

E. Rudenko (Minsk, Byelarus)

'TO KNOW' AND 'TO UNDERSTAND': MUTUAL RELATIONS AND WAYS OF MOTIVATION.

In the consciousness of a person thinking, understanding, knowledge are closely connected. The thinking does not come separately from the process of understanding and understanding is the purpose of thinking. In the same way knowledge is the result of understanding, all cognitive processes are closely interconnected. "For understanding and explanation of the reality it is necessary some beloved understanding: in one act of mental action all coordination of levels, all presuppositions and assumptions of this act is kept" [Mamardashvili, 1984, 10]. It is understanding, the principle, which underlies any research. "Before something to investigate, we understand it in some way; this understanding is the precondition of any research. But the research is the exit from the circle of pre-understanding: it is necessary to explain the realized fact. And the explanation should go by the way of system connections" [Antipov, 89].

These citations help to understand better the connection between mental processes named above. There are another relations between cognitive processes and memory. On words by M. Mamardashvili, "we could tell, that everywhere, where is consciousness, there is memory, but we can not tell, that everywhere, where is memory, there is consciousness" is not so direct reason-consequence as between understanding and knowledge.

Told above explains why semantics 'to know' and 'to understand' in Indo-European languages is not separated rigidly. The lexical-semantic groups of knowledge and understanding are largely blocked. In this article some aspects of ways of expression and mutual organization of the meanings 'to understand', 'to know' in separate Indo-European languages are examined. The language material will support theoretical reasonings.

From the point of view of the theory of information, all processes, which occur in the nature, are divided on two classes: physical and information. The information, on the most widespread definition, is the reflection, when the properties of one object become similar to the properties of another object. The more characteristics of one object are similar to the characteristics of another, the greater information have these objects about each other. Any reaction of object B on object A, any change in B owing to the influence of A is the increase of the information in B about A. From this point of view a blow with a hammer on a table is the information process, because on a table remains a trace. Then the difference between physical and information processes is reduced to the type of the carrier of information and some other "private" characteristics.

In general the relation between concepts (and appropriate lexical-semantic fields) "physical activity", "perception", "mental activity" is the subject of a special discussion, though this topic was spoken for a long time. Above it was told about division of all processes on physical and information. The three-measure physical space, in which a person lives, is completely designed on the world of the information: a person simulates the internal life in the same way, which his external life is organized. This axiom has been expressed, in particular, in the semantic qualifier of V. Martynov. In this qualifier those phenomena are reflected only which are characteristic for the majority of earthly languages, i.e. the question is about semantic universalities. Five information classes of the qualifier are completely symmetric to five classes physical.

In the field of information processes the perceptive and intellectual activity is not separately allocated. It is mathematically reasonable and, certainly, rational approach: the information essence of process does not change from what the origin information has. It can be received through bodies of feelings as a signal for processing (for example, smell of tasty food), or to be transferred through the certain semiotic system (as music, painting, etc.), or to be a product of own intellectual activity. For that, who receives this information and uses it, anything does not essentially change. In the semantic system of language this property is displayed that the perceptive and intellectual processes are grouped together in the information verbal classes within the semantic codes, developed by the different scientists and schools.

The spoken above characteristics and interrelations are kept in the lexical-semantic system of language. For example, in German languages the words with the meaning 'to understand' are often motivated by the semantics 'to put (together)', 'to collect', 'to separate', and sometimes by the meaning 'to take, to seize'. This last motivation is extremely widespread now, for example, modern E. *grasp* 'to take' - 'to understand' (*I grasped the main points of the speech*); *take in* 'to take' - 'to understand thoroughly, completely' (*I listened to the speech carefully, but still I couldn't take it all in*); *catch (on)* 'to seize, to catch' - 'to hear' - 'to understand' (*I don't quite catch the idea*). In the latter case the intermediate semantics of perception by bodies of feelings took place; it is represented, apparently, as the intermediate meaning in the previous cases, too. The same motivation has G. *begreifen*, which among other meanings has 'to understand' and ascends to *greifen* 'to take, to seize'. The way of motivation examined here is universal at least for Indo-European languages. E. *comprehend* 'to understand' - 'to cover' is borrowed from Roman languages. L. *comprehendere* (> It. *comprendere*, F. *comprendre*, Sp. *comprender*) < *prehendere* 'to take, to seize'. E. *understand*, G. *verstehen* 'to understand' was developed on the basis of semantics 'to stand before, under' through a number of intermediate meanings: 'to rise close to smth.' - 'to rise close, that

it it is better to apprehend smth.'. The similar development of meaning has Rus. представить - 'to imagine', the modern meaning of which, however, could be developed by semantic modeling of the similar German or Roman word. To the point, Byelorussian word with the same meaning уявіць has the initial semantics 'to show, to make easier for perception', that confirms once again indissoluble connection of perception and mental activity.

The considered above English verbs of understanding *understand*, *comprehend* in the majority of cases are free mutual-replaceable. The verb *appreciate*, which adjoins to them, was motivated by the semantics of perception. *Understand* frequently emphasizes just the fact of seizing, understanding, and *comprehend* — the process, which it is reached. Thus, *a person may understand a foreign language without comprehending exactly how he learned it*. Sometimes the difference between these two words is more thin: *understand* implies the effort for reception and registration of pure and exact impression, and *comprehend* — the mental act of complete understanding, seizing. Thus, *the concept of infinity can be understood theoretically though scarcely comprehended as a verify*. *Appreciate*, the third word of the given synonymic line, means revealing true value of an object and consequently is used regards to the people or things, the status of which is determined incorrectly (*you are of an age now to appreciate his character* — Meredith). According to English dictionaries of synonyms, the nearest to the examined synonymic line are the lexical-semantic groups with the generalizing meaning 'to think', 'to penetrate' and 'to explain', that confirms once again stated in the beginning of the article idea on the affinity of mental processes designated by them. To the point, the meaning 'to penetrate, to understand' is transferred, for example, by such verbs, as *enter*, that confirms the parallelity of physical and information processes, or *probe*, which illustrates the affinity of perception and thinking.

In the considered above synonymic line should be included other prefix derivative of the same root as *comprehend*, *apprehend*. It designates the intellectual efforts to know smth., however does not mean complete knowledge, understanding, but only a fluent sight on the nature, meaning, importance of the reflectioned object. *Apprehend* can mean the single mental act, and *comprehend* — the long and difficult process. Thus, *one apprehends many things (as infinity or beauty) which one can never comprehend*. The nearest lexical neighbours of *apprehend*, according to the dictionaries, are designations of seizing and visual perception in their metaphorical intellectual meaning.

From the point of view of C. Buck, modern E. *know* actually unites two major meanings: 'to know a fact' and 'to know a person, thing', which were transferred earlier by two different words [Buck, 1208]. In many modern German and Slavic languages there are two words with the meaning 'to know' (Rus. знать; G. *kennen*, *wissen*), but their semantics now is not differentiated precisely. The presence in many Indo-European languages of two verbs with the meaning 'to know' is connected with their development. Rus. ведать, знать, E. *know*, G. *kennen* are related in their origin, the same as Byelor. *уЦбм*, Rus. *уЦбл*, G. *wissen*. About it wrote O. Trubatchov: "For the Indo-European dictionary two different, at the first sight, stems are known, **gen-* 'to be born, to be in relationship' and **gen-* 'to know'. But that the meanings 'to be born, to be in relationship' and 'to know' are directly connected, the interesting peculiarity of the use speaks which not casually was well kept in a number of Indo-European languages. Except **gen-* 'to know', Indo-European languages know other root **uoid-*. The comparison shows, that they were differentiated in the use: I.-E. **gen*, *g(e)no* 'to know' was originally used in such contexts as *I know a person*, and **uoid-* — *I know a thing*, i.e. **gen*-1 'to be born, to be in relationship' > **gen*-2 'to know (a person); **ueid-* 'to see' > **uoid-* 'to know (a thing)'. Indo-European language, apparently, did not know the united abstract term 'to know'. About it speaks the obvious second character of both terms 'to know', which ascend to special concrete designations" [Трубачев, 154-157]. Thus, the origin of Rus. знать, E. *know*, G. *kennen* is found out. As to Byelor. ведаць, G. *wissen*, they, as follows from written above, were motivated by the meaning of visual perception. And when in any language one word was kept only (E. *know*, L. (*g*)*noscere*), it compiled all meanings.

Byelor. *разумець* (<оіаоу) 'to understand' is also connected on the origin with the semantics of visual perception: OSI. **umo* < I.-E. **au-mos* > Khet. *au-*, *aus-* 'to see' [Трубачев, 154-157]. Almost all of named above verbs with the meaning 'to know, to understand' transfer semantics 'to know, can, know how', and in the latter (Byelor. *блцм*) one can see it even in the history of development. It is interesting, that the meaning 'to know', which "blocks" with 'can, know how', rushes into the sphere of modal verbs. See, for example, E. *can*, G. *kennen* (which, to the point, also occur from I.-E. **gen*-2) 'to know, know how, to can', where the last semantics dominates. It is possible to meet the same mixture of the modal and intellectual semantics in Slavic (see, for example, Byelor. *ен і на-беларуску можа і на-польску*) and in modern German languages (see, for example, E. *beyond/outside/ not within one's ken* 'about smb.'s knowledge, opportunities').» The derivatives of English verbs *know* and *cognize*, the origin of which was examined above, *acknowledge* and *recognize* are synonymic in the meaning 'to recognize', but *recognize* means the more complete degree of recognition: *the ladies never acted so well as when they were in presence of a fact which they acknowledged but did not recognize* — Meredith. English dictionaries of synonyms consider the words *accept*, *admit*, *receive* 'to accept', 'to allow' close on semantics to *recognize*. In the main meaning they concern to the modal sphere (to the point, the same connection is in Byelorussian and Russian languages). The verbs *notice*, *note*, *observe*, *remark* 'to observe', 'to notice' are also semantically close to *recognize*.

nize, and it confirms once again, that any word with the meaning of perception easily develops intelligent semantics.

The word *cognize* is characterized by the dictionaries as rigidly book and is not considered the synonym to the verbs *perceive, discern, note, remark, notice, observe, contemplate, see, behold, descry, espy, view, survey* with the meaning of visual perception, where each word can get semantics 'to learn', 'to study'.

The nearest neighbours of the verbs with the meaning 'to know', according to the dictionaries of synonyms, are designations of the visual perception in their metaphorical meaning (see the previous paragraph), word with the meaning 'to seize' (*grasp, seize, take*), the verbs of understanding (see earlier) and the lexical-semantic group with the generalizing meaning 'to penetrate'. Thus, in the system of language the lexical-semantic groups with the meaning 'to understand' and 'to know' are directly closed.

REFERENCES

- Buck C. 1949. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. Chicago.
Martynov V. 1995. Universal Semantic Code: USC-5. Minsk.
Pokorny J. 1959. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern.
Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms. 1988. Springfield.
Антипов Г. Историческое прошлое и пути его познания. Новосибирск, 1987, с. 89.
Аперсян Ю. Ботякова В. и др. Англо-русский синонимический словарь. М., 1979.
Мамардашвили М., Пятигорский А. Символ и сознание. Иерусалим, 1982, с. 23-24.
Мамардашвили М. Классические и неклассические идеалы реальности. Тбилиси, 1984, с. 10.