of seeing through or establishing specific existing and newly created identities is exactly language seen as a part of the overall cultural context. Specifying our object of analysis in the aforementioned way, one concludes that one of the crucial issues to discuss is the relationship between culture and language.

## 1.1 Culture and language: A mutual inclusivity or exclusivity?

Owing to the fact that language here shall be discussed out of its communicational aspect (level), either regarded in its general frames (in its being an integral part of the general culture concept), or regarded in its specific terms (in its being an integral part of a determined specified society and social group belongings), I emphasize that *conventions within its contextual establishment* should also be seen as semiotic systems.<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact, semiotic systems should be created procedurally, be they of a linguistic nature or not. I shall intend chains of signification units by “semiotic systems” in the sense of a procedural defining a code or an encoding act, such as Eco observed:

However, in the social science (as well as in some mathematical disciplines), such systems are almost always recognized or posited in order to show how one such system can convey all or some of the elements of another such system, the latter being to some extent correlated with the former (and vice versa). In other words these systems are usually taken into account only insofar as they constitute one of the planes of a correlational function called a “code.” (Eco 1979: 38)

---

1 Terms used by Eco (1979) and Saussure (1959).

Prior to a structural ordering of languages, seen in their specific contexts (thus, being able to introduce the term of their contextual and semantic differentiating at such an instance), one has to treat language's stemming from a determined culture, and/or its specific categorizations. This shall in this context represent a precondition for language's semiotic relevance. Out of the communicational aspect however, I emphasize that the aforementioned differentiations are being made on the basis of a dichotomy between language and culture as an overall general semiotic system. In such a context, some questions may be advanced: To what an extent are their exclusivity and/or inclusivity dominant, so as to create relations that are structurally and narratively minded? One has to consider in addition, that an elaboration of possible created relations can bring about an omnipresence of the semiotic method, in an attempt to specify the aforementioned categories into a determined semantic universe. After all, one of the important tasks of the semiotic method (out of whichever approach that may be taken into account), is above all, its signification capacity, or a rightful adding of a meaning component.

Specifically speaking, here is one of the reasons why should language represent identity, among other related issues:

Language has such a commanding influence within a culture that Edwards believes language and culture hold the power to maintain national or cultural identity. For him, language is important in ethnic and nationalistic sentiment because of its powerful and visible symbolism; it becomes a core symbol of rallying point. (Samovar and Porter 2004: 141)

As can be seen, it is not only language or its established norms (after all, as a newly established reality; see, for instance, Saussure 1959; Benveniste 1975) that can bring about a conclusion on its usage and/or differentiating within a perceived or presumed reality. Other parameters may contribute to the mentioned goal, which are *embedded and/or inclusive into a specific cultural context*. This would in other words confirm Saussure's thesis on the *conventional* nature of a language, which further defines what he calls semiology (see Saussure 1959: 9–15, italics and paraphrasing mine).

Take identity, for example, as one of the important semiotically discussable components. One has to be aware of one of the language's tools and/or its qualitative capacities, among other related issues: the symbol concept itself (see Bourdieu 1982; Eco 1981). It should be understandable in addition, that semiotics treats the symbol apart from *its linguistic perceiving and/or conceptualizing* as well, among other issues, because of its obtainable semantic results, which may be of a logical and pragmatic nature (see CP). One can thus prove the concept of *differentiation* as a matter of fact, which in itself contains the possibility of the multifold semantic spectrum, and/or its

interpretation possibilities. Thus, all such components make semiotics methodologically significant, especially in terms of the semantic units' identification and/or manifestation. If such is the conclusion, it is logical to state that even different language(s) usage in same social contexts speaks not only of the linguistic difference within, but as well, such an issue would refer to the traditional, habitual and repetitive actions (and/or ways of living) belonging to determined social groups. In order to make such similar concepts visible, with the aim of exposing them to a semiotic representational methodology, one has to exemplify them. Thus, chosen components in consideration should not only be given their right place from a theoretical point of view, but they should also be presented according to well-determined and established theoretical paradigms.

## 2 Experiencing multilingualism: A cultural or a linguistic phenomenon only

### 2.1 Identity and its semiotic relevance

Owing to the fact that culturally distinguishable units are by all means competent for differentiating them specifically for semiotically analyzable purposes, I state that one has to treat *identity* here, as one of their basic items to discuss, alongside other socially related issues. It is in turn evident that there are some ways of identifying ourselves, such as biological, genetic, psychological, social, linguistic, and ethnic, which should as a matter of fact be intended as subcategories of the general cultural category. In order to treat multilingualism specifically and discuss its semiotic relevance, one has to count the aforementioned ways of human identification and/or self-representation. Although my aim in this text is not to give detailed scientific facts in a close relation with the identity notion, I consider it appropriate to give at least some of the definitions of the term. After all, the multilayered process of identifying ourselves entails in itself more than one semiotic process. It is for this reason that this notion should be semiotically revisited, in the sense of exposing such a notion to the multiplicity of choice: therefore, to overcome possible dualisms and oppositions at such an instance. In my view, this is one of the ways to render cognitively relevant interpretation possibilities, which are multiple and may all represent otherness instead of sameness, also seen as final and empiric results, with a sole aim of considering semiotics a core analytical methodology.

One of the aforementioned kinds of identification, for instance, is the biological and social one as well as its subsequent structuring: the sphere of human emotionality and interactionism.<sup>2</sup> I shall purposely insist on the aforementioned distinction in this part of the text, because of the encoding and decoding processes, which shall be discussed later. Not only can such concepts represent an outcome of determined psychological processes in close relation with the identity notion still to be discussed in this contribution, but they are also communicationally significant. The predispositions that define the aforementioned concept have already been specified as basic theoretical paradigms (either in initial human psychological developmental stages, such as for instance in Piaget and Inhelder 1969, or later after adolescence), which not only help building our formational processes, but are as well, conditioned by our *interaction with the other, and/or significant others* (Schwartz et al. 2011). In order to prove this statement, which as can be seen, puts identity in two different scientifically treatable fields, we shall quote here what has been observed in relation to this phenomenon:

In Erikson's conception, neither does the individual adapt to society nor does society mold him (sic) into its pattern; rather, society and individual form a *unity* within which a mutual regulation takes place. The social institutions are pre-conditions of individual development, and the developing individual's behavior, in turn, elicits that help which society gives through its adult members directed by its institutions and traditions. Society is not merely a prohibitor or provider; it is the necessary matrix of the development of all behavior. (Rapaport in Schwartz et al. 2011: 32)

One would thus have to conclude that all involved processes include a multi-dimensional approach that embodies all hypotheses for the aim of analyzing them properly. Namely, not only that the term *process* should have a psychological significance here, but it should also be a general part of *social reality's construction*, even if seen differently, or freed from its psychological frame (see Griffin 2003; Burke and Stets 2009). In conclusion, one has to treat identity in its both segments: either with regard to human developmental processes or interactionism, or as a part of social sciences and inter-human communication. As it is otherwise stated:

In other words, identity comprises not only "who you think you are" (individually or collectively), but also "who you act as being" in interpersonal and intergroup interactions – and the social recognition or otherwise that these actions receive from other individuals or groups ... (Schwartz et al. 2011: 2)

---

<sup>2</sup> I have inserted the term "interactionism" (see Griffin 2003) for the sake of discussing obtainable social realities. In my view, identity and human interactionism should be both treated as a tool for creating semiotic preconditions for further scientific elaboration.

Although differently perceived social realities represent ways of living of determined social groups, a fact that individualizes the process itself, each of us has his/her own social reality constructed and/or perceived. This would naturally regard a psychological way of viewing each identity's construction individually. Or, in other words, there is no such a thing as a oneness, or a uniform vision and/or perception of external reality (Bogdashina 2005, paraphrasing is mine). It should be understandable now, why the term identity represents a complex phenomenon. Otherwise, one of the semiotically relevant issues to discuss is the relationship between the self and the other. I shall consider this an additive circumstantial occurrence in terms of the linguistic identity, which here naturally shall be elaborated in detail. It is because of these reasons that one concludes that the matter is of a twofold nature: either a psychological if individual identity is considered, or a social one (if one considers collective identity, as well as its interactional processes, respectively). Treating both of them simultaneously, as well as aiming at *their own mutual way of forming meaning*, shall for us represent a process of semiosis, for purposes of applied semiotic units in concrete and perceivable grounds. The reason in conclusion as to why such sorts of human representations and/or self-representations have been mentioned here is the following: psychologically speaking, the verbal expression that entails language usage comes later within various stages of the human development as an occurrence in general, therefore such previously experienced and/or lived stages<sup>3</sup> should be counted for the methodological purpose of reaching the verbal component, as our main object of discussion. Or, in other words, not only that perception and cognition processes do not include language usage only, but they represent an important part of inter-human communication even in pre-verbal developmental stages. In such a context, the following regards the period when the child does not hold a *symbolic representation*:

This is particularly clear in the case of the period where language is still absent. We call it the “sensori-motor” period because the infant lacks the symbolic function; that is, he does not have representations by which he can evoke persons or objects in their absence. (Piaget and Inhelder 1969: 31)

As can be seen, there still are not real, realistically and/or essentially perceiving processes as well as cognitive ones in the frames of the developing child (naturally, as far as the aforementioned “sensory-motor” stage is

---

<sup>3</sup> As far as the difference between the “stories lived” and “stories told” is concerned, which to my view represents another issue of a semiotic relevance (see Griffin 2003) it will be later concluded that it also represents another encoding act in terms of exemplifying different kinds of identities.

concerned). His/her interactionism understandably should be intended as performed by the *intermediation* of other tools and/or by significant others (rather belonging to the biological and neuro-biological human systems), such as primitive defense mechanisms, infant reflexes, etc. The semiotic reason in conclusion to even mention the “sensori-motor” stage of the child’s development is precisely because of the absence of the *semiotic function*, as claimed by Piaget, which doubtlessly pre-conditions human verbal expressivity. It should be remarked in addition that not all stages of the child’s development shall be mentioned here: my aim is only to search for the initial stages of human self-identification. Consequently, the following question can be advanced: When does the verbal expression appear, and what importance does it hold for treating multilingualism? The following pages of this text, as claimed, shall hopefully contribute to the answer to the aforementioned question in a procedural way.

## 2.2 Perceiving the phenomenon semiotically

Basing ourselves on such grounds, I state that *a used language* compared to *a standardized language* differs in turn, which is, among other issues, culturally dependent. Saying that the society I am living uses Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish, in the frames of its contextual development would not represent a sufficient fact in terms of the usage of such languages. As a matter of fact, what we intend to say is that it is not only that linguistic forms (and/or their morphological backgrounds) that can be of a decisive nature, but also their *practical usages*. The usage term, or the explicit linguistic expressivity, communicationally regarded as *an act of speech* (see Searle 1969) shall here represent another dichotomy, as otherwise already shown by scholars. If one exemplifies here the early production of the Structural period in the early twentieth century (see, for instance, Saussure 1959) then the situation would be clear: not only that one differentiates among terms of expression (either in a standardized shape or not), but one can also contribute to other related issues, which thus make this concept socially conditioned. The fact itself, of language’s *brand new reality*, speaks of such a difference, which seen in the context I am living, makes it scientifically complex. Simply because of usage of more than one language that otherwise, as may be concluded, contain in themselves core semiotic processes. To conclude, semiotics should regard such a viewpoint as a starting point, thus enabling a deduction of meaningful units that should proceed to their manifestation status.

If the analytical object of our discussion is regarded in such a fashion, then there is no doubt in the existence and prevalence of the semiotic processes that



permanently occur. If our thesis is established in the aforementioned way, then it would be logical to ask: Which are such semiotic processes? Do various phenomena mentioned always have to be considered in terms of dichotomies? The answer to such question is no doubt, of a complex nature.

First, using one and only language, makes *oneness* visible. This would in turn equalize one's citizenship and ethnical belongings, which to such social contexts as mine, is not the case. Second, using more than one language makes *otherness* visible, which differentiates features within such aforementioned belongings on the one hand, but on the other, allows other distinctive features' exposure, for the aim of their further semiotic decomposition. Finally, it should be remarked here that procedures to reach a goal, a goal which should be semiotically and semantically relevant, shall be considered in this text as the applied part of semiotics (which shall still be explicated in later sections of this text).

Third, if such languages' usage is not considered in its standardized form and usage only, then it can further complicate one's analytical object in the following sense: the socially dependent units of a semantic verbal expressivity may be seen in their diversity of expression, which socio-linguistically and semiotically makes choices relevant. In conclusion, however, I state that multilingualism means using more than one language instantly or simultaneously; or better, having the competence for them, as foreseen by Chomsky's theory, for instance.

Such a situation can be easily witnessed in the present society I am living. My emphasis on the cultural component, which renders itself semiotically relevant for the choices and divisions in categories to discuss, is due to other contextual factors, that make such other components' inclusion within a language used as a tool contributing to an interpersonal sort of communication. Finally, such sort of communication becomes subjective and/or subjectivized as I shall attempt to show, and is therefore transformable and changeable. Such categories in conclusion should among other related issues, be intended as psychological processes as well.

Instancing multilingualism in societies and social realities of the kind, thus, attempting to produce *otherness* in terms of identity's perceiving instead of *same-ness* makes a semiotician describe encoding/decoding processes so as to reach their narration component, as a starting point towards enacting, as we said, a manifestation result. If the semiotic preconditions are conceptualized in the aforementioned way, then heterogeneity and singularity instead of dichotomous provisions should be established as a core methodology. Owing to the multiplicity of choice in semiotics as well as to the linguistic "comprehension" of semiotics, I shall here attempt to apply both aforementioned methodological choices

simultaneously. Then finally, one asks: What is “sameness” on one hand, and “otherness” on the other, within frames of the context being discussed in the present text?

First, *sameness* should stand for a biological perceiving of our identity status, due to determined developmental processes of human personality (exemplifying the early childhood period to adolescence; see Schwartz et al. 2011). Such processes however, should not only develop, but as we said, they should be a part of the overall acquisition process. It is here that the differentiating process starts. Or, in other words, it is for similar reasons that even this component should not be considered as invariable or unchangeable. As we shall attempt to show, certain “transformation” process may occur even in terms of such developmental stratification of human personalities, so as to conclude a determined process of action of signs, which definitely through stages may separately pertain to determined semantic units, which are procedurally obtainable.

Second then, *otherness* stands for each and every distinctive feature that would emerge as a result: either due to *transformational processes lived* owing to determined social contexts, or due to *pragmatic and logical consequences* of perceiving, or contextualizing various cultures’ units. Both of the terms, in conclusion, construct general concepts to discuss as semiotic systems. The first one of them belongs to ontologically based semiotics, whereas the second one belongs to epistemologically based semiotics. This renders semiotic relations passionate, as it is hoped that shall be seen in terms of the concrete analyzable units of our object of discussion. Both of the mentioned approaches, in my view, should not be seen as contradicting each other, but they should on the contrary be seen, as for instance, the second following the first one, therefore contributing to the multiplicity of choice in frames of perceiving semiotics as an analytical methodology. Or, in other words, if phenomena are considered to be contradicting each other, then it should stand for purposes of their stages of elaboration, and/or as a procedural choice towards their different perception in different given conditions. After all, even in pure linguistic view of the languages’ development, one should be certain that the word “transformation” should have key significance. It is in the aforementioned context, in conclusion, that the term “transformation” should not only be regarded out of its denotational aspect, but it should consider its connotative outcomes as well. Semiotically speaking then, it should also already be clear that transformation and/or “transformability” units emerging as a result of determined processes of decomposition of given semiotic entities under discussion should be a key conception in regard to the analytical object(s) being treated in this text.

## 3 Languages' semiotic relevance

### 3.1 Reterritorialization and deterritorialization

Claiming that pre-verbal communication and/or a determined sort of human behavior pre-conditions language's appearance and/or usage (especially in regard to the psychological background of the discussed problematics), entails in itself the heterogeneous nature of languages' acquisition. I shall intend by this the changeability of the term, specifically regarded in the sense of its usage in the frames of the society I am living. It is thus that the phenomenon can be seen as a "rhizome" (in the sense as described in Deleuze and Guattari 1987) in a continuum, and/or a phenomenon in a permanent process of a multiple transformability. Or, in other words, a rhizome shall for us be represented by the initial "internal speech behavior," which then further enables what we call speech and/or a verbal expressivity by way of "becoming" of its determined constituent parts. I shall intend by this term all sorts of language usage (in whichever condition of their applicability), which then by way of becoming, reterritorialize themselves in different given social conditions. As hopefully we shall be able to show, this is particularly significant in the case of the acquisition of more than one language.

Norms, or normative rules in language governance on the other hand, shall be regarded as a tool that helps building a common convention aimed at a mutual and an overall understanding process. Or, in other words, they should all represent a common code, by which an overall comprehension can be enabled, including all participants in given *cultural event(s)*.<sup>4</sup> It should in conclusion cover various semantic consequences and/or outcomes in frames of specific instances of language usage(s). One concludes additionally that the aforementioned problematics is of a twofold nature: either theoretical or practical. Let us now elaborate some practical matters. The country I am living uses Macedonian as a constitutionally established official language. However, due to other cultures' (as well as ethnic identities') existence, other languages such as Albanian, Turkish, Bosnian, and Serbian, have become parts of constitutional languages in official use. The official use of such other languages is based upon the percentage of the various ethnic groups living in determined specific areas of the country. Or, in other words, one can use these other official languages publicly in places where such populations live. As a matter of fact, such is the

---

<sup>4</sup> My reference is metaphorical: the "event" regards the initial stages of human verbal communication.

rule, and/or the legislative regulation. Owing to such mentioned facts, I consider that *local languages* in the frames of our discussion (and/or our own perceived social reality) can be conceived as parts of the reterritorialization process. In the context of the society (or country in other circumstances) in which I am living, I intend by this process their gradual coming into existence, therefore, into a practical communicating medium among verbal expressivities of different cultures' participants. If the situation is such as described then, all languages discussed act simultaneously, thus making their signification capacity irrelevant, because of the fact of their constant changeability and "becoming." In this case as a matter of fact, "becoming" means acquiring and linguistically *growing up*, in the metaphorical sense of the term. Or, in other words, this entails becoming multilingual.

In concrete and practical grounds, all languages used in Macedonia have reterritorialized their cultural roots, origin, and place. Such units, now transformed into rhizomes, if one wants to quote Deleuze and Guattari (1987) are seen as "lines," as I would be encouraged to add, in a shape of disproportional lines. Such is the way they encode themselves. Or, in other words, reterritorialization in this sense means encoding, on one hand, and on the other, deterritorialization means decoding. In the context of the matters discussed, languages in the society I am living deterritorialize themselves disproportionally; in other words, not each and every processed linguistic sign is decoded proportionally. Disproportionality in turn, regards unequivocal messages processed by linguistic signs, if matters are understood in terms of their practical expressivity and usage. The matter is consequently socially and politically conditioned. I shall name *extra-contextual factors* the ones that affect a language usage by other means that are different to the ones that we have described up to this point of the text; or, practically speaking, the political impact on the discussed problematics itself. Such matters, in my opinion, also regard interpretation possibilities and/or outcomes that would come as a result of a semiotic analysis of the languages in question. It is for such reasons that in the aforementioned contexts, the semiotic comprehension of multilingualism phenomenon in frames of societies of the kind may also belong to epistemological grounds.

Owing to various "contextual interventions," a language usage may not only rely on its norms: in frames of interpersonal communication capabilities, it may however become subjective, and/or intersubjective; thus consequently, a part of inter-human relations. This should not only be intended in cases of metaphoric usage and/or expressivity, but also in cases of languages' essential or basic denotational capacities. Or, in other words, contextual "interventions" among acts of speech as I have named them above, occur because of semiotic relations

existence. Such relations render themselves passionate, or may be a subject to passionate configurations; therefore, they render themselves subjectivized. In the event of such a subjectivization, various cultural, ethnic, and linguistic identities make themselves visible and exposable; therefore, an object of semiotic analysis.

## 4 Conclusion

Owing to the legislative regulations as we have attempted to show above, as well as the disproportionality of the languages in use in the social reality I am living, semiotic relations can be represented along two axes, one paradigmatic and one syntagmatic. I shall also intend by this the distinction between seeming and reality (see Greimas 1973; Greimas and Fontanille 1993). Consequently, in appearance all languages are used proportionally according to adopted laws by all *actors* and/or participants on the one hand, but on the other, in reality, languages are used disproportionately (and/or selectively). It is so because of the impact of the extra-contextual factors,<sup>5</sup> as we mentioned. Owing to the created relations, a sense of tensitivity is created, which is not only dependent on linguistic norms and regulations, but as it should be understandable on cultural and traditional components as well. On one hand, therefore, rules govern official languages' usage, whereas on the other, one should face the explicit linguistic expressivity, which by matters of occurrence in the area, naturally impose being multilingual. Since semiotics needs a sort of "conflictual situation" in terms of rendering relations of this kind, tensitivity appears. This is all caused by extra-contextual factors, such as various nominating of the cultural and ethnical groups, which gradually by now have been transformed into "ethnic communities." It is for this reason that "despair" appears as a passion in the mentioned context.

In conclusion, in the axis of appearance we have multilingualism accomplished, whereas in reality monolingualism and bilingualism are used partially. After all, this contributes to the heterogeneous nature of languages' acquisition.

---

<sup>5</sup> Such factors shall not be elaborated in this contribution, owing to the fact that they belong to "daily politics" rather than to "policy making," as well as because of the sensitiveness of the current political surroundings.

## References

- Benveniste, Emil. 1975. *Problemi opšte lingvistike*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Bogdashina, Olga. 2005. *Communication issues in autism and Asperger syndrome: Do we speak the same language?* London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Language & symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burke, J. Peter & E. Jan Stets. 2009. *Identity theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deely, John. 2009. *Purely objective reality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari. 1987. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1979. *A theory of semiotics*, Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1981. Simbolo. In *Enciclopedia Einaudi*, vol. 12, 877–915. Torino: Einaudi.
- Greimas, A. J. 1973. *On meaning*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Greimas, A. J. & Jacques Fontanille. 1993. *The semiotics of passions: From state of affairs to states of feelings*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Griffin, Em. 2003. *A first look at communication theory*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Guattari, Felix. 1995. *Chaosmosis*. Bloomington & Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Guiraud, Pierre. 1983. *Semiologija*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Peirce, Charles S. 1931–1966. *The collected papers of Charles S. Peirce*, 8 vols., C. Hartshorne, P. Weiss & A. W. Burks (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [Reference to Peirce's papers will be designated CP followed by volume and paragraph number.]
- Piaget, Jean & Bärbel Inhelder. 1969. *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic.
- Samovar, Larry A. & Richard E. Porter. 2004. *Communication between cultures*, Annie Mitchell (ed.), 5th edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959. *Course in general linguistics*, Charles Bally & Albert Sechehaye (eds.). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Schwartz, Seth J., Koen Luyckx & Vivian L. Vignoles. 2011. *Handbook of identity theory and research*. New York: Springer.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarasti, Eero. 2000. *Existential semiotics*. Bloomington & Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.