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Abstract

This study aims to emphasize on a preliminary basis that any communication takes into account as understandable an idea of a message. Using the hermeneutical method and a corpus of philosophical texts, the research argues that any speech, whether linguistic, philosophical, administrative, etc. is driven, trained, articulated by the thought of a message; so, it is concluded that in any communication the message is understandable. Rarely, communication takes the understandable message explicitly as a theme; in any case, however, communication is always impregnated by the thought of an implicit understandable message.
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1. Introduction

The message concept can only develop within a conceptual device that also includes communication. There is no message without message, but no message without communication. Therefore, any communication map that does not mark the message is an incomplete map. Diacronic speaking, the basics of the message concept were laid by the mathematical theory of communication, of cybernetics, and were consolidated by the theory of information. Important contributions to its initiation have brought linguistics, semantics and semiotics, pragmatics and communication science [Communicative - J.-A. De Vito (1982), Communicative - G. Métayer (1972)].

There is a legitimate question: where was philosophy at this time? The inference that philosophy stood on one side or that she was behind in the message is a false message.

In a surface photograph of philosophy, the message does not appear. But if an X-ray is done, it will be noticed that the message is right in the heart of philosophy. It’s not abnormal at all. Man is self-discerning from the outside to the inside. Hands are in the field of primary evidence, while the brain is a scientific evidence. No philosopher would have written or spoken unless he had something to say. This “to say” is loaded with an assumption to be validated and that means what is to be said is a thought before the thought of saying. If something becomes an object of practice, then it is in the constitution and it is also given. Whoever has something to say has before he starts to say it. What he has to say does not always coincide with what will be said later. “To be said” anticipates the message. What we have to say is the message. Something to say, something to show, something to indicate, something to show, something to be exposed, something to be represented, some forms of message. Once the question is asked, the answer is as it is. These forms can be narrowed into the message concept. They differ according to the material used and the intended purposes. Since a “to say” is aware, part of it has become a message. E. Benveniste denotes this to be said: “What the locator wants to say” (Benveniste, 1966, p. 36). Each communication gesture initiates a process, attracts something to say.
2. History and concept

The first science that proposes an intent entered into history is philosophy. Socrates introduced in philosophy the message “know yourself”. Hegel definitely assigns him to Socrates (Hegel, 1963). Professor Gheorghe Vlăduțescu, after Diogene Laërtius, assigns Thales’ apologism to Miletus (Vlăduțescu, 1996, p. 9). E. Husserl, in Cartesian Meditations, analyzes the message as belonging to the delphic temple, and, after passing it through the epiche filter, states: “Thus the delfic word (...) acquires a new meaning. You must first lose the world through the epoch, in order to regain it later in the universal reflection on your own self” (Husserl, 1994, p. 197). What does it mean that the message acquires a “new meaning”? This means that the message has an old meaning, meaning it includes meaning, meaning it is meaning. For Husserl and Hegel the idea that the message is made of meaning is understood (Alkilani, 2017), it is self-evident. That is why E. Husserl only poses a new significance.

What can be said as intuition is that in the philosophy so far the concept of philosophical message has been understood (de Beer & Mentz, 2017; Baic, 2018; Renea, 2018). Our belief that great philosophers have not used the concept of message should not be invested in the negativity of lack of message (Karpf, 2016; Qatawneh, 2018), but in the wisdom of never denying it. Hegel’s nothing, like that of Heidegger, concretises a message. The philosopher of “nothingness” becomes the core of cardinal significance. The second definition of the Absolute, Hegel points out, is nothing. The highest form of nothingness is freedom. The being is, however, precisely what is absolutely devoid of determinants, and the same lack of determination is nothing. The truth of being, as well as of nothing, is the unity of both, that is, the becoming. Being and nothing is the same thing. Being is the transition to nothing and the nothingness of the being. By becoming, both are overcome, and the result is being-in-fact (Dasein).

Science does not want to know anything about Nothing. By removing him, she calls him back. Nothing is properly recognized as such. Thinking, by its essence, is always the thought of something. It is not possible for us to do anything from the Nothing. Nothing is more original than nonsense and denial. Nothing is the complete denial of the totality of being. Fear Nothing. Only
Nothing brings Dasein to Being as Being. The pure being and the pure thing are one and the same thing - this Hegel’s proposition is justified. Human Dasein can relate to something of the being only when it is maintained in Nothing. The passage beyond being occurs in the essence of Dasein. But this passage beyond is metaphysical. Philosophy moves only through the leap in the fundamental possibilities of Dasein. To accomplish this jump, it is decisive to give space to the being in its entirety, also to get caught in Nothing. This is the fundamental question of metaphysics that Nothing itself compels us to ask: Why is it actually being, and not, rather, Nothing? If we did not know anything about Heidegger then this philosophy - a message of nothing - could be attributed to Hegel.

Here we have Hegel’s nothing, the italic text (Hegel, 1995, pp. 153-169) and Heidegger’s Nothing (1988, pp. 36-51). Dasein is common. Heidegger continues on Hegel, stepping back. The dialectic of becoming is turned into a metaphysics of the passage (“going beyond being” - Heidegger). The Message of Nothing-Nothing is like being about being: self-knowledge.

Philosophy does not refrain from invoking the message, but considering the message-message as a non-conceptual normality leaves the message to say itself. For the receiver, the message actually comes after. The transmitter emits it without completely dominating it, the receiver only knows it after (Karpf, 2016; Frunză, 2018; Kakalejčík, Bucko, Resende & Ferencova, 2018). Everyone has their own message. Their coincidence is in the rare part of the probability. As the receiver appreciates having received a specific message, the transmitter must have sent another message. In reality, the message is a building, a house that is not called a house until after it has been finished and is good to live. Lifting a home is a cognitive process of progressive installation of “home”. The house is being built parallel to the cognitive implementation of the “home” idea. Analogously, the message is effectively generated during communication, in cognitive convergence with the insertion of message cognition. Sending a message is the cognitive process of installing the idea and the message-substance (Motoi & Popescu, 2017; Jøsang, 2018).

The philosophical message is being built up to the middle of the 20th century without the philosophical message concept. Spirit gradually gathers material: signs, signals, symbols, clues.
meanings, meanings, meanings, meanings, in a word, meanings (Roșca, 2017; Rehor & Vrchota, 2018; Drămnescu & Enăchescu, 2018).

The concern of philosophers for this type of material comes from a preoccupation, from the care of a higher order: that of the message. To be able to convey their ideas, they have to give them a perceptible form. As such, they build messages using these materials. The processing of raw material is also a fundamental process. Moreover, once a material of signification has been used, the message triggers, the intention is not necessary or any other effort (Craig, 2018; Qatawneh, 2018; Бенчев; Starovoytova & Namango).

The construction material used predominantly by philosophers in the fulfillment of their conceptual organization of projects is the meaning. Philosophical work also attracts signs, clues, meanings, signals, concepts, concepts (Anton, 2016; Nicolescu, 2017; Unguru & Sandu, 2018).

For Kant, “the pure concepts of the intellect have no meaning”, when they are separated from the things in themselves (noumena)” (…) “The pure concepts of the intellect appear to have a much greater significance (Kant, 1987, p. 149). Without this understanding the categories are totally useless. The essence of the category system: through this system the true meaning of the pure concepts of the intellect and the condition of their use can be precisely determined “The already formed knowledge of logical relations, Hegel argues (Hegel, 1995, p. 15), is the first condition for a correct understanding of a philosophical fact.” “The fact of philosophy is already developed consciousness. There is only reflection in the sense of thought following thought” (Hegel, 1995, p.10).

To support our idea, from E. Husserl we will remember that “any great philosophy is not only a historical fact but also has in the development of the life of the spirit of mankind, even a teleological function of a particular kind, be the ultimate assessment of the experience of life, the cultural formation, the wisdom of its age. Let us pause for a moment to clarify these concepts. As a personal habitus, the experience is the sedimentation of acts of an attitude of natural experience achieved in life” (Husserl, 1996 p. 57).
In Heidegger's conception, the raw material for the edification of the world is language. “Thinking, it shows, builds the shelter of being” (Heidegger, 1988, p. 337). “Language is the place of shelter of the being, given by the being and fully grown by it, the shelter of man’s essence. Language is the place of shelter of the being, in which the ec-sister man lives, belonging to the truth of the being, which he watches. Not man is the essence, but the being as a dimension of ecstatic ec-sistence” (Heidegger, 1988, p. 315). “Language is not essentially the exteriorization of an organism, nor the expression of a living being. If the essence of the tongue is concerned, it cannot be conceived by its character as a sign, and perhaps not of its significance. Language is the appearance, which both illuminates and conceals, of being itself “(1988, p. 308). “We think the phonetic and graphic structure as the body of the word, the melody and the rhythm as the soul of the tongue, and the value of meaning as its spirit” (Heidegger, 1988, p. 314).

L. Wittgenstein, among the great philosophers, was the one who was at his closest time to the debate about the raw matter of the message. Neither did he cross the boundary that separates, and at the same time binds the order of significance to the order of the message. The sign, meaning and meaning appear to him: “The unused sign is meaningless. If everything behaves as if a sign had meaning, then it really has significance” (Wittgenstein, 1991, p. 52). Philosophical discourse is built as “a critique of language” (Wittgenstein, 1991, p. 54). The message is critical itself.

In his debut, re-edited in 1993, Constantin Noica commits to weigh “every meaning and meaning” (Noica, 1993, p. 7), to use only the facts that have one meaning, for the philosopher must realize the “meaning” (Noica, 1993, p. 34). Creators, the Romanian philosopher shows, “imbibes things with new meanings” (Noica, 1993, p. 50). “The question of the foundation of knowledge” is “whether to understand means to find or to make meaning” (Noica, 1993, p. 51, 52). He also considered that the word “cumine” means the intimacy of human communication, since “it only occurs if there is a rest, and the better, the greater the rest area. Communication is data, signals, meaning (or even meaning; Communism is meaningless” (Noica, 1987, p. 190). The rest to which the Romanian philosopher refers is what the addressee understands in the message he was sent to.
3. Conclusion

It follows that, in the perimeter of philosophy, as it was normal, semiotic-semantic materials are used to form the message, and philosophical messages are built just before the abstract and general idea of the message has been created. Significant practice is, as usual, before the theory of practice itself.
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