

УДК/UDC 740

Диалог как специфическая форма познавательного процесса и медиации Новейшего времени (историко-генетический аспект)

Песоцкая Елена Николаевна

кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии, профессор Российской Академии Естествознания

Историко-социологический институт Мордовского государственного университета имени Н. П. Огарёва

г. Саранск, Россия

e-mail:cerera-office@mail.ru

ORCID ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8788-3472>

Макарова Юлия Александровна

кандидат медицинских наук, доцент кафедры нормальной и патологической физиологии

Медицинский институт ФГБОУ ВО «Национальный Исследовательский Мордовский государственный университет имени Н.П. Огарёва

Саранск, Мордовия, Россия

e-mail:yulya-mm@yandex.ru

ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2955-9986>

Белова Людмила Александровна

кандидат медицинских наук, доцент кафедры нормальной и патологической физиологии, профессор Российской Академии Естествознания

Медицинский институт, ФГБОУ ВО «Национальный Исследовательский Мордовский государственный университет имени Н.П. Огарёва»

Саранск, Мордовия, Россия

e-mail:lyudbelova@yandex.ru

ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6054-0111>

Шамрова Елена Александровна

кандидат медицинских наук, доцент кафедры нормальной и патологической физиологии

Медицинский институт, ФГБОУ ВО «Национальный Исследовательский

Мордовский государственный университет имени Н.П. Огарёва»

Саранск, Мордовия, Россия

e-mail:shamrova.elena@yandex.ru

Аннотация

Диалог как древнейший метод познания и как традиционное семиотическое выражение культуры способствует исследованию систем и способов социальной коммуникации. В настоящей статье диалог и диалогичность рассматриваются феноменологически. В качестве особой и специфической формы познавательного процесса и медиации, актуальной в Новейшее время, рассмотрены его особенности, проявляемые при включенности личности в многообразные системы социокультурного взаимодействия. В инструментальном аспекте он носит практическую ценность и представлен в настоящей работе на уровне функциональной целостности. Метод диалога относится к корпусу ритуальных методов, связанному с искусством самоизменения личности человека. Отдельные исторические этапы развития данного метода, их характерные черты анализируются в сравнительном соотношении. Каждый из этапов носит свои специфические особенности, связанные с онтологической проблематикой, этикой, коммуникацией и метафизическим миром человека. В современности диалог всецело отражает особенности и онтологию коммуникации. Это моменты «присутствия» и принципы социальной перцепции времени-пространства в контексте символической модели медиареальности. Последняя, в свою очередь, меняет типологию субъекта. Методами настоящего исследования послужили аналитический и диалектический, а также сравнительный и описательный подходы к познанию.

Ключевые слова: диалог, метод познания, диалектика, инструментальность, ритуальные методы, диалогическое искусство, рефлексия, культура, культурный диалог, коммуникации, медиареальность, самопознание, метафизический мир личности

The dialogue as a specific form of cognitive process and mediation of the New times (historical and genetic aspect)

Pesotskaya Yelena Nikolayevna

Candidate of Philosophy, assistant professor of the Department of Philosophy, professor of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences

Ogarev Mordovia State University, Historical and Sociological Institute

Saransk, Russia

e-mail: cerera-office@mail.ru

ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8788-3472>

Makarova Yulia Aleksandrovna

PhD in Medical Science, Associate Professor, Department of Normal and Pathological Physiology

Medical Institute, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University

Saransk, Russia

e-mail: yulya-mm@yandex.ru

ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2955-9986>

Belova Ludmila Aleksandrovna

PhD in Medical Science, Associate Professor, Department of Normal and Pathological Physiology

Medical Institute, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University

Saransk, Russia

e-mail: lyudbelova@yandex.ru

ORCID/ResearcherID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6054-0111>

Shamrova Elena Aleksandrovna

PhD in Medical Science, Associate Professor, Department of Normal and Pathological Physiology

Medical Institute, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University

Saransk, Russia

e-mail: shamrova.elena@yandex.ru

Abstract

Dialogue as the oldest method of cognition and as a traditional semiotic expression of culture contributes to the study of systems and methods of social communication. In this article, the speech and the dialogue are considered phenomenologically. As a special and specific form of cognitive process and mediation, which is relevant in modern times, its peculiarities, manifested when personality is included in diverse systems of socio-cultural interaction, are considered. In the instrumental aspect, it is of practical value and is presented in the present work at the level of functional integrity. The method

of dialogue refers to the corpus of ritual methods connect with the art of self-change of a man's personality. The individual historical stages of development of this method, their characteristic features are analyzed in a comparative ratio. Each stage has its own specific features related to ontological issues, ethics, communication and the metaphysical world of a man. In modern times, dialogue fully reflects the peculiarities of the ontology of communication. These are the moments of "presence" and the principles of social perceptions of time-space in the context of a symbolic model of mediareality. The latter, in turn, changes the typology of the subject. The methods of the present research were analytical and dialectical, as well as comparative and descriptive approaches to cognition.

Key words: dialogue, method of cognition, dialectic, instrumentality, ritual methods, dialogue art, reflection, culture, cultural dialogue, communications, mediareality, self-knowledge, metaphysical world of a personality

Dialogue is one of the most important phenomenological characteristics of culture, which forms and implements the essential forces of a person in dialogue as an exchange of information, emotions, values. The dialogic character is directly existential values that determine the spiritual world of the person and its attitude to itself. The dialogic nature of existential values is communication with the outside world: a man reaches them through an internal reflexive dialogue. As the oldest method of knowing the world, dialogue performs an instrumental function, which is of practical value. It manifestes itself with the development of human speech and communications. The latter, orally and in writing, is the basis for the transfer of lessons learned. Cultural dialogue is a reflection of the socio-anthropological dimension of the personality as a subject of communication. The development of dialogue in the conditions of scientific and technological progress is polyphonic: if earlier several persons in the same place participated in the dialogue, then with the advent of the Internet millions of people can simultaneously participate in it. Dialogue is possible both between two separate persons, and between groups, collectives, classes, the people, cultures. Thus, the simultaneous inclusion of the individual in many systems of interaction and collective unity as "cumulative groups"[3, p. 74] becomes the functional integrity and subject of a wide socio-philosophical study. As a method of achieving truth, dialogue

is multifaceted and unique. The bright periods of its millennial history as an instrument of knowledge are: the period of classical ancient dialogue and the dialogue of the 20th century, studied in detail in the works of M. M. Bakhtin.

The genesis of communicative models obtained in the social and humanities sciences [2] demonstrates the constant variability of the basis, principles and mechanisms of communication, starting from the Middle Ages. From this period until our New time, a symbolic model of mediareality was formed [Ibid. С. 331] as the result of information exchange in society. The dialogue as an instrument of cognition of the everyday and scientific plan is generated in ancient Greece by philosophers and speakers in the process of development of democracy. People's assemblies and discussions (political, social and many others) encouraged thinkers of that time to improve their art of conducting dialogue to prove their thoughts to the opponent.

Speakers of antiquity - Lysius, Demosthenes, Longip, Priscus, Nikagor, Aristide, Isocrates, Antisphenes, Diogenes of Sinope, Socrates, Protagoras, Plato, Aristotle - formed their own dispute management system with the strict of presence of several techniques that could force the opponent to accept their point of view. The basis of the dispute is a certain provable position of the speaker, from which it is not customary to leave until the end of the conversation. Epithets, quotes, phraseologisms reflecting the meaning of what was said and at the same time the personality of the speaker are used as confirmation. They were also used dosed in certain places, for aestheticism, which personifies classical ancient dialogue. We can observe it in the works of Socrates, Euripides [1], Plato [8] and others, and partially attribute it to the group of ritual methods, which is associated with the art of self-change of a man as a person.

The result of the gradual improvement of dialogical art was the emergence of the sophist school and the school of Socrates. For philosophical dialogue in sophistic, a characteristic feature is the synthesis of philosophical and artistic speech, and a new characteristic is the close relationship with dialectics. Such a dialogue is more a thing for identifying the winner in a dispute, evidence, than a means of knowing the truth.

Sophists skillfully played on the opposites and relativity of some concepts, "good" and "evil," "justice" and "truth," "necessity" and "randomness," "absolute" and "relativity" in their close relationship, skillfully answering the questions of opponents.

Sophistics gained great popularity among the population for a number of the following reasons: in the disputes of the sophists, ordinary everyday problems were raised, and not philosophical issues that were far from ordinary citizens, which were understandable to most; extraordinary usefulness in various disputes, court sessions and other ordinary problems; The opposite of basic concepts, allowing flexibility and resourcefulness, as well as a huge arsenal of various language techniques that help prove one's idea; sophists opened schools for mastering the basics of dialogue and dialectical thinking, building correct and beautiful speech, epithets, comparisons and metaphors for misleading an opponent.

The school of sophists, as a breakthrough of its time, brought philosophy to the masses, having developed the foundations of subjective dialectics, catalyzing the development of oratory and political art. A weak link in sophistics was that speakers, with the frequent use of relativity of fundamental concepts, erased the border of truth and lies, truth and reality. This made it possible to inspire the meanings of communists, which impeded the knowledge of the truth. Socrates, and due to Plato, in contrast to sophistics, considered dialogue a means of knowing the truth for all its participants, without connecting the method with the identification of the winner in the dispute. Socrates believed that the dispute was useful only as an impetus to the dialogical and dialectical movement of the thought of the participants, in the process of which they collectively learn the truth.

Plato, as the continuator to Socrates, brought the art of conducting dialectical dialogue to improvement. In his dialogues [6; 7] he touched upon the problems of dialectics, human thinking, society, morality.

Plato's dialogues are the top of oratory art, on which the characteristic features of the method have become: the direction of dialogue to identify the truth; full equality of participants; the presence of a conflict that pushes

participants to find a common truth for all, rather than to defend their point of view; aesthetics of conversation, using stylistic techniques that do not mislead interlocutors; the ability to both speak and listen.

The problem of dialogue in the works of the Russian philosopher M. M. Bakhtin is revealed in such a way that dialogue appears as a method of man's knowledge not only of other people's thoughts, ideas of feelings, but also of self-knowledge. Characteristic features of the participants of the Bakhtin's dialogue are:

- 1) the uniqueness of the participants. Each participant in the dialogue is unique in his thoughts, beliefs, actions,
- 2) the situation of the border - the thinker believes that every dialogue, whether between people or between cultures, is conducted in a position on the borders between "I" and "Other,"
- 3) "non-alibi in being this category Bakhtin conveys the responsibility of the person who finds in the dialogue; dialogue here is a kind of act (9).

According to Bakhtin, the word should never be given to one speaker, it is always common, and each of the participants in the dialogue can use it.

This is Bakhtin who considers the dialogue from the positions of hermeneutic bases of the research of phenomena - as a system of interactions "I "You," or if this is a monologue "I "It." The philosopher approves that a person can reveal himself only in the context of other people, when interacting with them. Bakhtin attaches great philosophical importance to literary works. The philosopher believes that literature is not just words on paper, but it is a dialogue between the writer and the reader, who helps the latter to know the philosophy embedded in the work. Compare the structure of dialogue at different stages of its development.

(Table 1):

№	Analysis criteria	Sophistry	Socrates and Plato systems	M. M. Bahtin
1	Dialogue purpose	Win a dispute	To Know the Truth	Finding yourself as a person
2	The nature of the conversation	unequal	equal	equal
3	Purpose of using conflict of interests	To prove the point of view and to win a dispute	Message to participants to find a common truth	Push for participants to realize their place in the world
4	Topics addressed (frequent)	Everyday problems, problems of contrasts	Everyday problems, problems of opposites	Philosophical problems
5	Victory in the dispute	One communicant	Mutual Knowledge of Truth	Participants learn themselves and a position of another
6	Use of special vocabulary	Use of various lexical means to prove their correctness (epithets, comparisons, meta-forms)	Top of communicative aesthetics	Use of speech and terminology only understandable to both participants

Таблица 1

The changing structure of communicative and space over time transformed the worldview and worldview of modern a man, changed his subjectivity as «carrier» of social phenomena [4, с. 7-8], which became increasingly "soluble" in media and social reality. Consequently, socially significant meanings have also undergone transformation due to the emergence of new communicative principles, the formation of new communicative channels and environments. As a method of cognition and a form of exchange of information, values and meanings, dialogue fully reflects the features of communication "presence" and the principles of social perceptions of social time and the space of modern time.

The human worldview also acts as its conceptual "language," that is, as an instrument of communication, in relation to which the idea of scientificity and humanism takes on a special aspect [5, p. 109].

When analyzing the value of two historical stages of dialogue development as a method of cognitive process, the following results are obtained

Dialogue is one of the ancient and traditional methods of human cognition of the world, the genesis of which goes through several stages of development with its specific features related to everyday problems, ethics, communication and the metaphysical world of a man, who undergoes radical changes along with media reality in modern times.

Therefore, the study of methods of using instrumental properties of worldview [5, с. 77], relates to the metaphysical world. It is necessary in ethical preparation and as a study of a method of forming a cognitive construct that actualizes the instrumental properties of the worldview.

With all the differences in the structure of construction, vocabulary of speech, the nature of conversation, at all stages of development, a single hermeneutic aim was actualized - a person's cognition of his inner and world surrounding him, which actively manifested the combination of external and internal communications as a way of obtaining meaningful guidelines.

Список литературы:

1. Еврипид. Елена / Еврипид. Полное собрание трагедий в одном томе; пер. Анненский Е. Ф. - Москва: Альфа книга, 2017. - 1130 с. - Полное собрание в одном томе. 603 с.
2. Кузнецова Е.И. Эволюция медиакультурных коммуникативных форм в эпоху модерна: социально-философский аспект. // Вестник Нижегородского ун-та им. Н.И. Лобачевского. Н. Новгород: Изд-во ННГУ. № 1. 2009. С. 331-337.
3. Песоцкая Е.Н. Эволюция методологии социального анализа человека в истории науки (антропофилософский аспект). Монография. Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та, 2015. - 112 с.
4. Песоцкая Е. Н. Природно-биологические факторы социальной активности личности (философский анализ). Автореферат на соискание учёной степени кандидата философских наук. Саранск, 1996. 16 с.
5. Песоцкая Е.Н., Зорькина А.В., Белова Л.А. Теоретические основы интеграции медицины и философии. Монография. Саранск, МГУ им Н.П.Огарёва, Тип. Рузаевский печатник, 2017. 186 с.
6. Платон. О знании/ Платон. Полное собрание сочинений в одном томе; пер. Шейнман-Тошштейн С. Я., Соловьев М., Карпов В., Егунов А. Н., Кондратьев Сергей Александрович, Ананьин С, ред. Басова Е.Г.- Москва: Альфа книга, 2018. - 1311с. - Полное собрание в одном томе. - 129с.

7. Платон. О сущем / Платон. Полное собрание сочинений в одном томе; пер. Шейнман-Топштейн С. Я., Соловьев М., Карпов В., Егунов А. Н., Кондратьев Сергей Александрович, Ананьин С, ред. Басова Е.Г.- Москва: Альфа книга, 2018. – 1311с. – Полное собрание в одном томе. – 182с.

8.Платон. Государство / Платон. – Москва: Наука, 2005. – 572с. – Слово о сущем.

9.Философия диалога М. М. Бахтина. [электронный ресурс] / Режим доступа: https://spravochnick.ru/filosofiya/istoriya_russkoy_filosofii/filosofiya_dialoga_m_m_bahtina/

References:

1. Euripides. Helena / Euripides. Complete collection of tragedies in one volume; per. Annensky E.F. - Moscow: Alfa kniga, 2017. -1130 p. - Complete collection in one volume. 603 p.

2. Kuznetsova E.I. The evolution of media-cultural communication forms in the era of modernity: socio-philosophical aspect. // Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University. N.I. Lobachevsky. Nizhny Novgorod: Publishing house of UNN. No. 1. 2009. Pp. 331-337.

3. Pesotskaya E.N. The evolution of the methodology of social analysis of man in the history of science (anthropophilosophical aspect). Monograph. Saransk: Publishing House of Mordov. un-ta, 2015. 112 p.

4. Pesotskaya EN Natural and biological factors of social activity of the individual (philosophical analysis). Abstract for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences. Saransk, 1996. 16 p.

5. Pesotskaya E.N., Zorkina A.V., Belova L.A. Theoretical foundations of the integration of medicine and philosophy. Monograph. Saransk, Moscow State University named after N.P. Ogaryov, Type. Ruzaevsky printer, 2017. 186 p.

6. Plato. On knowledge / Plato. Complete works in one volume; per. Sheinman-Topshtein S. Ya., Solovyov M., Karpov V., Egunov A. N., Kondratiev Sergey Alexandrovich, Ananin S, red. Basova E.G. - Moscow: Alpha book, 2018. - 1311p. - Complete collection in one volume. – 129 p.

7. Plato. About being / Plato. Complete works in one volume; per. Sheinman-Topshtein S. Ya., Solovyov M., Karpov V., Egunov A. N., Kondratiev Sergey Alexandrovich, Ananin S, red. Basova E.G. - Moscow: Alpha book, 2018. - 1311p. - Complete collection in one volume. – 182 p.

8. Plato. State / Plato. - Moscow: Nauka, 2005. - 572 p. - A word about existence.

9. Philosophy of dialogue by M. M. Bakhtin. [electronic resource] / Access mode: https://spravochnick.ru/filosofiya/istoriya_russkoy_filosofii/filosofiya_dialoga_m_m_bahtina/