https://doi.org/10.46344/JBINO.2023.v14i01.01

THE SEMIOSIS OF FEAR

André Afonso Silva., Fabiano de Abreu Agrela Rodrigues & Elodia Avila

Mestrado (UFRJ)
andre.silva@uerj.br
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2007-293X

Pós-PhdemNeurociências - CPAH
Aveiro – Portugal
deabreu.fabiano@hotmail.com

Formadaemmedicina pela USP – EspecialistaemCirurgiaPlástica
São Paulo - Brasil
elodiaavila@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the semiosis of fear from the perspective of Charles Sanders Peirce's semiotics. Based on the Peircean triad of firstness-secondness-thirdness, the study seeks to understand how fear, a primary emotion (firstness), generates feelings (secondness) and triggers protective mechanisms, such as control (thirdness). The article explores the relationship between fear, suffering, and control, highlighting how the fear of suffering drives the search for control.Peircean semiotics is used to analyze the meaning of fear, revealing how the sign of fear triggers processes of interpretation and action. The study delves into the relationship between emotions, feelings, and memory, demonstrating how primary emotions, such as fear, are linked to feelings and memories, influencing how we interpret and react to the world.

Keywords: Semiosis of fear, Peircean semiotics, firstness, secondness, thirdness, emotions, feelings, memory, control.

Introduction

Our perception of the world relies fundamentally on what we believe—our beliefs—as well as on what we can perceive through our senses. Often, we even use devices (such as mobile phones) to enhance this perception.

Based on this experience, as children, our parents teach us their values and, more generally, everything they have learned—the pillars on which they walked and upon which they founded and justified their achievements. In most cases, various contents of past memories stored in the long-term memory systems of our parents are used as examples in the parent-child teaching process.

Along life's journey, there comes a point where we gain autonomy and begin to live our own lives, creating our own reference points through our personal experiences. These reference points, shaped by a series of experiences influenced by beliefs and perceptions, often generate certainties and convictions that underpin our lives with pillars that may, in fact, be real anchors. At this point, it becomes necessary to delve deeper into understanding our beliefs, emotions, feelings, memories, and how they are all interconnected.

Our Perception of the World and the Semiosis of Fear

Our perception of the world fundamentally depends on what we believe—our beliefs—and on what we can perceive through our senses. This concept is referenced by Heidegger using the German term Welt, meaning "world." Often, we even use devices (such as mobile phones) to extend this perception, allowing us to sense what our natural organs cannot. Heidegger refers to this expanded perception using the term Umwelt, which means "surrounding world." Based on this lived experience—referred to by Heidegger with the term Mitwelt, which alludes to the connections and relationships of human interactions, the realms of coexistence in which others meet us in their factual characterizations—as children, our parents teach us their values and, more broadly, everything they have learned, including the pillars upon which they walked and justified their achievements.

In most cases, various contents of past memories stored in the long-term memory systems of our parents are used as examples in the parent-child teaching process. Along life's journey, there comes a point where we gain autonomy and begin to live our own lives, creating our reference points through personal experiences. These reference points, shaped by a series of experiences influenced by beliefs and perceptions, often generate certainties and convictions that underpin our lives with pillars that may, in fact, be real anchors. At this point, it becomes necessary to delve deeper into understanding our beliefs, emotions, feelings, memories, and how they are all interconnected.

Emotions and feelings are distinctly different. Emotions are chemical reactions associated with external stimuli, such as food, smells, people, or even ideas, and occur unconsciously in our bodies. Emotions vary on a valence scale (motivation) and can be either positive or negative:

Positive valence: occurs when emotions generate approach behaviors.
Negative valence: occurs when emotions generate avoidance behaviors.
Feeling emerges as the awareness of emotions. It arises when we recognize an emotion (a chemical reaction) in our body and need to name it in order to interpret what is happening. Thus, the essence of a feeling stems from experiencing the emotions that gave rise to it, making it evident that one originates from the other. It is essential to understand that each individual interprets their emotions based on the meaning they assign to each event. In other words, the same emotional event generates different feelings in each participant, as the past experiences that shaped these emotions vary greatly from person to person.
Emotions are divided into primary and secondary categories. All secondary emotions (shame, guilt, pride, etc.) are derived from one of the five basic emotions, also known as primary emotions: love, anger, sadness, pleasure, and fear. These five primary emotions resonate and give rise to hundreds of other emotions, which, in turn, generate feelings.
Specifically, fear is an impulse often undervalued by humans. It is common to refer to fear as a negative impulse or even as a flaw or defect in people. However, fear teaches us to respect boundaries and must be managed or overcome when it becomes pathological. Fear functions as a warning signal that, unconsciously, a person emits to themselves in anticipation of a potential situation that might cause danger and, consequently, suffering.
Arising from the perception of danger, fear can lower our energy, often prompting us to seek protection to avoid suffering or even death—be it physical or psychological. As a result, fear typically triggers one of two primary responses: fight or flight.

Fear, when experienced negatively, can paralyze a person. However, the same fear, when approached positively, can drive people forward in a constructive way, guiding them within boundaries that help avoid pain and suffering. Generally, we are not prepared to endure suffering, and the mere possibility of something happening that could cause discomfort triggers fear. It is important to note the gradation of this fear, which can range from a slight sense of insecurity, anxiety, or restlessness to escalating into terror and panic. Additionally, it is worth noting that the suffering referred to here encompasses a broad spectrum, from minor inconveniences to severe injuries, that is, any event that threatens the body and life, employment and income, or even social standing, among other aspects.
Dealing with the fact that suffering is natural and an inherent part of everyone's life is often extremely challenging for the vast majority of people. The reactions stemming from this reality vary widely: depression (an excess of focus on the past), anxiety (an excess of focus on the future and a total lack of control), aggression, and more. Consequently, we see that fear and suffering, in their various gradations, are inseparably linked. On the other hand, as a protective measure, one of the most common attitudes people adopt is unconsciously creating the need to control everything that could potentially cause suffering. Through control, they aim

to eliminate (at least in theory) the risk—and therefore the fear—of future suffering.
An easily observable example of this dynamic can be found in many individuals who dedicate years of their lives to studying and striving to pass public service exams. Their goal is to secure the stability that most public servants enjoy, thereby eliminating the risk—and consequently the fear—of unemployment. Unemployment, in turn, could lead to financial hardship, which could cause various other problems. Stability, in this context, acts as a vaccine against the insecurity of joblessness, providing the person with the assurance that they will never lack money, and therefore will never go hungry, lack clothing, or face other basic deficiencies. Thus, it becomes evident that the triad of fear, suffering, and control consistently appears interconnected.

At this point, it is necessary to pause and introduce some concepts from semiotics, a branch of the humanities that studies processes of meaning and representation, particularly those involving cognition and communication in natural systems. In simpler terms, as stated by Silva, J.C., and Silva, A.C.T. (2012): "Semiotics can be broadly considered the science that studies all forms of language, that is, any phenomenon involving the production of meaning and sense, using signs to represent objects."

Over the years, various thinkers have attempted to categorize what occurs in our brains: Aristotle, Kant, Ranganathan, Durkheim, Mauss, and others. However, it was Charles Sanders Peirce who proposed three categories that, in my view, encompass all possible human thought processes. Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914), an American philosopher, logician, and mathematician, introduced just three "superclasses"—Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness. Inspired by the concept of chemical elements' valence, Peirce suggested that these categories could be combined to create as many other classes as needed. This framework allows thoughts to be seen as the "chemical elements" used to form the various "formulas" that our minds can generate.

- Firstness: This represents what exists in and of itself or what is as it is, without any cause-effect relationship. In this category, primary emotions, such as fear, are included. Peirce also associates Firstness with freedom, independence, novelty, and other subjective or objective elements of reality where no deterministic relationship exists between the element and something prior.

- Secondness: This pertains to what arises from something else, akin to a mathematical function. In our context, it refers to the feelings experienced as a result of fear. According to Peirce, Secondnessis linked to ideas of cause or static force, as both involve pairs where participants mutually influence one another.
- Thirdness: According to Peirce, Thirdness refers to "something that depends on a second but is independent of a fourth." He further explains that "a second is something that depends on a first but is independent of a third," and "a first exists in and of itself, independent of a second."

As Tiziana (2018) states: "In this sense, the many choices (conscious or unconscious) accumulated throughout the inferential

process and expressed in action ultimately determine finality, understood here, in Kantian terms, as an a posteriori process *ad continuum* in relational processes concerning signification put into motion in a continuous flow. The ability to understand something clearly is related to identifying the process of signification, in which the method employed serves to arrive at the truth or correspondence to reality in what one seeks to 'pragmatize.'

In the light of Peircean semiotics, the process of signification relies on the triadic relationship between sign, object, and interpretant. The sign can be likened to a vehicle that brings to the mind something external to it. As Peirce himself stated, "A sign is something capable of being cognized that, on one side, is determined by something other than itself, which I call the object, and, on the other side, determines some actual or potential kind of mental representation, the determination of which I call the interpretant created by the sign." Peirce further asserts that signs are quintessential examples of Thirdness.

Regarding the semiosis of fear, we can infer the following:

- Firstness: Primary emotion (fear) → Signifier
- Secondness: Experienced feeling → Signified
- Thirdness: Protective mechanisms (control) → Signs

In Peirce's conception, the sign is "something which, being known to us, enables us to know something else," or further elaborated as, "The word 'sign,' as used here, denotes any object of thought that generates any kind of mental action, whether voluntary or not, relating to something otherwise known. (...) Every sign denotes something, and whatever the sign denotes will be called its object. (...) I shall call the idea or mental action generated by the sign and which, through it, leads the interpreter to attribute the object or objects to the sign, the interpretant."

As Fidalgo and Gradim (2005) explain, "Peirce compares thought to hearing a melody, in which we have a direct perception of the individual sounds and an indirect perception of the whole. Each sound is a note, and we are aware of it (we hear it) at a specific moment, independently of the sounds heard before or after. In contrast, the melody is an element mediated in consciousness, constructed by the sounds that compose it. Similarly, thought is an action that has a beginning, middle, and end, and consists of the congruence of successive sensations passing through the mind."Or, as Peirce poetically puts it, "Thought is the thread of a melody woven through the succession of our sensations."

Thus, we observe a causal relationship that inseparably binds the elements participating in semiosis—the process of interpretation—proposed by Peirce. Whether it is note–sound–melody or sign–object–interpretant, each within its respective domain, they form a unified whole that involves the interpreter in a direct relationship with the established triad. From this relationship, it can be inferred that the set of impressions experienced by an individual directly and sensitively influences the mental reaction elicited by the sign. For instance, the figure of a national anthem, a type of sign, may evoke wonderful memories for those born and living in the country or may stir deep

feelings of nostalgia for expatriates. In musical terms, the music itself remains unchanged, yet its interpretation depends entirely on the musician performing it.

Consequently, the mnemonic records of an individual play a significant role. Through these records, the brain can conceive a vast array of information and sensations via a sequence of semioses, which are limited only by the interpreter's knowledge or by any psychological constraints that may exist. Using the earlier example, when discussing the Brazilian flag, a native Brazilian might spontaneously associate it with thoughts of the country's natural beauty, geographic location, language, accents, people, memories of travels, and pleasant experiences across its diverse natural landscapes. The list could potentially extend infinitely if one or something could encompass this breadth of knowledge.

Importantly, it is worth noting that such ideas generally "appear" in the mind without any voluntary action. These thoughts and sensations surface in the conscious mind automatically, whether they are positive or negative.

Thus, the mental action generated by the sign is directly connected to the interpreter's past and life history. As Peirce himself states, "Before we can interpret the memory or the suggestion, these are already past; before we can interpret the current emotion that implies a memory, or the current emotion that implies a suggestion, since interpretation takes time, this emotion has ceased to be present and is now past. Therefore, we cannot reach any conclusion about the present, only about the past"(C.P. 1.167).

Peirce addresses the topic of memory in several passages of his work, establishing a link between the present and the past. He asserts, "All of this is true in the initial presentation of a direct reality; however, when this reality is later criticized, it is already in the past and is represented by memory"(C.P. 1.146). He further elaborates, "A perceived fact is a memory that has not yet separated from the fact that generated this perception" (C.P. 2.146). According to Peirce's perspective, the present serves only as the foundation for the substrate where we truly work, draw conclusions, and acquire learning. This unequivocally illustrates the Secondness characteristic of memory. Peirce reaffirms this view in other passages, stating, for example, "As time passes in our minds, the past appears to act directly on the future, its effect being called memory, while the future can only act directly on the past through intermediaries" (C.P. 1.325).

It follows, then, that emotions, in most if not all cases, are directly tied to our memories. The relationship between them is intriguing, as emotions are always linked to memories, but memories are not always tied to emotions. This leads to a critical connection between emotions and feelings. In his writings, Peirce addresses both emotions (C.P. 1.250) and feelings (C.P. 1.306), stating that all emotion is a form of cognition (C.P. 1.376) or even a kind of predication of an object (C.P. 5.247). The term Peirce uses suggests that the object may or may not require a complement. Considering memory as the object, we can regard emotion as the predicate of memory. Since memory is categorized as Secondness and emotions as Firstness (C.P. 6.32), this establishes the

semiotic relationship between memory and emotion. It follows that every memory (involving past events experienced by the person) is associated with an emotion.

McGaugh supports this view, explaining that this is why the process of recollection is sometimes easier or, in certain situations, entirely blocked. A person's unconscious may suppress access to specific information so effectively that a traumatic past appears to be "locked away" in a compartment of the unconscious.

It is essential to note that there are five basic emotions: love, anger, sadness, pleasure, and fear. All other emotions stem from these. Modern science has since established a clear distinction between emotions and feelings, although Peirce does not make this distinction explicit or as clearly defined as contemporary studies in the field. This brings us to the point that connects memory to collateral existence, or collateral observation, as referenced in some of Peirce's works. According to Peirce, information remains retained in our minds and forms our memory only when accompanied by emotions that make the person feel good.

"Collateral experience," "collateral observation," and "collateral knowledge" are terms used by Peirce to refer to the same phenomenon: an indirect means of accessing the object, offering greater assurance that the derived idea aligns with the intended meaning, given the substantial diversity between the object and the sign. This prior knowledge is skillfully utilized by effective teachers when imparting knowledge to their students. By carefully crafting and combining the signs used in the teaching process, educators can align these with the preexisting knowledge stored in students' minds, creating a perfect conjunction between the collateral experience accumulated by the learners and the new material being taught, enabling the formation of new understanding.

Peirce introduces two new concepts—Dynamic Objectand Immediate Object—to illustrate the necessity of collateral experience for understanding. Before delving into these concepts, consider his clarification:

"We must distinguish between the Immediate Object—that is, the Object as represented in the Sign—and the Real (no, because the Object may be wholly fictitious; I must choose a different term, then), let us rather say the Dynamic Object, which, by the nature of things, the Sign cannot express, which it can only indicate and leave the interpreter to find out by collateral experience"(C.P. 8.314).

Based on Peirce's description, the Dynamic Object refers to the external stimulus—an element of the external world that elicits some form of emotional or cognitive reaction within the interpreter's mind. This object is accessible only through our senses. It represents the external reality that the sign attempts to represent but can never fully capture (C.P. 8.314).

The Immediate Object, on the other hand, is the internal codification of that stimulus within the interpreter's mind, shaped by their cognitive abilities. It is how the external stimulus is processed and represented internally.

The transformation of external stimuli into something comprehensible relies on prior knowledge or stored impressions. Without the ability to store and retrieve these impressions, exposure to the object would

be futile. In psychological terms, a stimulus can be defined as "a part of the external world of varying complexity, whose qualitative and/or quantitative change generates corresponding reactions proportional to the degree and type of this change, and distinguishable in terms of quality and quantity" (Houaiss Dictionary).

"Every part of the understanding of the Sign for which the Interpreting Mind required collateral observation lies outside the Interpretant. By 'collateral observation,' I do not mean knowledge of the system of signs. What is thus gathered is not COLLATERAL. On the contrary, it is the prerequisite for obtaining any idea signified by the sign. But by collateral observation, I mean prior knowledge of what the sign denotes. For example, if the Sign is the phrase 'Hamlet was mad,' to understand what this means, one must know that men sometimes experience this strange condition; one must have seen madmen or read about them; and it is all the better if we specifically know (and need not be led to assume) what Shakespeare's notion of madness was. All of this is collateral observation and lies outside the Interpretant" (C.P. 8.179).

The dynamic object, as an external reality, and the immediate object, as an internal representation, require collateral experience to bridge the gap between the sign and the interpreter's understanding. For example, in Peirce's illustration of the phrase "Hamlet was mad," comprehending its meaning depends on prior knowledge about insanity, experiences with it (direct or indirect), and contextual familiarity with Shakespeare's views. This collateral knowledge does not form part of the Interpretant but is essential for accurate interpretation.

In this way, collateral observation emphasizes the interplay between past knowledge, sensory experience, and cognitive interpretation in the process of understanding. It highlights how knowledge and memory are fundamental to grasping the significance of a sign and achieving meaningful comprehension.

"I think by now you must understand what I mean when I say that no sign can be understood—or at least that no proposition can be understood—unless the interpreter has 'collateral knowledge' of each Object of the same." (C.P. 8.183)

An interesting fact to note is that Peirce used sentences when addressing collateral experience. I believe Peirce employed this strategy to concretize something inherently abstract: outside the textual universe, discussing feelings would become extremely challenging, perhaps even impossible, as our vocabulary is not rich enough to express and explain emotions such as love, for instance.

Emotions, therefore, are responsible for the introjection (here based on the psychoanalytic concept—process of identification through which a person absorbs, as an integral part of the ego, objects and qualities inherent to those objects; affective direction of impulses and reactions of a person more toward a subjective, internalized image of an object than toward the object itself; internalization—Houaiss) and subsequent storage in various memories of the semiotic representation arising from contact with the external stimulus.

In the textual approach used by Peirce, emotions remain isolated and are accessed indirectly through a semiotic

sequence starting with the textual icon, which refers to content stored in semantic memory (a fundamental database for semiotic processing, where information that forms our knowledge is contained), forming words and then sentences. The new object formed by this combination may lead us to episodic memory (if the fact describes a situation experienced by the interpreter), finally reaching the emotion tied to the memory of the event, thereby completing the entire experience the interpreter has when engaging with the initial textual sign.

At all times, the concept of collateral experience introduced by Peirce remains present. As previously mentioned, memory functions as a vast repository of content derived from this interaction, making memory the essence of Peircean collateral experience. This allows collateral observation to be not only the product but also the producer of semiosis. Furthermore, intrinsic characteristics of memory support this assertion, such as:

1. Memory, referring both to the person's past experiences and its functional perspective—the ability to store data—is inseparably linked to emotions.
2. Memory serves as the grand library of information upon which the cognitive system relies to bring understanding to facts.
3. Memory does not store an exact replica of the presented content but only its meaningful parts.
4. Memory has various divisions. Episodic memory—a division of long-term memory—is the largest neurocognitive system we possess, with semantic characteristics, i.e., mechanisms innately capable of processing signs.
5. Emotions act as facilitators and motivators in the learning process, which involves multiple memory systems.
6. Analyses using fMRI (Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging) demonstrate that there are functions linked to both working memory and the cognitive processes involved in regulating emotions.
7. Further fMRI findings suggest that emotions modulate neural functions involved in retrieving and processing memories stored in episodic memory.

From this point, we can delve into and understand the memory structures related to the semiosis of fear. However, a preliminary analysis from the perspective of Neuroscience is necessary to contextualize all that has been presented thus far.

The Semiosis of Fear

Fear, present in all cultures and societies, shapes our perceptions, behaviors, and social relationships. Through the lens of semiotics, we can unravel how this complex emotion is constructed, transmitted, and utilized as a tool of power. According to Peirce (1931–1958), semiosis, or the process of meaning-making, is fundamental to understanding how fear becomes a sign laden with significance and how it influences our lives. Being an exceptionally complex sign, the semiosis of fear involves a continuous interpretative process, where the meaning of fear is negotiated and renegotiated within each context.

Historically, fear has taken on various forms, shaped by the beliefs, values, and conditions of its time. In antiquity, fear was often tied to supernatural forces, while in the Middle Ages, it was fueled by religious beliefs and wars. In modernity, fear has become associated with technological progress, social changes, and uncertainty about the future. Some key dimensions of fear include:

a) Fear as a Tool of Power

How is fear used to control and manipulate people? Foucault offers a critical perspective on power and social control, highlighting how fear is employed as an instrument of domination. By analyzing social institutions and practices, Foucault reveals how fear is systematically used to maintain social order and ensure individuals' submission.

b) Fear and Identity

How does fear contribute to the construction and maintenance of individual and collective identities? As Butler explains, fear unites us into groups but also limits us, shaping how we perceive ourselves and how we define who we are.

c) Fear and Religion

What is the role of fear in religions, and how is it used to strengthen faith? Eliade demonstrates that fear serves as an ally to religion, creating a sense of dependence and submission to the divine. This strengthens faith and ensures the cohesion of religious communities.

d) Fear and Politics

How is fear employed in politics to mobilize the masses and legitimize power? Laclau and Mouffe show that fear is a powerful political weapon, allowing leaders to manipulate people's emotions and build consensus around their agendas.

The semiosis of fear reveals its multifaceted role in human society, from fostering community cohesion to serving as a mechanism for control. By examining fear through these dimensions, we gain a deeper understanding of how it operates as both a cultural and a psychological phenomenon.

We can readily observe that the social construction of fear is a continuous process, influenced by various historical, cultural, and social factors. Over time, different societies have attributed distinct meanings to fear, shaping it according to their values, beliefs, and needs (28). The symbolization of fear occurs through various means, including language, imagery, and physical expressions. Language, for instance, plays a fundamental role in constructing and transmitting fear. Metaphors, allegories, and idiomatic expressions are used to describe and amplify the experience of fear (27).

Social psychology contributes to understanding the psychological and social processes underlying the experience of fear. Bandura (29) emphasizes the importance of social learning in acquiring fears, highlighting the role of modeling and observation in shaping beliefs and expectations related to danger. Perrone (31) examines fear in modern and postmodern contexts, identifying its transformations over time and the emergence of new forms of expression and experience.

Building on these perspectives, semiotics, with its concepts of sign, object, and

interpretant, provides a powerful tool for analyzing how fear is represented and interpreted across different contexts (23). It allows us to understand how fear is constructed and conveyed through various types of signs.

Baptista, Carvalho, & Lory (30) underline the importance of examining the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of signs to uncover the layers of meaning embedded in fear. Linguistic signs, for instance, can evoke fear through word choice, sentence structure, and narrative creation. Visual signs, such as images and films, use aesthetic and narrative techniques to elicit fear responses in viewers. Auditory signs, on the other hand, can evoke feelings of anxiety and dread through sounds, music, and environmental noise.

Through this lens, semiotics enables a deeper understanding of how fear is both constructed and experienced, shedding light on its multifaceted nature as a cultural and psychological phenomenon.

Fear, as a sign, can be analyzed from different semiotic perspectives:

- Index: Fear as an index relates directly to an object or situation that provokes a fear reaction. For example, increased heart rate and sweating are physiological indices of fear in response to a threat.

- Icon: Fear as an icon evokes a mental image of something that causes fear. Horror films, for instance, use images and sounds to create a terrifying atmosphere and elicit fear reactions in viewers.

- Symbol: Fear as a symbol is associated with cultural and social concepts, such as the fear of death, the unknown, or social exclusion. These fears are socially constructed and transmitted through narratives, myths, and rituals.

The semiotic analysis of fear reveals its use as a tool for social control. By associating certain behaviors with negative consequences—such as the fear of punishment or social exclusion—it becomes possible to shape individuals' actions. Governments, institutions, and social groups often utilize fear to maintain social order and ensure conformity to established norms.

- Discourse of Fear: Language, as a sign, constructs narratives that evoke fear. The media, for example, frequently appeals to fear to capture attention and influence public opinion.

- Images of Fear: Visual signs, such as images, are powerful tools for conveying fear. Advertising, political propaganda, and art use images that evoke fear to manipulate emotions and guide behavior.

Fear significantly impacts interpersonal interactions. When experiencing fear, people tend to avoid situations and individuals perceived as threatening. Fear can also lead to the formation of groups and the construction of collective identities centered on opposition to a common enemy.

- Fear of the Other: Fear of those who are different can result in discrimination, prejudice, and social exclusion. The construction of negative stereotypes about minority groups can generate fear and hostility, hindering peaceful coexistence.

- Fear of Rejection: The fear of social rejection often drives individuals to conform to group norms and avoid behaviors that might provoke conflict.

Fear influences individuals' self-perception, shaping their self-image and self-esteem. Those who frequently encounter fear-inducing situations may develop feelings of insecurity, inferiority, and helplessness.

By exploring fear through these semiotic and psychological dimensions, we gain a deeper understanding of its pervasive influence on personal, social, and cultural dynamics.

Fear of Failure and Rejection

Fear of Failure: Fear of failure can lead individuals to avoid challenges and underestimate their capabilities, limiting personal and professional growth.

Fear of Rejection: Fear of rejection may result in social isolation and difficulty in establishing interpersonal relationships, further perpetuating cycles of loneliness and insecurity.

The Semiotic Analysis of Fear

The semiotic analysis of fear reveals its complexity and its profound ability to shape social reality. By understanding how fear is represented, interpreted, and utilized, we can develop strategies to address it in healthier and more constructive ways, fostering peaceful coexistence and personal development.

Understanding the symbolism of fear in contemporary society is crucial for unraveling the complex social and political dynamics that shape our world. Analyzing fear as a sign enables us to identify power strategies, discursive manipulations, and social control mechanisms rooted in the induction and exploitation of this emotion.

As Foucault (1979) noted, power operates through subtle and often invisible mechanisms, with fear serving as a powerful tool in this context. By disseminating fear, dominant groups can control the masses, legitimize their actions, and maintain the status quo. Semiotic analysis allows us to uncover the discourses and imagery that evoke fear, exposing strategies of manipulation and control.

The media plays a pivotal role in constructing social reality, frequently leveraging fear as a resource to attract audiences and influence public opinion. The repetition of negative news, creation of alarmist narratives, and use of impactful imagery contribute to fostering a climate of fear and insecurity. As Hall (1997) asserts, the media does not merely reflect reality but actively constructs it, with fear serving as a potent tool in this process.

Politics is a field where fear is strategically used to mobilize voters, justify unpopular decisions, and legitimize power. The construction of external and internal enemies, the appeal to traditional values, and the use of alarmist rhetoric are examples of how fear is employed in the political arena. Laclau and Mouffe (1985) analyze how fear is used to construct political identities and create a "we" in opposition to a "they."

Fear also plays an important role in the construction of social identities. A group's identity can be defined in opposition to another group through the creation of a "we" and a "they." Fear of the "other" is used to justify discrimination, exclusion, and violence.

Semiotic analysis provides us with the tools needed to uncover the mechanisms of fear production and dissemination. By identifying the signs, codes, and

conventions that constitute representations of fear, we can understand how this feeling is used to manipulate, control, and divide people.

Understanding the symbolism of fear is fundamental to building a more just and democratic society. By exposing strategies of manipulation and control based on fear, we can develop critical awareness and resist attempts to manipulate us. Semiotic analysis offers a powerful tool to unmask hate speech, propaganda, and manipulations rooted in fear.

The Neurological Basis of the Triad:

The neurological basis of the triad of fear, suffering, and control involves complex neural networks in the brain. Fear, primarily processed by the amygdala, is a response to danger stimuli and activates the fight-or-flight system. Suffering, often associated with fear, involves brain areas such as the anterior cingulate cortex and the prefrontal cortex, which process emotional and physical pain. Control, as a protective mechanism, is mediated by the prefrontal cortex, which regulates emotional responses and seeks to minimize exposure to suffering.

The amygdala, upon detecting a threat, triggers the fear response by activating the fight-or-flight system. This process involves the release of hormones like adrenaline and cortisol. Suffering, which can result from fear, is processed in the anterior cingulate cortex, associated with the experience of emotional pain. To control and mitigate suffering, the prefrontal cortex comes into play, regulating emotions and implementing control strategies to avoid dangerous situations and minimize suffering. Thus, neural systems work interconnectedly to manage the emotions and behaviors arising from fear.

Long-term memory, particularly episodic memory, plays a crucial role in the semiosis of fear. Memories of past experiences, stored in episodic memory, influence how we perceive and react to new fear stimuli. Episodic memory involves the hippocampus and allows us to relive past experiences, which can intensify the fear response if those memories are associated with traumatic events. Therefore, understanding the semiosis of fear requires analyzing past memories and how they shape our emotional and behavioral reactions.

Citation System of C. S. Peirce's Work

CP - Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vol. I-VI, organized by P. Weiss and C. Hartshorne. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935-1935; *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vol. VII and VIII, edited by A. Weiss Burks. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

W - Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vol. I to VI, organized by the Peirce Edition Project. Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1982-2010.

Conclusion

The study of the semiosis of fear in light of Peircean semiotics reveals the complexity and depth of this primary emotion. Fear, as firstness, triggers feelings and protective mechanisms, such as control, which correspond to secondness and thirdness, respectively. The semiotic analysis of fear allows us to understand how this emotion manifests at different levels, from individual experience to social and cultural relationships. Understanding the semiosis of fear can contribute to the development of more effective strategies to deal with this emotion, both at an individual and

collective level. By comprehending how fear manifests and how it influences our actions and decisions, we can develop tools to handle it in a healthier and more constructive way.

References

(1) – **Silva, J.C e Silva A.C.T.** (2012), Pressupostos da Teoria Semiótica de Peirce e suaaplicaçãonaanálise das representaçõesemQuímica, VI Colóquio Internacional "Educação e Contemporaneidade", São Cristovão – SE/Brasil;
(2) – **SANTAELLA, L**. O que é semiótica. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1983.
(3) – **Marty, R**., 76 Definitions of Sign By C.S.Peirce, disponível on-line no endereço http://www.univ-perp.fr/see/rch/lts/marty/76defeng.htm
(4) – **Fidalgo, A. &Gradim, A., Manual de Semiótica**, Biblioteca On-line das Ciências da Computação (www.bocc.ubi.pt), Universidade da Beira Interior, 2005, 224p.;
(5) – Manuscripts of Charles Sanders Peirce, 849, 1911;
(6) – **Peirce, C.S**., Semiotics and Significs - The Correspondence Between Charles Sanders Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby, ed. Hardwick, Charles S., Indiana University Press, 1977, Bloomington, Indiana, p. 32.
(7) – **McGaugh, J.L**.; Memory and emotion: the making of lasting memories; New York : Columbia University Press, 2003, 162p.;
(8) – **Aranalde, M.M.**; Reflexõessobreossistemascategoriais de Aristóteles, Kant e Ranganathan; Ci. Inf., Brasília, v. 38, n. 1, p. 86-108, jan./abr. 2009 disponívelem https://www.scielo.br/j/ci/a/dm8qtBfrP44pjs46WGJsSwr/abstract/?lang=pt
(9) – **Ekman, P**. Strong evidence for universals in facial expressions: A reply to Russell's mistaken critique. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 268– 287, 1994;
(10) – **Linz, A.M.G**, A experiênciacolateral e suaimportância para a semiosetelejornalistica, Núcleo de SemióticanaComunicação, XXVI CongressoAnualemCiência da Comunicação, 2003;
(11) – **Taborsky, E**., The internal and external semiosic properties of reality; Semiosis, Evolution, Energy, Development, Volume 1, Number 1, March 2001;
(12) – **Clocksin, WF**. Memory and emotion in the cognitive architecture. In Visions of Mind (D. Davis, ed.), IDEA Group Publishing: Hershey, PA., 122-139, 2004;
(13) - **Hoerl, C. & McCormack, T**., Perspectives on time and memory, Oxford Press 2001;
(14) – **Schacter & Tulving, E**., Memory Systems, MIT Press, 1994;
(15) – **Howard, M.W. & Kahanna, M.J.,** When does semantic similarity help episodic retrieval?, Journal of Memory and Language 46, 85-98, 2002;
(16) – **Klein, SB, Cosmides L., ToobyJ.,Chance S**., Decisions and the evolution of memory: multiple systems, multiple functions, Psychological Review, vol.109, no.2, 306-329. 2002;
('7) – **Franklin S., McCauley L**., Feelings and emotions as motivators and learning facilitators, Architetures for modeling emotions, AAAI Spring Symposia Technical Series Technical Reports SS-04-02. 2004;
(18) - **Anwar, A., and S. Franklin**. Sparse Distributed Memory for "Conscious" Software Agents. Cognitive Systems Research 4:339-354. 2003;
(19) – **Ochsner KN, Gross JJ, Gabrieli JDE, Bunge SA**; Rethinking feelings: a fMRI study

of the cognitive regulation of emotion, Journal of Cognitive, 14:8, pp.1215-1229, MIT, 2002;
(20) – **Maratos EJ, Dolan RJ, Morris JS, Henson RNA, Rugg MD**; Neural activity associated with episodic memory for emotional context, Neuropsychologia, 39, pp.910–920, 2001;
(21) – **Oliveira, L. R. C. D.** (1993). As categorias do entendimentohumano e as noções de tempo e espaço entre os Nuer. Série Antropologia. Brasília, UnB, 1993.
(22) – **Cocchieri, T**.; O signo e a experiência : a lógicasemiótica de Charles Sanders Peirce, Tese de Doutorado, Escola de Humanidades, PUCRS, 13-Ago-2018; disponívelem https://tede2.pucrs.br/tede2/handle/tede/8440
(23) – **PEIRCE, Charles Sanders**. Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vols. 1-8. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958;
(24) – **FOUCAULT, Michel.** Vigiar e punir. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1979;
(25) – **BUTLER, Judith**. O gêneroemdisputa. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1990;
(26) – **ELIADE, Mircea.** O sagrado e o profano. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1959;
(27) – **LACLAU, Ernesto; MOUFFE, Chantal**. Hegemonia e estratégiasocialista: elementos para umateoria radical da democracia. São Paulo: Cortez, 1985;
(28) – **HALL, Stuart**. Representaçõesculturais: estudossobre a mídia. São Paulo: Loyola, 1997;
(29) – **BANDURA, A.** Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986;
(30) – **BAPTISTA, L.; CARVALHO, M.; LORY, A.** Semiótica: umaintrodução. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005;
(31) – **PERRONE, M. O** medocontemporâneo: abordandosuasdiferentesdimensões. Psicologia: Teoria e Prática, São Paulo, v. 15, n. 2, p. 237-246, 2003