

Volodymyr Kovchak
Wydział Filozofii
Uniwersytet Narodowy im. Iwana Franki we Lwowie

Embodiment of the Interpretant in a Sign: Reconsider the Concept of a Sign as a Factor of Social Construction in the Frame of Embodied and Disembodied Mind

Słowa kluczowe: koncept, projektowanie rzeczywistości społecznej, interpretant, świadomość, konceptualizacja.

Keywords: perception, concept, construction of social reality, interpretant, mind, conceptualization.

1. Introduction

For a long time, the social reality has been considered to be identical/corresponding to the natural reality as it is created on the basis of complementation or correspondence: for instance, in Cartesian philosophy an innate idea of subjective cognition of a thing corresponds to the exact thing in the real life based on the metaphysical explanation of the method (according to R. Descartes – through the idea of God and innate ideas). Modern philosophy doubts this construction and R. Rorty all over again argues this construction in his work *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. The main point is that the mental image of things is not strictly identical to things themselves – as they actually are: in the social reality, there is probably no correlate for objects of linguistic reality as models, which are sources of logical categories, however, we think as though it actually exists¹.

Adres/Adresse: mgr Volodymyr Kovchak, Department of Philosophy, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Universytetska St. 1, 79000 Lviv, Ukraine, ynvive@i.ua.

¹ R. Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, Princeton 1979, p. 12–53.

According to Ch. S. Peirce, thinking is a communicative process performed through signs: thinking is necessarily a sign-oriented (semiotic) process and thinking is open (communicative) – i.e. a person can not be beyond social interaction, and a person performs communicative involvement, which characterizes him/her as active and rational. Hence, thinking can be identified with semiosis as dynamic, communicative and significant process of a sign and sign relations interpreting.

Ch. Taylor states that R. Descartes (similarly to the stoics) bases his ethics on physics². This means that ethics in R. Descartes' philosophy (as semiotic behavior strategy in society) represents the physical and real world (which stands as a representant). According to the prevailing philosophical tradition from the ancient world to modern times, God is a guarantee of the inviolability of physical and real world, and so is his representant (ethics, thought, cognition). It is similar to ideas of O. Bazaluk³. However, it is historically noticeable that each epoch finds its influence on the inviolability of physics. In the modern time dominant constitution of new social physics (establishing the norms of physical, material life of a man) causes dominant impact on ethics – domination constructs reality of different kind (punishment system, wage system, political elections, semiotic strategies of an individual selfish and sexual behavior, semiotic strategies for pleasures of life, etc.) and stands as a new guarantee of its order constitution: domination by changing and controlling of elaborated by it social body breaks representational mechanism and adjust a representant.

The purpose of this study is to advance understanding of a sign, compare and complement the sign model by F. de Saussure and Ch. S. Peirce (general sign model of Saussure-Peirce) and reconsider the concept of a sign as a factor of social construction in the frame of embodied and disembodied mind in Ch. Taylor's philosophy.

2. Sign in the process of social reality construction

Although social boundaries of conceptual understanding of reality and its perceptual grasp are impacted by direct reality, they are also set by social core of people's community. Reality is never a direct given (an exception could probably be mystical experience), but it is always mediated by signs: all our knowledge about the world is only our image view of the world, which can be subjective, but also can be analyzed and synthe-

² Ч. Тейлор, *Джерела себе: творення новочасної ідентичності*, Київ 2005, с. 203.

³ O. Bazaluk, *The Philosophy of Cosmos: the Place of Human at the Scale of Earth and Cosmos. Chapter One*, *Philosophy and Cosmology* 16 (2016), p. 28–42.

sized in so they can make a system of general ideas about the world, i.e. gain knowledge about the objective⁴. Systems of knowledge as a structured and organized system of signs and sign mediation create another (artificial, artistic) reality – the social reality: linguistic, symbolic, political etc. This poses the question about the relationship between artificially constructed social reality and natural reality, which, in fact, is the foundation for constructing any reality. For instance, according to R. Descartes, there can not be any contradictions between natural reality and social reality – the inviolability of two worlds is guaranteed by God as the creator of all. However, this explanation is not enough for the post-classical epoch. The reason is perhaps in massive and bloody social upheavals of the last century that ethics is not only strongly and assured based on physics, but also under dominant pressure can generate into something opposed to itself and subdue physics. This means the collapse of conventional correspondential theory of cognition, according to which true cognition is a reflection of the reality. The problem of representation rises as a result of this collapse.

As A. Karas' states, "in no way representation is a reproduction of reality, as it can be derived from Marxist epistemology and its theory of reflection. Representation is not a reflection of reality even in terms of its creative copy"⁵ as any structure assumes reality in which it occurs and which it finds and tries to transform. On the other hand, the reality appears, actualizes for the subject only through its constructive activity, and constructive significance of cognition (and interpretation) reveals as it represent dynamic social process between the body and the mentality of the subject in construction of reality⁶.

Cognitive function of the language necessarily involves an actively thinking individual. Human mind does not just exchange information (like a computer) or symptoms (like an animal), but both symptoms and meanings. The meaning of a sign is brought by an interpreter – subject of construction, which uses the sign and at same time constructs it⁷.

According to A. Baumeister, speech, during which a person operates abstract concepts, is involved and leads to a good as a direction for various ambitions of a human and humankind⁸.

⁴ В. Попов, *Физическая реальность и язык*, С.-Петербург 2004, с. 5.

⁵ А. Карась, *Реальність, репрезентація, семіоз і філософія [лекція]*, <http://www.old.lnu.edu.ua/teachers/file.php?file=821> (12.01.2017).

⁶ В. Лекторский, *Реализм, антиреализм, конструктивизм и конструктивный реализм в современной философии и науке*, Конструктивистский подход в эпистемологии и науках о человеке, Москва, 2009, с. 33–37.

⁷ В. Попов, *Физическая реальность и язык*, С.-Петербург 2004, с. 131.

⁸ А. Баумейстер, *Буття і благо: монографія*, Вінниця 2014, с. 16–18.

Language has two components, which could be called ideal component and material component. A sign as material component is a quantum of reality, quantum of existence and functions as carrier of an idea, carrier of meaning. A meaning becomes real through material component of a sign. Unlike the signal language of animals, a person uses propositional language which allows people to formulate abstract concepts which is impossible for animals: abstraction allows not only art and science, but also family and state. Moreover, a human thanks to the predicative structure of his/her language not only operates abstract concepts and orients in space of different practices, but also can evaluate and justify his/her practices, and gives a set of practices as this or that image of being, as certain picture of reality⁹.

The language and thought abilities of a person are a fundamental principle of constructing the world of social reality and constructing oneself in this world.

Social reality is not simply coherent to natural reality, but can be artificially (artistically) constructed as a tool of total exposure, manipulation, concealment of apparent in linguistic and symbolic, political, private sphere of being and establishing of a person. "Signal language is a system of signals that allow recipients to cause a certain reaction. Animals communicate using sounds and gestures associated with certain types of behavior. However, it does not distinguish between descriptions and orders, indicatives and imperatives"¹⁰. Unlike the signal language of animals, language of people has another important and fundamental characteristics that is not characteristic for animals: language of people is able to generate and maintain the illusion that allows even opposite practice.

Construction raises the problem of two social semiotic processes – the constitution and deconstruction. Semiotic construct becomes more and more conventional sustainable – constitutionality: constitution of a semiotic construct is a consequence of weakening, simplification and loss of referential mechanism, in context of what a constituted semiotic construct gain characteristics of primacy regarding reality because of the increase of iconicity (depiction) and weakening of referential mechanism. That is, the constituted semiotic construct more and more subordinates reality (according to its expectations) and teaches the rational sense to see in the reality what is in reality already can not be, but is constituted in the construct. The extreme case of this constitution can be passed through the effect of Don Quixote: I see what is not here;

⁹ Ibidem, c. 16–18.

¹⁰ Ibidem, c. 23.

I can not see what is here, because so dictates conventional reason and generally accepted norms. A human constructs reality but is never pleased with just constructing. Not only our created image of reality, but also our ability to sense and emotional experiences, our abilities of language and thought have ontological basis and need special ontological interpretation¹¹.

The constitution is semiotically made through codes of acceptance/non-acceptance – both perceptual and conceptual. (The concept can be expanded through perceptual data channel and perception can be loaded with conceptual paradigm; after all, the concept and percept are an inseparable complex).

Construction can be done regardless of the actual state of affairs, but regarding to the will of presenter-manipulator of such presentations and simulations, which can be achieved in the result of manipulation with interpretant, and through manipulation with interpretant – the manipulation with human intelligence including constructual project of social reality in general.

Constructing of social reality is achieved through the creation of signs and sign relations, which is the first and primary function of human mind as semiotic processes are fundamental in the formation (construction) of a person and community of people. A person is involved in sign relationships before any understanding of themselves in these sign relations, and the creation of new signs and sign relations is start of human thinking activity.

3. Embodied interpretant

In the sign model by Ch. S. Peirce (signified-interpretant-signifier) an interpretant appears as (h)noseological conceptual relationship between a signifier and a signified. Social reality is in a constant process of (self) construction which is caused by complicated complex of semiotic factors. Constructing social reality is primarily the construction of interpretant that carries a full range of subtle shades (value judgements, aesthetics, ethics) – which provides structural strength and vitality of interpretant. Therefore, the social reality is a social involvement of interpretant that consists of explaining the wealth of meanings (senses) of constructed by human reality. According to A. Karas', "to interpret means to construct and reconstruct the semantic space of meanings and provide the latest

¹¹ Ibidem, c. 16–18.

narrative, textual and discursive forms. To interpret is to search for a sign of ones concern in frame of virtual freedom, in its experiences connected with the communicative community. Interpretation is actually finding new semantic possibilities [...]”¹². Interpretation is a creation, stabilization and activation (application) of represented mental constructs or schemes¹³.

Interpretant is formed as an intellectual sense of sign relation – between a beyond-signed thing (a signified) and a sign proper which indicates that thing (a signifier). Such intellectual sense necessarily require the carrier as mediator of interpretant. Moreover, mediator is directly rooted in the environment of its existence.

Interpretant as pure conceptual relationship between a signifier and a signified is possible in the context of psychosomatic existence of human and humankind; interpretant is always the embodied (i.e. through the body that is physiologically, perceptually endowed with fears, expectations, dreams, disappointments, pain, disgust, apathy, passion etc.) – interpretant which is devoid of specific body is a fiction: it is in an essential way to be rooted in the body of interpreter, where percepts and emotions can make a strong impact on all the mental and (psycho)logical structure of the individual interpreter, thus, impact an interpretant. Moreover, because of external factor the interpretant is to influence the surrounding amorphous world, the reality of human life. Thus, the interpretant is essentially physiologically embodied in a particular body of interpreter and through the body of interpreter is rooted in cultural, political, social and physical reality of daily life of a person-interpreter. A human not only mentally complements, creates, reproduces, represents reality through intelligence, reflection, thinking, but also sensually (in animal way) reacts to stimuli. Intellect (thinking, interpretation), mind and body mutually define each other. Thus, the same sign can – **given meaning (interpretant) that it carries** – be intellectually thought and can – **regardless of sense interpretant, and given the perceptual content of the sign** – prior to intellectual be felt as a sensual stimulus-trigger, causing physiological, physical representation. The physical aspect of the cognitive subject is the correlation aspect of knowledge adequately to objective reality: “the process of analysis and synthesis of sense data by human thinking in the broadest sense can be called the primary stage of its objectification, and result of this activity

¹² А. Карась, *Реальність, репрезентація, семіоз і філософія [лекція]*, <http://www.old.lnu.edu.ua/teachers/file.php?file=821> (12.01.2017).

¹³ Г. Ленк, *К методологической интеграции наук с интерпретационистской точки зрения*, *Вопросы философии* 4 (2004), с. 50–55.

– knowledge that includes the aspect about subjective precisely because knowledge is the source of the data delivered by feelings”¹⁴.

Therefore, the impact on the interpretant is possible through influencing specific physicality of the mediator, on the physiology of interpreter, physics of his daily life. To such understanding of interpretant is appropriate to apply the concept of the sign within the meaning of F. de Saussure: interpretant and interpreter (= mediator) are both a signified and a signifier. The body of interpreter and the daily reality in which the interpreter abandoned, form a single unit with the world of thinking concepts, constructs: as embodiment of interpretant, in a sign originates continuing of not only intellectual thinking, but also social and physical or psychosomatic existence of a human and society. Thus, arose the possibility (and hence – the threat of manipulation, since the usurpation of interpretant may be due to effects on physicality) of impact on interpretant by passing a logical, conceptual mechanism of the sign through social and physical strategies of impact on the human body or the physical environment as a social order to maintain control over interpretant. Usually it can be seen in modern advertising which is not appealing to the semantic shades, logic concepts or virtues, but acts directly on the physicality, the physiology of consumer mediation, sexual images that act directly on the physiology of the body of mediator of the individual interpretant. Or in marketing strategy of product placement, where the “right” product is placed at eye level.

According to Ch. Taylor, the central figure in establishing disembodied mind in the history of European philosophy is R. Descartes, who clearly emphasizes the mental reflection (cogito) as implicit argument of human being and God being. The act of cognition is the foundation of ontology and epistemology of R. Descartes. As noted by Ch. Taylor, R. Descartes continues and fundamentally rethinks Augustinism against scholastic Thomism-Aristotelism¹⁵. In the philosophy of R. Descartes, the mind control leaves an instrumental role to desires – creation of an interpretation as tool to control own mind, not desires¹⁶, which is the reason of defect. The body is a source of passions: individual, selfish, often animal, related to food, sexual pleasure, fear, the will to live and have power. Freedom from passions, disengaging from them was a maxim of ancient philosophy, but ancient philosophy had never declared a complete break between the passions of the body and the mind. For Aristotle, passions are tamed not by denial, but by public education: i.e. socially

¹⁴ В. Попов, *Физическая реальность и язык*, С.-Петербург 2004, с. 5.

¹⁵ Ч Тейлор, *Джерела себе: творення новочасної ідентичності*, Київ 2005, с. 197.

¹⁶ Ibidem, с. 202.

prescribed overinterpretation which sets the general (common) rule of interpretations of their individual passions¹⁷. The state and society have always established domination over the passions through training and cultivation of passions that were right by the constitution and the ruling power in society, and moralizing transformation of other passions – those that have destructive potential for construction of power relations. In other words, the state/society taught the rules of interpretation.

4. Interpretant as a binary sign

The proposed model of the interpretant as a binary sign (according to the model by F. de Saussure, the sign is “bilateral psychic essence”¹⁸) can be fit into the context of embodied mind by Ch. Taylor, and the concept of interpretant (only interpretant, regardless of a signified or a signifier) in the context of the triadic sign relations by Ch. S. Peirce – into the context of disembodied mind. The concept of disembodied and embodied mind by Ch. Taylor is a breeding ground, on which sign model by Ch. S. Peirce and F. de Saussure can be combined. These two sign models do not match because model by F. de Saussure covers a smaller set of signs and sign relations, detailing only the interpretant and its mediator. When considering semiotic relations, the best is the triadic model of sign by Ch. S. Peirce, but if researchers’ attention is focused on one of three sign components, namely interpretant, then the description of the interpretant is appropriate to the sign model by F. de Saussure. Thus, we achieve evident visibility that the interpretant has two mediators, two embodiments – the first acts as embodiment of the interpreter (neural structures of the brain are the significant provision of thinking), and the second – the embodiment of a sign (for instance, speech and gestures are the sign provision of the result of thinking). According to F. de Saussure¹⁹, the diadic sign structure has a mental nature, expressed through the neural activity of the brain and associations: we note that both signifier and signified in the dyadic sign structure by F. de Saussure are mental constructs where, for example, a signifier can be a concept or mental representation, and signified – a unit neural activity in the cerebral cortex of the brain. A signified stands as a sign of a sign, as mark of sign, as label of a sign: a unit of neural activity in the brain is a secondary (internal) sign of that initial sign of reality that is beyond the subject.

¹⁷ Ibidem, c. 203.

¹⁸ Ф. де Соссюр, *Курс общей лингвистики*, Москва 1998, с. 66–68.

¹⁹ Ibidem, с. 66–68.

It is considered that representamen in the triadic model by Ch. S. Peirce corresponds to a signifier in the diadic model by F. de Saussure and “an interpretant – to a signified”, but this is misleading, as a signified by F. de Saussure corresponds to a representant by Ch. S. Peirce: an interpretant is a field of sign diad exercise, diadic sign outside the field of interpretant is not implemented, and, thus, an interpretant is apriori a given environment implementation of a diadic sign.

The synthesis of the triadic model of the sign (signified-signifier-interpretant) by Ch. S. Peirce and the dyadic model of interpretant by F. de Saussure together with application of psychophysiological approach to semiotic functioning of neural brain structures sheds light on many problematic semiotic processes, namely: a plurality of construction of object, interdependence of subject’s self-construction and construction by subject the social reality, the primary semiotization in neural structures of the cortex of the subject, correspondence of neurons structure activity of brain structures in subjective images, feelings and states of empirical subject, internal mental interpretation of the empirical subject by transcendental subject, secondary semiotization by internal mental interpretant of verbal and nonverbal signs of social reality, construction of social reality through discourse (verbal signs system) and representation (non-verbal signs system).

Although the cognitive mechanism of the subject is connected with the social constructed semiotic structures, it goes further than it – it dates back to the source of its activity, in itself. Meanings, ideas, images, notions, logical conclusions etc. – the internal mental representation of the external regarding the subject of the world. The social reality is constructed by the systems of signs, thus, we can talk about social semiosis. However, the inner reality of institution and being of subject is also constructed by system of signs, but others in nature than social signs. The inner reality is constructed by inside semiosis. But there is no isolation between the inner semiosis of subject and social semiosis – you can argue that between them there is – **at the determinant level** (after all, according to Yu. Lotman, “sign is a materially expressed replacement of objects, events, concepts in the exchange of information in a community”²⁰) – a correspondent link. Internal mental semiosis is subject’s own signs, signs of themselves for themselves – a kind of subjective internal standards of measurement of the external real world and the world of social reality.

²⁰ Ю. Лотман, *Об искусстве*, С-Петербург 1998, с. 289.

5. Social hazards

Signifying is a mental procedure, but in addition to procedures, signifying is a perception that applies to both a signifier and a signified. Besides, signifying is carried out in an environment that not only carries its cognitive background, but also a perceptive one.

Usually perception of reality (object), perception of a signifier or perceptual background are dismissed as insignificant, but the determinant may play the central role in the mechanism of manipulative intervention in signifying processes, semiosis, construction.

Manipulation technology can elect as the key aspect not the impact on signifying process, but the construction of perceptual carrier and perceptual background, so that conflict of sign with the environment of semiosis or conflict between a signifier and a signified can be achieved and intensified. The social transformations cause the series of mentioned conflicts²¹.

The point is that at the individual level and at the level of society, there is a certain perceptive selection, the sign also has some perceptual load (as both a signifier and a signified). If perceptual load of a sign is beyond the perceptual threshold of perception of an individual or community, the semantic message of sign deforms or is lost at all. Thus, considering the relative failure to pass the threshold of perceptual selection, a perceptual loaded sign has two options of deformation or loss of a message: 1) message is lost due to perceptual load of a signified 2) message is lost due to perceptual load of a signifier. Firstly, this means that only a small fragment of reality goes through perceptual selective filters of human and humankind, the expansion of which undertakes an exact science (which can be interpreted as a continuously expandable perceptual filter of humanity). Secondly, loss or distortion of a message meaning can be caused by perceptual unclear carrier, i.e. – signifier.

Manipulative dominantion in the modern information age can no longer restrict the flow and the free circulation of meanings, but it can exercise control over the body, over that material shell, in which embodied meaning is arranged. However, this is no longer sacred control, such as in the case with the church in the Middle Ages, for example. Manipulative dominantion in the modern era has power over physical desires, passions, but not in the sense of denial passions of the body with the aim of liberation and enlightenment of the mind, the overall progress to

²¹ S. Terepischy, *Futurology as a subject of social philosophy*, Studia Warmińskie 52 (2015), p. 63–67.

social benefits, but in the sense of cultivation, nurturing dominantly needed passions – i.e. the kind of passions that is needed for the constitution of dominance, not for development of a human.

6. Conclusion

Construction of social reality is implemented on the ground of physical reality, but the main impulse is given from within the construction. Moreover, the construction of social reality is made by semiotic factors, and, thus, we can identify the process of constructing social reality with **semiosis**. **Intellectual interpretation of a sign** is performed in the core of semiosis – as setting, perception and consolidation of the ideal sense, that a sign carries. Intellectual interpretation of a sign is a factor that gives semiosis (= process of constructing social reality) dynamics, mobility, energy.

On the one hand, understanding of these processes can lead to creative liberation of man and society, to the creation of new, different reality of many new prospects and opportunities for living. On the other hand, reinforcement of manipulation mechanism in semiosis can lead to intellectual enslavement of a human by authorities.

Crucially important that the dynamic process of semiosis is provided not only by processes in the core, but also by those that are outside the core. Therefore, it should be further emphasized that along with intellectual construction of interpretant in the process of semiosis, there is also a construction of limits of physical perception.

Together with the intellectual construction of social reality, subject uses a perceptive carrier (signifier) for fixing, maintaining, transforming and obtaining intellectual content of construction. Processes of semiosis (as semiotic processes of constructing social reality) can not be performed only intellectually. There is a need to involve and perform perceptual mechanisms of 1) real object, 2) perception of the sign as a carrier, as a signifier, 3) perception of the interpreter and 4) perception of the background as the perception of the specific characteristics of living interpreter.

It is the perceptual limits that are associated with specific body of interpreter and a specific physical environment of interpreter's life, and are the factors that **embody interpretant**. This is clearly shown by Ch. Taylor in the concept of embodied and disembodied mind. The implementation of this concept to the concept of sign by F. de Saussure and Ch. Pierce sheds more light not only on the model of the sign, but also

increasingly on semiotic processes of incipience and functioning of society, human being in the world and human existence alongside other.

While neglecting perceptual load of sign carrier, perception of constructing environment and perception of constructing physical reality is reduced to conceptualization, and then – to ascribing of ideas, on the basis of which manipulative ideologies are constructed. It should be noted that constructing activity of the subject is not a source only of knowledge, but also of emotional and volitional sphere. (However, at the same time we should emphasize and remember that perceptual processes are peripheral and not core ones: perceptual processes are important, but they do not define energetic movement of semiosis processes).

WCIELENIE INTERPRETANTA W ZNAKU: NOWE SPOJRZENIE NA KONCEPT ZNAKU JAKO CZYNNIKA SPOŁECZNEGO PROJEKTOWANIA W KONTEKŚCIE ŚWIADOMOŚCI WCIELONEJ I NIEWCIELONEJ

(STRESZCZENIE)

Jako mechanizm mediacji oraz tworzenia „integralności”, rzeczywistość społeczna semiotycznie jest skonstruowana przez znak i relacje znakowe. Rzeczywistość społeczna znajduje się w ciągłym procesie twórczym dynamicznych zmian. Zapewnia ją interpretacja intelektualna mechanizmu, realny świat, istnienie innego, znak, znakowe relacje, z pomocą których człowiek odsłania sens swego istnienia i włącza się do ogólnego projektowania rzeczywistości społecznej. Dynamiczny ruch od myśli do wiedzy, postrzegania, przyjemności życia codziennego odbywa się poprzez interpretację jako komunikatywny i semiotyczny proces wyszukiwania i zaangażowania społeczeństwa jako całości. Historycznie najważniejszymi modelami znaku i mediacji znakowej są znakowe modele F. de Saussure’a i C.S. Peirce’a. Te znakowe modele przez długi czas były krytykowane, ale mimo tego wciąż pozostają podstawą socjosemiotycznego mechanizmu mediacji między podmiotem a przedmiotem wiedzy i projektowania rzeczywistości społecznej. Po opublikowaniu książki Charlesa Taylora Źródła współczesnej tożsamości koncepcja F. de Saussure’a i C.S. Peirce’a nabrała wyjątkowego znaczenia, wyjaśniając wiele ukrytych mechanizmów semiotycznego projektowania rzeczywistości społecznej. Otwarty umysł, który jest głównym procesem semiozy, odgrywa ważną rolę w projektowaniu rzeczywistości społecznej. Chodzi o to, że myślenie ukierunkowane jest na projektowanie nowego obiektu, a interpretant – na budowę nowego tłumacza. Przy czym projektowanie obiektu jest procesem obwodowym, tzn. jest nośnikiem wartości społecznej i „całościowo” angażuje społeczeństwo. Ponadto dany obiekt jest zawsze nośnikiem określonych treści, w których zakorzenione są procesy intelektualne twórcy i odbiorcy określonego znaku odnoszącego się do tegoż obiektu. Zatem interpretant danego znaku zawsze potrzebuje współpracy z tłumaczem, który wstępnie objaśni mu poszczególne konteksty, w których poszczególne znaki w określonym społeczeństwie funkcjonują, oznaczając dane obiekty.

EMBODIMENT OF THE INTERPRETANT IN A SIGN: RECONSIDER THE CONCEPT OF A SIGN AS A FACTOR OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION IN THE FRAME OF EMBODIED AND DISEMBODIED MIND

(SUMMARY)

Social reality is semiotically constructed through a sign and sign relations as the mechanism of mediation and creation of “being together”. Social reality is in a constant creative process of dynamic change. It is provided by an intellectual interpretation of the mechanism itself, the real world, the being of other, signs and sign relations, through which a person finds the meaning of his/her being and is included in the overall construction of social reality. Therefore, the dynamic movement of thought to knowledge, to sense, to the joy of everyday life is made through an interpretation as a communicative and semiotic process of searching and involving the general community to another being. Historically, the most important models of signs and sign mediation is the sign model by F. de Saussure and Ch.S. Peirce. These models have long been criticized, but remained fundamental in the socio-semiotic mechanism of mediation between subject and object of knowledge and the construction of social reality. Following the publication of Ch. Taylor’s book “Sources of the self”, the concept of F. de Saussure and Ch.S. Peirce clearly gained social significance, in light of which many hidden mechanisms of semiotic construction of social reality become clear. Open-mindedness, which is the core process of semiosis, has a great importance for the construction of social reality. Basically, thinking is directed at the construction of a new body, the interpretant is directed at constructing a new interpreter. Of course, the construction of the body and physicality is not core one, but a peripheral process. However, it is not devoid of social value and also has potential in the construction of social community “being together”. Intelligent processes are rooted in the daily functioning of the body as their carrier, and the interpretant therefore provides an essential concrete interpreter. If the interpretant aimed against the interpreter as its carrier, then the question arises about “mechanism of truth” of the interpretant.

