Signs of Colonial Discourse and their Psycho-Semiotic Significance

Shahzad-ul-Hassan Farooqi
Department of English, College of Education
Al-Majmaah University, Al-Majmaah, Saudi Arabia

Abstract
Colonial discourse is defined as a "complex of signs and practices" (Ashcraft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998, p.235). In the light of this statement this research article investigates following main questions. 1-What are those signs and practices which constitute colonial discourse? 2- How do they signify according to semiotic theory? This article is a philosophical endeavour to develop conclusive argument to determine the psycho-semiotic nature of those meaning making practices which form the very basis of the colonial discourse. The aim of this study is to establish a triangular link of the sign theory, psychological conditioning and colonial discourse. Fairclough's (1995) triadic model of Critical Discourse Analysis has been used to analyse various linguistic practices of colonisers at Description—Interpretation—Explanation levels. After exemplifying from various texts, the study concludes that colonial signs are psychologically conditioned, discursively conventionalised and socially upheld linguistic practices which disseminate ideas they stand for. Hence, colonialism is not only a historical fact but also a linguistically and semiotically crafted phenomenon. The article lays down a vivid criterion which can serve for further analytical studies in the domain of colonial and post-colonial discourse.

Key words: colonial discourse, post-colonial discourse, psychology, semiotics, sign theory

Introduction

Stubbs describes discourse as "language above the sentence or above the clause" (1983, p.1). However, Foucault's (1972) considers discourse from yet another dimension as "a regulated practice that accounts for a certain number of statements" (p.80). He speaks of two things about discourse; regularity and possibility of several meaning making practices which are ideologically unified. This becomes a seminal idea upon which many philosophers and linguists now base their peculiar fields of studies by demarcating the range of those regulated practices which constitute a particular discourse. Said (1978) believes colonial discourse is a system for making statements about the Orient. These statements are linguistic, social, and cultural representations of the colonised in every meaningful form of expression or text. Another important thing which Said mentions is the "discursive consistency" of such "cultural praxis" which he believes exists in colonial discourse (1978, p. 274). Ashcraft et al. (1998) dub this system of statements within the ambit of colonial discourse as a "complex of signs and practices" (p.235). Here arise many questions. Are there any signs which are related to the colonial discourse? Why *sign* has been differentiated from *practices*? Can *sign* encompass all the diverse dimensions of colonial discourse? What theoretical grounds can help us relate signs with colonial discourse? To understand the true nature of colonial discourse, it is imperative that we know as to what these signs and practices are and how do they constitute colonial discourse. Besides presenting a brief review of the sign theory, this article enumerates linguistic and social practices which serve to constitute signs of colonial discourse and its markers. The study relies on Critical Discourse Analysis model of Fairclough (1995) and through exemplification from different texts of colonisers it establishes conventionalised linguistic practices as signs signifying what we know as colonial discourse.

Objectives of the Study

The objective of this research is to determine linguistic practices which serve as signs of colonial discourse. Secondly, the research aims at explaining the psycho-semiotic link of the sign theory with the colonial discourse. Thirdly, it suggests criteria of analysis based on Fairclough's (1995) model to help researchers further investigate in this filed on proper grounds.

Research Questions:

1- What are the signs of colonial discourse?

2- Which linguistic practices are to be considered as signs?

3- How do these signs and practices signify within semiotic theory?

4- How do they generate psychologically associative meanings?

5- What colonial practices do these signs enunciate?

Literature Review:

Colonial discourse as a theory became known in late 1970s particularly after Said's (1978) critical and insightful work regarding oriental studies (Ashcroft et al. 1998), however, its emergence spans over centuries. Chronologically speaking, colonial discourse is the predecessor

of post-colonial discourse and part and parcel of social memory of societies which experienced it. Colonial discourse is difficult to define. According to Spurr (as cited in Bentley, 2016) it is a "series of colonizing discourses…having in common certain elements" (p.62). Although heterogeneous in time and space as Young (2016) observes, it is the collective body of discourses which share "systemic and general themes in the ideologies and vocabularies" (Bentley, 2016, p.63). As we have discussed that colonial discourse is a system of statements. These statements are made to uphold the political supremacy and racial superiority of the colonizer, represent the colonized as denigrated, and create a world view based on the hegemony of the colonizer. Statement is primarily anything that has meaning within a particular context. Hence, any meaning making practice may be regarded as statement of that particular discourse which it represents. In conclusive remarks Ashcraft et al. (1998) define colonial discourse as a "complex of signs and practices" (p.235), making it imperative upon us to know the real nature of these signs and practices within which they are imbedded.

Since time immemorial history man has been creating and interpreting signs to reflect his inner ideas. Whether it be graffiti of the cavemen, cuneiform and hieroglyphs or alphabets, all are forms of human expression in which he has been minting signs by connecting them with the signification they stand for. If we could encompass different theories about *signs* we would find that signs have been categorized as natural signs, associative signs and conventional or communicative signs. According to Augustine (as cited in Jackson, 1969), natural signs are natural objects or events which we can see, and which can refer to some unobservable things as smoke is a sign of fire. They signify on their own, without human intervention. Empiricus (2005) believes signs are associative. Associative signs are based on correlation between the sign and the signified, which we develop through our previous experiences. Hence, we interpret them but also interpret them differently. Conventional or communicative signs are also associative, but they are arbitrarily made to convey what we understand, and a general consensus is developed about their meanings. Augustine categorises them as intentionally produced or willingly given signs because they are made for "transferring to another mind (animum) what is conceived in the mind of the person who gives the sign." (as cited in Jackson, 1969, p.13). This is the crux of communication. The formation of conventional signs is based on purposefully relating a signifier with a signified, within a particular frame of reference, for a long period of time. When another person, besides the speaker, adopts this relationship of signifier and signified and makes it part of his working vocabulary, the sign gets its meaning through performing the communicative function between them. How does this relationship of signification become strong? It depends on:

1- The longer the signifier and the signified are associated, the stronger the connection.
2- The larger the number of people who understand associated meanings, the stronger the connection.
3- The more they conventionalize this relationship among themselves, the better the connection.

The meaning of conventional signs depends on how and for what purpose people use them. According to Arnauld and Nicole (1996) these signs have "distant relation to the thing symbolised or none at all" (p-6). In this way conventional signs are arbitrarily assigned.

Peirce (1955) in his triadic categorization of signs as icon, indices and symbols, designates human language as symbolic signs which arbitrarily stands for other things. It serves communicative purpose and has an intent behind its use. Locke (1794) also propounds that words are "sensible marks of ideas" (p.430). He is of the view that a linguistic expression gets its particular meaning when it is regularly used, and it continuously stands for a certain idea in communication.

In the light of the above discussion, we can say that words themselves are signs. But they do not appear alone in a void. They are spoken by people, in certain situations and for certain purposes. Searle (1969) says that linguistic communication helps us perform intended speech acts and we use language to present and represent things, state what we feel, give commands, suggestions, requests, and even threats. In this way words have performative force and makes us do or at least respond to what the speaker intends us to do or respond to. Our behavioral responses get connected with linguistic communication. This is the behavioral aspect of language. Linguistic signs arouse a certain psychic phenomenon, an understanding, a feeling or a judgment in minds of the listeners which results in a certain behavioral response and their continuous use together creates a psychic relation (Farooqi,2008). According to the Relevance Theory, a message is interpreted within "cognitive" relevance (Sperber & Wilson, 2004, p.608). This cognitive relevance is social relevance because social relevance structures an individual's cognition. That is why Saussure (1983) believes that signs have their life or role in society. Peirce (1955) further propounds about this social role of sign when he relates it to human intervention.

> A sign, or representamen, is something which stands to *somebody* [emphasis added] for something in some respect or capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. (p. 99).

In this way our language, our discursive practices and social and cultural patterns are all signs which mean what they mean within the social setting we are part of. When we receive a sign, we relate it to socially and conventionally accepted meanings. Kristeva (1973) believes that as language is a social practice and it signifies, so do all other social practices. Sapir (1949) opines "every cultural pattern and every single act of social behaviour involves communication in either explicit or implicit sense" (p.104). Therefore, anything that signifies and is adopted by the community as a convention becomes a sign.

Convention is mutually agreed meaning of something that a society or a linguistic community adopts. Regularity is the crux of convention. Peirce (1955) terms it as "learning by experience" (p.98), Clarke (1987) describes it as "association in the past.... result of prior learning" (p.27) and Reid (2000) considers it as "connection with the thing signified...discovered only by experience" (p.59). This is psychological and behavioural conditioning as discovered by Pavlov (1960) in his famous experiment on dog. With repeated associations of food and a bell, the sound becomes an arbitrary psychological stimulus which brings forth a physiological response. This is convergence of *psycho-semiotic paradigm* about which Ogden and Richards (1989) say that:

> When a context has affected us in the past the recurrence of merely a part of the context will cause us to react in the way in which we reacted before. A sign is always a stimulus similar to some part of an original stimulus and sufficient to call up the engram formed by that stimulus. (p.53)

This is "higher order contextualisation" (Thaibault, 1997, p.220), which is required for interpretation of the sign. Contextualisation constitutes significance of the sign by calling forth interpretive rules or conventions necessary for generating meanings. Production and interpretation of texts become a kind of rule-governed activity within which familiar narrative patterns are superimposed on signs and we convey and understand what they mean conventionally. Traffic signal lights work as conventional sign because we all know what they mean. *Psycho-semiotic paradigm* then converges into *socio-semiotic paradigm* because an individual's social conditioning plays basic role in his adoption of value systems, social trends and taboos etc. Things have meanings for us the way they have meanings for all other members of the community. Beyond the cultural context they don't have meaning for us because psychologically as well as semiotically, we live within the bounds of social conditioning. As language is a conditioned semiotic system, both above-mentioned paradigms merge into the third one; the *Linguo-Semiotic paradigm*. Linguistic conditioning gives birth to "conventionalised-linguistic practices" (Farooqi, 2008, p.40), which are part of our psychological, semiotic as well as social being. When we consistently associate a certain linguistic item or an expression with some idea, within a particular context, it becomes a sign of psychological, semiotic and social relevance. To know what a sign means we need to place it in that social, cultural and psychological context within which it means what it means. Hosper (1953) believes that when something starts standing for something else and this practice spreads among people, it is adopted by common convention. Alston (1964) terms this the "habit" of signification because conventions are consistent patterns of socio-semiological resources which are "being used in a certain way" (p.57). Hence, conventionalised linguistic practices are formed through consistent use of a word, a linguistic expression, standing for a particular signified idea or thought in a particular discursive perspective.

Colonial discourse is a reservoir of such signs which have been employed for centuries to create a world view. It is an ensemble of peculiar linguistic items and typical expressions, which are embedded in particular ideological assumptions. It is an example of such a sign functioning and these *conventionalized linguistic practices* are signs of colonial discourse. These practices are repeatedly and frequently found in texts of the colonizers wherein they describe the world of the colonized as well as their own. In following analysis, such linguistic and thematic features have been explained from various colonial texts of historical importance.

Methodological Background: Fairclough's Model
To analyse these signs, Fairclough's (1995) model of Critical Discourse Analysis is of particular importance. He describes three levels at which a researcher may perform in-depth analysis of discourse. Fairclough's levels of analysis can be understood in terms of these steps:
   1- Description: word level. (where exact words as linguistic items relate to a particular discourse and their semantic and connotative meanings are exposed)

2- Interpretation: discursive level. (where meanings interplay with intertextual relations of a text and it is embedded in the discourse it belongs to.)
3- Explanation: conventional or social level. (where particular meaning making practices become conventional narrative patterns of a society within which that discourse generates.)

It is very important to note that such an analysis starts from words, which are taken as particular signs of that typical discourse and then analysis keeps on expanding by incorporating semantic contiguity, intertextual relations and all those linguistic practices which stand for or refer to the same discourse from various dimensions of signification.

Conventionalised Linguistic Practices as Signs of Colonial Discourse

Following are major linguistic practices which stand out as signs of colonial discourse because they have attained status of a convention within colonial discourse. For any analysis pertaining to colonial discourse, they are fundamentally relevant.

Binaries

Binaries constitute the *Description* level of analysis where words are analysed. They hold special importance in colonial discourse. In binary conception, a thought or a thing is placed in relation with its opposite (Burke, 1969). They create a relation of hierarchical dominance between two opposing things or ideas in which one is superior and the other is inferior. (Ashcroft et al. 1998; Domke, 2004). In colonial discourse Self / Other representation holds special significance. It belongs to binaries of macro level. Macro level binaries like Self and Other exist conceptually through other binaries. They do not appear as lexical items, rather they are signified by micro binaries and are referred to indirectly. Micro level binaries are the lexical items like *good* and *evil*, *best* and *worst*, *we* and *they*, *our* and *their* etc. Sometimes, micro level binaries like traits of being good and evil become macro level binaries or conceptual ones when they are referred to semantically by using other linguistic expressions which are synonymous with or stand for good and evil. If *best* and *worst* binaries, both or any of them, appear as lexical items in a text, they are micro level binaries referring to a still bigger class of binaries i.e. *Self* and *Other*. For example, in his poem "The White Man's Burden", Kipling (1994) terms the Europeans as *best* when he says, "Send forth the best ye breed" (p.334). Here, the self-image is created through *best*. However, *best / worst* is to be considered macro level binaries if they are realised in a text through other semantic or even pragmatic expressions. In the same poem the image of the colonised *Other* is presented by words "fluttered folk", "wild" and "sullen peoples" who are "half devil" and "half child" (p.334). Here, the worst epithets signify the *Other* indirectly. Similarly, binaries of Humanitarian / Murderous, innocence/vile belong to macro level because they are conceptual ones and their signification appears through various linguistic expressions often other than themselves. Renowned proponent of colonialism in the U.S. Senate, Albert j. Beveridge's (1908) address is reflective of this fact when he says that Filipinos (people of then American Colony) were "savage blood, oriental blood, Malay blood" (p.72). He describes Filipinos as "barbarous", (p.65), which is a derogatory term. In comparison with them he upholds the good image of America as self-governing nation. He says, "What alchemy will change the oriental quality of their blood, in a year, and set the self-governing currents of the American pouring through their Malay veins?"

(Beveridge, 1908, p.71). He pragmatically rules out the likelihood of a change in Filipinos and relegates them to the lowest level of existence when he says, "in dealing with the Filipinos we deal with children." (Beveridge, 1908, p.73).

Binaries are linguistic practices which reflect the social practice of the colonizer to compartmentalise the world into *Self* and *Other*. Binaries are ways to create segregated worlds of different identities. In colonial discourse, projection of *Self* is a social practice of the colonizer through which everything superior, orderly and beautiful is related to his own self, while everything ugly, evil and bad is related to the colonised native and "to say 'native' is automatically to say 'evil'" (JanMohamed, 1995, p.19).

A similar binary construction of self, deeply embedded in the idea of racial superiority, finds expression in the words of Rhodes (1976) when he claims that "more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race more of the best the most human, most honourable race the world possesses." (p.250)

Lexical items *best, human,* and *honourable race* construct the self-image of the coloniser. Binaries are signs, which construct a psychological schema of immediate associations, expressed through linguistic practices that represent the coloniser and the colonized. Hence, such use of language or linguistic signs towards native people by the colonizer became a social practice, conventionalised in texts reflective of colonial discourse.

Pronouns and Adjectives
Next important sign functioning in colonial discourse is to be found in Pronouns and Adjectives. They are also closely related to the creation of *Self* and *Other* identities. Fairclough gives importance to Pronouns for their "relational values" (1989. p.127). The use of *We* in colonial discourse reflects national association and communal superiority. It presents the speaker as a member of a large authoritative community with a higher level of moral obligation and thus creates a psychologically unified and ideologically driven nation in this discursive process. *You, They, Those,* represent the oppositional unified community. So, the use of such Pronouns creates binary view of the world which is of primary importance in colonial discourse. Kipling, (1994) in his poem "We and They" dwells upon colonizer's mindset to compartmentalise the world in *We* and *They* categories:

> All nice people, like us, are we.
>
> And everyone else is they. (p.791)

Another important thing is the use of adjectives. When Beveridge says, "We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace" (1908, p.84) certain qualities are immediately following the Pronoun and this proximity creates a relation. Here *We* stands for the coloniser who is projected as the protector of the world, its progress and peace.

Similarly, Possessive Adjectives like *Our* and *Their***,** demarcate the ground of possession and belongingness. Whatever is *Ours* is superior and whatever is *Theirs* is inferior. They highlight the class differences and impose hegemony. These linguistic practices reflect psycho-semiotic working of the coloniser's mind.

Synonym / Hyponym and Type / Token

This pertains to semantic and pragmatic or in other words deictic analysis of discourse. Words have relations and in discourse it is important to determine as to what kind of relations do they have (Farooqi, 2008). Fairclough classifies meaning relations of words into three categories of synonym, hyponym, and antonym (1989, p.69). In colonial discourse it is common to use various synonyms to refer to same things belonging to a particular community. In the above-mentioned quote of Beveridge (1908), *trustees* and *guardians* are synonyms used to refer to the coloniser.

Hyponymy relates a smaller concept to a larger concept. For example, *totalitarianism,* which is a larger concept, may refer to Communism and Marxism or fundamentalism. Another dimension of hyponymy is type / token relationship found in words. Peirce opines that *type* is embodied in the *token* which is a sign of the *type* (1931-1935, CP 4.537). *Type* represents a larger class, category of signification whereas *token* is the unit referring to the *type*. *Tokens* may have some or partial quality of their respective *type*. For example, *fascism, terrorism***,** and *Nazism* share viciousness and they are tokens of a type. Similarly, words *civilized***,** *democratic,* and *liberal* share modern egalitarianism. These *Tokens* are instrumental in projecting *Other* and *Self* images respectively which are their *Types*. Beyond type-token relationship which words can express, discourses can also stand as tokens for yet another larger discourse as their relevant type. Discursively, Beveridge's (1908) repetitive statements about Filipinos that "they are not of a self-governing race……their general ability is no excellent" (p.71) are tokens of the type of discourse they allude to, i.e. the colonial discourse.

Intertextuality

Next important signs are the texts intertextually appearing within another text. This is the second level of discourse analysis which Fairclough (1995) describes as Interpretation. Titscher et al. (2000) opine that "every text is embedded in a context and is synchronically and diachronically related to many other texts" (p.24). Intertextuality determines as to which discourse a text belongs to. Intertextuality may be explicit or implicit. It may be in the form of a direct quote, similar words, indirect reference, an allusion, or even a structural or ideological resemblance of a text with another text.

A great deal of background knowledge is required to determine it because psychologically every text is structured in relation with what Fairclough describes as "members' resources" (1989, p.11). These are resources of knowledge and narrative patterns of thinking which people accumulate with the passage of time and which exist within their mental schema contributing to the structuring of texts. Studying Intertextuality means finding those relations within which a text is embedded. The values associated with the earlier discursive patterns are recontextualized to the

new ones in a manner what Fairclough (2003) calls "a movement from one context to another" (p.51). In colonial discourse we find similarity of language patterns, continuity of underlying ideas, and sharing of values. For example, Kipling (1994) in his poem highlights the duty of the colonizer in following words:

> Take up the White Man's burden
> Send forth the best ye breed
> Go bind your sons to exile
> To serve your captives' need;
> To wait, in heavy harness
> On fluttered folk and wild
> Your new-caught sullen peoples,
> Half devil and half child. (p.334)

This concept of duty dubbed by Kipling as burden, intertextually reappears in the speech of Beveridge (1908) when he says:

> We will not repudiate our *duty* in the archipelago. We will not abandon our *opportunity* in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the *mission* of our race…
>   What shall history say of us? Shall it say that we renounced that *holy trust*, left the *savage* to his base condition, the wilderness to the reign of waste, deserted duty, abandoned glory? ([Emphasis added], p.59,85)

In these texts we see a barrage of words like, *burden*, *duty, opportunity*, *mission*, *holy trust*, standing for the concept of colonizer's civilising mission. What Kipling describes as the *best breed*, is spoken of by Beveridge as a race with *glory*. Native people, described by Kipling as *wild*, *devil* and *sullen*, are intertextually referred to as *savage* by Beveridge. Rhodes (1976) also comes up with the same idea and says, "Africa is still lying ready for us it is our duty to take it" (p. 250). All these words stand as signs intertextually signifying colonial discourse.

The third level of discourse analysis pertains to *Explanation* (Fairclough, 1995) of the discursive patterns. It explains as to what purpose is achieved through certain linguistic practices. It is a parallel process and in the above discussion we see that the purpose of diverse linguistic practices is to project Self and Other image. Following are some themes which also signify colonial discourse through linguistic practices but they represent conventional narrative patterns of more general nature.

Universalism
Universalism or universality is an important concept with regard to colonial discourse. Ashcraft et al. (1995, p.55) call it a strategy of imperial control. Basically, it was a concept flaunted in connection with universal appeal of English literature. This concept envisages that everything European (or let me extend it) Western is universal because it is better and more civilised. It was

a kind of hegemonic strategy under which "experiences, values and expectations of a dominant culture are held to be true for all humanity" (Ashcraft et al., 1998, p.235).

The concept of universalism can branch out into three dimensions; 1st- values, 2nd- challenge, 3rd- duty. In colonial discourse, it is customary to believe that:

1- What the colonizer proclaims has universal value and appeal and all civilized nations / people must approve of it.
2- What the colonizer is facing is a universal challenge and all civilized nations / people must stand with him.
3- What the colonizer is performing is a universal duty and all civilized nations / people must join him.

As far as the universality of values of the coloniser is concerned it has further two aspects.

1- The values of the coloniser are universal, beyond time and bounds.
2- Th whole of humanity must adopt the great values of the coloniser, failing which they will be deprived of the status of being civilised.

Universality of values means that values and ideals which are acceptable and cherished by Europeans must be accepted by others. Otherwise, the differing notions must be relegated to marginal insignificance of being uncivilised. Democratically speaking, if more people accept an idea it means the idea is more valid. The more valid an idea, the more desirable, superior and valuable it is. Hence, universalism is propagated by the West in relation with everything it holds as true. The idea of universal values elevates the West as giver of values and constructs oriental nations as receiver of values. From this emanates glorification of the West as torchbearer of modern and higher civilization. Besides being a cultural claim, universality of western thought and values is also a political strategy and a pretext for extending colonial rule to other nations. Beveridge terms the coloniser's enterprise as a universal when he claims, "We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace" (1908, p.84). In this way Western ideas, methods of administration and values of progress and peace are universalised.

Regarding second and third dimensions of universalism namely universal challenge and universal duty, they accrue a moral justification for the colonial enterprise. To gain universal support from all the world or at least like-minded people, the colonial enterprise is projected as challenge for all the people and duty of all the nations.

High Moral Grounds for An Action
Accruing high moral ground is also a hallmark of colonial discourse. The coloniser proclaims his expedition as a call of God, call of duty, call of time, a great mission or a moral duty. A psychological affinity with God ordained mission is created to justify actions on high moral grounds. Beveridge (1908) highlighted this in his speech when he said that:

> God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns…This is the divine mission of America. (p.84)

A kind of self-awareness as superior race makes the colonizer embark on a God-sent divine and holy mission and imagine himself as "strongest of the saving forces of the world" (Beveridge, 1908, p.86). Macaulay (1835) also tries to accrue a moral justification while proposing a framework for educating the natives. He says:

> We do not even stand neuter in the contest between truth and falsehood. We are not content to leave the natives to the influence of their own hereditary prejudices. (para. 23)

Rhodes also expresses the idea of the westerners' moral obligation when he proclaims that "It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory and we should keep this one idea steadily before our eyes " (1976, p.250). This moral justification is solely based on the coloniser's claim of racial superiority as we find in the following statement of a British Government member Mr. Farish dated 28th August 1838:

> The natives of India must either be kept down by a sense of our power, or they must willingly submit from a conviction that we are more wise, more just, more humane, and more anxious to improve their condition than any other rulers they could have. (as cited in Boman-Bahram, 1974, p.237)

Conclusion

The choices of words and themes in above mentioned texts reflect a mindset, a wave of thought and assumptions and a whole discourse. It testifies the statement that colonial discourse is a complex of signs and practices. Mills' (1997) statement also authenticates that colonial discourse not only refers to texts which share similarity of subject matter but also to a "set of practices and rules which produced those texts and the methodological organization of the thinking underlying those texts" (p.107). We have seen that colonial discourse is an ensemble of linguistic practices within which these word-choices, the ways to use them and ideas they stand for, are to be taken as signs. The research questions No. 1 and No. 2 stand answered.

Question No.3 pertains to how they signify according to semiotic theory. In this regard we conclude that they are intentionally produced and communicative signs in Augustinian sense which we discussed in the beginning. Because the senders had specific message and purpose to inculcate through them. They are also conventional in the sense that they have been used with a consistency almost to the level of what Lewis describes as "behavioural regularity" (2002, p.42). This is how psychological patterns become behavioural practices. Psycho-social conditioning ultimately results in psycho-semiotic conditioning and vice-versa. Individuals of a particular community always act and think within the framework of those specific patterns which are shared by experiences and based on previous practices. Language choices and thought-patterns described

above are rooted in the colonizer's cognition which branch out in form of conventionalised linguistic practices which are signs of colonial discourse. Moreover, these practices suffice the three conditions which we established earlier for the communicative signs. 1- Signs of Colonial Discourse stand for ideas of *Self* and *Other* dichotomies, superiority of the coloniser, denigration of the native, universalism and moral duty of the West. 2- They have been repeatedly associated with the signified ideas they stand for and a plethora of literature is available to support this statement. 3- They are also conventional in the sense that there is a whole wave of western thought which has expressed and used these signs. Both the coloniser and the colonised equally comprehend their meanings as their worlds are constructed and described through these signs.

Regarding question No.4 we can confidently conclude that because of their conventional adoption and repetitive emergence in texts spanning over centuries, these signs and practice have attained conditioning in the mental schema not only of the coloniser but also in the mind of the colonised. This constitute the narrative framework of what has come to be known as colonial discourse.

Lastly, regarding question No.5, we saw that through these signs the coloniser has been successfully creating a dichotomic view of the world by presenting himself as superior and denigrating the native. The coloniser intertextually places his colonial enterprise in historical perspective, justifying it on moral grounds, winning an edge over others by propagating a superior value system. In doing all this he has been creating and exploiting signs of colonial discourse in his conventionalised linguistic practices.

Shahzad-ul-Hassan Farooqi, Ph.D is Assistant Professor in the Department of English, College of Education AzZulfi, Almajmaah University, Saudi Arabia. His areas of interest include English Language Teaching, Semiotics, Pragmatics, Historical Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis as well as Media Studies. ORCID identifier is 0000-0002-4409-0648

References
Alston, W. P. (1964). *Philosophy of language.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
Arnauld, A., & Nicole, P. (1990). *Logic or the art of thinking.* (J.V. Buroker, Trans. Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ashcraft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *The post-colonial studies reader*. London: Routledge.
Ashcraft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Key concepts in post-colonial studies.* London: Routledge.
Bentley, T. (2016). *Empire of remorse: Narrative, postcolonialism and apologies for colonial atrocity*. New York: Routledge.
Beveridge, A. J. (1908). Our Philippine policy. *The meaning of the times and other speeches* (pp.58-88)*.* Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill.
Boman-Behram, B.K. (1974). Educational controversies in India: The cultural conquest of India under British imperialism. Bombay: Taraporvala.
Burke K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Barkeley: University of California Press.

Clarke, D.S. (1987). *Principles of semiotics.* New York: Routledge & Kagan Paul.

Domke, D. (2004). *God willing?* London: Pluto Press.

Empiricus, S. (2005). *Against the logicians.* (R. Bett. Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse.* London: Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge.

Farooqi, S.H. (2008). Semiotic analysis of English as media language. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). NUML, Islamabad. Pakistan.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* (S. Smith, Trans). London: Tavistock.

Hosper, J. (1953). *An introduction to philosophical analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice Hall Inc.

Jackson, B.D. (1969). The theory of signs in St. Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana. *Revue de Etudes Augustiniennes et Patristiques,15(1-2),9-49.* Retrieved from https://www.brepolsonline.net/doi/pdf/10.1484/J.REA.5.104162

JanMohamed, A.R. (1995). The economy of Manichean allegory. In B. Ashcraft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.). *The post-colonial studies reader.* London: Routledge.

Kipling, R. (1994). The white man's burden. *The collected poems of Rudyard Kipling.* Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

Kipling, R. (1994). We and they. *The collected poems of Rudyard Kipling.* Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

Lewis, D. (2002). *Convention.* Oxford. Blackwell Publishing.

Locke, J. (1794). An essay concerning human understanding. *The works of John Locke in nine volumes.* London: Rivington. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/worksofjohnlocke01lock/page/430

Macaulay.T.B.(1835). Minutes on Indian education. Retrieved from http://www.english.ucsb.edu/faculty/rraley/research/english/macaulay.html

Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse.* London: Routledge.

Ogden, C.K., & Richards, I.A. (1989). *The Meaning of meaning.* New York: Harcourt & Brace.

Pavlov, I.P. (1960). *Conditioned reflexes.* (G.V. Anrep, Trans. Ed.) New York: Dover Publications.

Peirce, C. S. (1931-1935). *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce.* (Vols. 1-6). C. Hartshorne, & P. Weiss (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from: https://colorysemiotica.files.wordpress.com/2014/08/peirce-collectedpapers.pdf

Pierce, C.P. (1955). Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs. In J. Buchler. (Ed.). *Philosophical writings of Peirce* (pp.98-119). New York: Dover

Reid, T. (2000). *An Enquiry into the Human Mind.* D. R. Brookes (Ed.). Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.

Rhodes, C. (1976). The Confession of Faith. In J. Flint. *Cecil Rhodes* (pp.248-252). Hutchinson: London.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected writings in language, culture and personality*. London: University of
        California Press.
Saussure, F. D. (1983). *Course in general linguistics.* (R. Harris, Trans). London: Duckworth.
Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sperber, D., & Wilson D. (2004). Relevance Theory. In L. R. Horn and G. Ward. (Eds.) *The
        Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp.607-632).* *Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural   Language.*
        Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Thaibault, P. J. (1997*). Re-reading Saussure: The dynamics of signs in social life.* London:
        Routledge.
Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis.*
        London: Sage.
Young. R.J.C. (2016). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction.* West Sussex: Wiley.