

COMMUNICATION PROBLEM OF PERCEPTION

Ivushkina EB, Dashkova EV

In the article, we focused on the semantic processes in the mind of the communicant. The only way to master meanings is to understanding. Cognitive understanding is the subject of epistemology (theories of cognition), and communication understanding has been studied by hermeneutics since antiquity. Communication cognition is creative cognitive act. The problem of communication cognition remains open; this is another, along with the problem of meaning, terra incognita of our science.

In article we focused attention on semantic processes in consciousness of the communicant. The only way to seize senses is their understanding. The informative understanding is a subject of epistemology (the cognition theory), and communication understanding is studied by a hermeneutics since antiquity. The communication knowledge is the creative informative occupation. The problem of communication knowledge remains opened, it is one more, along with a sense problem, terra incognita of our science.

Keywords: Communication, meaning, cognitive understanding, communication knowledge, communication understanding.

We exchange ideas, exchange words, etc., while we are not deprived of our words, and our interlocutor - of his, we are mutually enriched by the ideas of another, interlocutor. It is more correct to say that we want to share our thoughts, share our feelings with someone. In everyday practice, a person is faced with the use of symbolic language, the role of which is to express a certain idea or thought. From an etymological point of view, the word symbol comes from the Greek *sumballein*, meaning to bind together. It originally meant a sign of recognition. The symbol is a bridge element, rich in connections and analogies. He bridges contradictions and reduces the intensity of disagreement. We can't understand or

communicate anything without his participation [1, p.5]. In the dictionary "Culturology. XX century" we find the following definition of a symbol: "Symbol (from Greek - a sign, a sign) - 1) In artificial formalized languages - a concept that is identical to a sign; 2) B aesthetics and philosophy of art - a universal category that reflects the specifics of the figurative development of life by art - a content element of a work of art, considered in its sign expression; 3) In the sociocultural sciences - material or ideational cultural object, acting in the communicative or translational process as a sign, the meaning of which is a conventional analogue of the meaning of another object" [2, p.406]. The complex, dichotomous nature of the concept of "symbol" is revealed in its relation to the sign. A sign is a material object that acts in a communicative or translational process as an analogue of another object (object, property, phenomenon, concept, action), replacing him. The sign is the main means of culture. With his with the help of fixing and evaluating individual and general meaningful information about a person and the world in cultural texts, communication individuals and social groups among themselves, joint goal achievement. Analysis inevitably encounters two sides of the sign - expression and content, their interconnection and interrelationships. Question about meaning is the main and most paradoxical question of communicative theory and all humanities. People need to live in a mythologized world, where sound and meaning, sign and object are connected, since this connection is in the mind allows you to organize both the work of the consciousness itself and the actions of a person in the world around him. The signs are thus mythological units (mythologemes) that contribute to the organization of human activity. As the theorist of mass communication M. McLuhan writes, the myth does not limp, but jumps. If you had to reason about each sign, communication would simply stop. Semiological studies of communication systems are largely based on the works of the Swiss linguist F. de Saussure. Saussure considered the sign as a bilateral (two-sided) mental formation connecting the concept (signified) and the acoustic image (meaning). This two-sided formation is created not for the individual, but only for the collective. Saussure's main contribution to science should be recognized as the idea of a systematic language and other communication systems. Each sign, each element of the system does not exist and does not have meaning by itself: meaning is maintained by the interconnection of all elements of the system [3, p.84].

Later, the Russian scientist S.O. Kartsevsky (1884-1955), developing the idea of a sign, introduced the concept of asymmetric dualism. Signified and signifiers are connected only for a moment, each of them can have their own development

history. This explains why in the history of signs, in diachrony, their external form changes, although the sign may not lose its meaning [4, p.68]. The sign receives an evaluative interpretation, but only from the point of view of the entire system, code, language that the user and his social group. The fundamental difference between a symbol and a sign is that the meaning of the symbol does not imply a direct indication of the denotation (the signified object). A sign becomes a symbol when its use implies a generally significant reaction not to the symbolized object itself (the extensional or intensional meaning of this sign), but to an abstract value conventionally associated with this object. But at the same time, the objective, symbolic form of a symbol can have and even strive to preserve the external similarity with the symbolized object or be deliberately stylized as it. Symbols on their own, without a sign and cultural environment, without a community using them, according to the agreed unspoken laws, do not mean anything. In the same time No wonder they say that symbols rule the world. The perception by the consciousness of a symbol as a reality is called semiotic by some researchers. idealism. Thus, in relation to the symbol, we can talk about a certain desire and approach to the identity of the signified and signifier. But this is an objective (sign) identity, behind which there is a semantic abstraction. Social communication is the movement of meanings in the social time and space. This movement is possible only between subjects involved in the social sphere. Therefore, it is imperative to have communicators and recipients. Meaning (meaning), according to S. Lem, is a “real disaster” for linguists, logicians, psychologists, and philosophers. The problem of meaning is stormy the epicenter of centuries-old disputes between idealists and materialists, since “meaning” is a pseudonym for the philosophical category “ideal” [5, p.208]. Meanings are found not only in the products of people's mental activity, but also in material cultural values. Some especially sensitive natures see meaningfulness in natural phenomena. It is known that people can communicate not only with similar animate subjects, but also with God, with Nature, with computer networks, and this communication is not meaningless. Therefore, the sources of meanings, those. communicants in semantic communication can be not only socialized individuals who speak orally and in writing. In purposeful, not chaotic social communication communicants and recipients consciously pursue three goals: 1) cognitive, 2) incentive, 3) stimulation. To achieve these goals, the content of communication messages should include knowledge and skills (the communicant knows something or knows how and can share this experience with other people); incentives (volitional influences that

encourage activity); emotions (it is important for the communicant to emotionally "discharge", receive sympathy, and the recipient is looking for positive emotions and spiritual comfort). Exactly these we call the products of spiritual human activity meanings. In the concept of "knowledge" we include not only authorized facts and concepts, but also intuitively accepted value orientations, ideals, beliefs and objects of faith, for a person knows about their existence in his mind. The term "skill" includes norms, skills, methods, techniques, habits, unconscious attitudes that determine a person's actions in a given situation. Briefly speaking speaking, knowledge is what a person thinks (the content of thinking), and skill is how a person acts. The fundamental difference between knowledge and skill is that knowledge can be communicated orally or in writing, and skill must be shown, demonstrated, because the description will always be incomplete. One must be aware of the existence of hybrid, intermediate meanings. Ideals, beliefs, objects of faith are a synthesis rational, emotional and volitional beginning; they are not only recognized by the mind as "the best", but are also sensually experienced and are able to induce action. Similarly, norms and methods are "instrumental knowledge" and do not fit fully into the skill category. The initial source of knowledge, skills, stimuli, emotions is the individual psyche, where these stimuli originate and move in mental time and space (communication with God and leave Nature aside). In order to start a social communication, the communicant must objectify, materialize his meanings, i.e. embody them in the content of the communication message .

The communication message moves in the material space and time, reaching its recipient. In order for social communication to be completed, the recipient needs to de-objectify the semantic message content, i.e. understand it and incorporate the understood meanings into their psyche, more precisely - into individual memory. The meanings possessed by the communicant can be "objectified" in two ways: firstly, in the form of communication messages (speech, writing, drawing); secondly, in the form of utilitarian products (tools, weapons, clothes, dwellings), where the knowledge and skills of a person are also embodied. The recipient can use both types of messages to comprehend the meanings, and in both cases there are problems. It would seem preferable to deal with an oral or written message on a familiar natural language, specially designed for the perception of it this recipient. After all, the meanings embodied in products need be able to extract, decode and comprehend, which, apparently, is more difficult reading text in their native language. However, in the latter case, adequate understanding is problematic. Let us now get acquainted with the problem of

understanding. Until now, we have focused on the semantic processes in the mind of the communicant, now we will turn to the recipient, since it is he who is the final authority that determines the effectiveness of semantic communication. The only way to master meanings is to understand them. Understanding is present in two mental processes: in cognition and in communication. When it comes to understanding cause and effect, the device of the machine, the motives of human behavior, the characteristics of the current situation, cognitive understanding takes place. When it is about understanding the message, meaning communication understanding.

Cognitive understanding is the subject of epistemology (theories of cognition), and communication understanding has been studied by hermeneutics since antiquity. Hermeneutics is etymologically connected with the name of Hermes, whom ancient Greek mythology portrayed as the messenger of the Olympian gods, conveying their orders and messages to the people. In charge of Hermes included the interpretation and explanation of the transmitted text, he was credited with the invention of writing. In ancient Greece, hermeneutics was the art of interpretation (interpretation) of allegories, symbols, works of ancient poets, especially Homer. In Christian hermeneutics theology focused on the interpretation of the Bible. Protestants attached particular importance to the search for the true meaning of sacred texts, who on this basis were irreconcilably at enmity with Catholics, who considered it impossible to correctly understand the Holy writings out of ecclesiastical tradition. Since the Renaissance, hermeneutic problems have become part of the the composition of classical philology in connection with the then topical problems understanding and inclusion in modernity of the monuments of ancient culture. Since the 19th century, the period of modern hermeneutics began, interpreted as a method of "getting used to", "feeling" in spiritual life, in culture past eras, which is characteristic of the humanities, in contrast to from the natural sciences. Communication understanding can take three forms: - the recipient receives new knowledge for him; communication understanding merges with cognitive and communication cognition takes place; - the recipient who received the message does not comprehend its deep meaning, being limited to communication perception; - the recipient remembers, repeats, rewrites individual words or phrases, not even understanding the superficial meaning of the message; then pseudo-communication takes place, since there is no movement of meanings, but there is only the movement of the material shell of signs. Communication cognition is a

creative cognitive act, because the recipient is not only aware of the superficial and deep meanings of the message, but also evaluates them from the point of view of ethical obligation and pragmatic benefit. Various criteria for recognizing the level of understanding are proposed. American pragmatists consider human behavior as a criterion : if one person asked another to turn off the light, then it is unimportant cognitive and communication operations in the heads of interlocutors, it matters if the lights are off. If so, then there is communication cognition. Other scholars believe that the message is understood correctly if the recipient can become the author of reasonable affirmative statements about its content, i.e. discuss the disclosure of the topic, ideological and artistic merits, style of presentation, usefulness of the message etc. Still others reject such simplistic criteria, believing that they do not are suitable for assessing an adequate understanding of an artistic, religious, scientific work. The fact is that deep understanding includes empathy, i.e. one must not only recognize the signs and understand the superficial and deep meaning of the message, but also discover and experience the emotional state that owned the author in the process of creativity. Of course, not everyone has the gift to recreate works of art in your soul , An overestimated, almost unattainable level of communication cognition feeds skepticism about the possibilities of understanding each other's people. Our contemporary Yu.B. Borev writes: "Understanding is not at all soul contact. We understand the author's thought as much as we turn out to be congenial to him... The scope of the author's spiritual world is wider the most extensive author's text. Understanding deals with text and not with the spiritual world of man, although they are not alien to each other" [6, p.38].

The problem of understanding is compounded by the fact that it is always accompanied by "attribution of meaning" on the part of the recipient. It turns out the situation of "super understanding", which A.A. Potebnya described like this: "The listener can understand much better than the speaker what hidden behind the word, and the reader can grasp the idea better than the poet himself. his work ..., the essence, the strength of such a work is not that the author meant by it, but in how it affects the reader"[7, p.330]. Thus, the problem of communication cognition remains open, this is another, along with the problem of meaning, the terra incognita of our science. The situation with communication perception is somewhat better. Not reaching the deep motives and intentions of the communicant, the recipient is able to maintain a dialogue with him and even

understand the author's thought as much as it turns out to be congenial to him. There are three chronotopes of space-time coordinates:

1) genetic, where the movement of biological images of genetic programs takes place;

2) mental (personal), where there are meanings mastered given personality, this is the area of spiritual life;

3) social, where there is a movement of meanings in the social time and space, i.e. in a particular human society.

For social communication, we choose a social chronotope, since social communication operates with an ideal nature meanings. Social space is intuitively felt by people system of social relations between them. And the spread of meanings in the social space means their perception by people who are in certain social relations with the communicant. It is important that the meaning of the message not only reach, but also be correct. understood.

Social space is an intuitive sense of flow social life experienced by contemporaries and depends on the intensity of social change. Social meanings have the property of aging. They lose value over time, because new, more relevant meanings appear that capture attention. society. The movement of meanings in social time is duration preservation of meanings of their value. Considering social communication as the movement of meanings in social space and time, we see how knowledge, skills, emotions, incentives reach the recipients and are understood by them, and also how long these meanings retain their value. value to society.

LITERATURE:

1. Benoise, L. "Signs, symbols and myths" [Text] / L. Benoise. – M.: LLC "Publishing House Astrel": LLC "Publishing House AST", 2004.

2. Cultural studies. XX century: Dictionary. [Text] / St. Petersburg: university book, 1997.

3. Konetskaya V.P. " Sociology of communications" textbook [Text] / V.P. Konetskaya. - M.: "International University of Business and management", 1977.

4. Borisnev, S.V. "Sociology of communication: textbook for universities" [Text] / S.V. Borisnev. – M.: UNITI-DANA, 2003.

5. Lemm, S. "The amount of technology" [Text] / S. Lemm. - M., 1968.

6. Borev, Yu B. "Theory of artistic perception and receptive aesthetics"// "Artistic reception and hermeneutics" [Text] / Yu.B.Borev. – M.: Nauka, 1985.

7. Potebnya, A. A. "Aesthetics and poetics" [Text] / A.A. Potebnya. - Moscow: Nauka, 1976.