УДК 130.2:165.212:7.038

ASTAPOVA-VYAZMINA Olena Igorivna,
Candidate of Sciences (Philosophy),
Associate Professor of the Departament
of Philisophy and Religions Studies,
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy,
e-mail: ast.elen.ig@gmail.com

INDEX OF SIGN UNDERSTANDING: SEMIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF MEANING FORMATION

Abstract. Introduction. The article focuses on considering sign systems (objectless art and Internet) in terms of meaning formation and the possibility of its interpretation in the context of semiological analysis. To solve the problem, we use the methods of logical and synthetic analysis. Characteristics and interpretations of sign systems are often limited to the analysis of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic aspects, allowing to operate with the concepts of "sign", "interpreter", "interpretanta", "sign meaning"; the reasons and conditions having led to the variant of a sign translation are overlooked to some extent. In other words, the question is what has allowed the author to present his text this way not otherwise. The originality of the work. The subject appeared in C. Peirce's concept assumes the function of an interpreter and creates a new sign world. The offered notion, "the index of sign understanding", includes the situation of sign expression and representation, as well as the variants of its decoding. The index of sign understanding allows to describe logical constructions of behaviour built by a man and his evaluation of the real world. Conclusions. Creating new semiotic systems, a subject articulates the semantics of the new possible world. Creating sign systems, we create the situation of their application. The meaning of the sign is intertwined into the given conceptual schemes creating the possible ways of their representation, expression, understanding and explanation. It helps to characterize the structure of translation variant of a sign and sign system as a whole, proposed by one or another author.

Key words: sign systems, semiological analysis, meaning, the index of sign understanding, suprematism.

Formulation of the problem. The modern world offers and produces an extraordinary variety of symbolic systems, sign situations that require understanding and explanation. Characteristics and interpretations of sign systems are often limited to the analysis of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic aspects, allowing to operate with the concepts of "sign", "interpreter", "interpretanta", "sign meaning"; the reasons and conditions having led to the variant of a sign translation are overlooked to some extent. In other words, the question is what has allowed the author to present his text this way not otherwise.

When comparing the major semiotic traditions laid by Charles Peirce and Ferdinand de Saussure, it is impossible to miss the feature that distinguishes the model of Charles Peirce, namely, the presence of such an element as a subject, combining reflection the surrounding world, in it. The subject, which not only forms the senses and meanings, but which is an active participant in decoding these very meanings.

V. Plochotnjuk points out that "we should distinguish semiological and semiotic analysis. Semiological analysis is to identify the maximum number of semiosis elements and all the possible kinds of relations between them, thereby creating different semiotic models, which, in their turn, can be used in the applied semiotic analysis of real communicative actions similar to the mathematical analysis of real processes" [1, p. 10].

Analysis of the recent research and publications. The problem of a sign is considered in the works of Ch. Peirce, F. de Saussure, Ch. Morris. The works of R. Carnap, S. Kripke, Y. Lotman, R. Pavilionis, B. Russell, W. Quine, L. Wittgenstein focus on the definite aspects of meaning and the formation of meaning. Logical philosophical analysis of the natural language is considered in the works of J. Austin, A Dummett, J. Searle. In 2011, the collective monograph "Semiotics of Culture: Anthropological Turn" was published; it focuses on the issues of semiotics in the 21st century, the problems of a man in the information space, the changed information space, real and virtual aspects in the texts of modern culture.

Purpose. Considering this distinction, in the given context, we are not interested in signs as such, which are analyzed in the context of semiotic systems, but in something which forms a sign and how this something affects its interpretation; it is the goal of our research.

Presenting the main material. Signs can take various forms of words, sentences, sounds, gestures, images. The central component of all semiotic systems is a language, and at the same time being the most important tool for the interpretation of all other systems, linguistic and nonlinguistic. However, the main property of a language is semiotic code, which is able to create infinite combinations having sense, and, as a result, the situation of the so-called double articulation. By creating a character or a system of signs, a person tries to use them to its own interpretation [2].

According to Pierce, nothing is a sign unless it is interpreted as a sign. The latter may be anything if it means anything, and, therefore, does not point to itself, and simply replaces something else.

A new sign violates the usual norms; it breaks the "truth" that is usual for all. By changing a habitual subject in all respects, a new sign offers a different approach to considering and interpreting the well-known subject. Modern culture, alive with new sign systems: the Internet, installation, performance, flash mob, and more, is overloaded with new characters and, consequently, the concepts of their interpretation. Without going into a detailed description of modern sign systems, we focus on the example of K. Malevich's concept concerning the representation of reality in art, and, as an illustration, we consider the Internet, a phenomenon creating a system of signs and functioning in it. Suprematism is chosen as a model being an avant-garde art example difficult for understanding, and the Internet as a construction, which is created and continues to be created by us.

K. Malevich presents his position concerning the features of suprematism in the article "Suprematism (in the works of 1915-1920)" and points out that "It cannot be about painting in suprematism. Painting art has long outlived, and an artist himself is a prejudice of the past". "Suprematism is also one of the regular prisms of picturesque sensation of impressions and the construction of the outlook. In this prism, the world is refracted in a different way than in the prism of Cubism and Futurism". Describing the philosophy of Suprematism, the artist determines its features being skeptical about the whole human wisdom and its attempts of cognition, believing that it is impossible to identify anything in the world, because there is nothing and there was nothing in it. Therefore, as the opposition of objectness, there is the concept of objectlessness; "nothing" is contrasted with "thing". "Suprematism renounces knowing anything, believing that there is neither such level of culture, nor the light of reason, in which knowledge would be feasible"[3, p. 36], K. Malevich stresses in his article "The world as objectlessness (fragments)". "Suprematism is also a prism through which one cannot see "anything". The world exists beyond the prism of Suprematism; real things are not refracted in it; as they do not exist, they are objectless" [4, p.41] concluded Malevich. Thus, the only question is that "the objectlessness of Art is the art of pure sensations, this is the milk without a bottle that lives by itself, in its form, having its life, and <it> does not depend on the shape of the bottle, which does not express its essence and taste sensations" [5, p. 107].

However, Malevich accuses critics that they considered art only from the standpoint of emotional position, regardless of the circumstances in which it resides. The environment, which the form of picturesque culture-manifestation depend on, is not considered; "the causes of colour and body construction of painting itself are not discussed" [6, p. 240]. The author articulates quite rightly on custom to compare the depicted object to the real one, and this is completely wrong. An object should be compared to painting relations; it is always forgotten that an art is not the art of duplicating, but the art of creating new phenomena. Abnormality, according to Malevich, just lurks in the repetition. Painting is always objectless and does not imply the identity with the depicted object; it is objectless even in the case of object visibility. Malevich shows his point of view on an example: a musical instrument, the violin and the violin of Braque and Picasso. Or, for example, the viewer sees blue cornflowers for the first time and admires their colour. Why? Because he isolates the colour of cornflower from the surrounding reality; he sees and perceives colour itself, rejecting all other circumstances. A botanist looks at the cornflower in a different way; he adds naturalistic features of the flower to the known ones. Unfortunately, we do not really pay attention to what accompanies the perception of an object. K. Malevich comes to the conclusion that "a painting is the result of the relationship between a subject and an object, which, in case of successful relationship, comes in the form of Impressionism, Divisionism, Cézanne, Cubism, etc., and due to it, conflicting resolution comes, forming a new direction of art [5, p. 72]. If an unprepared viewer interprets the paintings by Malevich:

Suprematism (1916-1917), Suprematism (1916), Suprematism № 50, Suprematism (1915), Suprema №56, Suprema №58, he will unlikely be able to do so; all the mentioned pictures will be similar to him; however, and if he reads the works of Malevich, in which the essence of Suprematism is revealed, analyzes the reason for this view of painting, his position as a spectator will be completely changed.

Semiotic transformations of culture are defined or considered from the point of view of a sign existence. In the context of the above examples, we assume the existence of availability levels for the interpretation of sign systems: more accessible and less accessible. The first group is fiction literature, music, paintings (a realistic option); the second one is scientific, religious, non-figurative pictorial text. Certainly, this division does not meet all the rules of the division correctness of a concept, but we suppose it to be possible. For decoding, for example, the biblical text, we do not only need to focus on those historical periods referred to in the Old and New Testaments, but also to consider the symbolism of biblical events and characters. However, the latter has already been edited, for example, in the sequence of annual worship, sermons and specialized literature, outlining the main principles of the behaviour of a Christian, prayers, etc. The same is considered concerning the scientific text, understanding of which will be guaranteed to some extent by the level of education.

Nowadays, culture is completed with a specific phenomenon, namely, the virtual world. Virtuality, a virtual game, a virtual friend, virtual communication, a virtual bank, virtual money and all the options on this issue do not surprise anyone. However, these notions being familiar to us are included into in a completely new sign system, which has been created by a man but has not been cognized and grasped by him. Without claiming to extensive study, we try to determine and analyze some characteristic features of this sign system.

Obviously, it is necessary to begin with the fact that the virtual world changes the consciousness of a man and the latter is faced with a completely new status of his Self. Information space provided by television, radio, various print publications is functionally different from the information space provided by the Internet. A worldwide network offers, first of all, active participation in the world of information. Reading traditional newspapers, magazines and books (recreational and scientific) approaches us or moves us away from the things informed. We can undoubtedly worry about news events, laugh or cry over the fate of a literary character, be involved into the radio play or follow the thoughts of a philosophic concept with a pencil in our hand. The same is possible in the Net but the latter gives an opportunity, first, of much larger amount of information, second, the speed of its getting.

An Internet-message allows us to combine all available broadcast channels and technologies together; it is the combination of oral spoken speech, visual language, a photographic image, television and sound broadcasting. The main position in this set is semantic potential allowing a person to express himself. In other words, it is the semiotic context of forming sense changes. Internet space allows to see visually the production mode of signs and characters as well as the codes in which they are used, somewhat moving away from the subject of sign system classification.

In terms of the perspective of constructing characters, an interesting aspect of identifying a person in the Internet is a nickname or a username. A person can, naturally, choose any of the possible names, which he will use as an account or communication in the system. There arises a question about the sense and sign load of this fictional name.

On the one hand, we have the crisis of identity; on the other hand, this crisis is overcome due to the instrument of fictional name. Naturally, there are situations when a person uses his own name when, for example, he communicates with his supervisor.

The Internet provides the opportunity of socialization of the people with specific needs, e.g. people with CP or the blind. In real life, such a person, unfortunately, often does not find any support of his healthy compatriots. The latter, choosing fictional names for the communication try to hide available, in their opinion, deficiencies including physiological imperfect features or the peculiarities of age, sex, social status, etc. The information space of the Net helps to cope with it. It is a tool for the construction of another possible world. But the latter is not new for us, it is familiar. For example, we face it in fairy tales, myths, and scientific works.

The Net provides graphical variant of identification, an avatar, the purpose of which is public graphical image of a user. Avatar (even with its periodic change) transmits stable virtual identity.

Since an information space entails a certain level of presence experienced by a user, in the user's opinion, the transition of the information is facilitated and social setting, once lost, is recreated.

The own culture is created with the help of the Net. Naturally, it can be negative as it is difficult to follow what music a person listens to, what films he chooses. However, there is a definite positive moment here. It is original *corporate and virtual* culture. The language of a social group or individual language entails a selective view of the world: maintaining own interests and limiting others, according the just remark of D. Chandler [7].

Virtual reality provides the space of freedom. By filling the possible world with personal sense, the Internet provides incredible opportunities for the self-realization of a person. It is, partly, images, partly, the simulation of the world order.

Virtuality meant as an opportunity can arise only under definite conditions. Hume in "An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding" wrote that, at first glance, nothing seems to be freer from restrictions than the human mind, which is not subject to the power and authority of the people, however, cannot be retained within the nature and reality. It is not more difficult for the imagination to create monsters and to join the most incompatible forms than to imagine the most natural and familiar objects [8, p. 20-21].

The design of the own existence in the virtual world is shifting towards private ideas about such existence. From a logical point of view, the possible world assumes the truth of a statement in the possible world and the falsity of it in the real world and vice versa. However, since it is not just a neutral statement but the situational factor of its application, logic constructions of behaviour built by a person and evaluation should consider the rules of the real world.

With all the positive assessments of the Internet features, it still limits the statement. The scheme of written communication in Skype, social network and ordinary e-mail correspondence provide a lot of (at first glance) additional images for the articulation of the sender's emotional state, which are used in the Internet and other simple text communication channels. The stylized image of a human face usually has a signature in the pop-up icons on the monitor. We can confirm the joy, malice, anger, confusion, love, etc. with a corresponding element. It is not just a simulation, image, elementary simplification of the opportunity to express the own state. It is a formulation or form taken for granted. There is no need to describe anything for a long time; it is enough for you to insert a smiley face and your recipient will think himself what you want to say. Text self-presentation is transformed into primitive labeling; the standardization of a person's emotions deprives him of speech as the image emphasizes the equivalence of a word and an action. The proposed smiley and card are only tools for a particular purpose, but their use has already become a part of this goal.

Y. Taratuta rightly points out that since the advent of the Internet, virtual reality is actually equal to it. "... Communication mediated by computers and the Internet, is inevitably perceived… as a space, ... and, in the case of virtual communication of people living miles apart, the parameter varied by the magical effect of the virtual aspect is the physical space. Here, only some characteristics of the parameter are changed; the parameter itself, its position and meaning remain unchanged and even consolidated" [9, p. 123].

A key position of the analysis of the production and operation of the given sign system is *the index of sign understanding*. This notion can help to describe and focus on the possible and available risks of global informatization. Thus, the text perceived and created by a man takes a form of not only conscious purpose but features of communication means, such as a language, writing instruments including social and psychological aspects. These are the consequences, which have differences in the channel and technology of information transmission, its potential sense, since the socio-cultural messages are used and acquire the status only in specific cultural contexts.

Conclusions. Thus, in both sign systems, proposed for the analysis, there is a problem of differentiation of the expressed information from the means by which it is expressed. These problems, for example, include the demarcation of the meaningful and meaningless in the construction of the world conceptual system, as well as the meaning in the context of the built structures for the interpretation in both objectless art and the Internet. The proposed notion, "the index of sign understanding", points out the object of decoding as the state of opinion, as the way of perception expression working in the situation of interpreting expression, in which a subject plays the major role.

References (in language original)

1. Плохотнюк В. С. Семиотический метод изучения культуры и семиология как теоретический фундамент культуры / В. С. Плохотнюк // Семиотика культуры: антропологический поворот. Коллективная монография. – СПб.: Эйдос, 2011. – С. 9-26.
2. Chandler D. Semiotics for Beginner [Electronic recourse]. – Accessed mode: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/S4B/
3. Малевич К. Супрематизм / К. Малевич // Малевич К. Собрание сочинений в 5 томах. – Т. 2. Статьи и теоретические сочинения, опубликованные в Германии, Польше и на Украине, 1924-1930. – М.: Гилея, 1998. – С. 33-35.
4. Малевич К. Мир как беспредметность (фрагменты) / К. Малевич // Малевич К. Собрание сочинений в 5 томах. – Т. 2. Статьи и теоретические сочинения, опубликованные в Германии, Польше и на Украине, 1924-1930. – М.: Гилея, 1998. – С. 36-50.
5. Малевич К. Мир как беспредметность / К. Малевич // Малевич К. Собрание сочинений в 5 томах. – Т. 2. Статьи и теоретические сочинения, опубликованные в Германии, Польше и на Украине, 1924-1930. – М.: Гилея, 1998. – С. 105-123.
6. Малевич К. Эстетика (попытка определить художественную и нехудожественную сторону произведений / К. Малевич // Малевич К. Собрание сочинений в 5 томах. – Т. 2. Статьи и теоретические сочинения, опубликованные в Германии, Польше и на Украине, 1924-1930. – М.: Гилея, 1998. – С. 238-253.
7. Chandler D. Technological or Media Determinism [Electronic recourse]. – Accessed mode: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/tecdet/
8. Юм Д. Исследования о человеческом разумении / Давид Юм. – М.: Мысль, 1966. – Т. 2. – 842 с.
9. Таратута Е. Е. Философия виртуальной реальности / Е. Е. Таратута. – СПБ.: СПбГУ, 2007. – 147 с.
10. Chandler D. The Act of Writing: A Media Theory Approach [Electronic recourse]. – Accessed mode: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/act/act.html
11. Философия языка. – Изд. 2-е. / Ред.-сост. Дж. Р. Сёрл; Пер. с англ. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2010. – 208 с.

References

1. Plochotnjuk, V. S. (2011). Semiotic method of Culture Study and Semiology as the Theoretical foundation of Culture. *Semiotics of Culture: Anthropological Turn*, 9-26. SPb.: Eydos (in Russ.)
2. Chandler, D. (1994). *Semiotics for Beginner.* Retrieved from: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/S4B/
3. Malevich, K. (1998). Suprematism // *Collected Writings, 5,* 33-35. M.: Gileya (in Russ.)
4. Malevich, K. (1998). The World as Objectlessness (fragments). *Collected Writings, 2,* 36-50. Moscow: Gileya (in Russ.)
5. Malevich, K. (1998). A World as the Objectless. *Collected Writings, 2*, 105-123. Moscow: Gileya (in Russ.)
6. Malevich, K. (1998). Aesthetics (An Attempt to determine fiction and nonfiction side of the works). *Collected Writings, 2,* 238-253. Moscow: Gileya (in Russ.)
7. Chandler, D. (1995). *Technological or Media Determinism.* Retrieved from: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/tecdet/
8. Hume, D. (1966). *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding.* Moscow: Mysl (in Russ.)
9. Taratuta, Y. Y. (2007). *Philosophy of virtual reality.* SPB. (in Russ.)
10. Chandler, D. (1995). *The Act of Writing: A Media Theory Approach.* Retrieved from: http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/act/act.html
11. *Language Philosophy* (2010). Moscow: Editorial URSS (in Russ.)

АСТАПОВА-ВЯЗЬМІНА Олена Ігорівна,
кандидат філософських наук,
доцент кафедри філософії та релігієзнавства
Черкаського національного університету
імені Богдана Хмельницького,
e-mail: ast.elen.ig@gmail.com

ІНДЕКС РОЗУМІННЯ ЗНАКУ: СЕМІОЛОГІЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ФОРМУВАННЯ СМИСЛУ

Анотація. *У статті розглядаються знакові системи (безпредметне мистецтво та Інтернет) з позиції формування смислу і можливості його інтерпретації в контексті семіологічного аналізу. Запропоноване поняття «індекс розуміння знаку» включає ситуацію вираження та презентації знаку, а також варіанти його розкодування.*

Ключові слова: *знакова система, семіологічний аналіз, смисл, індекс розуміння знаку, супрематизм.*