



The International Association for Cognitive Semiotics



UMCS
WYDZIAŁ FILOZOFII I SOCJOLOGII

Dymitry **Okropiridze**, dimitry.okropiridze@zegk.uni-heidelberg.de
Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Germany

Cognition as a Hyper-Cartesian Phenomenon and a Hypo-Hegelian Fact. A Cognitive Semiotics Model beyond Dualism and Dialectics.

Whenever we philosophize about mind, body, and society or psychologize cognitive, neural, and social processes, an entanglement of confounded ontological assumptions about the world, its agents, and their respective interactions takes place.

This epistemic abyss has deeply troubled the entire history of philosophy and accompanied the development of the empirical sciences. It has also challenged semioticians as students of general meaning making to become bridge builders and connect the cliffs of matter and ideas, the concrete and the uncertain, indivisible elements and irreducible complexity.

Far sweeping considerations have helped to connect and position the differing logics of molecules and metaphors if only on an evolutionary scale with constant reference to semiotic thresholds as structural boundaries.¹ They have not, however, explained the simultaneously antithetical and reciprocal tendency of materialist and discursive ontologies. On the one hand, even the most elaborate dyadic system (following the Saussurean camp and Poststructuralist theory), emphasizing the constantly deferred signified cannot resolve a lingering duality between material substances and discursive interpretations; on the other, the reality of material objects cannot be extracted from their socially mediated process, even if integrated in a triadic sign model (following Peirce).

This paper takes its point of departure from the epistemic position, in which cognition is coinstantaneously dualist and dialectic and therefore – philosophically speaking – a hyper-Cartesian phenomenon and a hypo-Hegelian fact. In other words, cognition has a dualist and a dialectic mode of functioning, which are constantly present.

I will argue that only a general model of the very *entanglement* of dualist and dialectic ontologies can explain the reciprocity of mutually exclusive dynamics in the evolution of sign systems and shed new light on semiotic thresholds as evolutionary boundaries of revolutionary emergence.

For this reason, three axiomatic processualities, which are common to all systems of signification – “Constraints”, “Re-Iterations”, and “Ascriptions” – will be introduced and exemplified using examples from all major semiotic levels as elaborated by Jordan Zlatev.² The central advantage of the hereby presented “CRIA” model lies in the non-static nature of the processualities, which can be studied from neural constraints to socio-historical re-iterations up to linguistic ascriptions.

¹ Cf.

Stjernfelt, Frederik. *Diagrammatology. An Investigation on the Borderlines of Phenomenology, Ontology, and Semiotics*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009;

Zlatev, Jordan. "Semiotic Hierarchy: Life, Consciousness, Signs and Language." Edited by Peer F. Bundgaard. *Cognitive Semiotics* (De Gruyter) 4 (Spring 2009): 169-200.

² Cf. e.g. Jordan Zlatev's plenary lecture at the Tartu Semiotics Summer School, 2015: <http://www.uttv.ee/naita?id=22394> [09.01.2016].