

Communication failure as communication power

Ștefan Vlăduțescu

University of Craiova, A. I. Cuza, no. 13, Craiova, Romania

E-mail address: stefan.vladutescu@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

After all communication remains a bitter idea that one could communicate properly, and better, and more efficient, and lower overall costs. The idea that persists after any communication is that the communication was imperfect. Being imperfect, any communication is also a failure. The power of communication is the communication failure. The failure is to not express yourself perfectly, or speak more or less than you should, or could not say everything, or being misunderstood. In essence, the failure and the primary means of communication to improve the communication could be expression, speech, discourse. Discourse can be verbal or non-verbal. In linguistic communication works the principle of general expression, the principle of strong effability (J. J. Katz). The range of expression through language we record influence of idea of ineffable: it is thought, content, feeling, feelings, expressiveness that cannot be expressed. Ineffable principle seems to be secondary. In fact, the natural state of the world is ineffability. Effability and Ineffability of communication are complementary principles. The power of communication is in communication failure. Perfection of communication cancel communication, perfection does not allow self-reproduction of communication and therefore stimulate its implosion. Deficient communication process development support communication; communication failure is the communication power. Communication failure is a relatively late theoretical discovery of communication discipline. It follows in a subsequent paper to investigate "the principle of communication failure" that emerges from the research of several renowned experts in General Science Communication (C. R. Berger - 1995, J. D. Noemi Marin - 2007).

Keywords: communication failure; communication power; principle of expressibility; principle of effability; principle of ineffability

1. INTRODUCTION

The failure of communication and communication power derives directly from a live communication tension between ineffable and effable. Cogitation cannot exist beside of a certain language. The discursive device put into language a cogitation that by formatting and expressing can change the triggering and opening a direction of communication. Two aspects are here delimited: cogitation and meaning through which this is self modeling in conveyance. Cogitation becomes vouching meanings that later are put into language and "language" (from putting into language) as message. Language, before to come to a inference-cogitation, is simply meaning. The pre-discursive stage of cogitation is represented by the meanings. Meanings are the nucleus of communication. Message is constituted from meanings.

2. FROM INEFFABILITY TO EFFABILITY

"Effable" has Latin etimon ("effari" - constituted from "ex-" - "out" plus „fari" - "to speak"), and comes directly from Late Latin and Old French word "effabilis" - "speakeable"; "effable" means able to be put into words, capable of being expressed in words or able to be described in words. Withal, "ineffable" which have also an Latin origin means something that cannot be expressed or described in words.

To "put in new accent" the old and wise cognition, as attributive invoked Mihai Eminescu, the most Romanian poet, is the form of the discourse producing. Originally thought message and constituted of meanings, without endowment concerning interpretation instructions arrives in language. This is the moment when the second time cogitation intervenes thinking the first message as designated message (Neacșu, 2006). That is the first thought is an unlimitted message of the idea of interpretation. The message reached the consumer is thought also as object, not only as meanings. It is not sent free of obligations and forms, but loaded of the interpretation instructions, so that nested as to arrive effectuated as the starting message (Dina & Văduțescu, 2012).

In this area essential for communication and, in particular verbal communication, two patterns were found which were known principles. John Searle (1969) talks about "the principle of expressibility" and J. J. Katz retains "effability principle" (Katz, 1982). The principle says that the reality of thought, feeling and will can be expressed, can be described, can be communicated through language. W. Lycan retains a "rule of effability".

John Searle admits that a language may not have a syntax and a vocabulary rich enough "to allow to say whatever we want to mean in this language" (Searle, 1969, p. 21). In principle, there is nothing to prevent us to complete an insufficient language or to find one more prosperous that allows us to say what we want to mean. We should say that thinking is vouching and is generating interpretation and performing meanings, that putting them in a language to form a message. Concerning the pointing of meanings, in philosophy of the language are two trends: one focused on the meaning of the sentence and the second focused on the using of the expressions within discourse situations (Măruș, 2007; Ionescu, 2008).

The phrases meaning theory is created by G. Frege, then caught up and consolidated by L. Wittgenstein and J. J. Katz. The words and expressions using theory in situations of discourse has as founder L. Wittgenstein. In other words, at L. Wittgenstein we found both of these incompatible positions: in his early works, he illustrates the meanings of sentences. Alleged Wittgenstein is situated, after Searle (1969, p. 22), with the idea of words having meaning as is given in using in a broader resonance trend. If you look closer the two highlighted trends we observe that the first is phrasing, and the second is discursive, i.e. trans-phrase. Therefore, these actions are complementary. The message process is outlined as follows: meanings are put into language, from the phrasing section and from the trans-phrase trend of the discourse are distinguished the meanings of the consumed message.

We can say that the message is unlimited. This feature of the message is the result of a principle functioning of meaningful thinking effability. Effability means illimitableness of expression. Effability is the infinite capacity of the language tools to put in discourse cogitation. Effability is opposite ineffability, describable to indescribable oppose, expressing to unexpressing oppose. John Searle detects this phenomenon of effability. But he calls it, unrevealed "principle of expressibility" and formulates it as "whatever can be meant can be said" (Searle, 1969, pp. 19-20). We must understand by this "principle of expressibility" that every language has available a finite set of words and syntactic rules by means of which we can put

in discourse cogitations. Thought is only a form of cogitation. J. J. Katz formulates, similarly, the "effability principle" (Katz, 1978).

A certain language cannot impose any upper limit expressing because effability consists of an unlimited expressing. If some cogitation reaches the limits of the language, this is only a contingent fact. Essentially, language and cogitation are limitless (Vlăduțescu, 2013a; Vlăduțescu, 2013b).

In "A Theory of Semiotics", Umberto Eco opposes this opinion. He shows that despite the fact that "language is the most powerful semiotic artifice", it does not satisfy "general expressibility principle" (Eco, 1976, p. 230). To admit that at some point the language does not dispose of whole tools necessary to put certain cogitation in discourse is one but to promote the idea that language itself does not satisfy the condition of the principle is another.

On the other hand, in his "Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus", Ludwig Wittgenstein prefers to talk not about the ineffable, but about the inexpressible: "There is indeed the inexpressible. This shows itself" (Wittgenstein, 6.522) (see also Dumitru, 2004; Ghinea, 2006). Always a limit of the language will be overcome by language: who does not have a word to express the truth will coin it. Rational knowing created the most of the language words, even if some basic vocabulary is pure and completely arbitrary and unconventional. Communication reaches at a moment a non-communication. Non-communication is one permanently exceeded limit and failure of communication.

To principle of the expressibility, John Searle assures a memorable equation: "for any meaning X for any speaker S means (intends to convey, wishes to communicate in an utterance etc.) X then it is possible that there is some expression E such that E is an exact expression of or formulation X" (Searle, 1969, p. 19). The principle does not imply at all that it would always be able to find or to invent a phrase which for all will produce the desired effect on consumers. These would be the effects of literary, poetic, emotional, beliefs etc. On the other hand, the principle does not employ the idea that everything that can be said can also be understood by others, which would exclude the possibility of having a proper system of comprehension. There are cases where the producer does not say exactly what he wants to mean. The principal consequence of the principle concerns those cases where the speaker does not say exactly what he means - the principal kinds of cases of which are nonliteralness, vagueness, ambiguity, and incompleteness - are not theoretically essential to linguistic communication" (Searle, 1969, p. 20). There are added also pre-suppositions and participatory, which together with implicit form the implicative.

A complementary principle is the principle of ineffability: effable is a result of a permanent battle with ineffable. Ineffable is natural state of the world. Effable always wins. Ineffable always come to battle. Effable is one. Ineffable is multiple (Kukla, 2013). Consideration of the effable-ineffable ratio is needed in order to plan and conduct effective communication. This is required because, as demonstrated by N. Asher and A. Lascarides, "people often mean more than they say" (Asher & Lascarides, 2003, p. 526). T. Pateman believes that "the principle of effability" means a situation in which "for every thought, there is a corresponding eternal sentence". In relation to Searle's Principle of Expressibility ("the principle that can be meant whatever can be said" - Searle, 1969, p. 19) and Katz's Principle of Effability ("each proposition can be expressed by some sentence in any natural language" - Katz, 1978), M. Albl-Mikasa develops "The Principle Express-ability" "to capture the nature of the human effort for expression" (Albl-Mikasa, 2013, p 101). In turn, Nirenburg, Beale, Mahesh, Onyshkevych, Raskin, Viegas, ... & Zajac (from University of New Mexico) extend Katz's Principle of Effability and formulate "The Practical Principle of Effability": "for most meanings Expressed by a word in one language, there is a word in Another Language Which

expresses this Meaning, though it May express different meanings, too "(Nirenburg, Beale, Mahesh, Onyshkevych, Raskin, Viegas, ... & Zajac, 1996).

K. von Fintel and Matthewson L. believe that Jerrold J. Katz illustrates "the Strong Effability Hypothesis and Translatability Thesis" (von Fintel & Matthewson, 2008) as well as E. Collin (2012). So we have "strong effability" (J. J. Katz, 1978) and weak effability (E. L. Keenan, 1978).

Noting that "strong effability" by J. J. Katz is a theoretical ideal, E. L. Keenan stands for "weak effability" ("Anything which can be thought enough can be expressed with precision for efficient communication") (Keenan, 1978). So, we have defined two approaches of effability.

From principle of the effability can be drawn a corollary. The corollary is that all what is understood, what is assumed, what is involved can be delivered. In every thought and every spoken there is an unthinkable and unspoken, philosophy must put into discourse ("to bring to language") everything. How can bring to language what is un-thought? Origin of the cognition is an un-thought that is hard put in discourse, appealing to the test language itself. Language missing of the cogitation is ineffable or the language expression of the cogitation missing. The components tools of the discursive device may to confront with the moment difficulties concerning the operating reliability: the flowing states of absolute effability are called relative ineffable, and a moment of thought stoppages are denoted as un-thought.

Effability is not perfect, it is general and is not unlimited. Effability is not homogeneous. Heterogeneity of effability consist of fact that some elements are quickly expressed their target and reach their target more difficult. Some ideas are more easily expressed, others are more difficult to express. Some express ideational objects are denser more condensed, others are more permeable even cooler. Without thinking heterogeneity phenomenon, as we conceive, several specialists talk about "weak effability" and "strong effability" (Ogarkov, Soriano & Lehr, 2012; Arhip, 2012).

F. Recanati notes rightly *efabilității* existence of limits: "limits of expressibility" (Recanati, 2003, p. 189), and P. Kolaiti accentuates "limits of expression" (Kolaiti, 2010). By default, the recognition of the limits of effability means to admit the existence of ineffability. We believe that any ineffable can be annihilated. Ineffability is only one point out of the way of effability. Finally, any effable becomes ineffable. At the limit, effable becomes ineffable and vice versa. Finding the ineffable is the first moment of its transformation effable. In the core of effable is always ineffable. The world is made of ineffable. The ineffable is the natural state of the world. What man brings is effable. The effable is the power of man. The effable is the power to communicate and power of communicating. Even, silence is a form of effable.

On the other hand, M. L. Schnitzer is "against effability", accepting yet no ineffability (see also Archie, 2009).

Silence reveals more effective than speech, because speech naming things or cogitation phenomena put them from the process, get away them from heraclitean flow. Immobilization causes destruction. The extraction from flow means destruction. Language but produces this effect: out of flow (Shopovski, 2011; Shopovski, Bezzina & Zammit, 2013; Traistaru, 2013). Language proves its inadequacy when it comes to express spontaneity and process in their immanence.

3. CONCLUSION

Effable is visible in direct, honest, and persuasively non-mined communication. For this ideal is allocated admirable energy. Ineffable is currently struggling with the language. The

ineffable stands often communication failure. Large quantities of mental energy, emotional energy and volitional energy are allocated to preventing and overcoming communication failures. Who consumes power has power. You can not actually consume what they do not own. By energy consumed, communication failure is an indication of the power of communication. Effort, willingness and effort to communicate shows fear of failure even in the failure and, simultaneously, indicates the power of communication. Communication failure is the power of communication.

References

- [1] Arhip O., *Philologica Jassyensia* VIII/2 (16) (2012) 123-127.
- [2] Asher, N., Lascarides, A. (2003). *Logics of conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Berger C. R. (1997). *Planning strategic interaction: Attainig goals through communicative action*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [4] Dima Ioan Constantin, Vlăduțescu Ștefan (2012). *Persuasion Elements Used in Logistical Negotiation: Persuasive Logistical Negotiation*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert.
- [5] Dumitru M. (2004). *Explorări logico-filozofice*. Humanitas.
- [6] Ghenea V. (2006). Language and reality. Some aspects of realism in the philosophy of language. *Analele Universitatii din Craiova. Seria Filosofie*, (17), 157-165.
- [7] Ionescu A. (2008). *Modalisateurs illocutoires et argumentation*. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.
- [8] Iorgulescu A. (2009). Sense and poetic dramatic. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Limbaj și Literatură Clasice*, 6(1-2), 64-68.
- [9] Katz J. J. (1978). *Effability and translation*. In F. Guenther & M. Guenther-Reutter (Eds.), *Meaning and translation: Philosophical and linguistic approaches*, (pp. 191-234). London: Duckworth.
- [10] Keenan L. (1978). *Some logical problems in translation*. In F. Guenther & M. Guenther-Reutter (Eds.), *Meaning and translation: Philosophical and linguistic approaches*, (pp. 157-189). London: Duckworth.
- [11] Kolar P. (2010). *The Limits of Expression : Language, Poetry, Thought*. London: Bloomsbury College London (University of London)
- [12] Kuhlmann A. (2013). *Ineffability and philosophy*. Routledge.
- [13] Marin N. (2007). *After the fall: Rhetoric in the aftermath of dissent in post-communist times*. Peter Lang.
- [14] Neacșu A. (2006). *Arheologia și evoluția conceptelor filozofice*. Editura Universitaria.
- [15] Nirenburg S., Beale S., Mahesh K., Onyshkevych B., Raskin V., Viegas E., ... & Zajac, R. (1996, April). Lexicons in the Mikrokosmos project. In *Proceedings of the Society for Artificial Intelligence and Simulated Behavior Workshop on Multilinguality in the Lexicon, Brighton, UK*.

- [16] Ogarkova A., Soriano C., Lehr C., *Lodz Studies in Language* 24 (2012) 3-35.
- [17] Recanati F. (2003). *The Limits of Expressibility*. In B. Smith (ed.), *John Searle* (pp. 189-213). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Searle J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Shopovski J., *European Scientific Journal* 10 (2011) 98-104.
- [20] Shopovski J., Bezzina F., Zammit M. M., *European Scientific Journal* 9(7) (2013) 14-31.
- [21] Strechie M., *Analele Universității din Craiova* (2009) 92.
- [22] Traistaru Aurelia, *Jokull Journal* 63(9) (2013) 125-135.
- [23] von Fintel K., Matthewson L., *The Linguistic Review* 25(1-2) (2008) 139-191.
- [24] Vlăduțescu Ștefan (a). *Jokull Journal* 63(8) (2013) 186-197.
- [25] Vlăduțescu Ștefan (b). *Jokull Journal* 63(9) (2013) 301-311.

(Received 25 November 2013; accepted 29 November 2013)

RETRACTED