The Sense as the Dominant Generating Speech Communication

Elena N. Klemenova*
Southern Federal University
53, 22/1 Dobrovolskogo Str., Rostov on Don, 344113 Russia[1]

The article contains the review of approaches to the description by the humanity of one of the most interesting phenomena of the mankind – the sense. Ideas of valuable and conceptual approach to understanding of the sense, sense- and text-forming and the author as the sense source are considered.

Keywords: sense, sense-forming, author, values, text, concept.

In modern science the problem of sense forming is ambiguously solved in various areas of humanitarian knowledge. According to psychologists, the solution of this problem is possible only at a support on such important categories as personality, activity, and communication. So, from the point of view of D.A. Leontyev, sense is the subjective significance of objects and the reality phenomena, manifested in two forms: 1) in emotional colouring of images of perception and representations of these objects and phenomena; 2) in understanding (interpretation) by the subject of their role and a place in the activity, in satisfaction of certain requirements, or actualization of these or those motives, values» (Leontyev, 1999, p. 423-424).

The human-being's need for optimization of the activity determines the sense forming process vector. Therefore it is not a coincidence that in modern psychological researches the idea on creating the semantic concept of personality (Leontyev, 1999) is persistently repeated. «But personality, – R.H. Shakurov writes, is just a set of semantic contours and systems. Personality is a human-being as a creator of senses, a creator of pleasures (underlined by E.K.)» (Shakurov, 2003, p. 31).

Sense forming is guided by values, abilities, nature of knowledge and thinking of a complete personality. In some way this process is also the manifestation of integrity of the personality.

V. Frankl, one of the largest researchers of sense, wrote that senses are objective and exist around us (Frankl, 1990); S. Frank argued that the meaning of life is «a certain eternal element», value (Frank, 1994).

In reality, values are a sense forming source, and to explain the nature of sense psychologists resort to the all-round description of personal senses (Shakurov, 2003; Bratus, 1981).

Various definitions of the "sense" concept, its forming and identification in the text show not

---

*   Corresponding author E-mail address: klemenova@yandex.ru

only the depth of the problem as a whole, but also its fragmentariness. The reason is the phenomenal character of sense.

The program guideline of specific allocating the sense itself as a pure phenomenon of consciousness is associated with the name of E. Husserl, a representative of philosophical phenomenology.

Following the general phenomenological guideline, a special role in judgment of the perspective of sense was played by works by Shpet, A.F. Losev, who, according to V. G. Lankin, made comments from the different points of view, developed some phenomenological ideas and actively included them into the context of a perspective of art originality and aesthetic phenomena. The aesthetic analysis of art by M. M. Bakhtin who writes that «each thought of mine with its contents is my individual and responsible act, one of those acts of which my one and only life as a continuous receipt is composed …» (Lankin, 2003, p. 8) is also close to their point of view.

The Hermeneutic branch considers the category of sense in a different way: uniting thought with language in its live self-interpretation, hermeneutics allows seeing the realization act from the inside.

Linguistic philosophy (R. Bart, C. Morris, S. Langer, Y. Lotman), information theories (A. Mol) and analytical philosophy (R. Carnap, B. Russell, L. Wittgenstein, etc.) consider the sense and its understanding as a secondary problem in relation to identification of reference (matrix) directions of use of signs and values corresponding to them in these or those verbal or nonverbal «language games» (Lankin, 2003, p. 12).

Sense and sense forming as the central components of understanding in their alternativeness and intermodality are considered in semiotics (E. Cassirer, S. Later, etc.),

structuralistic (R. Bart, M. Foucault, etc.) and post-structuralistic conceptions (Z. Derrida, Z. Lakan, etc.). «The concept of sense, being discredited as a metaphysical installation, V. G. Lankin writes, – in Z. Derrida's deconstructive philosophy is replaced with sense forming as with effect of open eventful game of consciousness on the verge of madness» (Lankin, 2003, p. 11). The same phenomenon is analysed by G. Deleuze in his book «Logic of Sense», where art acts as the dominating manifesto of deconstructive logic of eventful semantic game. Deleuze considers sense as a non-existent essence adjoining on nonsense (Deleuze, 1998).

Sense as an individual phenomenon with the need to be materialized in the course of communication is the object of attention in linguistic studies as well. G. Frege, B. Russell, L. Wittgenstein, M. M. Bakhtin, T. Todorov, A.A. Ufimtseva, N. N. Arutyunova, A.I. Novikov, B. M. Gasparov devoted their works to the problem of sense forming.

The primacy of sense in relation to language material, apparently, does not raise any doubts, but as B. M. Gasparov fairly noticed, in all of its transformations sense always remains embodied in the language material, and we always deal with its embodiments in the language material, instead of sense itself (Gasparov, 1996, p. 291). It becomes especially topical in the description of sense and text forming. «The sense and language material», – Gasparov points out, – exist «inseparably and non-blendingly». They are not identical with each other, and between them there are multiple relations: any movement of thought can receive infinite number of language transformations, the same as any «piece» of language material can receive infinite number of reconsiderations» (Gasparov, 1996, p. 292).

A.R. Luria paid attention to the fact that what lies behind a word of an individual is impossible to consider as a consistently developed linear

chain, even as a hierarchically constructed tree. The sense is suggested to be a certain multidimensional simultaneous structure which corresponds to the modern understanding of the concept (Luria, 1983). A.A. Zalevskaya specifies a similar type of concept, designates it an «Indus» index and opposes to an «Invus» concept (functioning in a super big system as a product of social interactions and communication). The author defines «Indus» as «spontaneously functioning in informative and communicative activity of an individual, basic perceptive and cognitive and affective formation of dynamic character submitting to regularities of mental human life and thereof in a number of parameters different from concepts and values as products of the scientific description from positions of the linguistic theory (Zalevskaya, 2005, p. 411).

It is the subjectivity of sense / concept that is considered by L.N. Churilina as the distinctive sign of a text as a whole, whereas «the possible world» breaks into separate, in a certain extent, independent worlds, subjective text spheres, and appears «as a system of the subjective spheres difficult to coordinate». In her thesis research, L.N. Churilina presents sense as a concept, as an absolutely anthropocentric phenomenon, and concept in literary text is presented as a polysubjective speech structure existing in two dimensions at the same time: as an element of the represented world view and as a base concept of text space, i.e. as an element of the individual picture of the world of the subject (author) embodied in a separate text (Churilina, 2003, p. 10-11).

The idea of the text sense as the author's concept sphere is characteristic for L.A. Chernyakhovskaya (Chernyakhovskaya, 1983) and for B. M. Gasparov (Gasparov, 1996).

«The sense mechanism, – writes A.I. Novikov, – in the most generalized look can be presented «as such mental device which transforms the linear sequence of any units to hierarchical structure of other units. With reference to text, it is possible to say that sense allows to carry out the algebraic transformation of a narration into the «geometry» of content presentation» (Novikov, 2004). From our point of view, the position of Novikov is interesting but disputable, as the hierarchical relations all the same result in linearity, but downwards, and, unfortunately, as we can see, sense appears as some substance which is not been limited to the framework of a certain text, but going beyond its limits, enveloping it. Long ago, H.-G. Gadamer noticed that «language never will reach the last, deep-rooted secrets of the individual personality» (H.-G. Gadamer, 1999).

So, on one hand, sense acts as the basic concept of activity, thinking, language and culture, and on the other hand, it is the main concept of generating and understanding speech communication.

The phenomenon of sense forming cannot be considered irrespectively to the central figure of the communication process, which is the author. It is impossible to disagree with M. Foucault, who wrote: «The author is not the source of the work sense; the author does not precede the work, he is the functional principle which complicates the uncontrolled cycling of senses in culture» (Foucault, 1996, p. 71). And here let us remember the words by F. Nietzsche: «Everything that has value in the present world, has it not by itself, not by nature, as in nature there are no values, – but because it was given the value once, presented it, and we were the details and the donators! It was only we who created the world about which people care!» (Nietzsche, 1990, p. 638).

Addressing to the author's model of the world embodied in the text, K.A. Dolinin prefers to say that it does not exist in a complete form before the text is created, and is self-constructed and specified in the course of text formation.

Incompleteness felt by the author or discrepancy of his model of the world can be an impulse to creation, according to Dolinin (Dolinin, 2004, p. 84).

This is what Yu.A. Shreyder also writes about: «The found and realized contradiction serves as the peculiar dialectic engine putting in action the mechanism of creativity» (Shreyder, 1976, p. 31). *The personality* is taken out by K.A. Dolinin as the significant sign of the art text (Dolinin, 2004, p. 85).

Cognitive approach to author's outlook revived the definition of art concept brought up by S.A. Askoldov in 1928 (Askoldov, 1997, p. 274). In this kind of concept the primeval position is occupied by the units of the author's individual consciousness, verbalized in the uniform text of the author's creativity.

The cognitive ability to reinterpret old and to create new mental designs in a creative way is given to human-being, and as a result, it is the person, his / her "Self" as the source of all new and creative, is creative, which is impossible to say about language. But, in our opinion, no matter how the researchers call the phenomenon («the current consciousness of the narrator» by A.V. Bondarko (Bondarko, 2001), author's concept sphere (Proskuryakov, 2000; L.V. Miller, 2000), author's consciousness (Maryin, 2000) or author's will (Gasparov, 1996)), its essence is the same: actualization of personal senses or "Self". And "Self" (conscious or unconscious) is a secret of universal scale.

Entering communication (written or spoken), the author aspires to convey this or that semantic matter to offer their own "Self" for dialogue with the world. Not without reason E.I. Dibrova defines the text as «difficult multidimensional language space where the psychology author's Self» (Dibrova, 1999, p. 27).

So, accepting the idea of the subject centrality, we consider any text as the manifestation of the author's model of the world, the influence of which is shown at all levels of the text, beginning with its semantic structure and finishing with its superficial structure.

But as a result of text generation, the certain compromise between what the writing / speaking "was intended" to express, and what it "turned out" to be, owing to use of a language material (L.S. Vygotsky also wrote about it), occurs.

«It is a compromise between the dug-out, not integrated fields of the possibilities induced by the thought of the speaker, – writes Gasparov, – and his communicative will, aspiring to catch in this stream of associations, spreading in all directions, such particles which, on one hand, would be a suitable material for embodying his plans and, on the other hand, would be capable of uniting with each other, and, being integrated in a whole the image of which would more or less correspond to what was there in his thought. It also a compromise between the press of the previous uses, which each recurring to the memory expression bears on itself, and the desire to adapt it to a unique, and always to a new task and combination of circumstances, in which and for the sake of which each statement» is created (Gasparov, 1996, p.104-107).

And the more separate "pieces" of the language fabric is stored in the speaker / writer's memory, the richer is «the grid of associative courses, analytical assimilations, plastic modifications of the available material» on the basis of which the speaking / writing subject creates statements and texts (Gasparov, 1996, p. 112). As sense unit, Gasparov points out a communicative fragment possessing the feature of complete sense: «Each CF is not simply ready to take a certain place in the cell intended to it, in the statement it actively predicts and directs the course of communication, from direct courses of growth to more separate subject, thematic and genre consequences» (Gasparov, 1996, p. 131).

M.Ya. Dymarsky also addressed to search of the main unit of semantic structure of text, which directly corresponds to concept (contents of text) as a whole; includes the subject and actual information on some (significative) situation, incorporated not only by the unity of situation, but also by the community attributed by it (information) of modal value; forms a cover of the subject and actual information on the basis of modal value, and represents information in general way.

Two signs became the border of this minimum unit which Dymarsky called the *conceptually significant* sense: a) change of modal value; б) change of the subject and actual basis, i.e. transition to other microsubject (Dymarsky, 2001, p. 61-62). Similar representation of the unit of sense, in our opinion, in many respects follows Gasparov, thus is better coordinated with the topic – comment approach to text of I.M.Boguslavsky and E.Farino.

But at Gasparov presents the generation of statement / text in a more precise way from the point of view of associative background: thought stimulated by activity gets various sets of expressions from the memory, in each case capable of serving as some certain material from which the resulting phrase (Gasparov, 1996 p. 165) is weaved. According to Gasparov, sense develops from some separate components, because in the memory of speaker / writer a large quantity of ready pieces of language fabric, comprehended in advance, is stored; the problem of the speaker / writer includes only the operation of "adjustment" of these pieces, so that the resulting whole makes the impression of correctness and intelligence (Gasparov, 1996, p. 167).

Sense is organized under the influence of the text structure, but it is not a linear, but a many-tier organization. So, L.A. Chernyakhovskaya presents it in the shape of an "umbrella". «As a rule, – the researcher writes, – the existence of umbrella communication in the model of text semantic structure allocates those semantic units which are usually referred to as the "subject" of the text. … If the text deals with only one "subject" which throughout the text is exposed to the characterization, in the semantic structure of the text there is one umbrella. But, as a rule, such umbrellas proving the existence of the narration subject, are multiple in the text» (Chernyakhovskaya, 1983, p. 124-126).

Besides this configuration the sense can be described also from the point of view of information structure of communication.

Jerzy Faryno, for example, establishes a related connection between the topic-comment articulation of the text and structure of signs, but projected from the hierarchy axis on the sequence axis, and writes that «the subject takes the position of the plane of expression whereas comment takes the position of the plane of content; the reviewer, as well as in the case of sign, is localized beyond the statement» (Faryno, 1991, p. 153-154).

For M. Proskuryakov, the idea by Faryno is also actualized in another way: the topic «is not only invariable, but also practically non-textual: it is what the comments» are strung on; «both topic and comment taken separately are incomplete: topic, though it has its referent, is semantically incomplete. Comment, though has its semantics is not referential enough». The problem of topic is to identify the object, which conditions its referentiality, and the problem of comment is to conceptualize it, describing it attributing it with these or those properties and features. At the same time, according to Faryno, «nothing from the outside can enter the text, and everything is derived (or: revealed, developed) from some initial motives and word forms. (…) all that is saved up behind this motive and the word form in culture, semantics and even formal history of word (obsolete archaisms, forgotten morphology

and etymology)» (Proskuryakov, Bugaev, 2005) are unexpectedly actualized.

Thus, in relation to semantic articulation of the text, the notion of topic should be treated in an expanded way. Topic is not any this, known content; it is the thing known to both interlocutors. It becomes a point, some kind of "springboard" for expanding actual information. Comment is something new that is reported about the topic that is the "kernel", i.e. macroinformation. Not without reason Van Dijk referres to it as to the "focus" of narration which, in its turn, in case of change draws our attention to the change of «the possible world»: «It can be a transition from more or less « general world» to a more special one, and vice versa …, at last, a transition from the real world to unreal …». The scientist calls transition an invariable phenomenon, though mentions some distinctions: focus «as a choice of one or several worlds» and focus as «a choice of the facts» where « facts and worlds are not absolutely diverse concepts», since «focusing on a certain fact is at the same time imposing of some restriction on that set of possible worlds in which the subsequent offers of sequence should be interpreted» (Van Dijk, 2001, p.152, 158).

N. V. Shkurina pays attention to the apt remark by Janco, saying that «comment is an absolute property of the sentence because it forms it as a piece of speech with a certain communicative task, and the role of topic is relative: it bears responsibility for the communication between the sentence, the text and extralinguistic reality» (Shkurina, 2003, p. 17).

Lack of functional symmetry between topic and theme does not raise any doubts, and concerning this matter the solution is to be provided by the author / speaker, who, according to the fair remark of G.A. Zolotova, resorts to any ways to express the thought in the most understandable way, therefore the words bearing on a logical stress within the text fragments of various standard contents, often become the object of linguistic research. The dominating role of comment is defined by its dual nature: on one hand, it is opposed to topic of the sentence, and on the other hand it is connected to comments of the other sentence, creates the comment dominant of the text (Zolotova, 2003, p.317-318).

It confirms the fact that the theory of topic-comment articulation has already overstepped the bounds of traditional grammar and extended its influence on all text.

So, at semantic and structural level of the organization of the speech, language means fix not only objective senses set by the author, but also subjective ones. The extent of the correct interpretation of the message only depends on the exact description of contours of the author's sense personal concept sphere.

References

Askoldov S. A. *Russian literature. From the literature theory to text structure. Anthology* (Moscow, 1997), 267-279, in Russian.

Bondarko A.V. Text linguistics in system of functional grammar" in *The Text. Structure and semantics* (Moscow, 2001), 4-13, in Russian.

Bratus B.S. "To studying of the semantic sphere", the Messenger of the Moscow university, 14 (2) (Moscow, 1981), 46-55, in Russian.

Gadamer H.G. "Text and interpretation", *Hermeneutics and deconstruction* (S- Petersburg, 1999), 202-242, in Russian.

Gasparov B. M. Language, memory, image. Linguistics of language existence (Moscow, 1996), in Russian

Dijk Van T.A., Kinch V. "Macrostrategies", *Language. Knowledge. Communication* (Moscow, 1989), in Russian.

Deleuze J. *Logic of sense* (Moscow, 1998), in Russian.

Dibrova E.I. Text space in composite partitioning, *Structure and semantics of the art text: Reports of the VII International conference* (Moscow, 1999), 23-29, in Russian.

Dolinin K.A. *Text interpretation: French* (Moscow, 2005), in Russian.

Dymarsky M I. *Problems of text building and the art text (on a material of Russian prose of the XIX-XX centuries)* (Moscow, 2001), in Russian.

Zalevskaya A.A. *Psycholinguistic researches. Word. Text: Selected works* (Moscow, 2005), in Russian .

Zolotov G. A. *Communicative aspects of Russian syntax* (Moscow, 2003), in Russian

Lankin V. G. *Phenomenally sense: Philosophical and methodological analysis: Dissertation on philological sciences* (Tomsk, 2003), in Russian.

Leontyev D. A. Sense psychology (Moscow, 1999), in Russian

Luriya A.R. On pathology of grammatical operations, *Aphasia and regenerative training: Texts* (Moscow, 1983), 91, in Russian.

Maryin L.P. Virtual modus cultures: text as special form of expression of author's consciousness in *Virtual space of culture* (S-Petersburg, 2000), 108-111, in Russian.

Miller L.V. Art concept as semantic and aesthetic category, *World of Russian word (4)* (2000), 39-45, in Russian.

Nietzsche F. The gay science, *Works in 2 volumes* (V.1) (Moscow: Mysl`, 1990), 638 in Russian.

Novikov A.I. The mechanism of dominance and sense formation (Electronic resource: access Mode: www.dialog-21.ru), in Russian.

Proskuryakov M., Bugayev L. *Russian mentality and the text in self-organizing terms* (Electronic resource: access Mode: www.fixed.ru), in Russian.

Proskuryakov M., Bugayev L. *Russian mentality and the text in self-organizing terms* (Electronic resource: access Mode: www.fixed.ru), in Russian.

Frankl V. *People in search of meaning of the life* (Moscow, 1990), in Russian.

Frank S.L. *Meaning of the life* (Moscow, 1994), in Russian.

Foucault M. "What is the author?" in *Will to truth: on that party of knowledge, the power and sexuality. Works of different years / Lanes with fr.* (Moscow, 1996).

Chernyakhovskaya L.A. "Semantic structure of the text and its units", *Linguistic Issues* (6), (1983), 117-126, in Russian.

Churilina L.N. *Anthropocentrism of the art text as principle of the organization of its lexical structure: Abstract of doctoral dissertation on Philological sciences (*S-Petersburg, 2003), in Rusian.

Shakurov R. H. "Psychology of senses: theory overcomings", *Psychology Questions* (5), (2003), 18-33, in Russian.

Shkurina N. V. *Functional aspect of front units of the art text (on an example of stories of L. Dobychin): Abstract of doctoral dissertation on Philological sciences* (S-Petersburg, 2003), in Russian.

Shreyder Yu.A. "Aspiration to new synthesis", *Literature Questions,* (11), (1976), 28-38.

Faryno J. "Some notes to topic-comment in the text" in *Words are physicians for an ailig mind* (Munich, 1991), 153-162.

Смысл как порождающая речевую коммуникацию доминанта

Е.Н. Клемёнова

Южный федеральный университет,
Россия 344113, Ростов-на-Дону, ул. Добровольского, 22/1, 53

В статье представлен обзор подходов к описанию гуманитарной наукой одного из самых интересных феноменов человечества – смысла. Рассматриваются идеи ценностного и концептуального подхода к пониманию смысла, смысло- и текстообразование и автор как источник смысла.

Ключевые слова: смысл, смыслообразование, автор, ценности, текст, концепт.