

EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION

Pigarkina E.A.

THE PARADOX SENSE GENERATIVE POTENTIAL IN FICTION

**Pigarkina E.A., Russian Federation, PhD, TVER STATE
UNIVERSITY, The Department of Foreign Languages and International
Relations**

Abstract

The paradox is taken as a means of sense creating and sense perception, a tool for understanding and interpreting of a fiction text from the philological hermeneutics points of view in the framework of the system-oriented activity approach.

Keywords: paradox, fiction text, understanding, comprehension, interpretation, meaning, reflection.

In philological hermeneutics, the study of the meaning of the paradox in the fiction text is closely related to the concepts of understanding and interpretation.

At various stages of the linguistics development comprehension was seen as defining the features of author's thinking, as an instrument for understanding oneself as an ability to comprehend being and as a conscious act aimed at discerning the meanings of a fictional text.

At present, philological hermeneutics studies the text at the level of interpretation of its content and the meanings revealing. It takes understanding to be interpreted within the framework of the system-driven activity-based approach [Bogin G]. At the same time, the fiction text is viewed as the result of certain actions of the author in selecting means at the level of planning, making a plot, composition and style, and choosing linguistic and extra linguistic techniques.

According to G. Bogin, "the subject of philological hermeneutics is understanding (comprehension) – the discretion and mastery of the ideal, represented in text forms" [Bogin 1986: 12]. Understanding is represented as one of the other sources of reflexion, a liaison between the epistemological image and available experience, and they both function as follows: the image is colored by available experience, and experience becomes the object of a changed attitude [Bogin http]. Reflection goes along with understanding. Reflection is the second (after sensuality) source of experience, the most important proper human construct, allowing to perfect the whole soul structure of the individual and society (their ontological construction) [Bogin 1986: 3].

While working with fiction texts, the recipient needs to comprehend his actions, i.e. mastering an active understanding that implies a process where "a person looks at himself, looking at the world" [Schedrovitsky 1992: 21]. Consequently, understanding means not only comprehending the artistic text, but also its actions aimed at mastering the meaning of the text and constructing the meanings present in the text space with the help of certain textual tools and techniques; and the paradox is one of them.

At present, in phenomenological hermeneutics, the paradox is considered as one of the ways of expressing one's attitude to the world. For texts flooded with paradoxes, a description of the existence of man in a social and cultural-historical environment is a definite characteristic (P. Woodhouse "Jeeves and Wooster", O. Wilde "Portrait of Dorian Gray", J. Orwell, Stephen Fry "The Fry Chronicles", etc.). Events and elements of the social world, e.g., texts, actions and actions of a person, historical events are considered as objects of interpretation. K. Meng considers the hermeneutic concept that the social world is characterized by to be the fact that the individuals interpret themselves and their social reality [Meng 1989: 55].

Through the paradox in the text, the fears of the individual are transmitted to lose their true "I" and the authenticity of their existence. In this case, the situation of the difficulty of understanding the paradox can be considered through the hermeneutics of Heidegger, who limits the concept of meaning to the framework of being in the moment, which is a consequence of the limitation of being able to be meaningful "articulately expressed in an understanding interpretation" [Heidegger 1993: 18].

Linguistic interpretation has common points of contact with the hermeneutic analysis described by Gadamer, in which the following stages are determined:

1) Misunderstanding. Understanding is always preceded by difficulties, obstacles in establishing consent. "Where there is any obstacle on the way to understanding, it is already given as a prerequisite ... The intense effort of the will to understand begins with a sense of collision with something alien, provocative, disorienting."

2) Questioning. The inability to move forward prompts reflection and revision of the initial orientation patterns. "Obviously, both puzzlement, surprise, and suspension in understanding are directly related to further progress towards the truth, with a persistent desire for its cognition."

3) The assumption. Openness to the opinion of the other is an exit from the sphere of one's own prejudices and tradition as the basis of our understanding to the border of another opinion.

4) The hermeneutical circle of interpretations where the movement proceeds from a preliminary representation of the whole text to the meaning of the parts so to clarify the general meaning.

5) Understanding (insight, guess) - the emergence of connection to the common sense.

6) The general meaning. Interpretation is always directed to the meaning, while simultaneously clarifying the interpreter's own existence through the text [Gadamer 1991: 321-355].

Understanding of philological hermeneutics is regarded as an adequate understanding of the text. G.I. Bogin, analyzing the understanding as an active thinking process characterized by the presence of the phenomenon of interweaving of various ways and types of understanding, believes that the texts are created with the system of different types of understanding: semantic, cognitive and dissimilar (*raspredmechivayuscheye*) [Bogin [http](#)]. There will be an appropriate type of understanding for every text and a combination of types of understanding. The difference in types of understanding does not mean neither their mutual impenetrability, nor absolute independence.

Since the result of understanding is *the meaning / some knowledge* that is included in an already existing system of knowledge or correlates with it, the sense as an ideal mental model is created by the subject in the process of understanding the text.

According to G.P. Shchedrovitsky, the meaning of the whole text is understood as "that configuration of all connections and relationships between the elements of the situation of activity and communication, which is created or restored by a person in understanding the message" [Shchedrovitsky 1994: 89].

Understanding depends on several factors: the knowledge and method of generalization of information inherent by the reader; and the multiplicity of interpretations of the text depends on the text parameters. While interpreting paradoxically marked texts, a dissimilar (*raspredmechivayuscheye*) type of interpretation prevails, characterized by the purposeful thought actions of the reader, aimed at a certain concept and the construction of meanings in the text. The presence of a paradox at different levels of the text creates an optimal space for reflection and understanding, which activates the reader's mental efforts aimed at mastering the meaningfulness of the text and constructing meanings.

The process of constructing meanings is carried out by the reader from the moment of starting thinking about the contemplated mental actions and one's own ways of comprehending the text, i.e. since its included in the process of thought activity. In the process of text understanding, the recipient's reflection can be fixed, according to G. Shchedrovitsky, in one (or several) of the three levels of the scheme of mind activity (SMA) [Shchedrovitsky 1995: 287].

In the diagram, belts are distinguished:

- 1) the mind activity level (mA); the representations, phenomena, mental "pictures" correspond to it;
- 2) the level of mind-communication (M-C), where there is direct verbal communication, i.e. verbalization of the literary text;
- 3) the level of pure thinking (M), "pure", i.e. un verbalized meanings and ideas are fixed and formed in it.

All these levels are interrelated, and none is reducible to the other. When creating and understanding *paradoxically marked fiction texts* (a paradoxically marked text is a text with a paradox at any level of the organization of the text space), reflection takes place in all the zones of the SMA, therefore one cannot speak of the leading role of any level in the organization of meanings. However, as a result of the complex analytical and synthetic activity stimulated by the logically contradictory nature of the paradox, new meanings are organized precisely in the level M, in which the general meanings are actualized and the subjective experience of the reader obtained through the distribution of meanings of the author's text is fixed. When analyzing paradoxically marked texts, two basic schemes of the sequence of fixation of reflection are defined:

1. M + M-C + mA;
2. M + mA + M-C.

The first scheme is more explicative, the second - is implicate. In this case, the actualization of new meanings in the level of pure thinking (M) is equally important for both options.

The recipient reflexion of the text is activated in the course of the hermeneutic act, which is the reader comprehension of the text meaning because of active actions (directed reflection) under the conditions of the hermeneutic situation that arises in the face of the paradox. At the same time, the paradox is a hermeneutic dominant, which sets the initial opposition on the basis of which further analysis is based on the functioning of the entire system of the reader's actions with the text as a sequence of hermeneutical situations constantly replacing each other.

Thus, in the analysis of the paradoxically marked abstract of the text "*Philanthropic people lose all sense of humanity. It is their distinguishing characteristic*" [Wild 2010: 49], the expressed opinion contradicts the common

sense at first sight and requires actualization of the reader's experience and the appellation to the knowledge of the individual and society nature. The author sneers at the sheer hypocrisy of philanthropists, criticizes fashion for the ostentatious and emphasizes the inconsistency of form and content through the opposition of philanthropy to human worshiping making the statement ambiguous. The concepts of "philanthropy" and "charity" come into conflict with each other in a situation where these qualities are mutually exclusive due to the lexical syntactic organization. Fixation of reflection at the M-A level allows one to see how the meanings of the human virtues characterize charity: "philanthropy", "help to the needy", "mercy", which are then re-expressed at the mA level in the form of objective representations of "ostentatious philanthropy" and "charity as a hobby ". At the M level, the following meanings are formed: "absence of true compassion," "insensitivity," and "indifference." Thus, the understanding of the mosaic of fixation of reflection is realized in accordance with the formula [M + mA + M-C].

To illustrate the work of the second formula [M + M-C + mA], let's take the paradox "Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing" [Wild 2010: 115]. The assertion of a global change in the world outlook and the reassessment of values expressed in the priority of the material principle in life, through the opposition of the synonyms price and value and the use of the antonyms everything and nothing, is the result of the fixation of reflection at the M-C level. At the mA level the reader's experience is activated in the form of objective representations: "depreciation of life values," "everything is bought and everything is sold." At the M level the objectification of reflection gives rise to the meanings "lack of spirituality," "lack of principle," and "immorality." These concepts are the characteristics of the time of the novel's action, and, on the contrary, the notions of "spiritual purity" and "morality" as the remnants of the past.

The use of paradoxically marked fiction texts, within the scheme of mind activity (SMA) enhances the activity of the reader's thinking activity in the process of mastering the content of the text and shows how the paradox allows to expand the ideal space for constructing meanings and the possibility of text influence on the reader.

References:

- [1] Bogin G.I. Methodological manual on the interpretation of the literary text (for those engaged in foreign philology) (manuscript): http://window.edu.ru/resource/096/42096/files/bogin_glava4.htm
- [2] Bogin G.I. Typology of text understanding. - Kalinin: Publishing House of KSU, 1986. - 85 p.
- [3] Gadamer G. Truth and method. Fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics. - Moscow: Progress, 1988. - 506 p.

*6th International Scientific-Practical Conference «Education
Transformation Issues» 23-29 December 2017*

- [4] Meng K. // Cognitive aspects of scientific rationality. Sat. sci. tr. - Frunze: KSU, 1989. - P. 50-58.
- [5] Heidegger M. The source of creation // Works and reflections of different years. - Moscow: Gnosis, 1993. - 333 p.
- [6] Schedrovitsky G.P. Reflection in activity // Questions of methodology. - 1994. - No. 3-4. - P. 76-121.
- [7] Schedrovitsky G.P. Selected works. - M., 1995. - 800 p.
- [8] Wild O. The Picture of Dorian Gray. - Moscow: Karo, 2010. - 400 p.